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### 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**

### Fellowship Assessment criteria

### Fellow Pathway (D2, FHEA)

You are able to choose between submitting a written Portfolio of no more than 3,500 words or a pre-recorded oral presentation of no more than 15 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.

### FHEA Portfolio route

There is a word limit of 3,500 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 is made up of two reflective case studies and detailed mapping to the [UKPSF](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=22140) framework. 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.

### FHEA 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 15 minutes in duration and should cover two case studies. The case studies need to highlight how you meet the criteria for D2 from the [UKPSF](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=22140). 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 of your teaching experience/evidence against the [UKPSF](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=22140); and referees’ statements covering elements of your presentation and highlighting how you fulfil the criteria D2 from the UKPSF. A maximum of 1 page A4 handout may be given to the assessors in addition to a copy of the PowerPoint slides. 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**

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**

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**

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

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

**Descriptor 2 – you will need to capture all elements of this descriptor for Fellowship. In addition to the criteria above, please evidence in your application the following**

D2.4 Successful engagement in appropriate teaching practices related to the Areas of Activity

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

D2.5 Successful incorporation of subject and pedagogic research and/or scholarship within the above activities, as part of an integrated approach to academic practice

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

D2.6 Successful engagement in continuing professional development in relation to teaching, learning, assessment and, where appropriate, related professional practices

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

### Advice for completing your FHEA 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. So, in my reflective account of practice, having painted the picture, my final three main paragraphs start *"In terms of the five Areas of Activity from the UKPSF... In terms of Core Knowledge... In terms of Professional Values..."* and makes direct connections to the evidence already presented.  (Earlier on I also signpost that my portfolio will cover those things, to make it explicitly and abundantly clear to assessors that I'm addressing the criteria.)   It's not the only way to structure the portfolio, of course, but it seems to me to be an effective way of doing so.
* Similarly, it might be wise to make it easier for your referees to 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 Reflective Account of Practice 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 a deep and sustained engagement with all five areas of teaching activity listed in the UKPSF, has solid core knowledge and understanding of his discipline and of teaching and learning more generally, and is absolutely committed to professional values."*

(But don't suggest the same words to both referees!)

* 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.
* Enjoy the opportunity to reflect and write about how wonderful you are!  We don't get that opportunity very often, and informally most of us recognise our numerous deficiencies more prominently than our modest merits, but this is a formal opportunity to focus exclusively on the merits - enjoy it (while staying modest).”

**Examples of Fellow Case Studies**

**Example 1**

**eProg: when is an e-learning environment more effective than face-to-face learning?**

My experiences in learning were a combination of face-to-face and later object-based, which I felt worked well for my field. Engaging directly with the objects was essential to thorough and scientific understanding. For this reason, I did not envisage e-learning working for my specialist subject. I was, however, curious as to the potential application e-learning may have and so I set to create a self- awareness of e-learning (A5), as I wished to understand its use as a learning tool and how this would benefit me as an educator.

One of the most successful projects I was involved in concerned the re-development of training for staff and students for a programme known as eProg (A2, K4). This was a little outside my comfort zone as it was not geared towards my usual public or student only audience. I also wondered, having attended training as a staff member (and how often this was primarily PowerPoint and reflective conversation led) how embedded in pedagogy staff training actually was. With this in mind, I undertook the role of Resource Developer for eProg online training.

Within Higher Education, there is an expectation that universities and colleges “*have in place, monitor and evaluate arrangements and resources which enable students to develop their academic personal and professional potential”* (QAA, Chapter B4 Enabling Student Development and Achievement). In order to support this, The University of Manchester’s vision for its approximately 4500 postgraduate (PGR) students was a university wide, transparent online tool that produced a formal record of progress that was accessible to students, academic and administrative staff. Other key drivers included improved postgraduate (PGR) submission and completion rates, and UKVI attendance monitoring, as well as easing administrative workloads. It was thought that an online tool would improve all of the above elements, thus having a beneficial impact on research funding, as well as producing an enhanced and equitable student experience (K6, V4).

Once users were aware of how to navigate eProg, it made either tracking your students, or your own degree progress, easier to visualise and manage. On paper, eProg appeared to be a perfect solution to administrating PGR degree programmes. The issue was learning how to use it. Initially a face-to- face training day was available to staff with online typed guides to support this, with PGR students being offered a simplified training session as part of their induction. Based on qualitative feedback from users via an informal discussion network carried out by the lead developers for eProg (K5), two major issues arose from this type of training. Firstly, the content layout and direction were often complex. The applicability of this content was specific to user types with administrative staff requiring more in depth knowledge of processes, followed by academic staff and then PGR students (V1). In addition, the content was applicable to certain periods in the PGR student lifecycle, for example submission to examination applied to the end of a research degree only. Secondly, was the lack of engagement from academic staff with eProg. This appeared to stem from a lack of awareness about how eProg was designed to be a tool to aid the progression of PGR students in a time effective manner. As a result, administrative staff were often seconded to execute tasks. Thus, the learning acquired by academic staff was lost and, due to time restraints and lack of engagement, they were often unable to partake in further training (V3, K3).

The primary underlying reason for the above issues was a loss of learning brought about by the counterproductive and overloaded training day for users of eProg (Clark 2002) (K3). Once this issue became apparent, the need for something different in terms of training was realised. In a nutshell, eProg training became an online, consistently accessible, user specific, annotated video and audio modular training resource, embedded in pedagogical theory, in particular to bite-sized learning (Armstrong and Sadler-Smith 2008) and Bloom’s taxonomy (Bloom 1956) (A1, A2, K2, K3, K4, V1, V3, V4). I will highlight below my approach to the development of this resource.

