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**FACULTY OF HUMANITIES PATHWAY FOR TEACHING ASSISTANTS**

### Associate Fellowship Booklet

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

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

LEAP is accredited by Advance HE (formerly known as the Higher Education Academy (HEA)), and so can award Associate, Fellowship, Senior and Principal HEA 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.

There is support for you throughout the process in the form of peer support groups and LEAP mentors offering advice and feedback on your submission. As the Faculty of Humanities’ LEAP Champion, **I welcome you onto the programme**

**Professor Claire McGourlay**

**Faculty of Humanities LEAP Champion**

**HEA Principal Fellow**

### 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 giving a videoed oral presentation of no more than 10 minutes (plus up to 10 minutes of discussion). 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. The case studies must illustrate your achievement and impact in two areas of activity, core knowledge (K1 and K2) and appropriate values from the UK Professional Standards Framework (UKSPF) - both should be reflective in nature. Your application should highlight how you meet all the D1 criteria from the UKPSF. 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 (see weblink <http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=37476> for the mapping exercise template) and provide one reference (see page 13-15) which will highlight how you fulfil the D1 criteria from the UKPSF.

### AFHEA Video presentation route

The videoed oral presentation 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, core knowledge (K1 and K2) and professional values from the UKPSF. In addition to your presentation you need to complete a mapping exercise ((see weblink <http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=37476> for the mapping exercise template) and provide one reference (see page 13-15) which will highlight how you fulfil the D1 criteria 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 format of the video presentation.

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

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

### Mapping my activity against the UKPSF

You only need to demonstrate activity against 2 areas of activity for Associate Fellowship.

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**

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 TA X’s career history and her two Case Studies, I am happy to confirm that the information presented is an accurate account of TA X’s activities and practices.  TA X has demonstrated engagement with two areas of teaching activity listed in the UKPSF, has solid core knowledge and understanding of her 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**

**Providing clear feedback, and listening to students’ needs**

Feedback is an essential component in the learning cycle (Weaver, 2006). Students tend to learn more by doing (Anzai and Simon, 1979), thinking about how they can apply in practical ways what they are taking from a module. In this context, the process of providing feedback about their work is a crucial opportunity for students to receive constructive comments about how they can apply concepts to the practice of critical analysis. As such I consider feedback at the centre of my teaching practice and I am committed with providing it in an effective and timely manner. In my role of Teaching Assistant, I have done this via digital platforms such as email and Turnitin. Also, I provide face-to-face verbal feedback to learners, during tutorials and office hours (A2, A3), which are mentioned at the beginning of each tutorial session (A4).

The goal of feedback should be to be guiding learning in an effective manner, by focusing on ‘growth rather than grading’ encouraging and advancing student learning (Sadler, 1983: 60). In this context, I deliver feedback combining my own academic and practical knowledge (K1), with the rubric provided by the School of Social Sciences for assessment. This has been a successful strategy when supporting the learners in the process of realising that concepts from social sciences that might seem distant -or too theoretical- are actually grounded in reality, and they can even observe these processes in their everyday life (A2, A3).

I have always looked for what students are doing correctly, and I praise their achievements, in order to stimulate their future work and rewarding their current progress (A2, A4). Furthermore, I have always paid attention to provide clear and practical ideas on how to improve future tasks (K2), especially for students who are registered at the Disability Advisory and Support Service at the University of Manchester (V1). For example, I have provided practical examples about how they can outline in a clearer manner the content of their work, or how to weave specific ideas together to achieve a more nuanced analysis of the topic they are addressing (K2, A2, A3).

Through this method, I am able to only ‘mark’ and ‘grade’ their tasks/essays (A1, K1), but also to promote an understanding –by using practical examples- of the areas they can improve (K2, K3). For this purpose, I assess their tasks twice. On the first round, I look to mark their work’s accomplishments and weaknesses in terms of content, following the rubric and lecturer´s instructions for marking (A2, A3). Then, I read their tasks a second time looking for the tasks’ specific strengths and weaknesses in order to suggest practical examples to improve it (A3, K2, K3). I always look to provide feedback using a clear structure (from general to particular; and from what has been achieved and what can be still improved) and a clear language (A2, A3, K2, K3).

I structure my feedback, using Hattie and Timperley (2007) model, looking at 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). By providing clear feedback in form and content while considering the student’s needs (feed up); students can learn to self-asses their own work before submitting, which is know as feed forward (K2 and A3). From the training received at university, I understood that feedback will not advance learning if misunderstandings exists, and if students are not able to make sense of feedback (Gibbs and Simpson, 2004). This implies that effective feedback should recognise the student’s perspective (Hounsell, 2004) which is one of the main inspirations for my pedagogical work, as I always provide feedback thinking about the student and reflecting about my own experience as student (A2, A3, K2, K3).

References

Hattie J, Timperley H. (2007) The power of feedback. Rev. Educational Resources. 77(1):81-112.

Hounsell, D. (2004) ‘Reinventing Feedback for the Contemporary Scottish University’. Paper presented at Quality Enhancement Workshop on ‘Improving Feedback to Students’, University of Glasgow, 4 June.

Gibbs, G. & Simpson, C. (2004) ‘Does your Assessment Support your Students’ Learning?’ Centre for Higher Education Practice, Open University: http://www.brookes.ac.uk/services/ocsd/1\_ocsld/lunchtime\_gibbs\_3.doc [accessed 28 February 2019].

