



Summary report

Annual Review of HEA accredited CPD schemes 2015-16

Dr Ruth Pilkington PFHEA

Foreword to the Report

This 2015-16 summary report, again authored by Dr Ruth Pilkington on this occasion commissioned in her capacity as an independent researcher, presents an analysis of the second cycle of annual reporting on HEA accredited CPD schemes. This **full report** is accompanied by a **shortened version** which highlights key points.

In this second reporting cycle, 109 scheme leaders have provided data and evaluation on various aspects of their institution's accredited scheme. In the 2014-15 review, feedback highlighted the value of disseminating the outcomes from institutional reviews to the wider sector as an evidence base for practice. The examples provided throughout are self-reported but they demonstrate impacts to teaching and learning being experienced across institutions reporting in this cycle.

In addition to asking institutions to evaluate the positive impacts/strengths and areas for further development of their accredited provision, linked to the usual annual QA/QE cycle, the annual review is also intended to:

- > identify and facilitate the sharing of good practice across the sector;
- > inform the ongoing development of support and guidance material provided by the HEA;
- > inform the annual visit planning of the HEA as part of sector wide quality enhancement initiatives.

So, how have the HEA responded to the findings of the 2014-15 review? Our response to some of the areas identified for further consideration/development is set out below.

New opportunities to network and share practice

The 2014-15 review reported the value of the HEA through **facilitating the sharing of practice through events and networks**. The HEA has consequently developed a **new network for accredited programmes**, which enables the sharing of practice between scheme and programme leaders. In 2016-17, accredited programme network meetings have been included within subscription benefits and have been well attended; for example, the first two network meetings held in December 2016 and February 2017 attracted over 80 attendees. The final event for 2016-17 will be held in Edinburgh in June. The format of these network meetings has been designed to promote the sharing of good practice around support mechanisms and successful approaches to embedding the UKPSF, HEA Fellowship and the value and profile of teaching and learning activity.

In addition to network meetings, the 2014-15 annual review prompted the HEA to hold an **accredited programme network conference, entitled 'Beyond Fellowship'** in June 2016. A second Beyond Fellowship conference will be held in March 2017. Speakers for the March 2017 conference have been selected on the basis of points for development identified in the 2014-15 review (e.g. impact of HEA Fellowship on institutions and individuals, good

practice in dialogic assessment, developments for Descriptor 1, etc.) and providing a forum for discussion of current developments impacting on accredited provision (e.g. development of a new academic role apprenticeship in England).

In addition to the new accredited programme network, over the past year the HEA has also supported the establishment of a **new network for Principal Fellows**. Based on the success of this self-sustaining model, the HEA is now supporting the development of additional networks aimed at individuals holding other categories of HEA Fellowship.

Change to a four-year accreditation cycle

The HEA responded to feedback from the new accredited programme network and **extended the accreditation cycle from three to four years**. Institutions new to accreditation are now accredited for an initial 12-month period during which time the HEA will monitor and review the quality of the provision. After successful completion of this initial period, accreditation will be extended for a further three years.

Embedding of the UKPSF into career paths and promotions as well as for reward and recognition

Over the last two years, accreditation submissions have demonstrated that institutions are now commonly linking career paths to the UKPSF and HEA Fellowship. Despite this, **promotions boards still present common challenges** to teaching-track promotion to professor. In partnership with Cardiff Metropolitan University, the HEA held a joint symposium in March 2017 to further discussion around this topic.

Supporting Fellowship judgements

As well as reporting the value of the input of Externals to accredited programmes and schemes, analysis of scheme leaders commentaries in the 2014-15 review identified the need for **greater clarity around the requirements for the External role** to ensure a consistent approach across institutional schemes. As a result of this finding, the HEA strengthened the 2016-17 accreditation policy to clarify the required functions Externals are expected to fulfil. This forms a new Section 4.6 of the policy.

Subscriber accreditation support has been used by institutions to provide development for internal reviewers and mentors. In addition, events aimed at supporting the standardisation of internal Fellowship judgements will be held regionally in 2017. The HEA also visits internal panels on a regular basis and although this information remains confidential to each institution, these visits provide valuable insights which feed into HEA developments.

Development of HEA resources

On the basis of feedback provided in the 2014-15 review, the HEA commissioned both some **new case studies** to highlight key aspects of successful institutional schemes and

some resources to support **good practice in dialogic assessment**. These resources will be published during 2016-17.

The 2015-16 summary report

We hope that you will once again find the depth of evaluation provided by scheme leaders, reporting on activity in 2015-16, will demonstrate the value of Annual CPD Reviews as a tool to monitor, inform and evidence practice across the sector. We thank scheme leaders for their input to the 2015-16 reporting cycle and we are very grateful to Ruth Pilkington for her thorough analysis which has provided a rich report, contrasting the activities and impacts of mature and newer schemes. The report identifies both successes and common challenges faced. We hope that individuals and institutions will be able to utilise both the shorter report and the full report to inform practice over the coming year. The 2016-17 review cycle will adopt the timing of the UK academic year (based on feedback from the accredited programme network) and **will be launched in September 2017**.

From this commentary I hope you can see that we have used the insights from the first review cycle to inform ongoing enhancement to our work on accreditation and HEA Fellowship. This 2015/6 report will similarly provide rich insights to inform how we take this agenda forward and support all our colleagues across the sector who share our ambition to raise the profile of learning and teaching.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Alison Robinson-Canham". The signature is written in a cursive style and is positioned above a horizontal line that tapers at both ends.

Alison Robinson-Canham
Assistant Director: Professional Practice

Contents

Forward to the Report	2
Contents	5
Executive summary	7
1.0 Methodology	10
1.1 Data set	10
2.0 Section 2 of the review - strengths, issues and areas for development across schemes	11
2.1 Process support, resourcing and structures of schemes	12
2.1.1 Wider embedding of schemes	12
2.1.2 Development of mentors	13
2.1.3 Administration and data management	14
2.1.4 Capacity, processes and structures	16
2.1.5 Training	21
2.1.6 Externality and Sharing Across Schemes	22
2.2 Priorities, developments, issues and solutions	23
2.3 Analysis of data from additional accredited scheme reports	25
2.3.1 Strengths within new cohort of HEPs submitting reviews	27
2.3.2 Issues and challenges within new cohort of HEP reviews	28
2.3.3 The narrative of evolution for an accredited scheme	29
2.4 Concluding thoughts on Section 2	32
3.0 Section 3 - impact on institutions	33
3.1 Key findings from reviewing Section 3 of reviews	37
3.2 Examples of how hard factors are impacting on institutions	39
3.2.1 Factors 1-5: impact on staffing, systems and processes	39
3.2.2 Factors 6-8 evidencing strategic links and impact	43

3.3 Examples showing impact on institutions through soft factors	47
3.4 Analysis of responses from those reporting for first time in 2015-16	51
3.5 Summary reflections for Section 3	54
4.0 Section 4: impact on teaching and learning	56
4.1 Impacts on staff	58
4.2 Changing practice and behaviours of staff	62
4.2.1 Changing practices involving students	64
4.2.2 Examples of impact on Graduate Teaching Assistants(GTAs)	64
4.2.3 Examples of evidence informing practice	65
4.2.4 Impact on practice through dialogue and peer sharing	65
4.3 Impact on progression and leadership	67
4.4 Changes to learning and teaching environments	68
4.5 Analysis of data for Section 4 submitted by institutions reporting for first time in 2015-16	69
4.6 Summary for Section 4 of reports	72
5.0 Conclusion	74
5.1 Key figures from 2015-16 report of annual review of accredited CPD schemes	74
5.2 Key conclusions drawn from each section	75
5.2.1 Conclusions drawn on strengths and issues for institutions	75
5.2.2 Conclusion on broader impact around schemes	77
5.2.3 Conclusions with respect to impact on teaching	77
5.3 Summary of review findings	78
6.0 References	80

Executive summary

Building on the report by Dr Ruth Pilkington, released in spring 2016, which analysed institutional submissions from the first 2014-15 annual review of HEA accredited CPD schemes, this second report extends the work and provides an analysis of 109 institutions reporting in 2015-16.

This analysis of responses from both established CPD schemes (reporting to the HEA in both 2014-15 and 2015-16) and newer schemes (reporting in 2015-16 for the first time) provides valuable insight around embedding programmes, evolving practice and common themes relevant to the establishment and ongoing development of HEA accredited CPD schemes.

The review informs on how institutional CPD schemes have developed and the wider impact of HEA accredited schemes and Fellowship. The first 2014-15 summary report drew on reviews submitted by 88 institutions. In that report, Sections 2, 3, 4 and 5 from the review were analysed. In this 2015-16 report, reviews from that original group of institutions are supplemented by an additional 21 recently accredited schemes.

The aim of the review is to explore:

- > Elements of impact and ongoing developments for mature accredited schemes
- > Specific areas of strength worthy of wider consideration
- > Developments and practice among recent accreditations
- > Conclusions which influence future activity by scheme leaders and the HEA to enhance the work of schemes in institutions

Whilst there have been amendments to the actual review documentation in this 2015-16 review, there is sufficient continuity between reviews to allow a comparison of qualitative data; scheme activities and progress made; self-reported strengths of schemes; impact across institutions and upon teaching more widely; and issues raised by implementation of the scheme. Interestingly, in more established schemes, there is already a shift in how weaknesses and issues have been reported, with a far stronger emphasis on future-orientated remedial activity and resolving issues. By comparing how recently accredited institutions report on their early schemes, it is apparent many lessons have been learned across the sector, and a lifecycle for accreditation is emerging. The new additions illustrate how institutions developing first iterations of an accredited

scheme have been influenced by pre-existing schemes; the impact of TEF is apparent too; and across all reports the emphasis on CPD and evaluation is high.

The qualitative comments from scheme leads were analysed thematically and themes reported under relevant headings, making links where appropriate to the previous cycle of reports. Since the first 2014-15 review, a further 36 institutions had gained accreditation for CPD schemes by the end of 2015-16. Only 21 'new' institutions were issued a 2015-16 review, however, as they had operated for the full 12 month reporting period. In this analysis, the 21 newly accredited schemes are reviewed as a distinct cohort in order to further findings and identify any trends which may inform institutions considering the development of an accredited scheme and future work across the sector.

The full report provides a valuable resource for the HEA in planning and developing future work; aids understanding of how institutions are currently engaging with Fellowships, UK Professional Standards Framework (UKPSF) and CPD for the purpose of enhancing teaching and learning; and in providing an evidence base to inform practice across the sector. The process of review is exposing benefits and areas for support and development by both the HEA and the academic community. Overall, it appears that the introduction of CPD schemes for accredited Higher Education Providers (HEPs) is having a significant impact on HE culture:

- > Fellowship schemes continue to inform mechanisms of culture change, both hard and soft, in respect of teaching and learning;
 - These changes have resulted in definitive changes to systems and processes with respect to reward and recognition of teaching.
- > Schemes are currently hesitant about concrete and definitive correlations between scheme activity and teaching, although many suggest there are cumulative impacts as a result of synergies across institutional activity in this area, of which CPD is one;
- > Evaluation and monitoring of impacts are priorities for all schemes;
- > It is apparent that the priorities for teaching enhancement in institutions and in scheme activity are being affected by wider TEF agendas;
- > It is apparent schemes are increasingly operating with confidence and authority; they are self-directed and have proactively developed systems and processes for future enhancement and growth, especially for CPD;
- > As in 2014-15, mentoring, the targeting of specific groups (such as Descriptor 3, Descriptor 1, GTAs and learning support services) and the embedding of

Fellowships as a tool for change continued to be highlighted by scheme leaders:

- There is a strong emphasis on becoming a Senior Fellow of the HEA (Descriptor 3) for the purposes of supporting and rewarding leadership and change work;
 - Associate Fellowship (Descriptor 1) is being successfully employed to ensure future teaching faculty and core teaching activity are meeting quality standards;
 - Clarity of processes and support associated with Fellowship continue to be a key success factor: writing retreats, peer exchange and mentoring are emphasised;
 - Data management appears to be a particular area of development.
- Schemes are now targeting hard-to-reach staff specifically, and the higher profile of teaching is having a positive impact on those faculty members operating from a research perspective, suggesting increased status for teaching;
 - Issues of capacity to manage demand, time, judgment and successful completion continue, but are being addressed responsively and pro-actively;
 - Embedded and distributed approaches (for departments, partners, addressing local agendas) with respect to Fellowship, teaching and learning enhancement and CPD appear to be prevalent;
 - Partnership and externality are also frequently referred to, both as success factors and as areas for development;
 - There is a question as to whether collaborations established during development (e.g. between HR and development units) will be sustained. As systems and expectations become embedded, it may be a challenge for institutions to maintain the initial high profile and interest levels. CPD and TEF requirements are providing impetus in the medium term.

1.0 Methodology

As previously, the data for the Annual CPD Review was provided in a template. HEPs provided qualitative and quantitative responses. In this summary report, Sections 2, 3 and 4 provided the focus for analysis, as these targeted specifically strengths, impact for the institution and impacts for the student experience/teaching and learning. It also allowed an exploration of issues for scheme activity over 2015-16. This review provides an analysis of the dataset and summarises evidence of impact and developments over the period of the two review cycles. The exploration of themes under each of the following headings should build a valuable and comprehensive picture of progress with respect to schemes so that learning can be shared, and inform wider activity. The inclusion of a further 21 reviews from recently accredited schemes enhances and extends conclusions and evidence with respect to trends, activity and institution responses.

Sections 2-4 of the reports are the main areas for reflective and qualitative commentary on scheme activities. Section 4 also adds specific evidence of impact on teaching and learning. In the first review of HEA accredited CPD schemes (2014-15); there were suggestions of findings that might parallel models of impact (Guskey, 2000; Kirkpatrick, 2006). Section 4 for 2015-16 adds further evidence, supplementing the 2014-15 review, and reveals trends of broader significance for learning and teaching. Data provided within the 2015-16 reviews was analysed largely using qualitative and thematic review drawing on themes identified within the 2014-15 review. Information was interrogated using thematic analysis, alongside some use of frequencies in respect of specific themes. It also involved comparison of findings, identification of trends and identification of examples of good practice.

Examples of good and interesting practice have been anonymised and included, highlighting specific approaches, which may be useful for others to consider. A discussion and comparison of findings and trends is included throughout to highlight how the original 88 institutions have changed and developed over the period 2014-16, alongside discussion of trends and patterns emerging from the analysis of the additional 21 reports for recent schemes.

1.1 Data set

In total 109 institutional reviews form the basis of this report, comprising 88 institutions also reporting in 2014-15 and an additional further 21 institutions reporting for the first time in 2015-16.

This report discusses each key theme in turn, with key points highlighted and comparisons made with findings from the previous cycle of review. Additional comments are made on the data for the new intake of schemes, cases of good practice given and final conclusions and recommendations drawn.

2.0 Section 2 of the review - strengths, issues and areas for development across schemes

In the 2014-15 review of schemes, four areas were identified as generating significant strengths: **'wider embedding', 'capacity and structures', 'process support elements'** and **'VLE and resources'**. Under each theme several strengths were discussed which showed how institutions were responding and benefitting from the scheme activity. Benefits emerged around how schemes were managed and embedded. In the first 2014-15 review, issues and challenges were addressed separately within Section 4, with strengths addressed in Section 2. In this second (2015-16) review, strengths and issues have been combined, and the consequence is that issues for the 2014-15 cohort of 88 institutions appear to be fewer in number, and in almost every case they are discussed in terms of how they have been addressed or are being addressed by new cycles of accreditation. At the same time, as noted below in Section 2.4 of this report, many of those issues persist: **time, capacity, demand, workloads, decision-making**, and **specific Descriptor requirements**. These issues also predominate in new institutions indicating they are fundamental, shared challenges.

There is evidence of significant learning taking place, some of which may be the result of **sharing between networks: externality** for example is a new strength often mentioned. The HEA has already strengthened and clarified guidance and expectations on externality in 2016 as a response to previous discussion of it as an issue. Another example of a strength from 2014-15 reports was mentoring. **Mentoring** is again highlighted as a key factor contributing to progress, successful completion, and which is given substantial attention in the form of training and expansion, with 56/109 (54%) institutions making explicit mention of mentoring in this section. Additionally, an interesting finding from the 2014-15 review of 88 institutions was that 40% of institutions offered some form of oral assessment within Fellowship processes. In the second (2015-16) review, it appears that oral assessment has been developed further: a number of institutions describe using oral forms of assessment as a response to issues identified for Descriptor 3 applications, namely around D3.VII, for example.

In this review, comments from scheme leaders in Section 2 focus more upon the **operational aspects** and **embedding** of the schemes. The responses appear

more targeted – whilst often lengthy. There is also an apparent shift in tone denoting a sense of confidence and **proactivity** rather than reactivity.

The revised themes emerging in Section 2 for this cycle of the review process are entitled: 'process support', 'resourcing and structures of schemes', 'priorities and developments', 'issues and responses'. There is considerable cross over between themes, and so in the following sections they are linked in the discussion where appropriate. Suggested trends are highlighted and comments linked back to the first 2014-15 review to indicate where these have acquired significant impetus. The findings for recently accredited schemes reporting for the first time in this review are given in Section 2.3.

2.1 Process support, resourcing and structures of schemes

This section combines a number of areas from the 2014-15 review of reports. Four key areas are discussed under this heading: wider embedding, mentoring, administration and externality.