My experiences as an eProg student user and dealings with academic staff users was that eProg represented another point to be actioned. There was no awareness of the usefulness of the tool to aid and centralise student monitoring; and for PGR students, as a personal progress monitor. It was therefore decided to design a homepage which directed each user type to a particular set of modules that they would encounter (V4). The use of an introductory video to highlight the purpose of eProg and how it could be used to centralise administrative tasks for academic staff; as a student, track your degree progress, highlighting important stages, and tasks associated with them, in your PGR degree; and for both the above users, act a reminder tool to complete tasks without which you, or your student, would not be able to progress to graduation. Prior to the implementation of eProg, these tasks were present, but this system has evolved into a facilitation tool. I felt that if users were more aware of the reasons for the existence of eProg, their engagement with it may be improved (K2, V1, V2, V3).

The mass of knowledge transfer expected in a single training day was overcome by adopting a micro learning, or ‘bite-sized’, approach (Armstrong and Sadler-Smith 2008) (A1, A4, K2, K3, V1, V3). This was particularly relevant for administrators who dealt with the largest number of tasks within eProg. A timeline format was used to divide the modules into their appropriate place within the PGR student lifecycle. These section included ‘Pre-Registration Tasks’, ‘Monitoring Student Progress’ and ‘End of Year Tasks’. A brief ‘Getting Started’ section was also included to navigate new users around eProg and where to find help if they required it. The content was then further divided into modules related to specific areas within eProg. Some areas, such as Pathways, required further sub-division. For example, a user was required to search for, create, amend and duplicate Pathways and connect them to other areas of eProg. This subdivision enabled further bite-sized learning to be undertaken and thus facilitate deeper learning.

Each module was introduced by a set of no more than three learning outcomes (A1, A2, A4). Kennedy (2006) indicated that six was an optimum number per module and that the language should consist of active verbs, in accordance with Bloom (1956). Each outcome applied active verbs associated with the content of each module, such as ‘search’, ‘create’ or ‘amend’ and was limited to three learning outcomes. It was considered an appropriate number, due to the micro-learning approach, whilst still allowing the user to understand the context of each module (K5). An important consideration for this was the time limit for each video module to avoid information overload and distraction. Doing some personal research on this topic, I asked individuals I knew to undertake training in an e-learning environment with the simple question: *“How long does it take before your mind wanders?”* This varied from person to person and the learning content but in a group of 10 people this averaged at about 4 minutes. I found this personally reflected my own attention span and so we set a limit of no longer than four minutes, preferably a maximum of three, for each module (A1, A4, A5, V1). In addition, I think often the expectation is for lots of information to be transferred and so when there is very little it can be unnerving. Thus it was considered important to add a brief sentence about the length of the each video module prior to the video being played. This avoided the above scenario by managing the expectations of the user (Mupinga et al. 2006) as to the amount of time they needed to dedicate to this particular module. This was also considered useful during personal evaluation to allow users to confirm if the module learning outcomes were met, or the need to repeat this particular module, either right away or at a later, more relevant, time (K4, K5).

The visual aspects of each video module comprised a single video screen, which could be increased in size if required, with highlighted and annotated sections and pointers to navigate the learner to the relevant aspects of the module. I felt this aided visual learners, although kinaesthetic learners reported the ability to play (and pause) the video module alongside their own eProg profile to be particularly useful (K3, V1, V2). Aural learners were considered although a voiceover, plus annotations on a video screen felt a little ‘busy’. One concern was that if there was no sound in the actual video modules, but there was in the introductory videos, the users might experience confusion and that there was a technical issue, such as, broken computer speakers. Thus, the decision to include a simple ‘click’ sound, like that heard when using a computer mouse, would be added when appropriate to avoid distraction in learning due to technical concerns (K3, V1, V2).

The overall visual interface maintained a linear ‘timeline’ at the lower aspect of the screen to allow ease of navigation to other sections or modules, and simple forward/backward arrows to allow consecutive movement to the next module. Importantly the actions in the video modules did not occur in too quick a succession. A short pause was appropriate between each point to allow the user to digest the information, especially as some of the videos were less than one minute. In accordance with Bloom (1956), self-reflection and evaluation is important at this point in the learning cycle and so time was needed to sufficiently digest particular elements of information, especially if this is the first time they would encounter eProg. It was found that initially these pauses were too short and required more time to allow effective absorption of the information. This was also appropriate in the opening and closing screens, which were given a slow-fade out of 15 seconds to allow the user to settle into the module before it began (A4, K3, K4, V3).

The opportunity to repeat modules was considered vital to allow deeper learning in accordance with Bloom (1956). The training day and the subsequent removal of the ‘knowledgeable individual’ facilitating the training did not allow this. In particular, learning which was relevant to ‘End of Year Tasks’ but was completed at the beginning of the academic year, was often lost due to the lack of a consistent teaching platform. The online availability of eProg meant that the original format in which knowledge of eProg processes was acquired was consistent and easier to recall and implement (K3, K4) and allowed the learner to learn at their own pace, thereby increasing retention (Clark 2002). To supplement this, a module summary produced as an infographic poster was made available. This sought to replace the text document that accompanied the training day with the caveat that each module summary should be no longer than a single side of A4. This approach was sustainable as a downloadable digital file and in paper format, if this was required.

What this experience taught me is that e-learning is more than just putting learning materials into a digital format. I feel some elements of Higher Education courses and training benefits from a face-to- face format (Bejerano 2008), but that an e-learning format has the ability to increase accessibility and because of this it has to be applicable to a variety of learning styles. It still requires as much thought, if not more at times, and pedagogical knowledge to create an effective e-learning environment, in particular as there is no opportunity as a developer/educator to ensure engagement with the resource if you are physically absent (Clark 2002; Concannon et al. 2005).
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**Example 2**

**Teaching for Researchers Blended Learning Workshop**

I designed and delivered a blended learning workshop for research staff on the Training for Researchers programme in May 2015. It was for 24 participants who were required to increase their understanding of blended learning as part of the programme and find ways to innovate their teaching practice.

