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### Associate Fellowship Booklet

### **Leadership in Education Awards Programme**

**On behalf of the LEAP programme team, I would like to welcome you to the Leadership in Education Awards Programme (LEAP) and support sessions for Fellowship applications**. **We hope that you find this resource booklet useful in supporting your application.**

LEAP is accredited by AdvanceHE (formerly the Higher Education Academy) and can award Associate, Fellowship, Senior and Principal Fellowships.

This programme supports you in documenting and evidencing your teaching excellence and is your opportunity to receive a formal national qualification for your teaching or to enhance your HEA fellowship status.

“This is…a great endorsement of the priority that the Faculty places on Teaching & Learning excellence - and will provide invaluable evidence for reporting against the proposed Teaching Excellence Framework” Gillian Wallis, Vice Dean for Teaching, Learning and Students.

In addition to the workshops, we have in place peer support groups, LEAP mentors and a champion’s network offering advice and feedback on your application. As Director of the **Centre for Academic and Researcher Development and Academic Lead for LEAP, I welcome you onto the programme.**



**Professor Judith Williams**

**Director of the Centre for Academic and Researcher Development**

**University of Manchester Academic Lead for LEAP**

### Associate Fellowship assessment criteria

### Associate Fellow Pathway (D1, AFHEA)

You are able to choose between submitting a written Portfolio of no more than 1,500 words or a pre-recorded oral presentation of no more than 10 minutes (plus a 500 word written piece to answer any questions). The assessment criteria are the same for both pathways and assessors will use the same pro-forma.

### AFHEA Portfolio route

There is a word limit of 1,500 words for the written portfolio. It must include an introduction (no more than 500 words) that sets the context for your application and gives a brief career history. The main part of your application consists of two 500 word case studies. These case studies must illustrate your achievement and impact in two areas of activity (A), core knowledge (K1 and K2) and appropriate values (V) from the UKSPF - both should be reflective in nature. Your application should highlight how you meet all the D1 criteria from the [UKPSF](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=22140). It may be helpful to view the assessment criteria prior to starting your application. To support your application you will need to complete a mapping exercise and provide two referees’ statements.

### AFHEA Oral presentation route

The oral presentation should be pre-recorded (slides and voice over, or a video of you giving your oral presentation to a camera). It should be up to 10 minutes in duration and cover two examples of practice. This must illustrate your achievement and impact in two areas of activity (A), core knowledge (K1 and K2) and professional values (V) from the UKPSF. It will be followed up by questions from the assessors which you can respond to in a 500 word written piece. In addition to your presentation you need to complete a mapping exercise and provide 2 written referees’ statements, which will highlight how you fulfil the D1 criteria from the [UKPSF](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=22140). A maximum of 1 page A4 handout may be provided to the assessors in addition to a copy of the PowerPoint slides. Your PowerPoint Slides can include notes at the bottom but these must not be extensive. Further guidance will be given in the workshop on the content and number of slides.

### My initial thoughts on which route of assessment to take

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

### Mapping my activity against the UKPSF

Capture your initial thoughts around the evidence that you may use

**Areas of Activity - You only need to demonstrate activity against 2 areas of activity**

A1 Design and plan learning activities and/or programmes of study

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

A2 Teach and/or support learning

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

A3 Assess and give feedback to learners

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

A4 Develop effective learning environments and approaches to student support and guidance

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

A5 Engage in continuing professional development in subjects/disciplines and their pedagogy, incorporating research, scholarship and the evaluation of professional practices

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

**Core Knowledge - You should consider what evidence you have for K1-2**

K1 The subject material

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

K2 Appropriate methods for teaching, learning and assessing in the subject area and at the level of the academic programme

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

K3 How students learn, both generally and within their subject/disciplinary area(s)

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

K4 The use and value of appropriate learning technologies

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

K5 Methods for evaluating the effectiveness of teaching

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

K6 The implications of quality assurance and quality enhancement for academic and professional practice with a particular focus on teaching

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

**Professional Values - You may want to consider which of the values you are able to discuss**

V1 Respect individual learners and diverse learning communities

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

V2 Promote participation in higher education and equality of opportunity for learners

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

V3 Use evidence-informed approaches and the outcomes from research, scholarship and continuing professional development

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

V4 Acknowledge the wider context in which higher education operates recognising the implications for professional practice