2.1.1 Wider embedding of schemes

In the 2014-15 review, Section 2 particularly emphasised the importance of having **senior** and **wider management buy-in**, the significant role played by **mentors**, and wider alignment of schemes with institutional objectives. Use of senior management team representation on panels; creating visibility for schemes by involving line and other managers in **celebrations**; the inclusion of managers visibly in mechanisms of the award and dissemination of success, were strongly highlighted in the earlier review.

In the second (2015-16) round of reports, the use of management in building **initial engagement** appears to have moved on. It is still mentioned as a positive factor in scheme activity, but more is made of how management relates to wider embedding. For example, scheme leads refer to **departmental strategies**, embedding support between HR, schools and the centre. Certain institutions discuss **revisions to committee structures** as the scheme matures. In one case a governance structure for the scheme is mentioned, in others they make reference to targeted discussions with Deans on progress and **bespoke provision** for schools/particular groups of staff. For example;

Following our re-accreditation we established a governance structure through the University Professional Development Sub-Committee. This involves a bi-annual process to review and enhance accredited provision at an institutional level together with strategic discussions reviewing all professional development opportunities and initiatives...

There is a strong support infrastructure of trained staff working at faculty levels. The recruitment of UKPSF Leads (all holding Descriptor 3/Descriptor 4) has enabled the Scheme to extend its reach within faculties and tailored support to suit a disciplinary context. Leads are a resource engaged to support and assess the quantity of applicants, in order to address institutional targets.

2.1.2 Development of mentors

Mentoring continues to be important across schemes. It is again widely noted as contributing to success within claims. In this instance however, the emphasis is on how they appear to work as a resource. With 59% of institutions from the original 88 referring to mentoring as part of their process or as a planned introduction, and further institutions discussing the role of '**Champions**', **School Leads**, and **Teaching Fellows**, it is clear that mentoring is playing a very specific role in how schemes for experienced staff are working. In addition, other institutions highlight the contribution and significance of mentoring using evidence from evaluations.

Mentors are often identified as a target for recruitment: for example, they are targeted in expansion activity as a response to capacity and workload issues; in profiling the role, it is often linked with Senior Fellow status and described as an **opportunity for good standing and professional development**. Mentoring is also discussed from the perspective of managing this mechanism of support: **workload** and work relief is mentioned, as is management of allocations of mentors. In one instance, it appears that having mentoring within the scheme led to **centralisation** of their work to harmonise with other institutional systems of mentoring. In several instances mentors are described as **acquiring formal roles** and recognition of their work, in others they do this as 'payback', as recognition of value gained from Fellowship. The example below shows how mentoring is being formally embedded as an institutional initiative and it suggests access to formal and essential training.

The [mentor] role is signposted as a leadership opportunity and valuable evidence when working towards Descriptor 3 combined with mentorship. This peer review activity is regarded as a valued contribution to professional development within the annual performance review process.

Mentoring examples indicate its role in assuring completions, as well as its value as a **strategy for personalising the process and engaging hard-to-reach** staff. This is significant as many institutions appear to be

widening the reach of schemes to meet targets and new priorities. Mentor training is therefore an additional focus for discussion.

Participants on the Experiential Route find it difficult to prioritise their application for Fellowship and take many months to complete it, becoming frustrated with the process and their ability to progress. To help address this, we invited an expert in academic mentoring to lead a development session with all mentors and leads; providing them with the necessary skills and approaches to help their mentees to maintain momentum.

In reviewing comments from scheme leaders, one of the challenges inherent in mentoring which requires careful management may be the support to mentors in terms of how they manage boundaries, and avoid becoming a potential 'prop' for the mentee. This can lead to changes in how mentoring is managed across an institution as the following suggests;

The original accreditation envisaged UKPSF being owned by faculties with faculty-based mentors guiding and supporting staff. ... We had not anticipated complications with how mentoring connected up with other systems of enhancing practice and faculty-based mentoring of all new staff in departments. Mentoring now falls under HR and Academic Development is currently involved in a university wide group pulling together the different mentoring schemes in operation at the university.

2.1.3 Administration and data management

With respect to process support there is considerable discussion of administration and data capture and management. 24 (27%) of the original 88 institutions specifically mention administration and data management both as an issue and an essential mechanism. A further 17 (19%) talk explicitly of managing progress within Fellowship processes. 46% of institutions outline the introduction of specific tools to **capture data on progress and Fellowship**. Progress within schemes is highlighted specifically in the context of reporting out to schools, and managing targets. In one interesting instance targets have been dropped and replaced by **planning meetings** with Deans and faculties, establishing a 'softer' approach to Fellowship. Scheme leaders, in collaboration with HR or central services, have introduced a number of VLE tools for **tracking** data and progress and providing access to **evaluative mechanisms**. There is evidence therefore that centralisation of information systems is occurring, which reflects embedded approaches.

Scheme information on completion and progress has in some cases led to 'quick wins' and helped **structure logistics** and even fed changes to delivery

management. One institution has introduced a **traffic light system** for managing progress. As numbers, growth and workload for panels was a considerable burden for institutions hitherto, structuring logistics is clearly aimed at resolving this issue. **Panel roles** are being clarified and whilst workload for panel members remains an issue, institutions are benefitting from earlier work to raise the numbers of Senior and Principal Fellows or have developed their logistics and **workload models**.

Commitment of significant operational resources to the panels is a factor, which is noted at various levels within the institution. As all the panels involve senior academic managers (Associate Heads of School and above), the cost in time of this resource is significant. However the Institutional commitment to the scheme and to the UKPSF means these resources are made available. As capacity at Senior Fellowship has increased the institution can broaden the membership of its panels.

The contribution and value of having dedicated administrators or an **admin resource** is widely cited by institutions, again reflecting the need to establish information and management systems to underpin institution-wide schemes. This also aids in reporting and profiling. Alongside this investment and resourcing, budgets emerge subtly as a concern with respect to securing future administrative resources. The data and administrative examples below exemplify clearly how schemes are applying data management systems to Fellowship progress and completion as well as for evaluation and broader enhancement activity.

The development of Qlikview to capture this data has helped in clearly identifying School data and statistics.

The provision of a dedicated administrator has enabled the extremely efficient operational running and the scaling up of the scheme; we have developed a comprehensive database to complement spreadsheet data and this will allow us to do more refined searches and analysis.

We have improved relationships, collaboration and working processes with HR, including processes for recruitment, induction, probation and annual review. An institutional online tracker tool was collaboratively developed to provide timely reports demonstrating progress against targets for Fellowship, with a traffic light system, of completions, progressors and non-engagers.

Recognising the potential of identifying good practice from across the institution at Panels, we are developing a 'Directory of Practice'. Those completing Descriptor 3 applications are asked to complete an additional piece indicating what they could contribute to others'

learning and are willing to share. This is captured in a themed directory, which is made available to all staff and will be further utilised in a forthcoming institution wide project to encourage peer learning and development.

2.1.4 Capacity, processes and structures

The 2014-15 reviews included a considerable amount of discussion around capacity building, and the operation of panels and support structures. Discussion of these elements has shifted in the second year of review. Cohorts are being used in a targeted way to manage numbers, workloads and completions. This means that mechanisms can be introduced in a more structured way to carry the process of application along.

We have responded by introducing a new 'cohort' approach and now invite each School in the university to identify a set number of staff to be supported by the Accelerate team each trimester. The cohort participates in a highly structured CPD experience with the expectation that they will complete within a short time period.

Many institutions appear to have invested in schemes so as to support collaboration with central services, or provide **additional administrative support**. This latter point is perceived as an important success factor. Schemes appear to have developed in many cases to a point where dispersed and distributed support for Fellowship is underway.

There is evidence of **streamlining of processes** occurring, and targeting of specific groups to meet institutional priorities and needs. The HEA reports institutions increasingly take advantage of the Major/Minor Change process to enable revisions to be made to schemes mid accreditation cycle. There are several schemes introducing specific pathways, e.g. targeting Descriptor 1, or to support progression to Descriptor 3. A frequency analysis revealed that 20 institutions (23%) identify 'Graduates who Teach', PGRs, hourly paid and professional service staff as receiving specific attention associated with Descriptor 1. Descriptor 3 is also given specific attention in 25 reports (28%). Many scheme leaders highlight the coherence of and complementarity between PG certificate programmes and experienced staff schemes.

Descriptor 3 is linked to mentoring and assessments as well as championing and wider leadership roles. It is targeted for career and promotional grounds and is linked specifically with midcareer staff. It is also associated with teaching quality both as a mechanism for its achievement and also in some institutions as evidence towards TEF.

Descriptor 4 (where mentioned) is discussed as something that is being dropped or a focus for greater rigour. **Decision-making** remains a concern for many but schemes appear to be aware of it and are developing solutions pro-actively: **streamlining assessment; strengthening training and moderation; incorporating exemplars** in documentation and using dedicated panel VLEs.

Examples highlight challenges for Senior Fellowship decision-making in particular; getting panels together, as well as avoiding conflicts of interest; and the issue of dealing with those who still do not engage with support systems. This accompanies widespread reports of increased attention being paid to developing Descriptor 3 numbers in institutions.

An issue is the distinct nature of criterion D3.VII, with some participants applying too soon after gaining Descriptor 2 (and thereby not being able to demonstrate “sustained” record of effectiveness) or with a role and experience insufficient for demonstrating D3.VII.

There is a minority of applicants who do not engage with the support structures (i.e. mentoring and guidance documents) and submit poor portfolios. The number of these has decreased over the time the scheme has been running and we have developed more rigorous approaches to sifting initial submissions.

Recognition panel members used to be drawn from the pool of scheme mentors. We are now developing a separate pool of panel members to reduce conflicts and challenges presented by conflicts of interest.

One challenge is finding enough trained assessors for each panel from an increasingly busy academic community. Numbers of applications for Senior Fellowship is increasing and having to find three assessors each time for each application is a challenge. This is being addressed by continuing to build and develop the pool of assessors and share the reading of drafts with a member of the team.

Reaccreditation is discussed as an opportunity to refine systems and processes, and there is considerable assurance in how systems are described. A handful of institutions reflect on **HEA changes to documentation**: process requirements (panel membership), HEA accreditation processes; they also voice a desire for consistency and fewer changes. The HEA has consulted widely in clarifying systems and this is reflected in how **reaccreditation** is also seen as providing an opportunity for enhancement and improvement; becoming something positive.

In general what emerges from reports are a number of key components of success, which are shared across all schemes.

Success factors associated with processes:

Diagnostic or pre-submission checklists; streamlined documents and use of mapping documents or templates linked to descriptors; VLEs and good practice examples; workshops and writing retreats to support mid process activity; mentors as a resource; trained confident assessors; clear feedback both for referrals and informing future professional development; establishing communities of practice for fellows.

Alongside talking confidently about streamlining documents and processes and about their strengths, scheme leaders also emphasise their confidence in their assessment and moderation training and the rigour of their approach.

Several instances emerge of innovative and interesting practices. There is a trend towards a **collective approach within Fellowship processes**: peer-to-peer events, for example, and cross-institutional learning groups. Examples suggest the purpose of this is to strengthen discursive practice and peer sharing.

We run three-hour 'Writing lunches'. Fellowship applicants get a quiet space to write their applications and benefit from support and advice. Working alongside curriculum and change initiatives, the scheme engages thousands in the development of **research-based education** for the institution

Investment in the infrastructure of the scheme has enabled growth and ensured it can be appropriately supported while maintaining the emphasis we give to **the collegial and supportive philosophies** developed around this scheme over the past few years when numbers were lower.

Use of **peer observation** mentioned in the 2014-15 review has been refined in some cases to comprise a crucial contribution, e.g. referee observation, and use of observation by mentors. This activity is also being developed by schemes so as to complement wider institutional initiatives in this area and in some instances may also demonstrate a response to the HEA requirements for 'authentication of practice'.

Assessment at Descriptor 2 and Descriptor 3 includes an account of learning and development gained through engagement in peer-to-peer observation, following the Collaborative Observation approach embodied in the new peer observation Code of Practice, introduced at the same time as the accreditation of the scheme.

The university operates a peer practice exchange based on existing literature and best practice in other institutions, which is popular among academics seeking HEA fellowship through the scheme. The exchange allows reflection on peer review of teaching and pedagogic practice for further enhancement.

Student involvement in CPD-related activity is an interesting development in a small minority of institutions (15, or 14%). It may reflect the growing interest in partnership across the sector and the importance of the student perspective in evidencing excellence. It also raises **challenges of confidentiality**, however, which are not noted in any reports, and therefore may be an area for HEA guidance.

Pedagogic theory and Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) is mentioned as a subject of formalised support. Examples highlight courses, and specific workshops. This reflects its important contribution to teaching excellence and embedding. In the 2014-15 review this was an area of weakness for many, with some still struggling in this area and it has therefore been a focus for development and targeted effort.

Key features of applications are the opportunities to discover, discuss and share different pedagogical approaches across disciplines and the focus of the course assignments on critical reflection on and application of scholarship to actual educational practice.

We recognise the need to strengthen the links between professional recognition, the scholarship of teaching and learning and pedagogic research and plan to consolidate this following the restructuring of the department which may involve a move into a newly formed 'Institute of Education'

Many participants have talked about successful changes they have made to their teaching practice, scholarship practice and research practice as well as using their portfolios to champion change and evidence-based educational developments.

A comprehensive evaluation of the participant scheme experience, undertaken in preparation for re-accreditation, indicated Fellows valued mentoring, the development, and some excellent scholarly outputs have been produced. Some participants experienced intellectual difficulty in engaging with practitioner inquiry and this will be addressed in our replacement scheme.

Experienced schemes identify the value of **writing retreats** (36% of 88 institutions), which take some interesting forms, being described as retreats, space, writing cafes and lunches, writing support sessions, 'time to think, time to write', online formats. These 'retreats' vary from short one hour slots to long dedicated days and may involve peers, Fellows, 1-2-1 opportunities and use of

exemplars. They are also highlighted as opportunities for sharing and discussion. This appears across reports as having almost as great a value as mentoring for successful completion, and especially as providing support for those using written submissions.

Through evaluation we became aware that colleagues in some disciplines were finding it challenging to write case studies in a style that was unfamiliar for their discipline affecting engagement. At writing retreats we now articulate more explicitly that the style of writing expected is not unlike that in science disciplines (analysing evidence, building an argument, drawing conclusions). For the next academic year the scheme is offering a session on Reflective Writing to support applicants.

Our Professional Writing retreats involve day-long workshop led by scheme facilitators. We engage in dialogue about supporting and learning and use “snack writing” and “writing to prompts” (Murray, 2013) to frame writing elements. As our scheme is currently a written only route, this retreat alongside mentoring is the most effective way to support a successful claim. Feedback from the retreats is consistently excellent.

Monthly HEA writing retreats offer academics a day away from their usual responsibilities. This enables meaningful engagement with the application and time for colleagues to reflect on their teaching identity. Participants work through writing exercises to shape their application, become familiar with the application process, and receive a 30 minute one-to-one consultation on their application. The day is cross-faculty so colleagues from a range of disciplines and teams come together to discuss their applications, teaching successes and share best practice. Successful applicants talk about the realities of writing and submitting an application.

There is also a group of institutions who recognise issues of **reflective writing** as a challenge for **specific disciplines** or which are trying to develop inclusive practice to respond to e.g. disability, international and partnership staff. They adopt a range of approaches to support progression in reflection and clarity of terminology for example.

Candidates were all very good at reflecting verbally but it took a while to do this in an essay format. All candidates acknowledged the tutorial process introduced had been useful in helping them to tell their own story and reflect on teaching and learning events.

There has been some variation in language and terminology across guidance documentation and handbooks. This guidance is currently being reviewed and updated in consultation with a number of internal

reviewers to produce clear and concise guidance with consistent language throughout.

Dialogue continues to be mentioned. In this review it is more frequently associated with Descriptor 3 (7 examples), and is discussed as a possible way of allowing applicants to explore the **requirements of D3.VII**. The use of dialogue described in Section 2 is often a response to early challenges and characterises a mature proactive approach to its development. It is discussed more extensively as an element within Section 3 in the context of 'impact' and embedding.

We are reviewing the Descriptor 3 dialogue process to make it more of a dialogue and less like a viva. We will be offering workshops for applicants with specific additional mentor and assessor training for those involved with dialogic assessments.

Although very labour-intensive from the mentor/assessor perspective, our "professional dialogue" route is popular for colleagues applying for Descriptor 3. They evaluate the professional dialogue as challenging and very supportive, which assessors conduct professionally. Dialogues are audio recorded rather than videoed, making it easier and more timely for verification purposes. With the permission of the applicant, we use these recordings for training and sharing of good practice sessions.

2.1.5 Training

Training of mentors and assessors is discussed positively. As an HEA requirement it is linked to clear mechanisms and processes. This also reflects a progression with respect to the first 2014-15 reviews, where responses indicated that the focus was on early capacity building or as a response to issues. The examples of shadowing, observing panels and participating in review and moderation from cycle one of reports appear to have gained broad acceptance across schemes, and been reinforced within systems. Scheme leaders also describe training as an important enhancement with staged and progressive involvement of Fellowship graduates as assessors and mentors respectively. They highlight particularly **panel shadowing and support for judgments**, hence addressing concerns voiced by scheme leaders in the first 2014-15 review.

Creating an active community of Mentors has enhanced the scheme. Colleagues awarded Fellowship at Descriptors 1-4 are invited to attend a Mentor Induction and Development Workshop, supported by a Mentoring Guide. Following the workshop, colleagues take part in an Assessment Panel consisting of Panel members experienced and competent in making Fellowship decisions. New members are supported with the Fellowship judgments and benefit from working closely with experienced colleagues. Colleagues with sufficient

development take on the role of mentor with continued support advice and guidance from the Scheme Team, who pair Mentors with applicants.