During the Analysis phase, I revisited the learning aim, whilst drawing from pedagogical principles and models, such as Re-Engineering Assessment Practices in Scottish Higher Education R.E.A.P. (<http://www.reap.ac.uk/reap/resourcesPrinciples.html>), I proposed three learning objectives which honed the purpose of the session and importantly provided clarity for the researchers [A1].   I sketched out the initial structure for the session and subsequently reflected with colleagues on the approach in a similar way to the “Gathering and Reflection” stage when creating a Teaching Philosophy Statement (Schonwetter et al 2002:88). This acted as a stop and check on my approach and included questions on the values and themes I wish to impart in order to support these new academics [A5] [V1]. I wanted to provide an immersive and authentic learning experience to motivate and inspire the researchers so designed the workshop to be in a blended format so the academics could experience the session as both teacher and student. [K2].

Essential to the design phase was positioning the workshop within the researchers’ wider programme of learning to ensure maximum impact.  As I was new to the university, I drew from previous projects where my knowledge of the audience needs was lacking.  I’d spent time with the learners at their place of work in financial services, however, in this instance it wasn’t practical to do this, so I built up a strong working relationship with the programme owner. [V3] This way I could create and revise the design storyboard with unlimited feedback from the stakeholder which gave me great insight to the learners own objectives for the session.[K3]  From this, I decided to produce a session where group support, engagement and practical application of eLearning would be central.  This was because the learners were new to teaching and I wanted to encourage a collaborative atmosphere which would promote engagement and build the foundations for future cooperation post session.[V1] As a framework, Ally's seven implications for Constructivism in online learning (Ally 2002), which I had found as part of my studies, became a great aid when implementing constructivist learning in to the design. It acted as a simple checklist with the seven elements listed as follows; 1) Make it an active process,2) Learners construct their own knowledge, 3) Encourage collaborative learning, 4)Learners given control of process, 5)Build in time to reflect, 6)Make it meaningful and 7)Interactive experience. [V3] Having a three part structure to the workshop meant that socialisation and collaboration could begin prior to the face to face session via the VLE. It also prepared the learners for the active learning ethos in the subsequent sessions with activities asking learners to post, read and reflect online ensuring their active involvement. For the second principle, I ensured the learners had models, frameworks and helpful guidance available after the session so they had the tools to construct their own knowledge when they were back at their desks. Collaboration was emphasized heavily in the online tasks prior to the classroom session and the case study evaluation was all done in groups which meant they had begun to build a support network. In terms of the fourth principle they could choose the case study from a selection of five which meant they exercised control over the learning. [K3] The three separate elements to the workshop (pre-session, classroom and post-session) was designed so the learners could reflect after each event and then build on their knowledge in the subsequent set of activities. For example “What is learning?” ran in the pre session, it was revisited in the classroom and then subsequently added to in the post-session with tools around the themes they had originally posted. Referring to the 6th principle, the case studies were actual nominees for the faculty best in eLearning annual award and so were authentic and relatable. I also gave them teaching-level access to the case studies on the VLE so they could investigate the mechanics of how they had been constructed and to make it an active and immersive experience in keeping with the last principle [V3]  Importantly to help build post session support mechanisms and develop self-led learning for the new staff, I created a wiki called “Resource builder” which collated recommendations for technology enhanced learning tools. Essentially the wiki asked for the practical application for the technology to illustrate how it could be used in professionally and to provide context to the recommendations. [K4] In terms of look and feel I created discrete areas for the three separate sessions to ensure comfort online and reduce any barriers to learning.

Implementing the session began two weeks prior to the face to face workshop with activities on the VLE for the pre session phase which involved me using eModerating skills of threading posts, facilitating and supporting them .[A4]  These pre-session materials were well received with the Padlet wall full of thoughts about the essence of “learning” rather than “blended” or technology element so that the pedagogy wasn’t overshadowed. The discussion forum was full with learners posting their own learning objectives for the workshop and them trying a teaching and learning modelling tool that compares current and ideal teaching practice allowing them to reflect. [V3]  During the face to face session, the themes were revisited and feedback given on the discussions on ideal practice and their own learning objectives. [A3] Also during the classroom session, the practical case study element was introduced with learners forming their own groups in the classroom based on interest in particular innovations.[V1] At this stage I knew, my pedagogical template now fitted into “Face 2 Face” template (B4) (Jara & Mohammed 2007:28) because the choice of activities made the most out of the environment it was conducted in. For example, having the choice of the case study made during the classroom session as a wider group really helped to build bonds. [A2] There were access issues , during implementation, to the course units because the case studies were all previous versions and so not live and available to non-eLearning staff. I worked closely with the administrative teams to resolve this and requested that each of the learners were added to their case of choice. Where this wasn’t possible I copied the courses and put them into a community space so we could bypass the automated archiving of the VLE and have a permanent case study online. Importantly, whilst this issue was happening I kept regular and clear communications with the learners to ensure they were updated and to keep them motivated despite the delay.

Post session, the evaluation of the case studies involved reflection in the groups on their own learning journey as well as the case study itself.  This was how I’d wanted to develop materials, so they could provide a story and introduce themes which would then influence future learning on TEL.  It fitted my social constructivist thinking.  When evaluating the course from the feedback survey, of the four activities (1. what is learning, 2. innovation modeller, 3. models and frameworks and 4. group resource evaluation), the first had “useful” as its top response with the other three having “very useful” as their top answer. The group resource evaluation received this top rating by 83% of the respondents. As a rule I always run a post implementation review for large scale eLearning projects, however given this size of this workshop I requested thoughts and suggestions from the programme organiser and my eLearning colleagues.[K6] The eLearning training team benefitted from having permanent case studies available for teaching new academics in the future, a set of materials readily available for self-led learning and the organiser had a workshop they could roll out with future cohorts.[A2][K6]
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**Example 3**

**Small group tutor for “Consultation Skills in Over the Counter (OTC) Supply” Workshop (2nd year, MPharm degree)**

There are approximately 12-15 students in each of these small group interactive workshops, led by a practising community pharmacist (myself). The basic structure of the classes is outlined by the module lead but allows some flexibility in how I deliver them (A2). Prior to the class, students are expected to prepare a formulary of medications suitable for the minor ailments to be discussed that week. In the class, we discuss these formularies and danger symptoms which require special attention; and develop consultation skills by 1:1 role play. One student is designated as the pharmacist for each scenario and consultations are video recorded to enable the student to reflect on their performance and skill development (K4). Consultation skills are specified in the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) for Higher Education MPharm benchmark (4) and are a key priority in the pharmacy postgraduate agenda. The Centre for Pharmacy Postgraduate Education (CPPE) have produced a consultation skills for pharmacy practice framework (5). This is also being used to inform undergraduate education and the mark schemes for the OSCEs in MPS are mapped to these standards. I completed the associated training package as a continuing professional development (CPD) activity in preparation for delivering this module (A5, K1).