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

### Advice for completing your AFHEA Fellowship application

* It's a good idea to make the direct connections for the assessors between the assessment criteria and your evidence.  Some examiners like to see the links within the text; others are happy for you to indicate.
* Similarly, to make it easier for your referees make those direct connections on your behalf by providing them with some words "that they might like to use or adapt" that explicitly make those connections, e.g. from one of my referees:

*"Based on the Guidance Notes for Referees, and having read Dr X career history and his two Case Studies, I am happy to confirm that the information presented is an accurate account of Dr X’s activities and practices.  Dr X has demonstrated engagement with two areas of teaching activity listed in the UKPSF, has solid core knowledge and understanding of his discipline and of teaching and learning more generally”*

* Don’t use too many quotes - I would advise using these carefully. What is important is your reflection and use of the feedback they provide and including a list of direct quotes is not really appropriate. I recommend summarising or paraphrasing and then saying how you reacted – the odd one is fine but not too many. We want your experience in your own voice rather than other people’s – your Referees provide the external corroboration.
* You need to write a personal narrative/reflection which you strengthen by making your underpinning pedagogic theory explicit. It helps to focus more on ‘why’ rather than ‘what’ in your narrative.

**Examples of Associate Fellow Case Studies**

**Example 1**

**Personalised teaching approaches make for more effective learning**

In 2014, I mentored a master’s student with little experience of the in vivo work her project entailed. She was assigned a very broad project aim by our supervisor, so my first task was to assist her in planning the specific aims of the project [A1]. This required a one-on-one teaching session regarding general experimental design, advanced statistics relating to the power of her study [K1] and specifically what would be attainable within her timeframe. On reflection, I feel this session went well; I created an appropriate learning environment by adapting the level of my input based on her verbal responses, and reading her facial expressions and body language to ensure she was comfortable with the level of information throughout [A4].

As the project commenced, it was my role to teach specific in vivo techniques such as how to take blood, ECG and perform echocardiography on the animals [K1, A2]. As it is rather daunting to work with live animals I thought it best to introduce her very slowly into what she would be doing [A4]. I achieved this by first demonstrating the procedures with an experienced assistant. This involved me both visually showing, and verbally explaining step-by-step what I was doing. I feel this was important as everyone learns differently; some students prefer visually led and some prefer auditory led learning [K3].

Over the course of the next month I gradually gave the student more responsibility and allowed her to do more of the procedures herself. Verbal feedback relating to task processing was given immediately during the procedures as this enhances the rate of skill acquisition (1). Additionally, written formative feedback was given, roughly once a week, in the form by completion of home office license training records [A3]. Together this feedback provided positive reinforcement for the skills she had learned and thereby increasing her confidence and motivation (1), and also allowed us to set small manageable goals for the coming week. This ultimately resulted in successful completion of the long term project goals (2). The student received a mark of 73% for the project which she informed me was the highest of the three projects she had completed that year. This in combination with her verbal feedback has led me to believe this reflects positively on my teaching skills and provides a good method of evaluating my teaching performance [K5].

**References**

1. Hattie J, Timperley H. The power of feedback. Rev Educ Res. 2007;77(1):81-112.
2. Harackiewicz JM, Barron KE, Tauer JM, Carter SM, Elliot AJ. Short-term and long-term consequences of achievement goals: Predicting interest and performance over time. J Educ Psychol.2000; 92(2):316-30.

**Example 2**

**Assessment and providing feedback to students (A3)**

Assessment and giving feedback is an important aspect of teaching. Throughout my teaching and support, there have been two ways I have been able to offer feedback; through written assignments and during face-to-face verbal feedback in seminars (**A3**).

Giving written feedback on formative assignments allowed me to offer constructive guidance on how students are performing currently and how they can improve on future assignments (**A3**). Effective feedback offers more than simply praise or support which does not offer ways to improve or build upon skills (Gigante et al., 2011; Kluger & DeNissi, 1996). Effective feedback pitched at the right level allows students to understand, engage, and develop their skillsets (Hattie, 2009). Therefore, I would use the sandwich style model as it enabled me to give constructive criticism and areas for improvement, whilst simultaneously giving praise and support for what was done well (Dohrenwend, 2002; **A3, K2**). Further, using a framework for feedback offered by Hattie and Timperley (2007) allowed me to further structure my feedback using three core elements: where is the student aiming for (feed up), how is the student doing (feedback), and what do they need to do to improve on the next assessment (feed forward). This was particularly useful as marking written assignments is ‘blind’ and you cannot know who you are giving guidance to so these techniques helped to ensure I used a consistent, fair, and goal-directed feedback framework (**A3, K2; V1**).