Trainee Peer Reviewers attend a three hour workshop facilitated by the CPD route leader, and following this are invited to 'shadow review' a portfolio and attend panel meetings in an observational capacity. After training, a new reviewer is paired with an experienced colleague, and will share judgments prior to attending the full panel meeting to gain confidence in the judgment process.

2.1.6 Externality and Sharing Across Schemes

Externality has emerged as an interesting trend within reports. The 2014-15 review recognised and raised some issues related to Externals in accredited schemes and, as a result of this, the HEA further strengthened the accreditation policy and associated guidance around the expectations and requirements related to the different functions Externals carry out in accredited schemes.

In this 2015-16 review, scheme leads discuss externality as a **formalised resource** and source of strength within their work. Externality takes a number of forms however. Some reports discuss involvement with the HEA and use of **HEA consultants** and training. They mention the value of having a local HEA accreditor as a resource. **Externals** are described in reports as a source of supporting evidence, of their strength and rigour, and as a resource in terms of establishing confidence, parity, and acquiring confidence in decision-making. There is frequent mention of **external review of schemes** and use of a consultant to address specific training needs, e.g. mentoring, Descriptor 4, writing retreats, dialogue.

There is also evidence that more institutions are sharing across networks and between institutions. They value this approach: they discuss **inter-institutional sharing** of practice, **partnership** and **international links** and in more than one instance East-West of Scotland Universities Partnership (E-WoSUP) is cited as a resource for Scottish networks. There are examples of bespoke workshop delivery at satellite campuses. This reinforces the importance of sharing and dialogue between scheme leads and the worth of external insights as a positive and significant trend. Partnership is – as will be seen – an important support factor for newer schemes. As a result of the importance of networks being reported in the 2014-15 reviews, the HEA established a new accredited programme network which provides a wider forum for the sharing of practice between scheme leads and engagement with the HEA. Network meetings have been well attended and feedback indicates that this is a welcome resource.

2.2 Priorities, developments, issues and solutions

Originally, Section 4 provided space for raising issues and concerns. This has been revised in this second review (2015-16) to conflate issues with strengths in Section 2. In the 2014-15 review, there were a number of issues of general and shared concern: such as the importance of mentors and training; managing panels; making judgments, especially for Descriptors 3 and 4; concerns about assessments and in particular the issue of time involved in preparing a claim, and that required for reviewing and mentoring claims.

In the current review, the original group of submitting institutions appear to have reframed many of their issues and concerns: they now appear as **on-going considerations** within narratives. Increasingly, scheme leaders describe responses to past issues that have been implemented, or they outline interventions as part of a reaccreditation process or discussion, or even as areas of confidence in practice. As a whole the finding from this section is that institutions are showing increased confidence in working with the UKPSF and HEA Fellowship.

Capacity is recognised as something that is an on-going concern for scheme teams given the unpredictability of the HE climate. This has generated creative solutions around completions and a pro-active approach to management as indicated above. An issue that continues to prevail for many is related to choice of Descriptor or mapping evidence, in particular to **Descriptor 3 and D3.VII**. One institution for example, suggests they are still battling an assumption that seniority is sufficient for Descriptor 3.

Despite the handbooks being updated, and guidance provided by mentors, detailing that Senior Fellowship applications must clearly evidence how colleagues have influenced and developed the teaching practice of others through their leadership, there has been a lack of understanding by some applicants of the criteria required for Senior Fellowship. A number of applications (mainly from the professional faculties) have been referred due to some colleagues considering the “seniority” of their role as the basis for their application

General issues associated with resourcing such as VLEs etc. A number of institutions have developed information systems linked to VLEs or central services. Where VLEs are mentioned, it is because they are under review, being enhanced, or have been developed as a resource. Occasionally they emerge as generating issues of access and **user friendliness** especially where used to support e-portfolios, however this is now a less visible issue and most

institutions talk positively about how they are using such resources rather than the problems they cause.

Originally designed by the Scheme Leader to help support staff with dyslexia, a version of the template was piloted with those applying for Associate Fellowship. All reported they preferred the structured template. ...We now provide a wider repertoire of structured critically reflective questions mapped to particular standards and areas of activity to help applicants reflect on their practice and identify evidence. The same repertoire of questions is also used as a wider CPD resource or for team development.

The Pebblepad software within which participants collate their work for the Award is not as user friendly as we would like so we are planning to pilot using WordPress to see if this is a better solution.

Time issues emerged across the board in cycle one and these continue to be a focus of attention, mostly in the context of resolving issues however (see above).

Whilst the Senior Management team are pushing and resourcing the running of this scheme, there is no formal workload allocation for the writing of applications. The objective of Fellowship, therefore, often clashes with research and teaching pressures.

Embedding appears to be well underway with many schemes confident of their approaches and proactively seeking to enhance processes. This is evident in the focus on **data capture and evaluation** for managing Fellowship in Section 2. Reflecting the value of evaluative tools, two scheme leaders talk about how they wish to address **gender imbalance** within Fellowship following evaluations. They raise this as an area of concern linked to careers and promotion, and challenges of engaging male academics. More broadly, **evaluation** is being purposefully applied as an **enhancement and reporting tool**.

One concern that has been identified through statistical analysis of the scheme is the significant gender differences in the numbers of applications and also in the success of those making applications. The issue of more unsuccessful applications by male candidates overlaps with poorer success rates for those staff not involved with the centrally-provided support systems or training sessions.

Regular review and evaluation, and open feedback from participants resulted in processes, guidance and support being improved and enhanced. Examples include revised guidance documentation, mentor training, reviewer training, writing retreats to support applicants and guidance on feedback for both successful and non-successful applicants.

There are some new issues mentioned. For example, there is a widespread interest in developing professional **learning beyond Fellowship**, and this is an area several institutions are actively working with. **Leadership linked to Descriptor 3** is widely discussed and appears to be an area for considerable development.

2.3 Analysis of data from additional accredited scheme reports

This next section discusses comments made by scheme leaders from the recently accredited schemes (21/36) in response to Section 2 of the 2015-16 review. It explores issues, strengths and weaknesses raised by this additional group of review submissions and reveals interesting evidence on, for example, how institutions may have benefited from the **experience of those early adopters** of CPD schemes; changes in **HEA support** for new schemes; and developments arising out of clarification of the accreditation process overall. Numbers of institutions are shown to indicate frequency rather than percentages, as numbers are relatively low. These are given in brackets in the text.

The range of institutions within this second group is diverse, with a number of smaller institutions and specialist institutions. There are also several large research-intensive institutions with newly developed schemes as well as larger post-1992 institutions. There are some examples where partnerships with existing schemes at other institutions have been formed. Smaller, specialist institutions comprise almost 50% of the group. Many in this group indicate they have not yet completed a full cycle of activity for these reports. Despite this, there are examples of institutions already emphasising **data collection** and **embedding of evaluation** mechanisms. This may be an indication of how attention within the sector has shifted and may also indicate the influence of TEF. One institution specifically highlighted 'evaluation of broad outcomes such as **impact on student experience**' as an area for development.

Evidencing impact is an on-going challenge, both on the attitudes and behaviour of the staff who gain HEA recognition and also the impact on the learner experience for students. 2016-17 will see the implementation of an evaluation framework designed to gather and analyse data around these key areas of impact.

It may be the case that newly accredited institutions have benefited from enhanced HEA guidance and the sharing of practice across the sector as these newer scheme leads seem to be placing much **greater emphasis on data**

management from the outset, which may either reflect a more general shift in perspective or insight gained from more established schemes:

Regular review and evaluation, and open feedback from participants has resulted in processes, guidance and support being improved and enhanced. Examples of this are revised guidance documentation, mentor training, reviewer training, writing retreats to support applicants and guidance on feedback for both successful and non-successful applicants.

Data gathered for evaluation include statistical data on uptake, quality of submissions, stakeholder feedback, both solicited and unsolicited, and comments from the External Examiner. Stakeholders were identified as the University's Leadership Team, Heads of Departments, HR, College Academic Directors, applicants, their referees, students, scheme assessors and the scheme itself.

We worked closely with our Human Resources (HR) team to determine the data that we need to obtain through the Scheme.

There is the suggestion from reports that the HEA has a more visible profile within accreditation and guidance, and also a high number of institutions for whom **externality** and **partnering** has been a benefit (10 institutions), if not an element of strategic choice. For smaller institutions such partnering approaches could offer significant value and may be an element for exploration by the HEA with the next cycle of adopters especially where these may involve colleges. Another area of emphasis is working with non-UK institutions. For example:

Learning from external advisors and working with our closest HEI (with whom we share a Joint Faculty) in reviewing submissions and developing assessor skills.

We are in frequent email and video-conference contact [with our overseas campus] ... This interaction is mutually beneficial in developing a cross-cultural understanding of the UKPSF and foregrounding discussions on the evidencing of professional values in practice.

Institution D's close collaboration with Institution E extends to a sharing of reviewers between institutional Panels, and detailed conversations between the CPD scheme leaders on "what we value". The two schemes were accredited at roughly the same time. One has a greater capacity for drawing reviewers from the disciplines and the other scheme are keen to learn from this by joining our Panels.

2.3.1 Strengths within new cohort of HEPs submitting reviews

As in the original cohort, the reports for Section 2 from this group of 21 institutions highlight the following benefits when introducing schemes:

- > 6 of 21 (29%) discuss the value of using **mentors** and having comprehensive **resources** to support claim development such as VLEs, templates, events and retreats, and exemplars;
- > the importance of **links with strategy** and KPIs as a mechanism for raising the profile of Fellowship and scheme activity is discussed by five HEPs (24%);
- > and three institutions (14%) highlight the value of **visible recognition** by management in raising the profile of Fellowship.

Collaboration has been mentioned previously and this is reiterated in the way scheme leaders comment on synergies between experienced routes and PG Certificates, highlighting the coherence of schemes across career profiles. The factor of 'embedded-ness' with respect to schemes across career paths and roles is well-established across all reports and is noted throughout this review.

There is a significant focus on **assessment** within the review, with 12 of the 21 schemes reporting strengths around training assessors, assessment panel processes, and use of templates and interventions to support resubmission. This indicates that assessment remains an early priority for newly accredited schemes, although as experience and guidance improve this may reduce. A further group of five institutions (23%) highlights development of resources to support processes of submission as a strength indicating lessons have been learnt.

There is evidence that where mentoring works as intended it is very successful. Mentors comment on draft submissions; undertake teaching observations (where required); and generally act as a critical friend to assist participants in developing their practice. We are providing training in a number of ways including, for example, working to build mentoring into a proposed new workload model.

The unit was also supported by an online resource on the university VLE containing a blog and supporting materials (handbook, brief, formative tasks, presentations, templates and useful literature)... There was a strong element of peer to peer participation and engagement, which was encouraged by the session facilitators.

Participants are put into small 'recognition' peer groups and engage in a process of action research facilitated by a member of the scheme academic team – this mirrors the institution's Peer Support for

Teaching policy which is modelled on the model of continuous improvement circles.

Process and the workings around assessment were a widely reported strength in the previous cycle of 2014-15 reviews, reinforcing the (self-evident) importance of giving attention to these two components of scheme management. A particular example of a good practice is given of the inclusion of a CPD plan within submissions.

The scheme has a specific 'development project' in which participants reflect on the impact of recent professional development activities: this has fostered a good level of interest in varied ongoing CPD.

The External Examiner was particularly interested in the Continuing Professional Development (CPD) plan that needs to be included with the application. It is not part of the decision-making process but all applicants receive feedforward comments from the assessors about their intentions to remain in good standing. The plan was noted as 'helpful in promoting meaningful engagement in CPD beyond the award of Fellowship'.

2.3.2 Issues and challenges within new cohort of HEP reviews

Issues are reported in ways reflective of those raised in the 2014-15 cycle of review. These include use of **SoTL** (5) and the necessity to develop and **enhance reflection and support** (7) for example. The issue of incorporating pedagogic literature is something needing early effort, and the challenge faced by academic and other faculty in **writing reflectively** clearly shows itself as a common challenge requiring thought and support. Institutions report on how they are using templates, prompts and writing retreats as well as mentoring and peer input as a response to such issues.

Dialogue does not appear as significant in these additional reports although presentations, verbal reflective discussions and professional dialogue options are described along with e-portfolios and, intriguingly, a 'placebo portfolio', hinting at the adoption of creative mechanisms for assessment. Institutions mention the value of **communities** and **sharing of practice** around scheme systems and processes, however, suggesting wider use of dialogue across schemes. In one instance the institution's introduction of a pedagogic forum is highlighted as a parallel and serendipitous embedding mechanism. One example of using an action research approach is mentioned. What is evident is that schemes regard **exchange, practice sharing and peer support** as crucial

outputs and contributing factors in success. Consequently these are specifically highlighted in eight instances as being targeted for development.

Reflecting a shared concern raised by this newer cohort, decision-making is given as an area for further work (something that has on-going resonance across all 109 reports in this review). **Timing** too is mentioned a number of times in these reports, alongside meeting deadlines, completion rates (5); and the need to refine assessment processes to manage Fellowship awards more effectively (6).

Due to discussion with other institutions we were prepared for the need to support staff in **critically reflecting** on their practice, however evaluations from our staff have revealed that this biggest block to writing their applications was, as they saw it “boasting about themselves”. To address this using the work of Klaus (2004), we developed some supporting material around the art of bragging: blowing your own horn. Feedback from this has proved that it has been effective.

Allowing claimants to book slots for presentations without having completed any ‘content’ towards the presentation created two problems: first, some have booked a slot and then not prepared a presentation and so pulled out last minute, leaving gaps in our panel agenda; and leaving the preparation to the last minute has meant some claimants requesting references at the time of the panel, causing delay between panels and full sign-off after scrutiny of references.

To offset issues, targeted sessions on the **process of reflection** and engagement with pedagogic scholarship were included in the writing retreats. Assessors were invited to suggest discipline-specific pedagogic literatures, which were added to the support resources.

Although not formally part of the scheme, the senior team responsible simultaneously launched a **Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Network** for staff to discuss seminal and emerging pedagogical research. This offers support for undertaking pedagogical scholarship. Many scheme participants have engaged with the network, influencing discussions around how to disseminate results of scheme investigations across the University. We are launching an in-house SoTL journal and case study database in response.

2.3.3 The narrative of evolution for an accredited scheme

One of the interesting conclusions from comparing the experiences of this small group of additional institutions with those in the 2014-15 review is how this

appears to reinforce stories from the original review. There are a considerable number of shared issues and strengths that reflect a commonality of experience in designing and managing processes of Fellowship in spite of individual contextual differences. The outcome from this generates a collection of common elements and issues within the early stages of development that must be thought through and that will raise issues. These are listed in the table below. However, because of the growing wealth of resources to inform schemes provided within such reports as this review, and the case studies of practice accessible through the HEA, new institutions and those undergoing re-accreditation should increasingly be able to build on existing expertise. This means institutional teams can plan activity with foresight and creativity and minimise some of the issues and challenges.

Table 1: A checklist for accreditation and embedding?

Area	Activities and strengths	Issues/Solutions
Systems and processes	Determine approach: written, oral, mixed Synergy with formal options Links with HR Process for submission Capacity building (Senior Fellowship)	Understanding, language, pedagogy, reflective writing Capacity building and training for roles Investment in scheme / team
Resourcing	Templates – fit to progress and Descriptor Exemplars, case studies VLE Good practice repository	Choice of Descriptor SoTL, reflection Access to resources/VLE Investment (time, admin, assessment)
Support	Peer review Mentoring, who, how, when?	Tracking of progress Completions (high/low)

	<p>Writing retreats, workshops, events</p> <p>Best practice sharing</p>	<p>Workload for team, etc.</p>
Assessment	<p>Mechanisms</p> <p>Panels</p> <p>Deadlines, cycle, cohort approach</p> <p>Resubmission process</p> <p>Externality</p>	<p>Time, workload</p> <p>Frequency, cycle of submission, managing numbers and completions; Externality</p> <p>Training of assessors,</p> <p>Capacity building</p> <p>Decision-making</p> <p>Managing Senior/Principal Fellowship referrals</p>
Evaluation and data	<p>System of tracking</p> <p>QA and reporting, purpose</p> <p>Link to information systems</p>	<p>Impact of scheme/CPD/re-profiling teaching</p> <p>Relationship to student experience</p>
Embedding	<p>Visible recognition</p> <p>Profile of teaching</p> <p>Link to strategy, KPIs</p> <p>Culture change</p> <p>CPD embedding, HR and PDR, jobs and promotions</p> <p>Community building</p> <p>Links to excellence</p> <p>Embedded approach to teaching enhancement and CPD</p>	<p>Involvement of Senior Managers;</p> <p>Involving specific areas, disciplines; responsiveness</p> <p>Meeting targets, hard-to-reach</p> <p>Workload management systems</p> <p>Targeting groups and their needs</p> <p>Student impact and involvement</p>
Re-accreditation	<p>Opportunity for</p>	<p>Data gathering and review</p>

	enhancement and reflection, reframing	Data cycles Changes to documentation
--	---------------------------------------	---

2.4 Concluding thoughts on Section 2

The analysis of responses from the original review cohort of 88 institutions suggests growing maturity, confidence and experience across the sector indicating that these early adopters have embedded approaches to the UKPSF. There are significant strengths across schemes within this original cohort. These centre on the establishment and enhancement of systems, processes, support and management tools. The sharing of practice across the sector suggests too that scheme leaders are operating from a position of confidence and assurance in themselves as a group. This is reflected in the pro-active and pragmatic way schemes appear to be responding to challenges around scheme activity.