I identified some potential barriers to participation and learning which might arise in these workshops: i) the requirement to prepare prior to the class; ii) the assignment of one person to role play to the whole group and to video record these interactions and iii) provision of real time peer feedback (V1). My interpretation of the class strives to address these barriers and satisfy the preferred learning styles of individuals. Austin (2003) produced and validated the “Pharmacists’ Inventory of Learning Styles (PILS)” which identified four types of learners: enactors, producers, directors and creators; was based on the learning styles coined by Kolb (6). The design of this class has been well received, both when I have asked students if they want me to repeat the class in the same format and also on the formal module review. Comments included "consultations should be done the way Hayley has done them" and “puts students at ease during role play sessions” (A1,A2,K5,K6).

I begin my classes with a question and answer session and discussion of pre- prepared formularies. The purpose of this activity is to resolve any queries, inconsistencies and standardise baseline knowledge to build upon. The discussion aspect also enables students to learn from each other and provide a supportive environment (A4). This conforms to the flexibility desired by “creators” and “directors” can lead the conversation (6). During this activity, I draw upon my knowledge and experience from community pharmacy and, where possible, incorporate scientific knowledge such as discussion of medication pharmacology and pharmacokinetics (K1). During practice-based discussions, we often talk about professional decision making and the role of the pharmacist in relation to other healthcare providers. Student feedback suggests they particularly enjoy the examples I give from practice (K3,V4). This integration of practice and science is a priority of the GPhC (1). Additionally, I promote evidence based practice and encourage students to explore evidence, particularly relating to new products available OTC. One way they can do that is via the *Voice of Young Science* "Ask for Evidence" campaign. This is a campaign which encourages young people, particularly scientists, to request proof for claims made to the public (7). I outlined to students a query I have in place at Bayer Pharmaceuticals about a women’s health product, when we covered this topic in the workshop (A5,V2,V3,V4); and I plan to share the response via blackboard when I receive it. Similarly, I have contacted the year group (via email) to share medication related news (K1, V4).

In the next stage of the class, I divide students into groups of 3 (pharmacist, patient and assessor). This encourages participation by the whole group and enables a more informal environment to practice role-play scenarios (K2,K3,V1). This should satisfy the preferences of “enactors”, who prefer a “hands-on” approach and “producers”, who do not like being the centre of attention therefore can practice in a safe environment (6). Where suitable, I have asked a volunteer to demonstrate the use of a specific product (e.g. bazuka gel), as they might do to a patient.

We then move to the 1:1 scenarios. In order to produce a supportive environment for the "pharmacist" I introduce the rest of the class as "team pharmacist", who the pharmacist can call upon at any time and the video recording is paused whilst the discussions happen. This has worked well. To date, no student has objected to being recorded and some asked to record on their mobile phones for convenience. “Team pharmacist” has provided a safety net for the "pharmacist" who can amend their consultation with advice from their peers. It also encourages peers to remain engaged, because they may be called upon, and who will also provide feedback against the marking protocol (A4). In situations where the “pharmacist” has made a mistake, often this has been rectified by pausing and discussing with “team pharmacist” but if they have not paused, I allow them to make the mistake, as recommended in the facilitation of small group work (8). I will then ask the group if anyone would have proceeded differently, this will open up a discussion about the most appropriate course of action and enable the “pharmacist” to reflect on the reasons for the mistake they made. At the end of the consultation, I ask the student how they felt the consultation went and then I ask peers to provide feedback using the "two stars and a wish" framework (9). This exercise not only enables the “pharmacist” student to realise their strengths and direct reflection for improvement, but it also enables other students to practice delivering effective feedback. This is important for leadership development, an essential skill for pharmacists which is being incorporated into the revised version of GPhC “Standards for Pharmacy Professionals”, which is currently under consultation (10). It also lays foundations for a series of workshops in the 4th year which focus on leadership using the “GROW” model (11). Furthermore, it essential that competency moves away from unconscious incompetence towards the target of conscious competence. (8) As pharmacists, it is essential that incompetence is conscious, so individuals can recognise their limitations and only act within their remit. Provision of feedback can aide this.

I also provide summative verbal and written feedback aligned to the mark scheme. This module will be assessed by OSCE. Last year, I was involved in the OSCE marking and used the e-form to provide extensive written feedback to direct improvement for the exam (A3). E-forms are electronic marking forms on an Ipad which the assessors uses to grade the student and provides additional comments which can be emailed to the lead assessor and student. I have since participated in an "Osceology" course. This improved my knowledge of the OSCE marking criteria, design and validation (A5, K5); and enabled me to sit on the OSCE validation panel for this year’s exams (K6). The course introduced me to the concept of the “minimally competent student” and because the OSCE is used to identify competent students, binary pass/fail schemes are the most appropriate mark schemes for this kind of assessment (12). I had previously felt that schemes which rewarded exceptional students would be preferable and was concerned that pass/fail nature of the assessment might deter students from study beyond the perceived minimal requirements. To mitigate this potential drawback of pass/fail schemes, I frequently remind students of the need for exemplary communication skills and continual improvement of these even as practising pharmacists. Moreover, although the marking guide is used as an aide throughout the sessions, I am clear about my priority to ensure that students are safe practitioners. If this is achieved, they will pass the OSCE. As a registered pharmacist, it is my professional and moral duty to ensure this. I aim to instil the principles of person-centred care and learnings from the "Consultation Skills for Pharmacy Practice" CPPE package (V4).
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**Example 4**