When marking 30-40 assignments at a time, I quite often noticed that grades could be influenced by weaker or stronger assignments marked beforehand. As such, I started self-moderating after a batch of assignments which became a useful way to ensure grades were in line with previous grades awarded, therefore not unintentionally discriminating against any student (**K2;** **V1**). Further, I would personalise feedback using the same language and style as the student to ensure that they are better able to understand and use it for their next assignment (**V1, K3**). I also aimed to focus my comments more on the psychological content (**K1**) and less on the student’s grammar in respect of diverse learning and language needs (**V1**). These techniques helped to ensure I was consistent across students in language use, style, and amount of feedback provided (**A3**).

In contrast, giving verbal feedback in seminars has a more personal, direct feel to it than written feedback and it is generally easier to ensure that the student has understood feedback given. However, in seminars to ensure students felt acknowledged and heard, especially to encourage those more reluctant to speak up, I would ensure that after a student verbalised an idea, I would acknowledge the point made, reflect and summarise it back to them (**A3**). I would then guide the discussion towards another point if the original point made was not quite right, or discuss the point further to extend the thinking and encourage further responses from others (**A4**). This would ensure the feedback was not simply corrective, but encouraged deeper thinking (**A2**; McKimm, 2013).

**References**

Dohrenwend, A. (2002). Serving up the feedback sandwich. *Family Practice Management, 9* (10), 43-50.

Gigante, J., Dell, M., & Sharkey, A. (2011). Getting beyond “good job”: how to give effective feedback. *Pediatrics, 127* (2), 205-207.

Hattie, J. (2009). The Black Box of Tertiary Assessment: an Impending Revolution. In L. H. Meyer, S. Davidson, H. Anderson, R. Fletcher, P. M. Johnston and M. Rees (eds.), Tertiary Assessment and Higher Education Student Outcomes: Policy, Practice and Research. Wellington: Ako Aotearoa National Centre for Tertiary Teaching Excellence, pp. 259– 275

Kluger, E., & Nisi, A. (1996). The effects of feedback interventions on performance: A historical review, a meta-analysis, and a preliminary feedback intervention theory. *Psychological Bulletin, 119,* 254 - 284

McKimm, J., & Swanwick, T. (2011). Clinical Teaching Made Easy – A Practical Guide to Teaching and Learning in Clinical Settings. London: Quay Books.

**Example 3**

**Design and development of an online course for 1000 students**

Another interesting and challenging project I was involved in was the design of the first large cohort online course of the MBA programme. My role in the project was to advise and support the academic team tasked with developing the course materials. The main areas I provided advice to the academic team was:

1. Teaching and learning theory and its application in online learning (K1-K3),
2. The use of educational technology (A1, A4, K4) and
3. Appropriate assessment methods for online learning evaluation (A3, K5).

The project was initiated as a response to the difficulty the programme was facing with organising large cohort workshops around the world and as a means to increase the offering of courses to the wider MBA student cohort. It was also a great opportunity for the School to put in practice, test and evaluate a different set of T&L methodologies, suitable for online delivery. From the initial stages of the project, it was evident that the academic team tasked with designing the course, required support and guidance, not only on the appropriate technological interventions but on the teaching and learning methodology that would be most appropriate for this type of delivery.

*Teaching and learning theory and its application in online learning*

To design the course and advise the academic team, I draw practice examples from the literature on designing constructivist online environments (Jonassen eta al, 1995) and sustaining online interactions. As explained, the academic team was not familiar with designing for online learning and my support was crucial to the successful design and delivery of the course.

*The use of educational technology*

A set of tools was chosen to support the student-to-student and student-to-teaching team interactions, which consisted of utilising asynchronous (discussion forums and blogs) and synchronous tools (Blackboard Collaborate and GoTo Meeting). Consequently, there were increased training requirements for both academics and students, as to how to make the best and appropriate use of these tools. The discussion forums were used as a means of assessing online engagement and participation and I produced a guide for academics and students based on the models for online collaboration presented in current literature (see Clark, 2001; Rovai, 2007). The synchronous communication tools supported the delivery a virtual workshop where students participated in live debates on current issues around the subject area of study.