The growing use of data and evaluative mechanisms indicate the potential to develop a significant body of evidence on how Fellowship is being received, embedded and impact recorded. Whilst teaching excellence is mentioned in this section, the extent to which the three factors – teaching excellence, Fellowship and evaluation of schemes - are being proactively pursued does not emerge strongly in reflections in this section.

From the review of new schemes within Section 2, it is clear that some of the earlier hurdles faced by schemes are being managed in advance. They reflect on many of the same on-going issues of time, decision-making, capacity and support, SoTL and reflection, highlighted by the original cohort. There appears to be greater clarity around operational issues, and fewer institutions appear to be reporting significant or unanticipated negatives around schemes. The second cohort, in mirroring much of what was found in the 2014-15 review cycle, allows this review to identify some key common threads to the narrative of scheme development as listed in the table in 2.3 above.

In summary, future work might focus on specific areas for enhancement: SoTL, mentor enhancement and leadership, reflection and the sharing of creative and inclusive practices, and of course embedding professional development as a sustained activity for Fellows. Progression is also an issue that may acquire greater focus associated with both professional development and workforce development.

3.0 Section 3 - impact on institutions

Here the review draws on reflections made by scheme leaders in response to Section 3. As with the previous review, the template provided to institutions had space for comments about how such schemes were impacting across institutions. This section of the review for 2015-16 focuses initially on a comparison with comments made in the original review. The aim of this approach is to explore whether the strong assertions of impact made by that original group are being sustained, and to explore how and where impact has strengthened. This allows conclusions to be inferred on the impact of introducing Fellowship schemes more generally and to investigate how and where impact is being felt, as well as the form it takes. This process therefore provides a foundation around which reports from newly accredited institutions in 2015-16 (21 institutions) can be discussed, allowing strategy development to be informed and implemented in these and future accredited schemes.

Six institutions from the 88 in the 2014-15 group reported only briefly in this section: three because they have either ceased to run or have no accredited scheme; the rest because they suggest it is 'still too early to tell'. This is generally claimed by newer schemes too, reflecting the need for a long view around impact. For a further small number of institutions restructure has generated a hiatus in embedding impact. For the original group, as a whole, impact is reported in respect of further embedding, strengthening, and growth.

The 2014-15 accredited CPD scheme review produced impact factors, which were grouped into two types:

1. **Hard factors** relating to systems, processes: targets, and changes to strategy and policies: as well as examples of how institutions targeted specific groups to capacity build for example; and specific interventions around CPD development, managing and reporting.
2. **Soft factors** which were about how teaching and learning is being spoken about, engaged with and profile raising; evidence of communities of practice emerging, growth in numbers and participation; and celebration, changes to attitudes towards teaching.

In the current review, these factors re-appear for the most part, however they are spoken of with greater specificity. A number of hard impact factors have been consolidated, in particular those in relation to **CPD development, HR systems and processes for career, promotions and employment**. This suggests they constitute established elements across institutions. This is reinforced by the fact that CPD development beyond Fellowship is mentioned more widely across all reports.

Specific mention continues to be made of how particular groups are being developed, targeted and influenced as a result of scheme activity. This relates in particular to on-going efforts with **Senior Fellowship, postgraduates who teach**, etc. A growing number of institutions are using Fellows purposefully, alongside funding activity, and creating new roles around learning and teaching initiatives. In the previous review Descriptor 3 was used to support capacity building for assessment and mentoring. Senior Fellows continue to be encouraged, however the focus is less on capacity building, and rather Senior Fellows are discussed as a wider leadership resource. Postgraduates who teach and Associate Fellows emerged in the 2014-15 review as a projected area for development. This time, it is apparent that a number of institutions have acted on this, and are reaping the benefits from their work.

Whilst celebration is mentioned less often, **senior manager involvement** continues to play an important role for schemes. Contributions have shifted in respect of how they are involved: panel involvement continues, though comments now highlight how managers are being drawn into localised developments and conversations; managers are also being targeted for Fellowships. **Institutional targets** continue to drive the agenda along with strategic priorities, and **teaching excellence** has emerged as a particular issue for many, with scheme leaders highlighting how excellence is acquiring importance as an **institutional metric**.

Tables 2 and 3 below list types of impacts identified in this review by the original 88 institutions. The range of impacts mentioned fall into two clear groups for the 2015-16 reports. The hard factors are numbered 1-11, and soft factors 12-20, and both sets of factors fall naturally into three sets. The percentages suggest that hard impact factors are more in evidence overall. It reflects how Fellowship has been embedded across institution systems, something that might be expected if institutions are indeed, as might be supposed, at a consolidation stage in embedding Fellowships

Table 2: List of types of hard impact mentioned in 2015-16 by original review cohort

Item	Type of Impact – hard factors = 69 (78%)	Number of Institutions (percentage)
1	Recruitment, career and promotion changes	43 (48%)
2	Appraisal and annual performance review	15 (17%)
3	Extension of CPD activity	27 (31%)
4	Specific reference to mapping CPD to Fellowship	11 (13%)
5	Collaboration with HR, HR and staff transitions	7 (8%)
6	Use of targets	22 (25%)
7	Strategy, inclusion in plans etc.	26 (30%)
8	Manager involvement (panels, targeting, local activity)	21 (24%)
9	Impact with specific groups e.g. IT, GTA, service, ALs	17 (19%)
10	Senior Fellow development	18 (20%)
11	Specific new initiatives led by fellows, e.g. funding, CATE, NTFS, new roles	29 (33%)

Table 3: List of types of soft impact mentioned in 2015-16 by original review of HEA accredited CPD schemes cohort

Item	Soft factors of impact	Number of Institutions (percentage)
12	Raising profile of learning and teaching	31 (35%)
13	General culture change	18 (20%)
14	Institutional dialogue on learning and teaching	13 (15%)
15	Good practice sharing, e.g. conferences, forums, panels	23 (26%)
16	Embedded and specific local initiatives	9 (10%)
17	Development or focus on SoTL	10 (11%)
18	Use of reflection, reflective approaches to teaching	16 (18%)
19	Links between teaching, research and student experience	14 (16%)
20	Links with teaching excellence (internal and external)	22 (25%)

It is immediately apparent the reports in this second review (2015-16) are more focused, with indications that concrete systematic changes have occurred (items 1-11 above). Under the hard factors, 69 of 88 institutions (78%) identify impact in those areas. These divide into three main groups of impact suggesting a focused, on-going and **systemised change** around teaching and learning at institution levels. The most significant area from the range of reflections was that associated with how academic roles and employment were being influenced (items 1-5). This can be considered in the light of Locke (2014, 2016) and Cashmore et al (2014) whose research findings point to increased diversity

and less clarity within academic career paths. This review suggests that Fellowships may be providing a mechanism for imposing some order for **career progression**.

With respect to the soft factors, the impression is that a shift to specific if qualitative change has taken place, e.g. to how teaching and learning is viewed (items 12,13); how **exchanges and discourse is being enacted** (items 14-16); and a **re-profiling of teaching** with respect to **behaviour** and supporting practice - evidence, status and research (items 17-20). The next paragraphs will discuss these changes in more detail and provide examples to show how scheme leaders are now describing and claiming impact. To inform discussion concrete, anonymised examples are used to illustrate points made.

3.1 Key findings from reviewing Section 3 of reviews

Whereas in the review last year this area showed a variety of impacts and wide interest characteristic of introductory activity, the 2015-16 review shows how institutions are acting more selectively, and many have implemented significant **changes to documentation** and **progression for Fellowship** into pathways. Drawing on the table above, this review concludes that there has been potentially widespread impact at institutional levels linked to scheme activity. In the following discussion, figures in brackets linked to relevant items in the table illustrate how soft and hard factors interconnect and build a picture of how this may be occurring.

49% (43 of 88) of institutions explicitly identify changes to recruitment documentation and **job specifications** incorporating explicit requirements for Fellowship (item 1, table 2). In the detailed review of comments, Fellowship is mentioned as having been specifically mapped to **promotion routes** and progression pathways in the majority of cases. Around this selected examples link Senior Fellow and Principal Fellow to **professorial roles** in particular, and some institutions highlight Senior Fellowship for particular activities and roles in their discussion of **Descriptor 3 targeting** (item 10). Under this category of comments a number of institutions relate Fellowship to **specific workload models**, either in respect of allowances made around roles, or by recognising **time allocations** for completing Fellowship applications. Two institutions make explicit reference to pay and Fellowship.

More widely within the comments where schemes refer to specific initiatives (items 9, 11), it is apparent that schemes are influencing the rewarding of Fellows. There is **funding** available for **teaching and learning initiatives** which can only be undertaken by Fellows (10 institutions); eight institutions mention

Fellowship leading to recognition of Collaborative Awards for Teaching Excellence (**CATE**) and the National Teaching Fellowship Scheme (**NTFS**) candidates; nine institutions list new roles emerging to complement Fellowship activity, and three further institutions discuss how schemes are attracting **new funding**. Questions of sustainability emerge around this, but the data implies that reward of teaching and learning standards linked to scheme activity is an important mechanism for **on-going embedding of change** for more than 30% of institutions. Given over a quarter of institutions identifies Fellowship within targets or strategic planning (respectively) as a further systems-related impact (items 6-7), the implications are that change is being incorporated on a number of levels and is cumulatively leading to **significant transformation** of teaching-related roles. **Manager involvement** is a visible reinforcement of how teaching is being more highly and **visibly profiled** at 24% of institutions (item 8).

Looking down the list in the table there is further evidence that culture change is building momentum. 20% of institutions explicitly mention **culture change** as having occurred in this second cycle (2015-16) of review suggesting sustained impact (item 13) with over 30% of scheme leaders claiming that the profile of teaching has been raised across institutions (item 12). This claim is backed up by reported examples of specific instances of **exchange** around teaching and learning, forums, communities of practice and sharing of good practice (items 14-16). The mention of embedded activity is of interest because scheme leaders discuss it in the context of **wider CPD** use, closer liaison and **collaboration with partners**, Deans or heads showing how Fellowship is being embedded locally. Though only emerging for 10% of institutions, alongside other mention of engagement for specific groups, etc., it appears that mature schemes see themselves in a position of enhancement and wider outreach (item 16), which may have implications for wider partnering and collaboration, especially in respect of TEF.

The impact on teaching and learning from schemes within this 2014-15 cohort of institutions is strongly supported by the evidence - hard and soft - of changes to how teaching and learning is being developed and informed. This emerges through the examples given of how institutions are extending CPD activity and mapping the UKPSF across CPD activity. This process now appears firmly in place within 31% of institutions (items 3, 4) but was formerly mentioned in the previous cycle of reports as an area for potential development. Many of those responding also comment that they have reaccredited or are preparing for **reaccreditation** suggesting that **scheme revisions** and **institution CPD approaches** are being reshaped for **sustained development of teaching** and learning (and the staff). It also indicates the role played by re-/accreditation as a **focus for quality enhancement**.

The soft impact factors are important in showing that sustained teaching development potentially goes deeper than simple systems: scheme leaders report that use of **SoTL** has grown (item 17); the **standards of reflection** have improved and reflective approaches to teaching are listed as significant positives within applications (item 18); more poignantly scheme leaders report a significant shift in how teaching and learning activity is being linked to research and aligned to it, with some suggesting connections emerging for the students' experience (item 19). This is discussed further under Section 4. These changes are discussed in each case by at least 10% of those from the 2014-15 review. As a final reflection of how institutions are changing with respect to schemes, a quarter of institutions mention '**excellence**' in terms of how it is being seen as a wider support for change and a performance metric, and of these at least a third of institutions describe the use and development of **internal excellence awards**.

In considering impact, therefore, and returning to Guskey's model of evaluating impact of staff development (2000), which was mentioned in the 2014-15 review, it is apparent that the influence on institutional context and systems, the **reshaping of how teaching sits** within institutional practice, is progressing significantly. Institutions have **altered systems of reward and recognition**. Indicators of how the profile for teaching and learning activity has grown have hardened and become systematised. The nature of the examples cited show that **awareness of Fellowship** has grown and acquired **credibility** across institutions with a consequent shift in how learning and teaching is being developed and talked about. As a final point, however, and in contrast to the positive picture described above, 6 of 88 institutions claim their scheme is still too new for impact to be confidently claimed and many other institutions voice concerns about measuring impact, commenting that actual impact remains a challenging area to track.

3.2 Examples of how hard factors are impacting on institutions

3.2.1 Factors 1-5: impact on staffing, systems and processes

These examples illustrate how in general institutions are incorporating changes. Institutions appear to be fundamentally changing their systems with Fellowship as a component within HR, as exemplified in the following statements:

The profile of the Scheme has increased during the last year, and engagement with it is becoming embedded within HR processes such as probation, promotion and the staff development review process.

Our recruitment and promotion procedures now include reference to categories of Fellowship as required, or desirable. Our probation

arrangements for staff new to teaching in HE require the satisfactory completion of a PG Cert and Fellowship of the HEA, while experienced teaching staff are required to obtain the category of Fellowship commensurate with their role and experience. The achievement of Fellowship in one category or another is appearing as objectives in academic and service staff appraisals.

There is now evidence across the 2015-16 reviews that staff performance mechanisms are now more likely to draw on or link to Fellowship activity. Annual reporting systems discussed in 2014-15, now appear to be in place or well established:

University staff are expected to continue to develop their learning and teaching practice and to engage with the UKPSF throughout their careers. An annual peer dialogue activity, which is linked to the UKPSF, is a core element of the Performance Development Review process.

Some institutions appear well advanced in how Fellowship is related to employment, and have incorporated specific interventions at institutional and local levels and to address particular staff groups:

GTA's are also now paid to undertake their CPD activities and rewarded when they complete their applications successfully with a higher rate of pay under a recently re-negotiated contract of employment. Similarly, more departments are paying attention to engagement with Fellowship (as participants and reviewers) when running workload models.

As mentioned by many in the 2014-15 reviews, job specifications are now firmly linked to Fellowships, making this a formalised element in promotions. This approach is widely discussed although previously this was only discussed as a future area of development:

All new recruits to teaching posts are contractually required to gain Fellowship either by taught programme routes or by the CPD scheme. In the 2016 Staff Development Review cycle all colleagues in teaching roles are asked about their Fellowship status and their progress towards gaining the appropriate Fellowship level for their role. There are questions to check on Fellowship application progress in the induction and probation line manager reporting process.

In particular, different categories of Fellowship are now embedded within promotion requirements at large numbers of institutions, even at reader levels, and this is driving interest for schemes. Fellowship can contribute to success or emerge as a pre-requisite.

At an institutional level our scheme has also provided us with the opportunity to lever change in the criteria for promotion to Senior Lecturer, Reader and Chair. All three now contain reference to obtaining HEA Fellowship (normally, although not exclusively, via our CPD scheme) as a starting point for any application.

A number of colleagues have expressed interest in applying either because it is a condition for promotion or because they wish to develop and move beyond the roles they are currently in.

Staff are therefore using Fellowships pro-actively to plan and inform career plans, aware of the requirement to evidence Fellowship. They are also aware of the particular importance of Descriptor 3 to promotion and scheme leaders discuss Descriptor 3 both in terms of promotion success and institutional targets.

Job descriptions were reviewed and standardised and referenced to Fellowship status and are now an embedded part of the person specification e.g. For Associate Professor - Professional Status: Senior Fellow status, and ready to upgrade to Principal Fellow status under the Higher Education Academy's Professional Standards Framework.

Fellowship is having particular impact on professorial and higher research roles evidencing the broadening of expectations across career paths for teaching within role requirements. This trend may also affect the way professorial roles generally conceptualise and articulate their strategic work (cf MacFarlane 2008), and in turn influence those at professorial level applying for Fellowship, Fellowship may acquire the **status of an expectation or pre-requisite**. Examples describe Fellowship as a criterion for promotion all the way to **professorial level**; it is also being used for **Teaching Professorships**, and is increasingly accepted as an indicator of '**national recognition**' at promotion.

Bridging hard and soft factors, the way institutions are engaging in **wider CPD** suggests it is acquiring a higher profile. In reports this is described as being formalised in systems or evident in how staff attitudes are changing towards their development. These examples show Fellowship schemes are being integrated at a fundamental level within institutions showing considerable impact on CPD activity.

The UKPSF provides a framework for identifying staff need and is one means by which workshop provision is informed. The need to identify ongoing CPD needs within the application also serves to highlight the nature and currency of CPD opportunities and provision, and inform strategic development.

Some of these colleagues are also making an impact at academic department level, as Course/Subject leaders and presenters at staff development days/workshops; and at an institutional level as active members – sometimes even leaders – of university working groups. Our CPD scheme is thus also contributing to the career development of our staff.

The scheme is helping to alert staff to a range of local developmental opportunities. For example, web analytics suggests extensive traffic through our scheme webpages, suggesting that engagement with the scheme acts as a catalyst to seek out additional information relating to teaching and learning.

This integration of scheme and process is emerging in synergies within and between Fellowship pathways, as well as across wider HR activities. The reports exemplify how numbers of institutions are achieving this. Reports also draw attention to **synergies** between not only the **taught provision and experienced pathways** they offer, they are also **developing this purposefully** within schemes and seeing a corresponding **impact on behaviours**. This comes through in Section 4 and as a trend among those recently accredited schemes.

We are increasingly noticing how our taught provision and experienced scheme can be flexibly encouraged to work hand-in-hand to support each other, whilst at the same time, drawing in HR processes such as promotion and PDR, key quality processes and recognising links between research, teaching and positive student experiences.