**Group Based Learning (GBL) as a method to introduce students to research**

Year 2 Biology students at the University of Manchester are encouraged to join GBL as part of their tutorial sessions. The programme aims to expose undergraduate students to scientific research from the point of view of the researchers themselves. I found the idea of teaching my field of research to a small group an attractive form of enhancing my career and decided to take part. In fact, it has been suggested that small groups are ideal contexts for learners to “digest information” (Race, 2006). After undergoing a selection process, I was invited to lead GBL sessions focusing on blood vessel development, the area of research I have been working on in my current postdoctoral post. One interesting aspect of the GBL programme was that I had to design, plan and organise learning activities relate to my research area in an autonomous manner (**A1, K1**). I delivered these sessions to two different groups of 6- 7 students in two distinct semesters in 2014 (first group) and 2016 (second group) (**A2**). Thus, I will draw parallels between the two groups and elucidate how reflections on the first group improved my methodology with the second one.

In the first session of both semesters I decided to deliver a PowerPoint presentation on basic aspects vascular biology, in development and disease. This first session was crucial to introduce the students the key questions in the field and what models are used to address them. For this, I used schemes adapted from the literature, my own drawings and microscopy research videos acquired by our team (A4, K1). It has long been proposed that visual material enhances learning and aids information retention (Poldrack et al., 1998). Thus, when presenting scientific material, I believe that simple schematics summarising data and biological mechanisms are the best option to efficiently convey information. Given that the different students may prefer distinct vehicles of information delivery, I provided the PowerPoint file so they could read it after the session and suggested background literature (K3, V1). In order to assess whether the students followed my presentation I encouraged them to interrupt and ask questions to clarify doubts. It is well established that student active engagement positively influences the learning process (Graham et al., 2007). This way, while presenting to the first group, it came to my attention that the students were not participating actively. One reason could have been that some of the material was excessively advanced for some students. According to Paivio’s memory theory Paivio, 2007), there is limited amount information that can be processed and transferred to long-term memory and therefore, initial complex information should be avoided. I then decided to simplify information without compromising the message when presenting to second group (K2). In addition, given that during the time interval between semesters I attended the RDP “Facilitating group learning” workshop (A5, V3), I tried to apply facilitation methodology to the second group that I had perhaps not used with the first one. Facilitation theory suggests a humanist approach of learning, whereby the teacher’s role in the classroom is to facilitate learning to promote better outcomes (Rogers, 1967). I took a step back and let the second group find their way by being more interactive during my introduction to the scientific material and tried a student-centred approach to guide them through the GBL sessions. Hence, the second group did show a much more active role in the session than the first one reflecting their comprehension of the material (K3, K5).

At the end of the first session, I explained the activities planned for the following sessions. Whist with the first group I simply assigned tasks, with the second one I tried to adapt the GROW model of coaching (Alexander, 2006; Whitmore, 2010). This method helped to break the tasks assigned into their component parts and to define the concrete steps that the students should adapt during problem solving for the next sessions (K3). In addition, I explained how researchers access literature (Pubmed) and research resources online (ZFIN - The Zebrafish Model Organism Database) (A4, K4). This not only helped them to obtain material to support their assigned work, but it also introduced them to methods that scientists routinely use to progress in their research. I also encouraged the students to visit the lab where I work, as I believe this is the best way for students to have a better idea of what research work is really like (A4, V2). At the end of the GBL sessions I accepted a request by one of the students for a summer project in the lab under my supervision.

The second session in the GBL programme entails a group presentation on a proposed exercise, which is assigned at the end of the first session. At the end of the presentation I asked questions for five minutes and used the remaining time to provide informal formative feedback on their presentation style and contents (A3). Importantly, feedback not only rectifies mistakes and helps understanding via explanations, but it is also an incentive for further studying (Gibbs and Simpson, 2005). The exercises were fundamentally different between the two groups, allowing me to assess what type of teaching exercise is more adequate for students at this level of education (K2). Whilst the first group had to dissect a research article on molecular mechanisms regulating angiogenesis, the second group analysed in detail one piece of my research data and interpret the results. The two different exercises directed the groups to enter different stages within Kolb’s learning cycle (Kolb, 1984), shaping the learning styles presented by the students. Overall, the first group approached the task through “reflective observation” and transformed their experience through “feeling” producing a “diverging” learning style. On the other hand, the students in the second group practiced “active experimentation” and transformed it into abstract “thinking” resulting in a “converging” learning style. The first group found it difficult to understand some of the methodology and to interpret complex results described in the article. On the other hand, the second group demonstrated a greater level of confidence at presenting their analysis of the data, interpretation of the results and answering my questions. In my opinion, the differences in performance showed that students at this level of education do not have enough expertise to analyse highly specialised research articles on an unfamiliar subject (K2). However, one caveat of this GBL session is the fact that the suggested exercise directs the students’ learning style rather than informing what the students’ individual learning styles are.

At the end of the second session, the students were assigned an individual written essay on the article / data they worked on the oral presentation. I suggested that the first group should write their own interpretation of the research article they presented, whereas the second group wrote a report-type essay on their analysis of the data I provided them with. I then marked the essays using marking sheets as guidance, focusing on one question at a time across all essays to ensure fairness in the evaluation process (K6). I explained to the students my marking criteria so they could reflect on the strengths and weaknesses of their work. Subsequently, on the third GBL session I delivered summative feedback on the students’ work (A3). For this, I applied knowledge gained in the RDP workshop “How to assess student learning in Higher Education” (A5, V3), clarifying good performance and encouraging effort on challenging tasks as these are key for good assessment. Using the “feedback sandwich” model (Daniels, 2009), I pointed out the strongest aspects of the essays, discussed errors and misconceptions, but always ensured that the students felt positive about their efforts at the end of the session. This is particularly important as negative feedback can be have a detrimental impact on the students’ self-esteem and ultimately lead to loss of interest (Carless, 2006). To the first group the feedback was delivered on a one-to-one basis, discussing individually all the details of the essays. I then realised that the students would benefit more from a general feedback on data presentation and writing style rather then scientific detail, with the involvement of everyone in the group. As suggested by Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick (2006), encouraging students to participate in their own feedback increases learning effectiveness. Hence, instead of the one-to-one format, I then decided to deliver group feedback to the second group, in an active dialogue examining with the students common aspects across all the reports (A3). In fact, this proved to be an extremely dynamic and interesting alternative as the students were collectively involved in the discussion. In future GBL sessions, I would also like to apply self-feedback to promote reflection, as recommended by Juwah et al. (2004).