*Assessment methods for online learning evaluation*

Since there was no face to face interaction between the academic team and the students, the assessment regime was of significant importance where I advised the academic team on assessment approaches that provided i) authentic assessment opportunities, ii) provided appropriate formative and summative feedback and iii) ensured the academic integrity of the course. The assessment was based on a continuous assessment regime where students had to participate on online debates based on the discussion forums, a simulation exercise which was designed using synchronous and asynchronous tools and a final reflective paper. The assessment structure, received very positive feedback on the end of semester feedback questionnaire and students commented on how it was designed to promote and sustain engagement throughout the semester.

Since, it was our first attempt on delivering a large cohort online course, we sought to gather additional feedback from students and we organised online focus groups to discuss how the course was perceived. Students were viewed as co-creators and their feedback was invaluable to further improve the course for the coming semesters.

**References**

Jonassen, D. et al., 1995. Constructivism and computer‐mediated communication in

distance education. *American Journal of Distance Education*, 9(2), pp.7–26.

Clark, J. (2001) Stimulating collaboration and discussion in online learning environments,

Internet and Higher Education, 4, 119–124.

Rovai, A. P. (2007). Facilitating online discussions effectively. *The Internet and Higher*

*Education, 10*(1), 77–88.

### Example 4

**Supervision of international Erasmus BSc students**

The Erasmus student exchange programme is aimed at facilitating international study and to provide an opportunity for students to study abroad. The opportunity to work in foreign laboratories is an exceptionally valuable experience with respect to enhancing knowledge and laboratory skills, improving language skills and learning about other countries and practices of work. This prepares biomedical students to their future carriers in science. High teaching standards are particularly important in enhancing the reputation of the UK higher education in the world.

A different approach was taken in supervising international BSc students. Through communication with the students (e-mails before enrolment in the programme) I established that they had a strong scientific and experimental work background in life sciences and had previously performed lab work which had helped them to acquire skills in routine laboratory techniques. Therefore, more complex projects were designed for training (A1, V1). Also, the projects were designed to help the students to learn as much as possible in terms of a variety of different laboratory techniques which would be useful to their future doctoral degree studies or to a career in the pharmaceutical industry (A1, K1, V1). These projects also fitted very well with our group’s research.

At the beginning of the project, I made a presentation to introduce the background, aims, objectives and experimental design of each project. The presentation helped the students to focus their efforts on relevant theoretical and experimental training (K2). At the beginning of the project, relevant review papers and other scientific literature were given to the students to study, in order to understand the scientific problems in the field (K2). This approach usually works very well since it helps students to understand the broader scientific questions and to position their project in the field. I evaluated their understanding of the subject through discussions and question and answer sessions (A2, A3, A4). As summarized in Figure 1 (page 530) in Trigwell and Shell “Student learning and the scholarship of university teaching” (2004) the interaction between knowledge, practice and outcome ensures the effectiveness of teaching and learning.

Next, the students were presented with a detailed experimental plan (A2). Supervision of laboratory work was also my responsibility (A1, A2). I taught students how to build very sophisticated assays by demonstrating myself the intricacies of each laboratory technique. After the initial demonstration was completed, I allowed the students to build assays themselves, while observing them and giving them a feedback (A3). After each experiment was completed, I showed the students how to analyse the data and how to present the data in formats used in scientific publications (A2, A4, K2).

The results of both projects were of a high standard and of publication quality. The data produced by students were included in our group’s publications.

I gave a mid-term written feedback about the students’ progress to the Erasmus programme committee and a final report to the Universities’ degree schemes. I also wrote recommendation letters on behalf of the students to help them secure doctorate study places.

### Example 5

**Case Study 1: Leadership in Education and Awards Programme (LEAP) Design and Support (A1, A2, A4, K1, K2, K6, V1, V2)**

The LEAP was launched as a pilot programme in January 2016, prior to the launch of the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF), to provide an easier route for colleagues to apply for HEA fellowship. The programme supports learners in understanding and gathering evidence to meet the UKPSF criteria and writing reflectively. I led the administrative support for all aspects of the pilot until its conclusion in March 2016. During the pilot, I encountered a number of problems as a result of the open nature of the programme. Whilst grateful for the opportunity to lead on the project, these issues often felt quite daunting as this was my first experience of designing and implementing processes and, as a small team, there was limited support available.