There is a newly introduced field in application forms, where colleagues are explicitly asked to outline future plans for remaining in good standing and developing teaching and learning skills. This section provides a means for the applicant and manager to identify and discuss options during the drafting and review process.

HR and institutional objectives are reportedly reframing CPD as part of staff expectations, confirming that the trend towards embedding CPD and aligning it to UKPSF, indicated within last year's reviews, is becoming more widely established.

Our commitment as a teaching focused institution ensures that teaching excellence and professional recognition are embraced from initial appointment through the career trajectory of academic staff. This year we have reviewed our initial CPD policy to ensure that all staff that support learning and teaching are contractually obliged to engage with the UKPSF

In a survey a quarter of applicants said they have engaged more widely with CPD at the University as a result of participating in the scheme.

Something that was highlighted in the 2014-15 review as a potential strength, **the mapping of the UKPSF** against wider CPD activities, is also showing progress within institutions. The result is that UKPSF is now being formally and extensively mapped across many institutions' HR approaches, uniting strategic priorities and the role of CPD within the student learning experience and teaching activities.

A cross-institutional group of staff came together in a series of creative workshops to plan the CPD programme, led by an HEA consultant. This provided a very rich CPD experience in itself and ensured cross-institutional 'buy in'. Each event was mapped to the UKPSF, Learning Teaching and Assessment Strategy and Institutional Health Enhancement Plan.

The events programme has been mapped against the UKPSF and has been carefully planned to ensure that it provides sufficient variety of CPD workshops for staff on all pathway levels but also caters for the needs of staff who have yet to engage with the scheme, as well as those who have completed it and wish to remain in good standing.

All academics are asked to map their CPD against the UKPSF within their Continuous Professional Learning Plan on an annual basis to ensure and demonstrate how staff are remaining in good standing and continuing to practice in line with the relevant Fellow Descriptor and the Fellowship of the HEA Code of Practice.

The HR department is advertising their staff development aligned with the UKPSF, showcasing the importance of the framework for career development. These initiatives are collectively changing the mind-set of academics to be reflective on peer observation, unit performance, external examiner comments, and student feedback.

The conclusion from this is that for some institutions at least, CPD, good standing, and evidence of professional teaching development are well advanced, driven by excellence, audit and TEF agendas. It is impacting significantly on career expectations and behaviours for staff.

3.2.2 Factors 6-8 evidencing strategic links and impact

Strategy and targets continue to be mentioned across reports, but in the 2015-16 review they are mentioned more rarely or spoken about more reflectively and with specific purposes in mind. The conclusion drawn from this is that the connection between strategy and schemes has become established within the **institutional environment**, rather than being flagged as a strength or a particular developmental initiative. The following examples clearly show how Fellowships and the UKPSF are being embedded within wider objectives, at a range of levels

beyond the strategic. Impacts are emerging within **peer observation systems; in action plans locally and institutionally;** in recognition activity; **committee work;** and as a fundamental component for achieving HE student goals. The process of embedding Fellowships and wider consideration of teaching is being led from the top down as well as from grass root levels, as the first example emphasises:

The scheme is not a standalone provision but is embedded into institutional and personal goals around education practice and leadership. It would be disingenuous to suggest that *all* academics are fully engaged with the UKPSF, but a 'top down' (institutional) and 'bottom up' (individual) approach appears to be effective in moving towards the goal of engagement by all academics across the institution by 2018.

The framework led to the University's engagement with the HEA's Strategic Enhancement Programme, and a funded review of the Peer Supported Review of Teaching Practice Scheme for remaining in good standing.

The Scheme is now embedded into our Learning, Teaching and Student Experience Strategy. It is ultimately driving conversations about the nature of our 'offer' to students.

The University's LTA Action Plan centred around three strands of student engagement, learning enhancement and academic professional development. This latter strand has enabled School LTA plans to set targets for professional recognition and qualification to teach with staff supported via the scheme.

Targets are mentioned less frequently overall than in the 2014-15 reviews. They still emerge in the majority of reports but are not as highly profiled, suggesting the wider acceptance of Fellowship. Targets are however highlighted as being applied locally. This suggests Fellowship as a target and performance measure has become normalised.

The refreshing of the CPD Framework has led to the professional recognition of teaching and supporting student learning being built into School annual operational plans and monitoring processes.

Institutions are **developing specific groups** to achieve particular objectives in teaching and learning support. Hence where targets are mentioned, they are often related to **targets for specific groups** of staff. There is evidence that the spotlight for development and Fellowship has definitely become more inclusive across reports; **associate lecturers** are even receiving specific support and encouragement; postgraduate students (e.g. GTAs) mentioned as a future target

in the last cycle of reports are now discussed in terms of outcomes; and Senior Fellowship is becoming part of wider change processes.

There is wider impact for the scheme with non-teaching contract staff who have face-to-face contact with students (Course Administrators, IT technicians) and those who offer “training” to staff (HR advisers, registry staff) attending workshops as a first step to applying for Descriptor 1.

Associate Lecturers are trained mentors and supported to run support sessions at AL staff development events.

We are noticing is the interest in teaching amongst our growing number of research students who now number 130 a year and attend the non-accredited pathway of the scheme ... This is contributing to a culture change in departments with many of the graduates of the programme taking up both part-time and full-time lectureships at the university.

Recognition as a Senior Fellow has empowered some staff whose contributions to CPD and PGCert have greater confidence, vision and impact on colleagues. Some see recognition as Senior Fellowship as enabling them to take a leading role.

Impact measurement is an issue that arises across sections in reports, now with a shift in its significance, value and use. Impact across institutions appears sustained and embedded with respect to hard factors, however as will be indicated in the exploration of responses to Section 4 of the 2015-16 review, there remains considerable caution about claiming too much impact from schemes and Fellowships. Often reports of impact draw on anecdote lacking the mechanisms and data to draw on more comprehensive evaluations. Others suggest National Student Survey (NSS) linkages. Many institutions note plans for future impact evaluation.

The student learning experience and outcomes are improving because of this favourable climate for the development of education rooted in the UKPSF. Our NSS scores have improved.

The development and engagement of **Descriptor 3** is reportedly having a widespread **impact as the involvement of managers** and those in leadership roles have the potential to affect practice significantly across institutions. This issue of how Senior Fellows (Descriptor 3) are **profiled and used** influences culture change, wider awareness raising, status, and also concrete initiatives as the example below shows:

Senior Fellows have been invited to become Distinguished Fellows of the Teaching Academy. Distinguished Fellows are invited to contribute

to think-tanks to discuss and influence educational strategy within the institution, as well as to provide guidance for promotion and Fellowships to others and to judge applications for a variety of awards.

Staff across institutions engage more readily, and Fellowship appears to be enabling teams to work more confidently, something that is discussed further under Section 4.

Teams when going through processes such as periodic review and course (re)validation through staff have: a common language with which to discuss their practices; considered the rationale for their teaching practices; demonstrated/utilised a pedagogic underpinning; reflected on the effectiveness of their approaches.

The growing number of Senior and Principal Fellowships we are able to award includes colleagues who gained Fellowship a number of years ago have gone on to refine their practice, increase their influence in terms of teaching and supporting learning and to show an impact on the development of the teaching of their areas/disciplines

The hard factor impact is evident too in **investment and funding**. These provide concrete affirmation of how institutions are committing time, funding and resource into the development of scheme activity. Even as some institutions may report on restructuring and its impact, there appears to be very clear allocation of value to having staff with Fellowship. This extends beyond institution boundaries to partners in some cases.

This university actively supports academics going for Fellowship. It puts time and money into enabling us to think through our applications, reflect on our working life and access experienced mentors to help with the process. (Principal Fellow applicant)

One result has been some seed funding to develop an internal case study resource to recognise and promote good practice.

Colleagues who engage with the scheme become subsequent contributors at university conference events, as well as applicants to our dedicated, institution-wide 'Pedagogic Research and Teaching Innovation Fund'.

The introduction of recognition for selected overseas partners is having strategic impact on partner relations and the collaborative offer.

3.3 Examples showing impact on institutions through soft factors

Within the previous cycle of reports, the **re-profiling of teaching and learning** across institutions through visibility and the activity of schemes was mentioned as a significant strength for schemes. In the 2015-16 reviews, raising the profile of teaching and learning again appears frequently. In this case, it is being discussed in terms of how research and teaching are repositioning themselves across staff groups, in particular those in research areas. This suggests a genuine opening up of discourses around teaching and the **growth in acceptability** and **credibility** for this area of practice. Fellowship continues to be identified as crucial in creating a **sense of confidence and value** for those completing the process: its value as a mechanism of **visible recognition** and reward is a transformational consequence for many across roles and levels. This is even more clearly indicated in Section 4.

The consequences of how and where the impact from re-profiling teaching through soft organisational change factors emerges in how Fellowship is described. For example, it is influencing choice and selection for NTFS applications:

One colleague has submitted an application to the NTFS, their knowledge and understanding of the UKPSF was instrumental in the development of their NTFS account and further demonstrates the institutions commitment to the delivery of the CPD scheme and development of their staff.

An unexpected outcome is that some of those who have engaged positively with the scheme and gained recognition have been put forward for national and international awards on the basis of their UKPSF application. Though not always successful, it does mean their good practice is being valued highly.

Engagement in a scheme legitimises discussion about teaching and learning for researchers, and Early Career Academics (ECAs) as well as more widely, making teaching a valuable and legitimate area of practice. It means that research institutions can increasingly draw on credible and committed staff in key teaching or curriculum initiatives. More broadly it develops a group of staff that institutions can use to enhance teaching.

The impact of the scheme has been strong because of the engagement of so many individuals and groups of staff. Scheme work is intertwined with our major institutional initiatives: The Connected Curriculum (CC) and students as ChangeMakers. Also Fellowship applicants draw inspiration from stimulating approaches to helping students to learn through active involvement in research.

The balance between research and learning and teaching is being redressed and many research-only staff members (those with a minimal teaching/supervision commitment) are choosing to undertake Fellowship.

The CPD scheme is impacting through raising the profile of teaching through peer esteem – colleagues who achieve Descriptor 3 or 4 become eligible to join the University's Teacher's Senate.

The shift in how teaching is perceived and its recognition contributes to outcomes of self-efficacy. In this the comments predict many of the points raised and discussed in Section 4.

Improved self-esteem from identifying the effectiveness of their current practice and tangible examples of good practice they are sharing.

There is much discussion of how **wider embedding and culture change** is occurring through institutional and individual behavioural change. Examples are given of involvement in initiatives, a greater willingness to be involved in committee work related to teaching and learning, and seen to be doing so. A particular consequence is the higher profile given in reports to scheme-related activity at departmental levels, showing the trend to 'bottom up' and purposeful activity locally for teaching and learning enhancement. In a few reports this wider embedding is extended overseas and to partner institutions.

Many heads of department have organised away days and writing retreats with specific aims of encouraging staff to complete their Fellowship applications and to promote the importance of learning and teaching at a faculty and departmental level.

Achievement of Descriptor 2 and Descriptor 3 of the UKPSF has become a trigger for an invitation to be involved with University wide initiatives such as our current Assessment task and finish group, review of University Level Descriptors, validation panels etc.

We are very proud of our strong relationships with partner institutions and were particularly pleased that our first colleagues from overseas collaborative provision institutions achieved Descriptor 2 in this cycle.

Soft factors (items 14-16) group together to evidence how learning and teaching is becoming a permitted and openly welcomed focus for sharing and discussion. This is evident in how **discussion and dialogue** is being described. It is leading to staff thinking about and discussing educational roles and ideas; exploring teaching activity in a more scholarly manner within and across faculties. This is helped by senior management sponsorship of Fellowship activity and support for teaching discussions.

Some Faculties that presumed 'educational discourse' as something alien and insignificant in their practice have changed their perceptions about teaching as a result of their engagement in our CPD sessions.

The scheme acts as a catalyst for conversations about learning and teaching across the institution – we are speaking to colleagues about their practice all the time and encouraging them to explore their activity in a scholarly manner and these conversations are also replicated within the faculties.

It has led to increased discussions around CPD and professional development in Learning and Teaching, new resources and processes for providing this and the engagement of senior management in HEA Fellowship activities and discussions.

Mirroring the hard investment in specific groups and areas of scheme activity that was mentioned under hard factors, recognition and culture change continues to be spoken about in terms of **senior manager support and engagement**, and the impact of that involvement on enabling culture change around teaching. In particular it appears increasing numbers of institutions expect senior managers to hold Fellowship and this expertise is recognised as a resource.

A working group is considering what the university regards as excellent teaching. The makeup of the group has been drawn from Senior managers and Senior Fellows and as part of the remit are looking to do some mapping to the UKPSF- a paper on this 'Defining the Academic' was presented by two Principal Fellows to Management Forum, focus groups of staff have been held and there is much reference to the HEA CPD Framework in the report.

There is clear evidence of institutional support and there is strong buy-in from senior staff. Investment in the development of a supportive expert network of Professional Standards Advisors and Faculty Programme Liaison Officers ensures that participants are extremely well supported, both across the scheme and within their faculty, to achieve professional recognition.

A Head of Department gave all staff a week free of any other duty to give them dedicated time to write up their applications. These are examples of how senior staff have encouraged engagement with the UKPSF and Fellowship applications.

An interesting trend in the way institutions are shifting how they profile teaching and learning is evident in the emergence of **new roles**. These new roles may be linked directly to schemes or form part of wider embedding, for example as recognition of engagement. They include school directors of learning and

teaching, student engagement champions, teaching scholars, leads, and faculty teaching fellows.

Likewise, many of those who have been awarded Fellowships continue to take on **prominent learning and teaching roles** across the institution (for example, School Directors of Learning and Teaching; student engagement champions; Principal lecturers and senior personal tutors).

The CPD Scheme is embedded within a ladder of opportunity for staff teaching and supporting learning. Our **Teaching Scholar Scheme** aims to support and share good practice from excellent teachers and draws upon Descriptor 3 to help develop practice to impact upon peers. Teaching Scholars who are Senior Fellows are eligible to become Senior Teaching Scholars in recognition of their achievement.

Leads are instrumental in maintaining engagement with continuing professional development in teaching and learning, as well as in creating active communities of practice that engage in the exploration of pedagogy in a multitude of ways.

An important aspect within reports that heralds Section 4 on 'impact on teaching', is evident under factors 17-20, which provide examples of how staff attitudes have changed, and the way reflection and scholarship of learning and teaching (**Reflection and SoTL**) are entering practice. This formal, largely anecdotal reporting of culture change continues a trend introduced in the 2014-15 review. Here the impacts are reported as ongoing and sustained changes. Reflection on practice prompted by Fellowship is described as leading to actual changes to teaching and even influencing new campus design.

Qualitative surveys of staff with Fellowships indicate that the greatest impact from preparing a submission has been the opportunity to engage in a critical reflection of practice.

Teaching Fellows in faculties are increasingly engaged in supporting their colleagues to be more familiar with teaching-learning theories and relevant pedagogic approaches.

The new campus will include resources and facilities to support the use of innovative and more technologically advanced pedagogies and staff are recognising the need to become more engaged in research into best practice in teaching and learning.

Finally, a selection of reviews flag the influence of national attention on **Teaching excellence**. This is clearly driving many of the institutional agendas and priorities around teaching and scheme activity. It will be interesting to monitor the

sustainability of these trends once goals have been achieved or national agendas change.

The NSS and the TEF are contributing to this increased emphasis in the central importance of good teaching for student success, particularly the value that students place on the calibre and approachability of their lecturers and the impact this has on student satisfaction.

3.4 Analysis of responses from those reporting for first time in 2015-16

In reviewing Section 3 for those institutions reporting for the first time in 2015-16 on their accredited scheme, it was initially noteworthy that most of these are actually reporting quite early in their scheme activity. At least three respondents (of the 21 institutions) indicated it was too early for them to report on impact, others commented on pilot outcomes and on early interventions to support shifts in how learning and teaching is being profiled, and on current interventions, which are also the subject of ongoing review. The interest in evaluation is however already obvious with these newer schemes; many indicating the purpose of providing evidence for TEF, QAA, re-accreditation, and other purposes as being a priority. Of interest is how these parallel models of evaluation (discussed above under 3.1.), as this next example shows, generate an expectation of impact for new schemes of changed behaviours, something that is actually being reported as taking place among the mature schemes.

The scheme has capacity to encourage changes and improvements in practice:

- Impact on the behaviour and practice of teachers – do they make changes to their own practice as a result of the process, what are these changes and are they short-term or long-term.
- Impact on the learning experience of students.
- Impact of the scheme on the culture and structures of the university, whether there has been cultural and/or structural change since the implementation of the scheme? What does this change look like and does it enhance the learner experience?
- Impact on the achievement of students.

The UKPSF is also occasionally explicitly linked to **excellence** (four institutions) in reports. As with the first cycle of institutions in the 2014-15 review, there is evidence of **soft and hard** changes within systems, even this early. There is early evidence on comments that **hard culture change** impacts are prevalent across

this group, reinforcing the wider findings from this review. For example, **system changes and links to strategy** predominate (62%) for this group. The use of **links to teaching and learning strategy and KPIs** are given as examples that promote and support embedding of Fellowships (38%), whilst 86% of group respondents reported changes to systems involving HR such as **performance review, promotions, job specification and employment**. **Peer review** is specifically mentioned as part of systematised change to practice by three institutions. It exemplifies the embedded change to how learning and teaching is being affected, profiled within the institutions and the way it influences further cycles of activity. This further reinforces the conclusion that the experience of more mature schemes, as reported in the 2014-15 review, is being repeated for newer ones.