In order to assess the effectiveness of my teaching, I requested feedback from the students. To the first group, I suggested the students could contact their academic tutors with their comments on the GBL session. The students did not seem to adhere to this method and I only received feedback from one student. The lack of anonymity could have intimidated the students, reducing their participation. Therefore, I decided to bring feedback forms to the second group to be completed, in anonymity, during the last GBL session. All students present participated, proving that this method is more efficient and produced better results (K5).

In summary, delivering GBL sessions to two successive groups permitted to reflect on my methodology and to improve my skills in the higher education setting. My own reflections are also significantly based on feedback provided by the students on my teaching style. By comparing my experiences with the two groups, I conclude that the most important factor to stimulate learners’ interest in the subject is not necessarily the complexity level of the delivered material, but rather the learner’s involvement with the material itself.
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**Example FHEA Mapping Exercise**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Areas of Activity** | **Brief Summary of Experiences Reflected Upon in the Portfolio** | **Portfolio Page References** |
| *A1: Design and plan learning activities and/or programmes of study* | Designed lecture content for 2nd year unit (including in class activities and quiz); designed multiple choice questions assessment tool; prepared teaching material for supervision of 3rd year research projects | Throughout |
| *A2: Teach and/or support learning* | Delivered lectures in big groups; delivered small group teaching for research; acted as academic advisor and supported learning | 2, 3, 4, 6, 11 |
| *A3: Assess and give feedback to learners* | Provided feedback on in-class activities during lecture; designed multiple choice questions assessment tool; provided summative and formative feedback for 3rd year dissertations | 2, 3, 7, 8, 9 |
| *A4: Develop effective learning environments and approaches to student support and guidance* | Used virtual boards and online quiz to collect students’ responses in lecture anonymously; created safe environment for teaching in small groups | 5, 6, 7, 10 |
| *A5: Engage in continuing professional development in subjects/disciplines and their pedagogy, incorporating research, scholarship and the evaluation of professional practices.* | Attended professional development course and gained status of Associate Fellow; discussed with colleagues and identified training on how to create assessments and give feedback; discussed with colleagues implementation of learning technology as suggested by students; discussed with colleagues and read pedagogical literature to inform the design of assessments and my teaching in small groups; research informed teaching | 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10 |
| **Core Knowledge** | **Brief Summary of Experiences Reflected Upon in the Portfolio** | **Portfolio Page References** |
| *K1: The subject material* | Used my doctoral research to inform my teaching; presented students my research activity in lectures and small groups | 4, 5, 6, 10 |
| *K2: Appropriate methods for teaching, learning and assessing in the subject area and at the level of the academic programme* | Presented current research finding and my research activity aside to seminal theories in lectures to engage students’ attention in a new topic; tailored the study of psychology of language within a psychology degree; designed assessment tool according to guidelines and literature; implemented active learning focused on research related skills | 4, 5, 6, 7, 10 |
| *K3: How students learn, both generally and within their subject/disciplinary area(s)* | Offered hands-on experience with research essential for psychology career; embedded language lectures in the discipline of psychology; used scaffolding and built-up knowledge; used visual demonstrations to introduce learning content based on literature about learning styles; applied active and research-based learning. | 3, 4, 5, 6, 9 |
| *K4: The use and value of appropriate learning technologies* | Used videos to engage students’ attention to learning content; used online quiz, virtual boards and mobile technology to allow anonymous and instant responses | 2, 5, 6, 7, 9 |
| *K5: Methods for evaluating the effectiveness of teaching* | Developed informal evaluation form for project supervision; developed and administered short online questionnaire about effectiveness of teaching mid-term; collected official evaluation forms with students’ feedback; used informal personal communications with students to inform my teaching; asked colleague to observe and comment on my teaching; discussed with peers about teaching | 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11 |
| *K6: The implications of quality assurance and quality enhancement for academic and professional practice with a particular focus on teaching* | Followed British Psychological Society guidelines for content material to be taught; used educational textbooks to inform the design of assessment; followed approved academic advising scheme | 4, 8, 11 |
| **Professional Values** | **Brief Summary of Experiences Reflected Upon in the Portfolio** | **Portfolio Page References** |
| *V1: Respect individual learners and diverse learning communities* | Ensured all students actively participate in big lectures via the use of technology; respected individual needs and skills in research and introduced group work; respected individual needs and offered academic advisory support | 3, 5, 6, 10, 11 |
| *V2: Promote participation in higher education and equality of opportunity for learners* | Promoted psychology programme in open days; promoted further post-graduate studies to students as an academic advisor; promoted studies in science as a STEM Ambassador | 3 |
| *V3: use evidence-informed approaches and the outcomes from research, scholarship and continuing professional development* | Delivered research informed teaching; introduced current research to students; inform the design of teaching material based on pedagogical literature | 3, 5, 6, 8, 9 |
| *V4: Acknowledge the wider context in which higher education operates recognising the implications for professional practice.* | Offered hands-on research experience through vacation scholarship scheme; encouraged the students to develop transferrable skills; advised students on gaining voluntary work experience | 3, 5, 10, 11 |

### Example reference

**Reference for Dr. Y University of Manchester**

**Name**: Dr. X

**Email address**: [X@manchester.ac.uk](mailto:X@manchester.ac.uk)

**Job Title**: Graduate Training Programme Manager, Faculty of Life Sciences

**Connection with Dr. Y**: I have worked with Dr. Y designing/delivering teaching and have undertaken peer review her teaching.