Consequently, I reviewed the end of programme and unsolicited feedback, the frequency, content of and attendance on the programme workshops and the availability and accessibility of resources. Following the problems I had encountered, I felt strongly that I needed to ensure that the support available, the methods of delivery and the administrative processes underpinning the programme were effective and efficient, met the individual and collective needs of learners and practitioners and that participants were enabled to take ownership of their learning (Biggs, 1996). To do this I implemented a number of changes to the programme structure, content and resources:

* Using my knowledge of the subject material and the issues that learners had faced during the pilot, I felt that learners would benefit from access to one-to-one support rather than solely from group workshops where content is driven by the practitioner (A1, K1, K2). The programme provides support to learners writing a reflective account of practice regarding their contribution to teaching and learning and this often leads learners, from a wide range of diverse backgrounds, to seek support for varied and often personal queries. I felt that the addition of one-to-one support was crucial to enable practitioners to address individual learner’s needs more effectively and in a more suitable environment therefore enhancing the learner experience (A4, K1, K2, V1) (Garrick et al, 2017). Consequently, I reduced the number of group workshops from five per pathway to two per pathway and introduced one-to-one support appointments where content could be driven by the learner to supplement the group sessions. I think that the addition of one-to-one support to the programme has been a success. I have received positive feedback from learners’ regarding the appointments which are very popular and the number of individual enquiries has reduced significantly.
* The pilot was run as an open programme allowing participants to join at any time however, this created difficulties in managing the expectations of learners and practitioners (Mentors). Learners joining the programme at a later stage found that they had missed the majority of support workshops available to them and Mentors were faced with an increasing number of mentees at short notice. This created a negative experience for learners and practitioners as well as being tricky to resolve. As a result, I introduced a cap on the number of places available on the programme to effectively manage the Mentors workloads which I feel better enabled Mentors to support learners (A1, K6, V1, V2). I also introduced registration deadlines for places on the programme which meant that learners no longer missed the support workshops available by joining the programme late. I believe that these changes resulted in an improved experience and increased learner engagement as demonstrated by the improvement in feedback scores, particularly in relation to mentor support, and the increase in the number of successful fellowship awards.
* I liaised with the academic programme lead to introduce Mentor and Assessor training sessions to equip practitioners with a greater understanding of the UKPSF and assessment requirements. This enables Mentors to provide more effective support to learners and also highlighted to Assessors the need to provide both feedback and feedforward on applications to further support learner development as well as ensuring a consistent standard of applicant feedback (A1, K1, K2, K6) (Bruner, 1977; Hattie and Timperley, 2007).
* I developed online resources for learners and practitioners e.g. targeted FAQ documents, application templates and online information and guidance pages to enable learners to access programme resources as easily as possible. I believed that this was important as it would encourage learner engagement and enable participants to take ownership of their learning and become lifelong learners (A2, K1, K2, V1, V2) (Briggs, 2011).
* I ensure that workshops can be delivered effectively by securing suitable venues, e.g. large, flat rooms to allow for the effective facilitation of group work and discussion during workshops, or private rooms for one-to-one support and mentoring, and by making the correct resources and AV equipment available for facilitators (A2, A4, K1, K2) (Cannon & Kapelis, 1976).

The combined result of these changes was an improved learner and practitioner experience. This has enabled me to work with senior colleagues across the University to extend the programme to increased numbers of colleagues and students. The programme has made a significant impact in encouraging and supporting large numbers of colleagues to apply for fellowships, a major contribution towards the University’s strategic goal two and TEF submission. Now in its third year, there are over 550 colleagues registered on the LEAP and 186 fellowships have successfully been awarded spanning descriptors 1-4 (V2). LEAP alumni have also joined the programme to support their colleagues applying for fellowship.

