**General Themes Emerging from NTFS Reviewer Feedback 2024**

All 2024 NTFS nominations were judged against three main award criteria which are summarised below:

**Criterion 1: Individual excellence:** *Evidence of enhancing and transforming student outcomes and/or the teaching profession; demonstrating impact commensurate with the individual’s context and the opportunities afforded by it.*

**Criterion 2: Raising the profile of excellence:** *Evidence of supporting colleagues and influencing support for student learning and/or the teaching profession; demonstrating impact and engagement beyond the nominee’s immediate academic or professional role.*

**Criterion 3: Developing excellence:** *Evidence of the nominee’s commitment to and impact of ongoing professional development with regard to teaching and learning and/or learning support.*

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

**Areas of Strength:**

Impact and Value were frequently mentioned, strongly evidenced by a combination of qualitative and quantitative means. For instance, the benefit of nominee practice on both student outcomes and transformation of the student experience was often noted, the latter supported by positive student quotes. A focus on inclusion and widening participation was a recurring theme as was the influence on the teaching practice of others and on HE policy.

Reach was frequently mentioned in terms of evidence of the wider dissemination of good practice, both within the nominee’s institution and beyond, including at the regional, national and global level, and in the student groups targeted. Notably, reviewers also commended highly localised impact and the commensurate value to those impacted.

Evidence of the nominee’s approach to their practice was commended in various ways, for example; their passion for teaching and in particular for reaching and supporting underrepresented groups; a clear pedagogical underpinning to their practice, and evidence of creativity in their practice.

Evidence of the nominee’s commitment to continuing professional development (CPD) and its positive impact on their own practice.

Reviewers frequently commented that the Claim was clear and well written, in an effective and engaging style.

**Areas for Development:**

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

• Further evidence of reach, value and / or impact would have strengthened some claims:

Impact: more explicit evidence of impact on student outcomes and/or colleagues’ practice was frequently mentioned. The need for more quantitative evidence of outcomes, beyond satisfaction, was also highlighted.

Reach was frequently mentioned, but in broad terms. Reviewers often commented that the evidence for ‘reach’ could be made more explicit. Some commented that the Claim had been submitted too early and more time was required to build a body of evidence; or that more evidence of how the nominee’s practice was exceptional and resulting in transformative reach, value and impact was required.

Value was also frequently mentioned, again in broad terms. Reviewers commented particularly that a clearer articulation of the value of the nominee’s practice on teaching and learning or the value for students and colleagues would strengthen the claim. Sometimes reviewers suggested that quantitative data might help to articulate value more effectively than evidencing value using a descriptive narrative.

• Reviewers identified the following **development points** in relation to some Claims that could strengthen the supporting evidence that had been included:

Providing greater detail and depth in the evidence. Fewer, more persuasive examples that clarify the nominees individual contribution to larger pieces of work might evidence the criteria more effectively.

Streamlining the number and length of testimonials used to allow nominees to maximise their use of the word count for evidencing their claim.

Including a breadth and balance of evidence types, particularly including quantitative data. Some commented that quantitative evidence could better demonstrate the impact of the nominee’s activities on students.

Ensuring there were no significant unexplained gaps in the timeline of evidence presented. Gaps led some reviewers to question whether excellence and impact were sustained.

• Some reviewers commented that **more focus** was needed on the **impact and value** of the nominee’s practice rather than on the theoretical underpinnings; conversely some reviewers commented that the pedagogical underpinning of the nominee’s practice could be more clearly articulated.

• Some reviewers noted that **Claims could be further developed** in various ways, for example some reviewers felt that nominations had been submitted too early and more time was required for the development of evidence, particularly to demonstrate reach and impact. Some reviewers felt that nominees might have benefitted from the support of a mentor to develop their Claim more effectively and to fully understand the criteria. Finally, some reviewers noted that the presence of typographical or grammatical errors and/or missing or incorrect references impacted the quality of the claim.

• Some reviewers noted that the **guidance** regarding the supporting documentation **could be followed more closely:**

The Context Statement could be used more effectively, particularly in terms of clarifying the nominee’s role. Reviewers commented on the distinction between the ‘normal’ scope of the nominee’s job role versus their practice beyond this and that the Context Statement might have better helped to define this distinction.

The Institutional Statement of Support contained evidence of reach and impact that was not included in the Claim; the Statement of Support was stronger than the Claim or that the Statement of Support did not effectively support the Claim.

The Reference List sometimes included an excessive number of references.

• Some reviewers highlighted that **evidence** had been included that **was not relevant to the NTFS assessment criteria**. For example, evidence was presented that did not always refer to higher education, but to secondary education. Some found that claims were more aligned to an application for Senior or Principal Fellowship than NTFS. Some reviewers also found that although the evidence provided was relevant to the NTFS criteria overall, evidence was provided under the ‘wrong’ criteria, which resulted in less space overall to evidence all criteria equally.