The institutional accreditation is embedded within the University at all levels. The scheme reports to the Staffing Committee, which in turn reports to Academic Board. The Corporate Management Team receives progress reports, which include recommendations and actions. The UKPSF is therefore embedded in the dialogue on learning and teaching across the University. In this reporting period a new Learning and Teaching Strategy has been developed in which the UKPSF forms a key component.

In order to embed such **systematic changes** there is the necessity for closer collaboration with HR departments and academic units, and **senior management involvement**. Further systematic changes emerge around the use of mentors. For example, at least two schemes reported how **mentoring** is being reviewed and formally embedded within institutional processes.

The Academic Development Unit is working in conjunction with the School of Education on a fast-track scheme to mentor and support staff who could easily demonstrate their practice at Descriptor 2. This has meant that the training, mentoring and holistic support offered by the Scheme administrators can be migrated to other well-placed members of staff such as Senior Fellows and National Teaching Fellows, ensuring the team have capacity for development projects and further training.

The scheme is enhancing cross-School working and even School-Professional Service working and relationship building through mentoring etc. Another impact of the scheme is the mentoring principles and approach we have adopted as part of the CPD scheme, which has been adopted by the University more widely.

There is similar potential for systematised change and impact through the way **Senior Fellowship (Descriptor 3)** is profiled for schemes even within these early reports. Here it is about progression, involvement as mentors and reviewers,

building networks – reflecting the early stage of scheme development. The interest in the development of Descriptor 3, in its capacity to reward and recognise leadership activity across the middle tiers of academic roles and function, is something that is strongly highlighted among reports from mature schemes. This reflects the contribution of Descriptor 3 initially as a scheme resource for mentors and panels, and latterly how it becomes a tool for wider change as schemes develop. This reinforces the importance of Descriptor 3; clearly this category of Fellowship plays a significant role to play in progressing teaching and learning within the sector.

One of our Senior Fellows from the pilot has convened a group including all our Senior and Principal Fellows. This Senior/Principal Fellowship Network is becoming active in teaching enhancement across the institution both for their own developmental needs and in support of colleagues who are not yet recognised. They are providing a much broader and more co-ordinated engagement with the teaching enhancement agenda.

Efforts to increase the number of Senior Fellows pre-dated the scheme and we decided to continue to support a group working towards direct applications. The approach has been successful and the number of Senior Fellows has increased significantly. This both increases capacity for the successful operation of the scheme and raised the profile of professional recognition in the University.

Soft elements of impact relate to raising the **profile of learning and teaching**, and this involves centralised activity as well as distributed, grass roots engagement of staff. Over half the respondents in this section report on such forms of impact specifically. Examples include the broader **increase in engagement** and **growth in demand** for Fellowships. This includes the involvement of services which is contributing to **exchange** and profile enhancement of teaching and learning across the service/academic boundary. Other elements mentioned here include the shift in **interest in teaching and learning**, the perceived **value of Fellowships** among staff, and finally the value of this from career and professional development perspectives. All reports by this group reported similar benefits and impact. Within this group, at least 25% comment on the importance of **reflective practice** to staff and potential/emerging culture change.

Culture change appears to be supported by a range of supplementary activities aligned to scheme activity such as **conferences** and **visible celebration, mapping CPD to the UKPSF**, and the coherence between formal programmes and experienced scheme pathways. The suggestion is that synergies are reinforcing the shift in how teaching and learning is profiled (28%).

3.5 Summary reflections for Section 3

There are a number of conclusions to be drawn from this section. For the more mature schemes, key messages emerging from reports are of continuation and embedding. Changes to systems and schemes evidence this convincingly. The reports highlight how HR systems, use of Fellowships and CPD have become established elements within institution landscapes. These embed culture change more formally alongside softer mechanisms that reflect and reinforce the shifts in perception and attitude towards teaching activities. This cumulatively leads to new behaviours. For those reporting for the first time this year, many of the areas for impact appear to mirror those from the 2014-15 report. However, this in itself is useful because it suggests a narrative that involves gradual embedding and culture change.

History of impact

Schemes construct a narrative where introduction of a scheme may involve links to strategy and KPIs in early stages. These drivers in turn lead to developments institutionally at a systems level of change involving performance review, promotions, CPD mapping, and, generally, a raised profile for teaching. This raised profile also leads to wider engagement across academic, service areas and collaborations. In turn this contributes to further embedding of a formal and non-formal nature. Schemes appear to flourish where they are backed up by interventions from above, such as celebration, senior manager involvement; and from the scheme through mentoring, exchange, the value of the process elements; and from individual fellows through their involvement in reflection, a growing sense of self efficacy, perception of value and interest in teaching, and Fellowship participants' gradual involvement in communities and exchange. Institutions begin to regard and use fellows as a resource, especially in the context of achieving excellence and driving change to the student experience. This can generate an impetus for further change through interventions and collaboration, as well as a more scholarly, reflective and evaluative approach to teaching.

The more mature schemes appear to be flourishing on the whole, and whilst this section provides fewer instances where specific practices are discussed in terms of enabling change, the statements and examples provide a comprehensive and convincing picture that change has happened. Institutional CPD schemes have

become an established component within the institutional landscape, and in particular they are providing a focus for substantive and substantial change within systems and processes.

The issue of CPD could become a significant area of wider activity and support for institutions, although there are also many indications that institutions are already, to some extent, acting unilaterally and creatively in pre-empting possible future guidance for good standing, and in the post-award stage of Fellowship. This is largely driven by national agendas of excellence.

Questions arise regarding how and whether the initial effort and interest in CPD, Fellowship and teaching can be sustained as it becomes normalised. It is clear that TEF will have a role to play in this respect, especially in driving the interest in evidence and evaluation, alongside reinforcement for the professionalisation of teaching through it becoming visibly scholarly and evidence-based.

4.0 Section 4: impact on teaching and learning

This new Section 4 was included in reports for 2015-16 because of the numerous assertions of impact on the teaching and learning environment made in the first (2014-15) cycle of reporting from CPD schemes. It reflects wider research questions about evaluation of impact, that refer to the challenge of definitively proving influence on student learning as a consequence of changing teaching practices. It is not anticipated this review will yield unequivocal evidence, however it will contribute to the accumulation of qualitative evidence in this regard.

The original group of 88 institutions reported widespread impacts across institutions in terms of both hard and soft impact. In particular, they reflected on culture changes of some significance being initiated with respect to learning and teaching, its profiling, status and recognition. It seems appropriate therefore to explore within this second cycle (2015-16) how the original 2014-15 cohort of institutions are now describing impact with respect to learning and teaching. Interestingly, there is a similar trend to impact already in evidence within the reports from new accredited schemes in 2015-16. Here whilst the institutions reviewed (21) are clearly in the early stages of implementation, it is apparent that the influence of TEF and the greater interest in formal evaluation of teaching and impact of Fellowship is changing how impact is framed in reports. The 'new' cohort is already discussing impact at different levels: individual, cultural, student focused, behavioural and organisational, and they are seeking evidence for each aspect (see below, cf Guskey, 2000).

This section was further prompted by the growing interest in recording impact of how the widespread adoption of UKPSF is affecting the student experience, and also how it is raising standards for learning and teaching. It is important to the sector that the HEA starts to gather data on how teaching informed by UKPSF is impacting on high quality learning as soon as possible. These reviews provide data and evidence in this respect and are therefore valuable to the sector. It is acknowledged that causality between teaching interventions and learning cannot be assumed and remains difficult to demonstrate. At the same time, wider research does suggest cumulative impact because so many initiatives can come together synergistically around the introduction of CPD schemes, especially where it is positioned within a context of the TEF and wider measurement of student satisfaction. The 2014-15 review highlighted perceptions of impact and this 2015-16 review is an early opportunity to investigate the evidence base further.

As mentioned in the previous review there are models of evaluation, which provide invaluable mechanisms for investigating potential impact. In fact the

adoption of Guskey's 5-stage model was used within the 2014-15 review to highlight types of potential impact. The model identifies immediate and embedded impact factors. Immediate impact factors comprise feedback from e.g. staff on a learning experience; changes to perceptions. More embedded factors incorporate changes to institutional systems processes and modes of operating around teaching on the one hand, changes to staff behaviours, and ultimately, the most impactful, changes to student learning outcomes/experiences. This approach has recently been adapted by the HEA sponsored project led by University of Plymouth to develop an evaluation toolkit for CPD (Kneale et al, 2016, HEA website).

Student learning change was rarely evidenced explicitly although references to impact on the student experience or NSS scores were made within selected reports. More widely evidenced was the perceived value of being involved in CPD schemes as well as specific activities or elements of the scheme itself that generate a sense of value around CPD, namely, award of Fellowship, and a sense of professional worth. This was reported using feedback and quotes from survey data and case studies in the original cycle of review. This factor is about value to scheme participants.

How the institutional context was reported to be changing for teaching and learning was evidenced in the original review. Scheme leaders reported on how CPD had been re-profiled and linked to strategy, learning and teaching aims and targets, and how the result was influencing both engagement in learning and teaching and generating a shift in attitude towards, and profiling of, teaching and learning across an institution. This has to a large extent been addressed under Section 3 above.

The 2014-15 summary report identified early evidence of impact through visible celebration of Fellowship and learning and teaching, and formal involvement of senior managers. This also addressed institutional contexts through the visible promotion and embedding that was happening within systems and processes. This has resulted in more extensive impacts on HR, promotions, rewards (Teaching Fellowships) and Professional/Personal Development Reviews (PDR) as we have seen in Section 3.

In the original 2014-15 review, much was reported on how the profile of learning and teaching and/or SoTL was shifting. This was linked to awareness-raising in reports for 2014-15 because of scheme activities, and how they were being received. The 2014-15 review highlighted the impact of increased dialogue around learning and teaching issues as a result of UKPSF. An aim of this second review (2015-16) is to explore how this profile may have developed beyond awareness-raising to embedded processes. Certainly, several indicators from

Section 3 suggest this has occurred, with widespread mention of funding, engagement in learning and teaching initiatives, communities of practice, etc. This section enables further exploration of this factor.

Impacts on staff learning and behaviours sit as crucial factors within Guskey's model. This is an area where impact was predicted in 2014-15 and 2015-16 reviews from scheme leaders for the original group of 88 institutions suggest it has been realised and sustained. One thing that does emerge, is the assumption that teaching change can impact on student engagement and enhancement of the student experience. This reflects research findings by Hattie that suggests good teaching should impact positively on student learning (Hattie, 2012).

In analysing reviews from 2015-16 scheme leaders, it is clear that this section was a difficult area to complete. Several commentaries are quite short, some reporting it is too early to tell (five institutions). Where detailed and lengthy comments are provided there is also recognition that impact is difficult to measure. Indeed, this comment was made in 19 reports (22%) with a handful of institutions suggesting that evaluation through the PG Certificates was easier to evidence, and only a small number report on significant formal scheme evaluation. There is an accumulation of anecdotal evidence, however, which may valuably inform case studies. Many institutions plan to evaluate (9%) but have not yet devised tools sufficient to do so. Many employ regular feedback mechanisms but acknowledge these provide only anecdotal or qualitative evidence, case study and feedback on staff perceptions and satisfaction (the least embedded impact areas within Guskey's model). By summarising trends and discussion examples provided in the annual CPD scheme reviews, this section identifies the implications for teaching of the emerging picture.

4.1 Impacts on staff

Within reports of how schemes and Fellowships had impacted on staff and teaching and learning, the most widespread comments were about how the schemes have developed staff with respect to their development of learning and teaching practice. This has occurred through the way schemes encouraged **'reflection on teaching', 'critical reflection', 'review of practice'**. 36 (41%) schemes identified this as an impact. The suggestion is the process of Fellowship engages staff in ways that lead them to review and appraise practice, which within supported processes of e.g. mentoring and writing, helps them to recognise the value of reflecting on teaching; to shift their attention onto students' experience of teaching; and to enhance their capacity to enhance and develop their practice longer term. These are potentially far-reaching and substantive changes, which

hitherto have largely been associated with those completing PG Certificates (Kahn et al, 2006; Parsons et al, 2012; Turner, et al 2013).

In unpacking some of the related comments for this particular area of impact, interesting examples emerged around values, inclusivity and diversity, as in where reflection had led to specific shifts around disability, for example:

This is improving our knowledge of recent developments with relation to assessment and identification of dyslexia. Level 3 students are assessed as they require full diagnostic reports to enable them to apply for disabled students' allowances when entering higher education. Our knowledge of current research and findings in the field of dyslexia/SpLD informs our assessment process, analysis of test results and the consequent diagnostic report writing.

Other ways in which reflection is discussed include examples of the way staff acquire **the habit of reflection** and hence become more thoughtful and insightful about teaching, as well as gaining a stronger sense of themselves as teachers. It encourages exchanges of practice across institutions, and a shift in attitudes towards their own CPD, influencing learning about teaching. For example:

Getting into the habit of reflecting' is something we are keen to encourage so that academics can be more critical, thoughtful and insightful about how their teaching impacts on and enhances students' learning.

We have also observed a small change in the way colleagues reflect on their continuous professional development, gradually shifting their attention from the attendance of workshops to more informal but equally beneficial arrangements as they happen in their areas of practice or communities.

The CPD programme has supported learning support tutors and librarians to conceive of their practice more critically as teaching. This in turn helped them to feel more confident in their roles and to recognise the significance of their practice upon the student experience. The impact of the CPD programme can be subtle by making participants feel valued and that their contribution is noted and recognised.

Furthermore, such reflection has reportedly contributed to changes in perceptions and attitudes to teaching for staff on 14% of schemes (12 of 88). A greater number (17 of 88) of institutions report development in **self-efficacy beliefs**, which were impacting on staff confidence to enhance and to perform (19%). This is an especially significant area of development because impact on self-efficacy is widely discussed as playing a crucial role in the willingness of

teachers to take risks, to initiate and engage in enhancement or creative practices, and that has a measurable impact on performance and effectiveness of teachers (Schunk, 1991).

One institution in particular surveyed staff participants in detail. The quantitative study by this scheme showed evidence of a **shift in self-efficacy** belief in 50% of responses: staff responses indicated they had changed practice, were more confident as a university teacher and were more confident about informing practice with research evidence. Another institution reflects on the impact of self-efficacy and identifies it as leading to:

- Enhanced sharing of good practice
- Greater engagement in the peer observation process
- Increased focus on student engagement
- Increased scholarship of teaching
- Increased numbers engaged in learning and teaching working groups
- Wider awareness of factors demonstrating impact of teaching on learning.

Alongside these occasional examples, it is clear that schemes have been able to gather substantial evidence in the form of anecdote and from submissions (written and oral), which are providing an **evidence base of good practice** and successful **interventions** providing a resource and evidence base for enhancement and learning. One institution reports on how Fellowship resulted in a system of logging good practice and impact by individuals, which could in turn be applied within the context of TEF, for example:

More directly, colleagues across the institution are now identifying the need to log and save examples of their own good practice in order to use this in an upcoming application for HEA Fellowship via our CPD scheme. A CPD scheme accredited by the HEA legitimises the identification and collection of examples of good practice and by so doing helps to cement a culture of improvement in learning and teaching which can only be beneficial to our students.

Fellowship helped increase my confidence to engage with a wide range of colleagues in the college and the university. This increased engagement led to two developments: a renewed interest in my own development as a professional, occasionally culminating in conference presentations; and the recent redevelopment of assessments and module delivery to better meet the needs of students transferring to university. I remain more conscious of the learning opportunities I provide personally and collegially.

The conclusion shared by many institutions on scheme impact for teaching is illustrated in the following:

Evaluation feedback from colleagues on the experience-based route reports the process has had a beneficial impact on participant's teaching:

- Engaging with the reading and resources provided helped participant's teaching practice
- Reflecting on one's practice is insightful
- Evaluating one's teaching is useful.

This form of impact on teaching and self-efficacy beliefs is also reported widely as being experienced by support service groups and amongst those acting as leaders and gaining Senior Fellowship as indicated in the following two instances:

Service colleagues especially value the UKPSF since it enables them to both identify and have formally recognised their expertise and contribution to supporting the student's learning experience.

Supporting practitioners to discover an evidence-led approach to teaching development informs practice and increases confidence for academics that their teaching is good. Senior Fellows, colleagues who have explored theory in a greater depth and had their leadership and influence recognised in this way, are bolder in their convictions around teaching, benefitting their teams and improving the student experience.

Whilst specific impact from such stories and narratives of success cannot be used to indicate a definite impact on student learning within reports, there are substantial claims and comments across reports that suggest impact was occurring from being engaged in scheme activity. This **perceptual change around teaching** is cumulatively leading to **enhanced student engagement** and a shift in attention by staff to more **student-focused teaching**. Such outcomes were reported as happening through committees and panels; had resulted in reports of enhanced module and **student evaluations**, and shifts in **NSS results**; as well as recognition through **student-led awards** (24%). The reports provide a mechanism for capturing some of this, suggesting a national trend, although scheme leaders acknowledge in comments that such gathering of data is an institutional priority: institutions have an urgent need to establish independent mechanisms for doing this in order to gather and provide institutional evidence of quality and impact. Currently comments in this area reflect prevailing tentative conclusions on impact and the qualitative nature of evidence. Nearly every comment began with a statement on the difficulty of measuring impact,

but comments also suggest student satisfaction is being influenced: departments respond to NSS using Fellowship and scheme activity to intervene in curriculum delivery/design, for example, and in actually changing behaviour in student assessments.