I am incredibly proud of my role in supporting the LEAP and contribution to the programme’s success. Supporting the LEAP has given me the opportunity to work with senior academic and PSS colleagues from across the University as part of the Recognition Panel and Management Group and has developed my strategic awareness. I’ve also developed skills in servicing panels and committees, taking minutes, database and reporting skills which are fundamental for my CPD. I feel much more confident in making decisions and this has been useful as I am undertaking the ILM Level 3 Award which includes a problem solving and decision making unit. I also feel confident in designing and implementing processes.
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**Example AFHEA Mapping Exercise**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Areas of Activity** | **Brief Summary of Experiences Reflected Upon in the Portfolio** | **Portfolio Pages** |
| *A1: Design and plan learning activities and/or programmes of study* | Further activities not referenced within the portfolio:   * Jointly planning key activities for my 3rd year BSc Psychology student’s project * Planning each seminar. Reading up on background information and theories behind seminar content. * Supervision of a short-term student working on my PhD project: planning in weekly activities for them including participant research visits, transcribing interviews, and inter-rater reliability assessments | Page 1 |
| *A2: Teach and/or support learning* | Activities referred to within the portfolio:   * Delivering seminars on the BSc Psychology programme * During statistics modules demonstrating * In group work activities during seminars | Pages 1, 2, 3 |
| *A3: Assess and give feedback to learners* | Further activities not referenced within the portfolio :   * Marking essays, reflective reports, group presentations, and mock career interviews. I have regularly marked mid-term essays according to structured marking criteria. * Verbal and written feedback during mock career interviews bearing in mind the sensitive nature and real-life implications of somebody’s performance in preparation for a job interview. | Page 3 |
| *A4: Develop effective learning environments and approaches to student support and guidance* | Activities already referred to within the portfolio:   * Giving students the option to contact me as facilitator at times either during or after the seminar session * Consideration of different ways for all students to contribute equally to group work * Encouraging students during verbal feedback and guiding their answers to think more deeply about Psychological topics | Pages 2 and 3 |
| *A5: Engage in continuing professional development in subjects/disciplines and their pedagogy, incorporating research, scholarship and the evaluation of professional practices.* | Activities already referred to within the portfolio:   * Attending graduate teacher training given by the Psychology department * Seeking advice from lecturers on related modules when teaching or marking assignments * Consulting advice from books on teaching methods in Psychology, and incorporating relevant pedagogic models in my teaching and reflection on my teaching. | Pages 1 and 2 |
| **Core Knowledge** | **Brief Summary of Experiences Reflected Upon in the Portfolio** | **Portfolio Pages** |
| *K1: The subject material* | Activities already referred to within the portfolio:   * Having an academic and professional background in Psychology * Planning before each seminar and making sure my understanding of the content and wider context is as up to date as possible within the time limits | Pages 2 and 3 |
| *K2: Appropriate methods for teaching, learning and assessing in the subject area and at the level of the academic programme* | Activities already referred to within the portfolio:   * Adapting ways to engage students in group work * Encouraging students to go deeper in their understanding of Psychological concepts by asking them to explain their working and reasoning (in statistics modules) * Using appropriate frameworks for giving feedback * Self-moderating when marking assignments | Pages 2 and 3 |
| *K3: How students learn, both generally and within their subject/disciplinary area(s)* | Activities already referred to within the portfolio:   * Giving options for all students to feel they can contact me if they need advice or explanations for key concepts. * Using personalised feedback with the students’ own language style to ensure students understand what they can do to improve | Pages 1 and 3 |
| *K4: The use and value of appropriate learning technologies* | Further activities not referenced within the portfolio :   * Using of both audio and visual presentations and YouTube videos for explaining key Psychological concepts. | Not explicitly referred to |
| *K5: Methods for evaluating the effectiveness of teaching* | Not explicitly referred to in the portfolio | Not explicitly referred to |
| *K6: The implications of quality assurance and quality enhancement for academic and professional practice with a particular focus on teaching* | Not explicitly referred to in the portfolio | Not explicitly referred to |
| **Professional Values** | **Brief Summary of Experiences Reflected Upon in the Portfolio** | **Portfolio Pages** |
| *V1: Respect individual learners and diverse learning communities* | Activities already referred to within the portfolio:   * Encouraging all students to approach me if there are difficulties – either during the session, after the session, or over email * Using a consistent marking approach to ensure consistency across all students * Using the same language style the student uses to ensure they understand the feedback | Pages 1 and 3 |
| *V2: Promote participation in higher education and equality of opportunity for learners* | Activities already referred to within the portfolio:   * Encouraging all students to approach me if there are difficulties – either during the session, after the session, or over email | Page 1 |
| *V3: use evidence-informed approaches and the outcomes from research, scholarship and continuing professional development* | Not explicitly referred to in the portfolio | Not explicitly referred to |
| *V4: Acknowledge the wider context in which higher education operates recognising the implications for professional practice.* | Not explicitly referred to in the portfolio | Not explicitly referred to |
| **Descriptor 1** | **Brief Summary of Experiences Reflected Upon in the Portfolio** | **Portfolio Pages** |
| *1.1 Successful engagement with at least two of the five Areas of Activity* | See A1, A2, A3, A4, A5 | Pages 1, 2, 3 |
| *1.2 Successful engagement in appropriate teaching and practices related to those Areas of Activity* | * Seminars on the BSc Psychology programme * Demonstrating in Statistics modules * In group work activities during seminars * Marking essays, reflective reports, group presentations, and mock career interviews * Providing feedback on assessment * Supervising students | Pages 1, 2, 3 |
| *1.3 Appropriate Core Knowledge and understanding of at least K1 and K2* | See K1, K2, K3, K4 | Pages 1, 2, 3 |
| *1.4 A commitment to appropriate Professional Values in facilitating others’ learning* | See V1, V2 | Pages 1 and 3 |
| *1.5 Relevant professional practices, subject and pedagogic research and/or scholarship within the above activities* | Consulting advice from books on teaching methods in Psychology, and incorporating relevant pedagogic models in my teaching and reflection on my teaching. | Pages 1 and 2 |
| *1.6 Successful engagement, where appropriate, in professional development activity related to teaching, learning and assessment responsibilities* | Activities already referred to within the portfolio:   * Attending graduate teacher training given by the Psychology department * Seeking advice from lecturers on related modules when teaching or marking assignments | Pages 1 and 2 |

