|  |
| --- |
| **1. The Review process** |
| You will be provided with no more than three applications to assess and will be allocated to a Panel; for D2, this will be with one other colleague, although others may participate for developmental or quality assurance purposes.  You should firstly independently assess the application, considering the Areas of Activity, Core Knowledge and Professional Values, as appropriate for this category, as set out overleaf. Using the Review form, select Award, Award Pending Condition (APC) or Refer for each Descriptor and, considering all of the Descriptors together, select an overall decision. You may also wish to make your own notes on why you have reached this decision, to discuss with other Panel members. |
| One colleague will act as Lead Reviewer for the Panel and is responsible for arranging and facilitating any discussions about the application (face-to-face, email, phone-call). The Panel should agree an overall decision; if the Panel is unable to agree a decision, the Lead Reviewer will raise this with EDS, stating the area(s) of concern. The Convenor will discuss the application with EDS colleagues, reach a decision and advise the Panel of this. The Lead Reviewer will complete and return the Panel’s completed Review form to EDS, by the required date, and this should include any comments/feedback for the candidate that the Panel have agreed on. |
| Whether as a Lead reviewer or Panel member, your feedback on the review process, the overall standard of applications or any suggestions for enhancement to the PSF scheme is always welcome and will be taken forward to our Advisory Board, which meets twice each year. You may pass any comments to the Lead Reviewer, who can return with the completed Review forms, or do contact us directly at [psf@bcu.ac.uk](mailto:psf@bcu.ac.uk). If you would like to attend the Advisory Board, do let us know. It would be useful if you could highlight any application, or part of an application, that is seen as excellent, in order that we can liaise with the applicant for potential future use of their application as an example for colleagues. |
| EDS will advise candidates of the Panel’s decision and attach the completed Review form. If the decision is APC, the applicant will be advised to review the dimension(s) judged as requiring more evidence to achieve Award and to prepare for a professional dialogue with one or more Panel members; the Panel may agree that this can be conducted by one Panel member only. It is the candidate’s responsibility to contact the Panel Lead to arrange a date for this dialogue, to allow the Panel to return their decision by the agreed APC date.  In the case of both Refer and APC, candidates are advised to contact their Faculty/School Lead (Fellowship) for advice, although EDS may contact one of more Panel members to clarify any feedback on the Review form, should the candidate request this. |

|  |
| --- |
| **2. Reviewing applications** |
| You should judge applications in relation to these UKPSF Descriptors for D2:  I. Successful engagement across all five Areas of Activity  II. Appropriate knowledge and understanding across all aspects of Core Knowledge  III. A commitment to all the Professional Values  IV. Successful engagement in appropriate teaching practices related to the Areas of Activity  V. Successful incorporation of subject and pedagogic research and/or scholarship within the above activities, as part of an integrated approach to academic practice  VI. Successful engagement in continuing professional development in relation to teaching, learning, assessment, and, where appropriate, related academic or professional practices |
| **Making your judgement** |
| D2.I and 2.IV are closely linked and are treated together. There must be evidence of successful engagement and appropriate teaching practices with all five Areas of Activity. This evidence will give brief descriptions of specific examples of when and how the candidate engaged with each of the Areas and provide at least two examples of engagement in each Areas. It is important that the candidate clearly indicates their role in relation to the examples given; e.g. for A3 they should explain what their contribution was to the design of that assessment.  The depth of coverage of particular Areas will vary according to the particular context and role of the candidate - sections don’t necessarily have to be of the same length. However, all Areas must be adequately addressed and examples should be drawn from recent practice.  If a reviewer ‘refers’ any Area of Activity then **this is an automatic overall referral** for Fellowship for that reviewer; if the view of the other accreditor differs then a joint decision must be negotiated.  The evidence for the Areas of Activity should be reflective and this reflection should be based directly on the other Dimensions of Framework - that is, on the Core Knowledge and Professional Values; candidates must demonstrate that they have engaged explicitly with all Dimensions and not just with the Areas of Activity.  D2.III Professional values underpin all of the professional activity of teaching and supporting learning and the candidate should provide evidence of their commitment to the values throughout their application. In principle, evidence of all of the professional values might be found anywhere within the APP though evidence for V1, perhaps in particular, naturally falls into A3. V2 may often be found in A3 and A4. V3 and V4 tie in particularly to A5.  D2.II, D2.V and D2.VI are closely linked and are treated together and evidence of fulfilling these Descriptors may be found in all sections of the APP. D2.II The examples must be accompanied by a discussion of the rationale of the candidate’s approach in terms of their acquisition and application of Core Knowledge. You are expected to use your professional judgement in relation to the overall depth and adequacy of coverage of each element of Core Knowledge.  The term ‘appropriate’ should also be used to inform your judgement about evidence of Core Knowledge. All the elements should be interpreted in the light of the professional context of the applicant and what is appropriate for them given that context. For example, the learning technologies they choose to employ will be heavily dependent on the context in which they are teaching and/or supporting learning.  D2.VI A real and practical commitment to CPD is central to the Framework and no candidate should gain Fellowship who has not clearly and explicitly evidenced such a commitment. This emphasis is stated explicitly in A5, but is also reaffirmed in K5 and 6 and V3. It follows that evidence for this Descriptor is likely to be found in the A5 section of the APP and in particular will draw on K5 and 6 and V3. |
| **Completing the Review form** |
| Insert the candidate’s name, the names of all Panel members and date the decision was agreed.  For ‘Overall decision’ insert **Award**, **APC** or **Refer**, as appropriate:  Award: all criteria have been met; comment if there are substantial strengths which it would be good to share with the applicant  APC: one or more Dimensions require clarification before a final decision can be made. The candidate will be invited to consider Reviewers’ feedback and prepare to justify how they have met the requirements of the Dimension(s). This process is carried out via dialogue with one or more members of the Panel and lasts no longer than 20 minutes. It is the candidate’s responsibility to contact the Lead reviewer to arrange this dialogue and the EDS will advise the date by which the dialogue should take place. The Lead Reviewer should advise EDS of the final decision, no later than one week of the dialogue taking place.  Refer: one or more Dimensions were insufficiently covered. The candidate will be directed to use Reviewers’ feedback in preparing for a re-submission and should therefore indicate what the applicant needs to do to achieve Award.  Please label the Review form ‘**NAME\_CATEGORY\_DECISION**’ e.g. ‘SMITH\_D1\_REFER’ and return the form to [psf@bcu.ac.uk](mailto:psf@bcu.ac.uk), by the agreed date. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **All Areas of Activity, Core Knowledge and Professional Values must be evident.** | Some reviewers find it helpful to use this as a ‘marking grid’, for ✓ or their notes, to support the Panel discussion. This is optional, for your own use only – there is no requirement to complete this. |
| **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 |  |