There is a clear correlation between departments with a higher percentage of staff with professional recognition and NSS scores for student satisfaction. For example Education and Health have NSS scores of 100% student satisfaction; these departments have a high percentage of Associate Fellows, Fellows and Senior Fellows of the HEA.

Examples of impact identified from staff statements collected as part of the Scheme Evaluation in the 2015/16 academic year include strategies for planning new module structures and content (A1, A2,); new understanding of the opportunities to engage learners through different technologies (A2, A4, K2); greater appreciation for the need to have a logical flow from the objectives, to content, to assessment (V3, A2).

The main impact is in terms of colleagues actively engaging in the process of reflection on their teaching and what that means for student learning. When this is done in a supported and supportive way, through our scheme, colleagues are tending to reflect more honestly and openly than they may otherwise have done and are, as a result, refining elements of their practice. One example of this is in terms of the amount and nature of assessment that they require of their students.

Allied to scheme **engagement**, 33% of reports (29 of 88) provided evidence of high levels of **satisfaction and positive feedback from staff**. This was linked to value perceptions being voiced by staff such as being recognised for their work, and a **raised profile** for teaching. This raising of the profile for teaching is further reflected in several examples where **new senior management appointments** had occurred, **Professorial Teaching and Learning Fellows** and **new roles** introduced, and examples given of Deans gaining Principal Fellowship – all representative of **senior management involvement**. This reinforces the reflections in Section 3 on senior manager support for schemes but specifically highlights it as an impact for teaching because it represents a shift in how teaching is being profiled and valued.

4.2 Changing practice and behaviours of staff

This impact measure in Guskey's model sits as a **crucial tipping point** in terms of how embedded impact can be claimed. Early indications of emergent trends

here seem to indicate a **genuine impactful change to practice**. Alongside reports on how faculty is increasingly engaging in reflection, the suggestion is that **transformative learning** may be occurring here. This process is described in the extract below, and implies that staff becomes empowered to transform practice and transform how they teach through processes of reflection.

Our scheme requires colleagues to reflect on their practice and the UKPSF criteria through a case study approach. Colleagues identify an issue (case), discuss what they did, why they did it and how that relates to how students in HE learn; they then discuss and reflect and on the impact. This affords the opportunity to see explicitly the impact that their practice has on the student experience.

Such reflection leads to different ways of approaching teaching as the survey outcomes illustrate:

Impacts on practice include: Clarifying understanding of the planning, reflection and evaluation process involved in the design and implementation of effective learning experiences in HE. Giving more time to students to prepare responses to questions. Improving pacing to provide more opportunities for active student engagement. Improving interaction with students by being more inclusive in approach

Under this heading, 24% of scheme reports specifically mention **changes to behaviours** as a consequent impact from Fellowship engagement. This however is enhanced by a further 10 examples of institutions where scheme leaders report increased engagement in learning and teaching initiatives. These are demonstrated either through the submissions themselves where individuals have reported on particular and successful **teaching interventions**, or they take the form of scheme leaders being able to report on awarded Fellows engaging more pro-actively in teaching and learning initiatives.

Further enhanced engagement occurs in how Fellows are reported as engaging in the use and application of pedagogic research and **evidence-based practice** (7 examples). This is reinforced by reported impacts in the form of **exchange of practice**, growth in buddying activity, sharing within and between teams and individuals and mentoring. 35% of reports suggest this form of impact is occurring, and there is a significant shift in behaviour of staff for over 34 institutions as a result. Others make explicit mention of how **dialogue exchange** is happening between staff. Four institution reports present explicit and detailed examples of how **graduate teaching assistants** are changing their practice as a result of Fellowship (Descriptor 1). These reports maintain this is having a widespread impact on the student learning experience. One even outlines the introduction of a non-accredited student award.

4.2.1 Changing practices involving students

The examples below illustrate a number of examples where the introduction of schemes has led to changes at practice level, which have brought students into Fellowship processes through, e.g. a new (unaccredited) student award and through their involvement in panels. Whilst these may not be without implications for wider use of Fellowships in institutions, they show a shift in how students are engaged with that which is transformational.

An important impact that the CPD programme has had on our students is through the Student Fellow award. Although this is not officially accredited by the HEA it is part of our framework. We felt that it was important to acknowledge the students who support learning and teaching but are not doing sufficient to gain Associate Fellowship. We therefore have DS (Descriptor Student) as an integrated part of the framework. There are specific instances that are perceivable for example the inclusion of representatives from our Student Association in the accredited programmes of the CPD Framework has led to increased awareness of the challenge of supporting student learning reported by these staff, and the refinement of criteria for the Student Led Teachers Awards.

An example that is more typical of what is occurring in institutions and having a transformative impact on student experiences is where scheme activity is engaging staff in wider debate and development of teaching practices that will influence conceptions of curriculum.

Through the scheme, it has been possible to work with staff in workshops and on an individual level to help them develop creative and innovative ways to help students develop their employability skills and the hallmarks of a [University] Graduate. This included a major conference organised and chaired by the PVC of Education and Student Experience working in partnership with colleagues in Academic Development. The conference was attended by 272 members of staff and had excellent feedback.

4.2.2 Examples of impact on Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs)

The changes outlined for GTA-type roles across the sector are important as they provide a reinforcement of reflections under Section 2 on how schemes have been able to develop Fellowships for Descriptor 1 groups. This has impact through the crucial contribution made by such groups to teaching and student

support, and also because it evidences the reach and potential impact of Fellowship across teaching-related activities. Once established at a foundation level for early career academic staff, such outcomes contribute to the creation of an experienced and committed, skilled teaching workforce. The following example illustrates this convincingly and is representative of numerous anecdotes and reports.

As a research student, I think that the biggest impact of undertaking the Associate Fellowship is my new appreciation for the different teaching methodologies, and how they can be used to facilitate different learning styles and teaching outcomes. Prior to undertaking the Associate Fellowship it is not something I have given much thought to, and as such it probably was not reflected as much in my teaching. I now definitely feel that the quality and scope of my teaching has improved significantly, and this can only in my view have a positive impact of student learning and experience at this university.

4.2.3 Examples of evidence informing practice

One of the gaps widely commented in the 2015-16 review was the need to support an evidence-based culture and enhanced SoTL around teaching. Kennedy (2009) positions inquiry-based approaches to professional learning as having transformative value. In the two survey examples below schemes are making that link and assumption explicitly.

Retrospective survey data, collected from colleagues who engaged at length with the scheme, suggests positive impacts on applied practice. For example, some feedback suggests that the scheme encourages staff to take an evidenced-informed approach to their teaching work, much as they do in their disciplinary research (A5, V3 from the UKPSF).

Quantitative evaluation data reinforces the notion that, as a result of navigating the scheme, colleagues may be applying more evidence-informed approaches to supporting learning amongst students. Amongst respondents 80% indicated that participation had impacted on their work in support of students' learning; 78% stated enhanced awareness of pedagogic/leadership literature.

4.2.4 Impact on practice through dialogue and peer sharing

Across reports in the 2014-15 review, **dialogue and exchange** were highly rated for their value and potential in generating and supporting culture change

around teaching. Within this second review (2015-16), dialogic exchange and sharing is again identified for its value, in this case however it is reported not only as a strength and wider outcome (cf Section 3), rather it is used to argue **influence on and shifts in behaviours** of staff. Dialogue enables sharing of practice and learning from others leading in some cases to the development of resource banks; sharing and exchange through communities and events stimulating innovation; and, as already mentioned from previous sections, invaluable learning through **peer review processes**. In each of the cases below scheme leaders claim the influence of schemes and Fellowship on the changes to behaviour and practice, **arguing cumulative impact on teaching**.

Evaluating the scheme has highlighted a range of wider benefits for the institution:

- the dialogic approach has acted as a trigger for ongoing engagement with learning and teaching, and the development of meaningful communities of practice where effective practice and innovations can be disseminated,
- the value of dialogue in brokering new professional relationships and expanding the usual “significant networks”,
- recognising and gauging the role of professional recognition in fostering cultural change in SoTL,
- the surfacing and further development of more hidden, and previously unrecognised, academic leaders.

The CPD Scheme enabled the recognition of best practice across the institution, especially through Senior Fellowship claims and has led to the development of a ‘Directory of Practice’. The writing retreats enabled networking and cross-disciplinary connections between staff, resulting in new working relationships. This networking is currently being built upon through the establishment of the community of practice and an ‘open door’ initiative for peer observation across the institution.

By reinforcing **evidence-based teaching and SoTL**, staff acquire the confidence to challenge and influence teaching practice. This is a clear outcome of engagement with Fellowship.

Staff members have highlighted the value of engaging in the teaching enquiry to gather a more evidence-based approach to educational developments and undertaking scholarly enquiries into their practice. Staff have also formally and anecdotally reported the positive influence of their engagement for giving them the confidence to ‘push’ for enhancements to student learning experiences using justifiable pedagogical decisions to counter assumptions made about learners’ needs and expectations.

Two examples show how dialogue and peer review of teaching constitute concrete transformational outcomes of peer supported teaching development prompted by schemes.

One example of a specific change to organisational systems is the introduction of our 'Peer Dialogue on Teaching' scheme to replace the 'Peer Observation of Teaching'. Participation in the scheme is required on an annual basis. This dialogue extends and enriches peer observation of teaching and has the potential to generate the development of effective approaches to facilitating learning and alternatives to unseen written assessment.

All staff undertake an annual graded observation of their teaching and learning (OTL) and receive feedback from the observer which leads to the creation of a developmental action plan. They include one copy of their OTL report in the portfolio and reflect upon feedback. The process of reflection and the implementation of the action plan have a positive impact on teaching, learning and the student experience, evidenced through student feedback and the External Examiner Report. The portfolio includes a copy of student feedback at module level with tutor reflection on any changes that have resulted.

The introduction of conferences, events and networks around schemes mean staff communities emerge and use these informally and formally to learn about and develop their teaching practices.

More generally impacts included participants: using flipped classroom; using more effective techniques; and being more open to trying new techniques. In the survey of participants, around half had already made changes to their teaching or assessment practice based on participation in the scheme.

It was clear from the networking going on, as well as in discussions after presentations, how much learning and sharing of good practice was going on informally. This draws attention to the diffused impact a scheme can have when it begins to attain maturity within an institution and forms the locus of an active community of pedagogic practice.

4.3 Impact on progression and leadership

The change to staff behaviour is presented and discussed as having an even greater impact in the case of **Senior Fellows**. Continuing the thread begun under Section 3 that Senior Fellows are a crucial focus for attention and resource for change, this Section 4 provides numerous examples of how Senior Fellows **are being used to influence teaching**, and examples of how the drive to become

Senior Fellows is leading to substantive engagement in teaching initiatives either as part or as a consequence of the process. This form of impact is reported using a range of examples by 32% of scheme reports (28 institutions). Specifically scheme leaders report on application of evidence to show **effective leadership around teaching, active engagement in Descriptor 3**; and post award, the **use of Senior Fellows** for curriculum design initiatives, on committees, to engage wider curriculum change, and as leaders. The implication is that Senior Fellows in particular are being developed as a **resource for change** and development of high quality teaching, learning and curriculum practice across institutions: **as a mechanism for behavioural shifts**.

This is apparent in the reports of teaching Fellows that undertake teaching enhancement activity, and use this in Senior Fellowship claims. They are targeted as potential NTFS and become a resource for further embedding of teaching via committees, working groups and on schemes themselves.

As applicants achieve Senior Fellowship, their expertise in teaching and supporting learning is being noticed and such individuals are being encouraged to consider working towards making a claim for National Teaching Fellow and being invited onto particular working groups. Recent Senior Fellow award winners presented and shared their innovative aspects of their practice at the annual teaching and learning conference.

4.4 Changes to learning and teaching environments

As has emerged in Section 3, this form of impact is being constructed around **changes in organisational systems, processes and policy linked to teaching and learning**. Whilst this is certainly being fed by wider drivers at sector level, and institutional priorities, the case is made across reports that CPD schemes are playing a significant part in this, and that needs to be acknowledged. Beyond the links to institutional strategy and priorities that again emerge in this section, there is further evidence to support this shift in the reports of how peer observation is being shaped (13%). This adds to those mentions of how Senior Fellows are being used as a resource within institutional process of curriculum development and teaching enhancement, and to examples of senior manager involvement, and specific examples of teaching and learning initiatives. Together with the considerable evidence of changes to **how teaching and learning activity is being profiled** within institutions that merged from Section 3, this section adds further explicit evidence that **learning and teaching environments** are being extensively **reshaped** and altered with CPD schemes acting as an important focus and mechanism around which this is taking place, e.g.

The impact on Learning and Teaching can be mapped to each sub-aim of the LTA Strategy, because each event is aligned. For example, there have been sessions on peer observation of teaching, assessment for learning, technology enhanced learning, pedagogic principles, independent learning, research informed teaching, internationalisation of the curricula and innovative teaching. The four sub groups of the Learning and Teaching Committee have captured and reported on enhancements in student engagement, employability, creative learning spaces and widening participation.

Linked to the scheme we examined how staff within the institution maintains the currency of their teaching. I, as scheme leader, and the Associate Deans for Education proposed that all staff engage in the equivalent of one day's development each year for their teaching. We developed a list of appropriate activities that included peer review, attendance at workshops and the annual learning and teaching conference. Approved by our Education and Student Committee, this is a significant achievement for all staff to be able to use one day in this way.

4.5 Analysis of data for Section 4 submitted by institutions reporting for first time in 2015-16

As indicated in the opening paragraphs to this section's discussion, there is a clear trend suggested by how institutions reporting on their accredited schemes for the first time in 2016 are discussing 'impact on teaching'. There is suggested evidence in the structure of comments that they are **applying impact models** in how they frame their reflections, and while all institutions comment that 'it is still too early to tell', they comment on **impact at individual level, level of practice and behaviour**, with considerations of **impact on students**, and comments around **organisational impact**. This is significant. It suggests that impact has become part of **broader teaching and institutional reporting**. Institutions and schemes are clearly finding their way in this respect, and share the universal view that direct causal relationships are difficult to evidence. Nevertheless they are **accumulating evidence** and approaching reports in ways that show that a narrative of impact is desirable and have a distinct role and contribution within scheme, and Fellowship, activity.

The number of institutions in this second 'new' cohort reporting for the first time is small (21 institutions), and comments within this section were also short and frequently supported by anecdote and comments from participants. These highlight the perceptions of change happening, and the impact is primarily being experienced through **individuals as they reflect**, review their teaching, **change**

their behaviours and practices. This analysis will therefore reflect the limitations inherent in reports and the fact that for this group data gathering on impact is very much in the early stages. In this respect, as in the discussion above, it reinforces the question about how to evidence impact in acceptable ways so as to serve institutional and TEF requirements.

Across all reports from this group there are indications that an impact on teaching is being experienced at a strongly personal and individual level. Fellowship requires individuals to **reflect on their practice** (13 institutions), and, as one institution comments, **exposes 'blind spots'**. Individuals are reportedly becoming **more informed** (6 institutions); they engage with **SoTL** (4) and acquire a **shared language** for talking about teaching through UKPSF. Furthermore they benefit through sharing practice and learning from the reflection and Fellowship process (11) which involves exchange. Finally, it encourages individuals to **focus on their own CPD** and professional development with respect to teaching (5 institutions) and hence encourages them to develop strategies in this regard. The outcome for many individuals, as reported above, is in enhanced **self-efficacy and recognition** (9).

This process of reflection and learning is recognised within reports for its contribution to **changes in behaviours**. Primarily these are being seen at an individual level and are reported in anecdote and case examples. The inference is that this will cumulatively impact on students through practice and enhanced, more confident teaching. The specific examples of changes to behaviours are fewer, reflecting the early stage of these schemes. However, reports mention **growth in engagement**, increased **involvement in conferences**; the emergence of **conversations about teaching**; and they provide specific example of how individuals have altered what they do. This comes across in examples from 11 reports (over 50% of institutions).

Interviewees were asked about the impact the Fellowship had made on them as professional practitioners. All of them acknowledged a particular interest in pedagogical processes and practice that preceded their engagement with the scheme and for most was the rationale for their initial participation. One individual declared a singular and specific interest in achieving Fellowship as the key motivating factor, and her success in this quest had the precise impact she had sought. For most of the other participants, the impact was regarded as more diffuse and enduring, and two individuals described the process as 'transformational' in the way they now practiced.

The following have already been observed by mentors:

- Increased appreciation that teaching has its own scholarship,

- Increased incorporation of pedagogical principles and evidence-based practice into teaching, supporting learning and assessment,
- Increased numbers of peer observation of teaching events,
- Increased awareness of what the impact of professional practice in teaching and learning might be.

Having the opportunity for personal reflection on teaching methods provided reassurance and enhanced my confidence on my teaching practice. Assuming the same effect on other colleagues in our institution, I believe the effects are definitely positive increasing the quality of teaching irrespective of the discipline taught.

Scheme leaders also report on specific evidence of changes to practice. These may be supported by **projects prompted by Fellowship** schemes, although seem more likely in relation to formalised programmes. The importance of **peer review** emerges very strongly in these reports at both a practice level and at an organisational (systems) level when providing evidence of teaching practice especially for Descriptors 1 and 2. Another potentially quantifiable measure of impact is infrequently mentioned, though seen as significant, and that is **NSS** results.

The scheme has a specific 'development project' in which participants reflect on the impact of recent professional development activities: this has fostered a good level of interest in varied ongoing CPD and numerous instances of (planned) developments in individuals' teaching practices.