### Example reference 1

**Name: Dr. Y**

**Email: Y@manchester.ac.uk**

**Post: Senior Lecturer, University of Manchester**

**Relationship to X: Lead for Postgraduate Teaching Assistants at University of Manchester and well acquainted with X’s teaching activity.**

I am writing this reference in endorsement of X’s application for HEA Associate Fellowship status and am fully supportive of this submission. I am providing this reference in the capacity of being the Lead for Postgraduate Teaching Assistants in Psychology here at Manchester and am so well acquainted with the scope of X's teaching activity and the success with which she has delivered her classes.

X is a valued member of the teaching staff contributing to the delivery of the BSc Psychology degree at the University of Manchester in her role as a Teaching Assistant. She has demonstrated a continued commitment to teaching practice across a range of contexts throughout her PhD and has actively sought out opportunities to develop her skills and independence as a teacher. Below I provide specific examples that relate to the UKPSF Areas of Activity and Core Knowledge commensurate with Associate Fellow status.

X has multiple areas where she can provide evidence of accomplishment in Areas of Activity A2 (teaching in Psychology) and A3 (assessment and feedback in Psychology) as well as multiple clear demonstrations of Core Knowledge areas K1 (Psychology disciplinary knowledge) and K2 (appropriate methods for Teaching and Learning for Undergraduate Psychology). She has taken opportunities to develop as a teacher with respect to both professional training (e.g., TA training; further development via a broad range of teaching activities alongside established staff); and her APP shows reflective practice with respect to the underlying pedagogic principles and theory (e.g., as applied to the provision of effective feedback; see below).

With respect to A2 - teaching, and support for learning, two highlights of X's teaching (and we are certainly not limited to these examples, as her Account of Professional Practice demonstrates) are her significant involvement in small group teaching in a seminar format, in a number of areas spanning the discipline of Psychology (K1), for example conceptual and historical issues; personality and individual differences, as well as team-teaching statistics classes where one-to-one learning support is required.

On our degree, X has needed to manage undergraduate seminars of around 20 students and deliver learning activities designed to consolidate lecture content. The one-hour sessions are interactive and, for the TA, require a level of subject knowledge in Psychology as well as the ability to facilitate effective student working (often in pairs and groups) in order to achieve the stated learning outcomes. X has had to demonstrate independence in her teaching in taking responsibility for the success of sessions that draw on a range of teaching techniques, including group discussion and critical analysis of research material.

Further, I have witnessed X's teaching in our statistics practical classes, where first year students are introduced to data analytic techniques and statistical approaches for the first time, and in weekly classes throughout the year they cumulatively develop their knowledge. Statistics teaching in Psychology requires excellent judgement on behalf of the teacher because of the range of abilities within the class from students who are strong mathematically to those for whom the subject is a significant hurdle to clear in their degree (K2). X, in her role, needed to be fully in command of the material (e.g., the procedures that are used as well as the conceptual underpinning; K1) and also had to be able to articulate concepts in a way that matched the needs of the learner. The support provided in these classes was always well received by students and we consider these practical classes to be an essential component of our students' education on the degree.

For Area of Activity A3 - assessment and feedback, X can provide evidence that she has been engaged in extensive grading of undergraduate work across a variety of assessment methods and all under the expectation that we deliver detailed, high quality and timely feedback to students. For example, the varieties of student work X has successfully assessed and delivered summative and formative feedback on include: 'traditional' academic essays, but also group presentations, reflective reports, and also formats designed for students' personal and professional development, such as career interviews. The academic essays require the use of the Psychology degree's specific essay marking criteria whereby a piece of work is evaluated according to principles such as structure; extent to which the question is being addressed; demonstration of understanding; quality of argument; standard of written expression; evidence of accurate subject knowledge. For X to be able to judge these criteria in grading undergraduate work has required subject knowledge on her part (e.g., in the subject area of Conceptual and Historical Issues in Psychology - K1), as well as the ability to deliver constructive, individualised qualitative feedback (K2) that identifies where students have met, or failed to achieve, assessment criteria with a view to subsequent improvement.