**Example 2**

**Creating a suitable learning environment and appropriate strategies.**

In 2018, as part of the course Engaging in Social Research, one of the students I was tutoring struggled to understand how to write academic essays, as he told me during the second tutorial session. As Teaching Assistant, my first task was to see him during working hours in order to understand what was making so difficult for him to submit a task and plan together specific strategies of support to tackle the problem (A2, K1, K3, V1). We worked together on thinking about the best approach to specific subject (K1) considering his specific needs (V1). By sitting together during my office hours, I created a more relaxed and appropriate environment which was more suitable for this student, who was registered at DASS (V1).

It became my role as tutor to support him further in teaching him about the relevant anthropological discussions with regards the ethnographies we were reading and how those were linked to big anthropological debates (K1, K2, A2). I noticed it was particularly difficult for him to speak in front of his classmates. In consequence, during the rest of the semester we did some activities that involved writing, rather than verbal analysis (K3, V1). In addition, regularly during the semester I checked that he was on the right track by his opinion about the ethnographies we were reading (A2, V1). This was a way to not only checking the content of the module, but also supporting him to build his own self-confidence (V1).

Over the course of the module, I invited all the students to discuss the structure and approach of the papers they were preparing for submission, which provided a positive reinforcement of our discussions in terms of how to conduct an anthropological analysis as part of their own essays and tasks (A2, K2, K3). This resulted in a successful completion of the tasks, with an improvement of the average quality of submitted pieces of writing, and a great success for everyone at the end of the module (A2, A4, K3). It also helped the student registered at DASS to boost his self-confidence and get a good final mark, which seemed so distant to him at the beginning of the module (V1). This effort and flexibility to adapt approaches to teaching was reflected on the students’ final survey where they highlighted my role as TA, suggesting that the support provided by the TA had been crucial in getting to understand how to write academic essays and engage with complex ideas (A2, K2, V2). This success encouraged me to continue adapting my teaching skills considering the students’ needs in particular (K5).

References

Anzai, Y., & Simon, H. A. (1979) The theory of learning by Psychological Review, 86(2), 124-140.

**Example 3**

**Organising workshops**

In 2019, I planned and organised two workshops of circa two hours each on the current impact that digital media and digital tools have on working practices in the humanities (A1, A2, A5, V4). These were aimed at postgraduate students (mainly PGRs), but also attracted more senior members of staff. As an effective way to achieve the instructional goals of these workshops, I used a mix of active learning strategies in conjunction with the traditional lecture (Cashin, 1990; A2, K2, K3). I applied this in different ways with different results. The expertise to give this workshop, I developed through the training and work I undertook as part of my PhD (K1).

The first workshop was focused on the use of network analysis and visualisation in the humanities. I began by introducing myself and asking the participants to do the same. I see this to create an effective learning environment since it allows me to adjust the workshop to the different needs and skillset or background of the individual learners (A4, V1). It also allows me to group people together with similar interests during exercises and discussion. In order to accommodate for different kinds of learning, I gave a traditional lecture that used a combination of text, images, and videos in visual presentations to introduce the basic concepts and theory (Flemming, 1995; K4). The second part of the workshop consisted of a practical introduction that helped to integrate technology in the working practices of the participants. For this, I had created a case study that I demonstrated and asked students to replicate it themselves (K2, K3). During each step of this tutorial, the participants would support each other in each step through cooperative learning or Iwould provide one-to-one learning support where required (A3, K3). At the end of each exercise, I verbally asked for feedback on the effectiveness the exercises. Also, at the end of the workshop I used anonymised written feedback forms to gather additional feedback (A3, K3). This aims to follow the model of 'new feedback' (Boud and Molloy, 2013; Orsmond, et al., 2013). In other words, it encourages dialogue between giver and receiver of feedback, self-assessment, involves peers, etc.

The second workshop I gave was on best practices for 3D modelling in academic research (A1, A2). Similar to the other workshop, I used a mix of active learning strategies in conjunction with the traditional lecture (A2, K2). But rather than a practical introduction to a particular piece of software, the focus in this workshop was more on instruction and cooperative learning. To discuss the information I presented, I divided the participants into small groups (K2, K3). After each section, they were given the opportunity to share their experiences with each other. Then, I asked them to feed this back to me (Falchikov and Blythman, 2001). This allowed me to evaluate the effectiveness of my teaching (A4). In spite of enjoying these discussions, the feedback that I received informally and formally from the participants was that they would have loved some hands-on experience. Looking forward, I will make sure that in the mix of teaching strategies I will make sure that there are a variety of active learning activities; and that these go beyond cooperative learning. When I will give this workshop in the future, for example, I will ensure that I get licenses to enable the participants to create a small 3D model during the workshop.
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### Example 4 - Assessment and feedback

(The following are Powerpoint slides from a successful video presentation for the award of Associate Fellowship.)

**

****

### References

### Two references are required to support a LEAP submission. However, the Faculty of Humanities will provide you with one of these two references, so you only need to identify one referee yourself. The Faculty of Humanities LEAP team will contact your nominated person for their reference.

### 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 |  |
| One referee identified and alerted |  |
| Completed Mapping exercise |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Video Presentation (10 min)** |  |
| Introduction – about me (approx. 1 slide) |  |
| Case Study 1 (approx. 1-2 slides) |  |
| Case Study 2 (approx. 1-2 slides) |  |
| Summary (approx. 1 slide) |  |
| 1 A4 handout (optional) |  |
| One referee identified and alerted |  |
| Completed Mapping exercise |  |