There is evidence that the process of applying for recognition, and particularly the scheme requirement for teaching observations in Descriptor 1 and Descriptor 2 applications is contributing to changes in practice. Such outcomes are particularly pleasing as the introduction of the scheme coincided with efforts to enact a fundamental culture change in the conduct of and underlying motivation for teaching observations.

The Peer Supported Review scheme strives to be developmental in philosophy and practice. The workshop and recognition scheme experience has brought further development and enhancement opportunities for Peer Supported Review to the attention of the facilitators who are currently developing the scheme. The work focuses on enabling an enhancement of practice dialogue through the provision 'dialogue guides'. These ensure good inclusive practice is incorporated into all review activities.

With respect to how scheme leaders report on changes to the **organisational context** and support for teaching, they highlight **peer review**, the evolution of a

structured development framework, how links are made to **university enhancement** themes within Fellowship, **links to TEF** and the **value of visible reward** (7 institutions). An interesting minority of institutions discuss the impact on teaching that is happening through **Descriptor 3**.

Discussions around Senior Fellowship have raised important issues about the nature of educational leadership, as distinct from line-management. These have helped staff realise the range of leadership roles undertaken and the opportunities to effect change through programme leadership, mentoring or project working.

The Scheme is linked to the University's plans for the TEF, as the Academic Development Unit will be responsible for the co-ordination of evidence, especially with regards to the continuing process of developing teaching and learning excellence. The KPI of how many academic staff members have HEA Fellowship by 2017 is important to the University's TEF plans, and teaching staff are being formally and informally encouraged to engage and work towards their application.

The University has also been able to integrate enhancement themes (e.g. personal tutoring and digital capability) into the HEA Fellowship process, both of which have impacted positively on the student experience. The development of staff through the HEA Fellowship process has therefore encouraged them to focus on learning and teaching, and to understand what underpins their belief and practice.

4.6 Summary for Section 4 of reports

As an exercise in comparing comments from recently accredited and the original group of schemes within this analysis, two tagclouds were produced using anonymised comments from Section 4.

NEW Schemes (21 institutions)



ORIGINAL Schemes (88 institutions)



As can be seen above, there was a very close alignment between comments from newer and mature schemes reflecting the very strong correlation in focus and impact themes. The tagclouds show correlations within the size and depth of colour on the image and so it is immediately apparent where schemes place emphasis in talking about impacts on teaching. As tagclouds act as a frequency analysis, the groupings bring out immediate impact for staff, their learning and practices, and especially benefits from reflection. This is closely followed by attention being given to how students may be impacted by changes to teaching practice. As an indicator they suggest that schemes see themselves and Fellowships as playing a significant role in contributing to and enhancing teaching across institutions, and consequently benefitting student learning.

In summary, the reports from the 88 institutions appear to suggest that impact on teaching is sustained and cumulative across institutions and that CPD schemes are playing a significant part in this change. At the same time, the issue of such impact measurement is clearly one that requires support and development across the sector so the necessary rich picture can be built up and impact unequivocally argued. The HEA's development of a CPD Evaluation Toolkit is an essential resource in this, but the toolkit requires data to be gathered longitudinally and extensively. This implies the necessity for further exploration of how the relationship of teaching standards and student learning can be measured.

Further areas for development and attention clearly emerge around Senior Fellow roles and leading change on the one hand and the development of roles linked to Descriptor 1 (support and professional services and GTA activities).

Finally, this section reinforces again that sharing and exchange is essential to enable schemes to learn from practice beyond their institutions and these reports provide an invaluable source in terms of developing a resource of case studies from which to learn.

The data analysed from institutions reporting for the first time this cycle reinforce that impact and its measurement with respect to teaching effect and quality are now firmly established within institutional agendas. This raises questions for the sector and HEA on the nature of that evidence, and how coherent and valid narratives can be constructed. Reports such as these provide invaluable insights into impact and how institutional agendas and teaching align and are mutually reinforcing.

Both the new and established cohort of institutions provide many anecdotal examples evidencing impact on teaching practices. They focus on the individual and cumulatively represent a significant narrative of transformation and change.

The examples provided throughout this section are self-reported and largely anecdote, yet they exemplify that impacts to teaching and learning are emerging in individual narratives of change and excellence. The examples provide a convincing representation of how impact at local level can evolve out of Fellowship involvement and the development of an interest in teaching by staff.

The examples suggest that Fellowships and scheme activity are supporting colleagues through reflection to initiate and engage in change to what they do with students and that these have proven potential to impact on the student experience: the impact on student learning however remains a subject for on-going academic debate. Hattie's assumption that good teaching has the potential to impact learning is worthy of note. The importance of examples and cases appears considerable in generating narratives of impact for teaching therefore, especially if they can be incorporated with other data that map onto impact models.

5.0 Conclusion

The process of review is exposing benefits and areas for support and development by both the HEA and the academic development community. This conclusion is divided into two sections summarising key figures from the data in the first part and highlighting key conclusions for each section in the second. Together they provide a vivid picture of the progress of schemes and the accumulating impact.

5.1 Key figures from 2015-16 report of annual review of accredited CPD schemes

At the end of 2015-16, 124 institutions had HEA accredited CPD schemes although 15 of these had operated for less than a 12 month period and so were not required to complete a review in 2015-16. Overall there has been a 50% growth in accredited schemes since the first review in 2014-15.

With respect to strengths, the 2015-16 CPD reviews report the following:

- > Over 50% of all institutions (both established and new schemes) refer to mentoring as a strength in Section 2 in this review. Additional value is drawn from champions, leads and teaching fellows. This is often linked to Descriptor 3 activity and award,

- > 40% of mature schemes are exploiting specific data capture and management tools to manage Fellowships,
- > A quarter of established schemes are specifically developing Descriptor 1 and Descriptor 3 respectively, both areas previously identified as a focus for development. From a frequency analysis of reports, 20 institutions (23%) identify GTAs, PGRs, hourly paid and professional service staff as receiving specific attention associated with Associate Fellowship. At the other end Descriptor 3 is given specific attention in 25 reports (28%).

With respect to how broad impact is being discussed:

- > 36% of HEPs are making widespread use of writing retreats, a practice also adopted by new schemes,
- > Around half of mature schemes have now mapped Fellowship to jobs and employment,
- > 80% of mature schemes report on hard factors contributing to impact around scheme activity,
- > Job specifications now clearly link to Fellowships in the majority of institutions with established schemes, making it a formal element in performance review for almost 50% of HEPs included in this review,
- > 36 (41%) of mature schemes identified reflection on practice and teaching as an impact.

Impact on teaching is specifically highlighted as follows:

- > Over a quarter of scheme reports mention changes to behaviours when discussing impact on teaching,
- > Over one third of reports suggest exchanges between staff on practice is impacting on both behaviour and teaching,
- > Half of the established schemes report on how Senior Fellowship is influencing teaching practice and highlight leadership as a contributing element.

5.2 Key conclusions drawn from each section

5.2.1 Conclusions drawn on strengths and issues for institutions

- > There is a much higher profile being given to externality, partnership and collaboration between schemes and within institutions

- Institutions have learnt from sharing and report proactively on how issues of scheme implementation are being addressed rather than regarded purely as challenges
- Externality within reports takes a number of forms, such as HEA involvement and consultancy, partnership and collaboration with other HEPs, use of externals, and external consultants in evaluations, activity with other campuses in the UK and abroad
- Many issues persist in common across reviews, e.g. time capacity, demand, workloads, decision-making and specific Descriptor requirements,
- There is a shift in tone with report comments denoting a sense of confidence, proactivity rather than reactivity
- The use of management in building credibility appears to have moved on in the 2015-16 review of reports. It is still mentioned as a positive factor in scheme activity, but more is made in this section of how management contributes to the wider embedding taking place
- There is much more focus on embedding, including e.g. workload allocation, cohort and process management, embedding of good practice for training, use of fellows for teaching enhancement
- The approach of aligning Fellowship to job descriptions is now well established and has made Fellowship and CPD a factor in promotions
- The key success factors associated with scheme processes include the following: diagnostic or pre-submission checklists; streamlined documents and use of mapping documents or templates linked to descriptors; VLEs and good practice examples; workshops and writing retreats to support mid process activity; mentors as a resource; trained confident assessors; clear feedback both for referrals and informing future professional development; establishing communities of practice for fellows
- There are many instances of reports showing how earlier issues have been overcome and innovative practices embedded in respect of mentoring, peer observation, process management, student involvement and teaching activity
- Many of those areas raised as concerns or issues in the first 2014-15 review shows that institutions have addressed them confidently and with authority in the interim, indicating considerable learning
- Newly accredited schemes are benefitting in their introduction of schemes from the experience of the more mature schemes in turn
- Data management is also a priority for newly accredited schemes from the outset. This may reflect a new approach associated with the high profile given to TEF.

5.2.2 Conclusion on broader impact around schemes

- It is apparent from the reports on impact that this is a crucial issue for institutions and is increasing as TEF and wider policy drive the agenda. This suggests a clear and particular need for long term approaches to impact. That embedding should be viewed as a long-term process and evaluated with a view to its relationship/relevance for wider policy, localised goals, and sustainability
- There has been significant change in respect of how Fellowship is now linked to academic roles and profiles
- Schemes from mature group are being reviewed strengthened and rationalised
- Descriptor 4 is increasingly described as a pre-requisite or career expectation for professorial roles which may impact on how it is discussed, evidenced and profiled across teaching and research activity
- HR and institutional objectives are reportedly reframing CPD as part of staff expectations, confirming that the trend indicated within last year's reports is becoming more widely established
- Whilst broad impact from CPD schemes is widely claimed, there is also considerable caution about claiming too much, too early
- Soft and hard factors generating impact are described as reinforcing each other and ultimately as leading to changes in teaching behaviours, both for individuals and the institution
- Newly accredited schemes recognise early the importance of reflective practice to staff and as a mechanism for wider cultural and behavioural change.

5.2.3 Conclusions with respect to impact on teaching

- Self-efficacy is widely discussed in Section 4 of reports as playing a crucial role in the willingness of teachers to take risks, to initiate and engage in enhancement or creative practices, and that has a measurable impact on performance and effectiveness of teachers
- From perceptual changes on teaching, a quarter of schemes extrapolate an impact on students experience as evidenced in positive evaluations, improved NSS scores, and student-led awards
- There is clear evidence of impact on staff perceptions and attitudes to teaching reported in surveys, anecdote and case study across reports

- > Section 4 adds further explicit evidence that learning and teaching environments are being extensively reshaped and altered with CPD schemes acting as an important focus and mechanism around which this is taking place
- > Institutions reporting for the first time indicate strong interest in evaluation and impact with respect to teaching. This may be an outcome of TEF influences.

5.3 Summary of review findings

An interesting conclusion for further exploration is in relation to CPD in that Kennedy (2009) discusses three models: transmission, transitional and transformational. In developing schemes aligned to CPD, something that clearly represents a goal from these schemes' reviews, it is worth reflecting as a whole on how such schemes now function within the model. Increasingly discussion, especially in Section 4, identifies the transformational value of Fellowship. This is largely a product of mentoring and exchange, alongside the use of standards to focus reflection and interrogation of practice. This positions scheme activity strongly within the transitional model, however there is growing evidence from reports that SoTL and theoretically informed, evidence based work is emerging from Fellowship activities. This repositions scheme activities and impact, and Fellowships as potentially contributing to the transformative model of CPD as Kennedy outlines (ibid: 248). Given there is an accompanying shift in institutional systems and behaviours around CPD, Fellowship and teaching standards, the impact of schemes could grow significantly. This suggests a need to continue to interrogate HEA accredited CPD schemes and HEP activity around Fellowships to support and monitor these changes.

Overall, from this review, it appears that the introduction of CPD schemes for accredited HEPs is having a significant impact on HE culture, in that:

- > Fellowship schemes continue to inform mechanisms of culture change, both hard and soft, in respect of teaching and learning
 - These changes have resulted in definitive changes to systems and processes with respect to reward and recognition of teaching.
- > Schemes are currently hesitant about concrete and definitive correlations between scheme activity and teaching, although many suggest there are cumulative impacts as a result of synergies across institutional activity in this area, of which CPD is one
- > Evaluation and monitoring of impacts are priorities for all schemes

- It is apparent that the priorities for teaching enhancement in institutions and in scheme activity are being affected by wider TEF agendas
- It is apparent schemes are increasingly operating with confidence and authority. They are self-directed and have independently and proactively developed systems and processes for future enhancement and growth, especially for CPD
- Key themes from the 2014-15 review remain evident in 2015-16, around mentoring, the targeting of specific groups such as Descriptor 3, Descriptor 1, GTA, learning support services, embedding Fellowships as a tool for change.
 - There is a strong emphasis on becoming a Senior Fellow (Descriptor 3) for the purposes of supporting and rewarding leadership and change work.
 - Associate Fellows are being successfully employed to ensure future teaching faculty and core teaching activity are meeting quality standards.
 - Clarity of processes and support associated with Fellowship continue to be a key success factor: writing retreats, peer exchange and mentoring are emphasised.
 - Data management appears to be a particular area of development.
- Schemes are now specifically targeting hard-to-reach staff, and the higher profile of teaching is having a positive impact on those faculty members operating from a research perspective, suggesting increasing status for teaching
- Issues of capacity to manage demand, time, judgment and successful completion continue, but are being addressed responsively and pro-actively
- Embedded and distributed approaches (for departments, partners, and addressing local agendas) with respect to Fellowship, teaching and learning enhancement and CPD appear to be prevalent
- Partnership and externality are also highly profiled both as success factors and as areas for development.
- There is a question as to whether collaborations established during development (e.g. between HR and development units) will be sustained. As systems and expectations become embedded, it may be a challenge for institutions to maintain the initial high profile and interest levels. CPD and TEF requirements are providing impetus in the medium term.

6.0 References

- Cashmore, A., Cane, C. and Cane, R. (2013) *Rebalancing promotion in the HE sector: Is teaching excellence being rewarded?* York: Higher Education Academy. Available from: <https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/resource/rebalancing-promotion-he-sector-teaching-excellence-being-rewarded> [Accessed 1 April 2016].
- Kneale, P., Winter, J., Turner, R., Spowart, L., and Muneer, R. with McKenna, C. and Hughes, J. (2016) (Plymouth) *Evaluating Teaching Development: towards impact assessment a Literature review and The CPD Evaluation Toolkit*, HEA
- Gibbs, G., Knapper, C., and Picinnin, S. (2008) Disciplinary and Contextually Appropriate Approaches to Leadership of Teaching in Research-Intensive Academic Departments in Higher Education. *Higher Educational Quarterly*, 62(4), 416-436.
- Guskey, T.R. (2000) *Evaluating Professional Development* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press
- Hattie, J. (2012) *Visible Learning for Teachers: maximizing impact on learning* Routledge
- Kahn, P., Young, R., Grace, S., Pilkington, R., Rush, L., Tomkinson, B., Willis, I. (2006) 'The role and effectiveness of reflective practices in programmes for new academic staff: a grounded practitioner review of the research literature' University of Manchester, The HE Academy
- Kennedy, A. (2009) Models of Continuing Professional Development: a framework for analysis *Journal of In-service Education*, 31(2), 235-50
- Kirkpatrick, D. (1959, reprint 2006) *Evaluating Training Programs* Berrett Koehler Pubs
- Locke, W. (2014) *Shifting Academic Careers: implications for enhancing professionalism in teaching and supporting learning*, HEA
- Locke, W., Whitchurch, C., Smith, H, Mazenod, A. (2016) *Shifting Landscapes: Meeting the staff development needs of the changing academic workforce* HEA
- Macfarlane, B (2011) Prizes, pedagogic research and teaching professors: lowering the status of teaching and learning through bifurcation *Teaching in HE* 16:1 127-130
- Murray, R. (2013) *Writing for Academic Journals* OUP/McGraw-Hill

Parsons, D., Hill, I., Holland, J., Willis, D. (2012) *The impact of teaching development programmes in higher education* HEA

Schunk, D. (1991) Self Efficacy and Academic Motivation, *Educational Psychologist* 26:3and4, 207-231

Turner, N., Oliver, M., McKenna, C., Hughes, J., Deepwell, F., Shrives, L. (2013) *Measuring the Impact of the UK Professional Standards Framework for Teaching and Supporting Learning* (UKPSF), SEDA/HEA

Contact us

+44 (0)1904 717500 enquiries@heacademy.ac.uk
Innovation Way, York Science Park, Heslington, York, YO10 5BR
Twitter: @HEAcademy www.heacademy.ac.uk

© Higher Education Academy, 2016

Higher Education Academy (HEA) is the national body for learning and teaching in higher education. We work with universities and other higher education providers to bring about change in learning and teaching. We do this to improve the experience that students have while they are studying, and to support and develop those who teach them. Our activities focus on rewarding and recognising excellence in teaching, bringing together people and resources to research and share best practice, and by helping to influence, shape and implement policy - locally, nationally, and internationally.

HEA has knowledge, experience and expertise in higher education. Our service and product range is broader than any other competitor.

The views expressed in this publication are those of the author and not necessarily those of the Higher Education Academy. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any storage and retrieval system without the written permission of the Editor. Such permission will normally be granted for educational purposes provided that due acknowledgement is given.

To request copies of this report in large print or in a different format, please contact the communications office at the Higher Education Academy: 01904 717500 or pressoffice@heacademy.ac.uk

Higher Education Academy is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales no. 04931031. Registered as a charity in England and Wales no. 1101607. Registered as a charity in Scotland no. SC043946.

The words "Higher Education Academy" and logo should not be used without our permission.