I worked closely with Dr Y during my time as Graduate Training Programme Manager in Life Sciences at The University of Manchester and it is with pleasure that I provide a reference for Y in support of this Fellowship Application.

There are two main aspects of learning development where Y has made a huge contribution to postgraduate and staff training, the way we do things, and the student experience as a whole. These are designing and facilitating small group learning activities and developing bespoke online resources.

**Designing and Facilitating Small Group Learning – summary**

Y is responsible for the break-out group delivery of the Postgraduate Researcher (PGR) Communications workshops in the Faculty of Life Sciences and oversees the activities, exercises and peer-to-peer feedback as a workshop facilitator (A1). The range of training delivered includes face-to-face development workshops, individual support, providing feedback to learners in collaboration with the Faculty Development team and Graduate Training Programme (GTP) teams (A2, K3 & K4). Y has achieved the UKPSF descriptor level 2, through the small group teaching and facilitation undertaken over the years. Furthermore, Y has actively improved the design of the training by responding to feedback, reacting to the learning environment and anticipating unique learn needs (K6, V1).

Pedagogical theories are proficiently used to underpin the approach and are utilised to manage the learners, group dynamics and encourage knowledge transfer (V3). Y encourages participants to reflect and assess their own learning and has put the learning in context to improve student engagement (A4). Her ‘hands on’ approach encourages participants to consider their own research, experiences and development (K1 & V1).

**Developing Bespoke Online Resources – summary**

Y worked closely with institutional and academic leads and the eLearning team to successfully deliver on-line training programmes for PGRs, Administrators and Academic Staff across the institution for the use of organisational software called eProg (K1, V2).

With curriculum management responsibility she ensures that the training modules are: i) fit for purpose, ii) accessible to the target audience iii) develops the content and pedagogical mechanisms and iv) provides on-going support and monitoring to assess quality (A1, K5 & K6). As part of the module management, exploration of new technologies, platforms and methodologies are required to enhance learning and Y has transformed current training modules with new approaches (K4).

In addition to the development of online content, Y is a valued member of the development team and her commitment, enthusiasm and logical approach to projects has been essential to the success of the suite of on-line resources now provided (V4).

**Teaching and Learning**

It is clear when undertaking a peer review of Dr. Y’s teaching that she is an exceptional teacher who places high value on the quality of her teaching. This has been recognised by a number of staff with central and senior management responsibilities and from the positive feedback she has received from her students. In her teaching activities she uses a wide range of innovative approaches to suit the needs of the learning situation. The approaches include:

* E-learning technologies to support knowledge transfer
* Adapting the format of the training to suit the learning environment
* Coaching techniques to increase learner confidence
* Reflective practice to help embed the learning into longer term development opportunities
* Encourages participant peer feedback and exchanging experiences to help build peer support networks and foster a sense of community

Y continually seeks to improve her teaching approach based on the latest research and best practice and uses appropriate technologies and techniques to support the learning experience. The feedback she receives is positive and readily establishes a rapport with the audience in face-to-face teaching. I would describe Dr. Y’s teaching as dynamic, enjoyable, thorough and bespoke to learners needs.

**A1 Design and plan learning activities and programmes of study**

The application highlights the development of online learning resources to support the institutional software 'eProg.' Y managed the project and successfully demonstrated teaching best practice in the following areas:

* Researching and establishing the learners training needs
* Assessed, evaluated and testing of resources and provision
* Recognised that the learners represent a broad and diverse audience
* Designed bespoke learning modules for five core users: students, supervisors, advisors, administrators and super users
* Identified the need for online learning and successfully selected and applied the appropriate technologies
* Utilised pedagogical models to address the learners training needs
* Used evaluation and feedback responses to inform the design of learning activities
* Evidenced to key stakeholders the value of the approach taken
* Provided regular communication to key stakeholders on the progress of development
* Tested/piloted proposed approaches and adapted the learning based on the feedback
* Provided extensive support learning activities to complement the core learning modules
* Embedded the learning into existing process, curriculum's and support services
* Produced learning modules that complied with The University policies on access, learning development and data protection.

The feedback from stakeholders and learners is extremely positive and the modules remain an example of institutional best practice for online and blended learning within IT Services.

**A2 Teach and support Learning**

Y demonstrates that she is extremely skilled at teaching through:

* Student evaluation feedback which remains consistently high (rated as excellent or good)
* Her experience of training and supporting PhD workshop and development events
* The selection and application of e-learning technologies
* Command of the GTP Curriculum and software for addressing learning needs
* Awareness of the diverse learning environment at the University
* Empathy with different users and audiences
* Positive anecdotal feedback of her performance and presence
* Improved engagement with learning resources and interventions by the target audiences

Further evidence of her commitment to teach and support learning comes from requests asking her to facilitate internal and external training and events with the museum and supporting researcher-led initiatives.

**A3 Assess and give feedback to learners**

Dr Y has a natural supportive and encouraging style of giving formative and summative feedback that allows students to focus clearly on areas to develop. Her approach is sympathetic to researchers needs. The feedback provided focuses on writing style and adapting to different audiences/applications. Y encourages students to provide feedback to each other as well as contributing with her own individual feedback on their work. Her approach is enabling and facilitating and she uses memorable interventions such as kiss, kick, kiss to help students focus their peer-to-peer responses. In her work providing support for staff on specific institutional software, she encourages learners to provide feedback and utilises this for improving the training offering. Some of the mechanisms she has built into the online learning provides automated feedback to learners which has taken considerable time to develop. From a user perspective the feedback is seamless and useful and helps support them progress through the learning. Y has also taken the time to source infographics and frequently asked questions to further facilitate the learning experience.

