**Advance HE General Themes Emerging from CATE Reviewer Feedback 2024**

All 2024 CATE nominations were judged against two award criteria which are summarised below:

**Criterion 1 - Excellence in the Team’s Collaborative Approach:** *Evidence of excellence in the team’s approach to working collaboratively, commensurate with their context and the opportunities afforded by it.*

**Criterion 2 - Excellence in the Impact of Collaborative Working:** *Evidence of the team having a demonstrable impact on teaching and learning, including beyond their immediate academic or professional area.*

Some general themes emerged in the feedback received from all reviewers across the 2024 CATE nominations and a summary of these issues is provided below.

**Areas of strength:**

Where reviewers identified areas of strength in the 2024 CATE nominations, the following themes emerged from their feedback:

* There was strong evidence of teams’ reach, value and impact, demonstrated in a range of ways:
* Evidence of impact was highlighted in terms of positive outcomes for students (particularly those from disadvantaged backgrounds) and for institutions (on strategy, policy and practice as well as on staff). Evidence of a team’s impact being clearly linked to their collaborative approach was also highlighted.
* Evidence of reach was clear in terms of breadth of support across the institution and beyond, within the discipline, cross-institutionally, nationally and internationally and in terms of engaging groups who are normally hard to reach.
* Evidence of value was clear in terms of the benefits realised for team members, students and external partners.
* There was convincing evidence of the team’s collaborative approach, particularly in terms of the following:
* How the team collaborated effectively with one another, with other parts of the institution and with external partners;
* Evidence of an authentic partnership with students at the centre of the team’s working model, with a clear sense of how students knowingly enhanced the collaboration.
* Demonstration of a genuine collaboration based on interdependence rather than simply a cooperation between individuals;
* A coherent sense of the strengths each team member contributed to the benefit of the collaboration as a whole and, in turn, how the collaboration supported and developed individual team members;
* A clear sense of the vision, values and ethos of the team. In this context, some reviewers commended a commitment to inclusivity;
* Evidence of continuous monitoring and evaluation processes for teams which enabled them to build resilience, drive sustainable change and respond to evolving sector priorities.
* Evidence of a commitment to sustained excellence; in terms of ensuring the continued diversity of team members and the bonds of trust between them. Evidence of an ongoing critique of collaborative practices.
* Claims were underpinned by strong and varied evidence.
* The claim received strong endorsement from the Institutional Statement of Support.
* Claims were structured or written in an engaging and coherent way.
* Context Statements were well-crafted and enabled reviewers to understand what was transformative about the team’s practice in their context.

**Areas for development:**

Where reviewers identified areas for development in the 2024 CATE nominations, the following themes emerged from their feedback:

* Claims could have been strengthened by providing more practical detail about the ‘mechanics’ of the team’s collaboration. Specific areas that could have been further developed included: how the team operated, both with each other and with external stakeholders; how the team worked with students (beyond simply seeking feedback through consultation); the value of the team’s collaborative approach and any pedagogical underpinnings for this; how the team’s collaborative approach directly informed their reach, value and impact; more focus on the nature of the collaborative approach rather than on description of the team’s project; how the team continuously reflected on and evaluated their processes, continuously responded to feedback and overcame challenges as a group; and, how the team’s approach reflected a true collaboration rather than a cooperation.
* Greater evidence of impact was required in a range of areas, including on team members, on the institution (in terms of practices, and on learning and teaching), on student learning and outcomes (including disaggregating data which demonstrated impact for students from underrepresented backgrounds), and on other institutions and external partners. Some reviewers sought evidence that the team’s impact went beyond the normal remit of their role (even when performed excellently), whereas others highlighted that the team was referring to potential future impact, which does not provide sufficient evidence.
* Greater evidence of reach was sought further than the immediate team and field; for example, across the institution and beyond into the wider sector and in terms of engaging hard to reach groups.
* The quality of the evidence could be improved in a range of ways, including: more detailed and/or varied quantitative and qualitative evidence; avoiding an overreliance on testimonials and streamlining the length of testimonials; narrowing the scope of the evidence provided and clearly linking it with the team’s remit; ensuring evidence was directly relevant to the criterion and avoiding repetition of evidence; and, for criterion two in particular, ensuring there was a stronger underpinning of quantitative evidence.
* Ensuring the claim had not been made too early and had acquired sufficient time for reflection and evidence.
* Ensuring the claim was written and structured in a coherent and effective way
* Ensuring that sufficient context was included in the Claim to make it readily understandable for those not familiar with the team’s project.
* Ensuring that Claims followed the formatting requirements set out in the guidance, for example by not including hyperlinks in the Claim.