

Issues Discovered During 2022 Tutor Awards and Recommendations

Issue	Recommendation
Anonymisation of the nominations, was a time- consuming task.	Support from the staff team and a group of representatives to share this workload further. It was under-estimated how much work this would involve.
2. Students on cross-faculty qualifications often nominated a tutor for one faculty award, when they were based in a different. For example, we had 3 nominations for a tutor based in WELS for the FASS panel to determine. This was a result of the students studying for a degree in Arts and Humanities (Creative Writing).	Awards can be generalised, instead of being faculty specific.
 Many responses focussed on the pastoral support received from tutors. This was great to see but was often hard to differentiate between what was a tutor doing what was expected of them, and what was going above and beyond. 	Split the questions so that those have supported academically and pastorally, including the impact this had, stand out. This will also help when appraising nominations, as different panel members will look have differing areas of priority. Having separate questions will provide greater consistency. Additionally, better guidance on how to score applicants ahead of the meeting will help in this area.
 Due to the late development of the idea, the process seemed condensed, with the end (award giving event etc.) still not fully determined. 	A longer lead in time, with a more complete plan at the outset will help the smoothness of the process.
5. Presentation of the nominations to the shortlisting panel was not ideal. With nominations running into 40+ for two panels, this led to some initial confusion.	With a longer lead in time, there will be opportunity to improve on how this is presented. Clear indication of when a tutor has received multiple nominations will also be of benefit.
6. Some panel members were of the belief that support levels, and subsequently expectations, would vary dependent on level of study. Not knowing what level of	Ahead of future iterations of this project, consideration should be given to the level of anonymity versus the benefits of sharing more information with shortlisting panels. It should be



		-
	study the nomination referred to hampered them in this	noted that panel members felt that the anonymity did help to
	area.	uphold the integrity of the process.
7.	Due to Access receiving a significantly lower number of nominations (3), it was decided to incorporate	Consideration of the composition of the panels and the appointment of a sole chair in all panels.
	deliberations into another panel for efficiency reasons.	appointment of a sole chair in all panels.
	However, this led to two FARs chairing one panel, and	
	concerns were made that have two chairs meant that	
	there was no single, casting vote in the event of a tie.	