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

Dr Y provides support to students throughout their lifecycle and the students appreciate the consistency and the opportunity to see an impartial trainer/teacher on a regular basis. Y has engineered seeing and teaching the same group of students at the annual GTP workshops, research symposium and researcher-led activities. This has provided an additional mentoring arm to support the student experience but an additional resource to the students who have developed a good rapport with her. Furthermore, we have been able to track student progress on specific aspects of their PhD journey such as writing skills and have documented an improvement in their academic literacy and writing confidence from year one to year three. The online eProg resources have also been very well received and there is an appreciation that they have been carefully crafted to take into account the end users’ needs. This has involved understanding how they will be accessed e.g. as a quick reference guide or at a glance resources and as part of more detailed learning for new users to orientate and learn the system from scratch. As Y has experienced the system from multiple perspectives in developing the learning materials this has provided an excellent insight into user behaviour which continues to inform future updates to the resources.

**A5 Engaging in continued professional developments in subjects/disciplines and their pedagogy, incorporating research and the evaluation of professional practices**

Y continues to further her own professional development experience in delivering teaching (V4 & K2). Her continued support for enhancing the early career researcher experience has provided the Faculty and University with valuable resources that have positively improved the Graduate Training Programme for PGRs and user software experiences for students and staff (V2). I’m delighted to provide a reference for Y and additional endorsements or information where required. As an independent training consultant, I would not hesitate to employ Y to design and deliver quality training across the sector and fully intend to call upon her for her invaluable input and expertise in this area. I would like to take the opportunity to wish Y every success with her HEA application and future development.

### Example reference 2

**Reference for Dr. X University of Manchester**

**Name**: Y

**Email address**: [Y@manchester.ac.uk](mailto:Y@manchester.ac.uk)

**Connection with X: masters student in Dr X’s lab**

The time that I spent in the Experimental Oncology laboratory in Division of Pharmacy and Optometry at the University of Manchester was a very gratifying experience for me. I did my practical work (full-time for 6 months) under Dr X’s supervision. The experience that I had was very constructive and over all very pleasant.

Dr X is an inspiring and patient teacher, with a wide knowledge of the field in which she is working in. I had a chance to attend to a local training workshop in University of Manchester in which she was one of the invited speakers. Following her talk, it was very inspiring to see how many people were willing to learn from her experiences and knowledge. At the same time, this experience was slightly intimidating as it made me to realize how respected she was in her field [K1, A5]. During my internship, she was always happy and open to share her knowledge and experience that she gained through her degrees and professional training [K1] and the way she did it was very efficient. She adapted her explanations to the level of my language and my scientific knowledge, provided details in a patient manner, made me research (using specialised tools such as

PubMed), learn and analyse the possible causes and effects of a problem by making me to think about it rather than just giving me the answer [A2, K2]. I had the opportunity to learn a lot from her, especially on how to deal with different kinds of problems that might occur during a scientific experiment in a calm and smart way. Dr X has a natural supportive, encouraging and motivating style of giving formative and summative feedback that directed me to focus clearly on areas to develop. She never hesitated to provide positive feedback (when I delivered what was expected of me) and constructive criticism during my training. I found this very motivating because this was the only way to know that my efforts were being noticed. She always spared time to be accessible and to assess my performance and was very supportive when things did not go as planned because of an obvious mistake I could have avoided. She provided feedback about my assessment to my Department

in Javeriana University in Colombia verbally and in written format against the criteria provided [A3].

I don’t have a strong background in molecular biology or pharmacy and because of that it was more difficult to adjust to this kind of work, but even so I did learn a lot. She designed a small project considering my abilities, knowledge and previous experience [A1]. While she was providing training she reflected on and adapted her teaching to meet my needs [V1]. Where appropriate she broke down the project into manageable tasks to ensure that I gained some confidence in this relatively new field. Shortly after I started my internship, she gave me more space and opportunity to take my own decisions for my experiments. Although this period was slightly painful because of the mistakes that I made, it really helped with my confidence and personal development. More importantly, the way she handled these days was impressive. She always told me about a mistake that she has done and made me to realize that everyone at every level will make mistakes and it is all right to do so as long as we learn from it. Her tolerant attitude pushed me to learn more details and to think more about the procedures that I was dealing with. I can confidently say that these are now engraved to my conscious [A4].

During my internship, we had daily and weekly meetings based on my needs. During this period I was pleased with Dr X’s desire to know/receive feedback about her teaching/training style. She provided the opportunity to express my opinion and give feedback about her teaching style. Where appropriate she was willing to modify her style according to the feedback she has received [K5, A5].

She had a tolerant and wise attitude towards the personal problems that I had at the time, too. I had some flat mate issues and I had to change my flat immediately which resulted in disruption of my studies by about a week. When I made my way into the office it was obvious that there was something bothering me. Dr X has taken her time to listen to the problem and provided guidance and support. She told me to take as much time as needed to sort out this problem because she knew how best students learn and how important it is to maintain their wellbeing for their overall productivity [A4].

She managed everything with the thought that I will still be part of higher education. She always endeavoured to tailor all activities to help me gain transferable skills such as communication skills and by recognising the importance of these in my future as a professional. Her guidance through my internship was very useful for my personal and professional development and she has been an inspiration since the day I joined her lab [V2].

**Application Checklist: Fellow**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Written Portfolio (3500 words, excluding references and mapping exercise** |  |
| Introduction – about me (approx.. 500 words) |  |
| Case Study 1 (approx. 1500 words) |  |
| Case Study 2 (approx. 1500 words) |  |
| Bibliography |  |
| Two references fully aligned to the UKPSF |  |
| Completed Mapping exercise |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Oral Presentation (15 min pre-recorded presentation)** |  |
| Introduction – about me (approx. 1 slide) |  |
| Case Study 1 (approx. 2-4 slides) |  |
| Case Study 2 (approx. 2-4 slides) |  |
| Summary (approx. 1 slide) |  |
| Bibliography |  |
| 1 A4 handout (optional) |  |
| Two references fully aligned to the UKPSF |  |
| Completed Mapping exercise |  |