In X's regular work as a TA alongside the demands of her PhD she has displayed professionalism and commitment in the management and delivery of her teaching workload and has displayed the professional values that are central to the work of a successful educator in Higher Education, suggesting success in her future career in teaching and research. On Manchester's Psychology degree we place much value on ensuring students feel included on the course, are able to approach teaching staff and have equal opportunity to achieve excellent outcomes regardless of background, and X has delivered successful classes to a diverse student cohort with a range of abilities, expectations and cultural backgrounds.

I fully expect AFHEA status to be merely the first step in X’s academic career and that Associate Fellowship will provide a measure of formalisation and accreditation for the excellent and varied experience that X has already built up, even at this stage alongside her doctoral research. The scope of her teaching experience to date suggests that an application for full Fellowship status will not be far off as she goes on to build on these achievements.

### Example reference 2

**Name: Dr. A**

**Email: A@manchester.ac.uk**

**Post: Senior Lecturer, University of Manchester**

**Relationship to B: Primary supervisor to a final year student largely supervised by A and unit lead for modules supported by B**

B has been employed for the last two academic years as one of four Employability Tutors along with other teaching assistant work. She received training from me and our dedicated Careers Consultants to enable her to advise on and assess four assignments related to careers modules. Having been so impressed with B’s work and approach to students, I was keen to engage her in co-supervision for our final year BSc students. Many students want to conduct mental health related research and I knew that B would provide an excellent learning experience for a student in this area.

I am very confident that B meets all relevant criteria in the UK Professional Standards Framework descriptor 1 level for the reasons outline below:

* I can confirm that B has engaged successfully with all five areas of activity as outlined in her portfolio. B particularly excels in ‘developing effective learning environments’ and ‘giving feedback to learners’. B’s written feedback for group presentations, interviews and reflective writing is always personalised effectively, formative and sensitive. She takes care to relate to individual students in a style that demonstrates thought and understanding.
* B demonstrates the highest standards of respect and understanding of learners’ different requirements, backgrounds, levels of academic self-efficacy and expectation (V1 & V2). She has been exceptionally sensitive to these factors in guiding and giving feedback to students on their very personal CVs and interview assignments. B is aware of factors that can drive differential student experience and attainment and ensures that her practices promote active participation by all learners and provides a learning environment that respects diversity and encourages growth in self efficacy.

B has demonstrated through her case studies that she can effectively utilise pedagogic theory in both her own reflection and in informing her own teaching practice (V3). It has also been clear to me that B has engaged with research and theory around assessing reflective writing because her contribution to developing our marking framework for the students’ reflective reports was informed by recent and influential work in the field. B also completed our School’s graduate teacher training course and has effectively utilised the skills and knowledge she gained in her practice.

In summary, B has developed effective practice, knowledge and values in a relatively short period of time whilst completing her PhD work and training and this demonstrates a strong commitment to achieving a level of teaching excellence that she can build on in her future career in academia. My confidence in B’s competence, knowledge and values lead to me having complete trust in her to supervise a very bright and ambitious student through their final year project; there are very few PhD students who have earned this level of trust in such a short space of time. For all of the reasons above, I strongly support B’s application for Associate Fellow.

### Application Checklist: Associate Fellow

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Written Portfolio (1500 words, excluding references and mapping exercise** |  |
| Introduction – about me (approx.. 500 words) |  |
| Case Study 1 (approx. 500 words) |  |
| Case Study 2 (approx. 500 words) |  |
| Bibliography |  |
| Two references fully aligned to the UKPSF |  |
| Completed Mapping exercise |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Oral Presentation (10 min pre-recorded presentation)** |  |
| Introduction – about me (approx. 1 slide) |  |
| Case Study 1 (approx. 1-2 slides) |  |
| Case Study 2 (approx. 1-2 slides) |  |
| Summary (approx. 1 slide) |  |
| Bibliography |  |
| 1 A4 handout (optional) |  |
| Two references fully aligned to the UKPSF |  |
| Completed Mapping exercise |  |