



Annual Review of HEA accredited CPD schemes 2015-16

Summary report

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 report is the **shortened version** and I recommend that institutions and individuals also explore the full report, which presents rich data and includes a **range of excerpts** drawn from institutional reviews illustrating the identified key points. The examples provided are self-reported but they demonstrate impacts to teaching and learning being experienced across institutions reporting in this cycle.

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.

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.



Alison Robinson-Canham
Assistant Director: Professional Practice

Contents

Forward to the Report	2
Contents	5
Introduction	7
1.0 Methodology	7
2.0 Section 2 of the review - strengths, issues and areas for development across schemes	8
2.1 Process support, resourcing and structures of schemes	9
2.1.1 Wider embedding of schemes	9
2.1.2 Development of mentors	9
2.1.3 Administration and data management	10
2.1.4 Capacity, processes and structures	10
2.1.5 Training	13
2.1.6 Externality and Sharing Across Schemes	13
2.2 Priorities, developments, issues and solutions	14
2.3 Analysis of data from additional accredited scheme reports	15
2.3.1 Strengths within new cohort of HEPs submitting reviews	16
2.3.2 Issues and challenges within new cohort of HEP reviews	16
2.3.3 The narrative of evolution for an accredited scheme	17
2.4 Concluding thoughts on Section 2	17
3.0 Section 3 - impact on institutions	18
3.1 Key findings from reviewing Section 3 of reviews	19
3.2 Examples of how hard factors are impacting on institutions	21
3.2.1 Impact on staffing, systems and processes	21
3.2.2 Factors evidencing strategic links and impact	22

3.3 Examples showing impact on institutions through soft factors	22
3.4 Analysis of responses from those reporting for first time in 2015-16	24
3.5 Summary reflections for Section 3	25
4.0 Section 4: impact on teaching and learning	26
4.1 Impacts on staff	27
4.2 Changing practice and behaviours of staff	28
4.3 Impact on progression and leadership	29
4.4 Changes to learning and teaching environments	30
4.5 Analysis of data for Section 4 submitted by institutions reporting for first time in 2015-16	30
4.6 Summary for section 4 of reports	31
5.0 Conclusion	32
6.0 References	39

Introduction

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 review extends the work and provides an analysis of 109 schemes institutions reporting in 2015-16.

The review offers insight into how institutional CPD schemes have developed their progress, and the wider impact of HEA accredited schemes and Fellowship. The first review drew on reports submitted for 2014-15 representing 88 institutions. In that review, Sections 2, 3, 4 and 5 from the report were analysed. In the 2015-16 review, reports 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

This short version of the report provides an overview of key elements from the **longer review report**, which can be accessed via the HEA website www.heacademy.ac.uk

1.0 Methodology

As previously, the data for the Annual CPD Review was provided in a template. HEPs provided qualitative and quantitative responses. 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. Sections 2-4 of the reviews 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 and drawing on themes identified within the 2014-15 review. Information was interrogated using thematic analysis, alongside use of frequencies. It compares findings, identification of trends and identification of examples of good practice.

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. 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, many 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. **Mentoring** is again highlighted as a key factor contributing to progress and successful completion. It is given substantial attention in the form of training and expansion with 56/109 (54%) institutions making explicit mention of mentoring in this section. In the second (2015-16) review, **oral assessment** has been developed with 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, Section 2 focuses more upon the **operational aspects** and **embedding** of the schemes. There is also a 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'** and **'issues and responses'**. There is considerable cross over

between themes. 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

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 – all were strongly highlighted in that 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 mention is made in this section of how management relates to wider embedding. For example, scheme leads refer to **departmental strategies** and 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. Others make reference to targeted discussions with Deans on progress and **bespoke provision** for schools/particular groups of staff.

2.1.2 Development of mentors

Mentoring is widely noted as contributing to success within claims. Some 59% of institutions from the original 88 refer to mentoring as part of their process or as a planned introduction with other 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.

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, 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.

2.1.3 Administration and data management

With respect to process support, there is considerable discussion of administration and data capture and management. Specific mention of administration and data management, both as an issue and an essential mechanism, is made by 24 (27%) of the original 88 institutions. . A further 17 (19%) talk explicitly of managing progress within Fellowship processes. The introduction of specific tools to **capture data on progress and fellowship** are outlined by 46% of institutions. . 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 leads, 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**. Reflecting embedded approaches, there is evidence that centralisation of information systems is occurring.

Scheme information on completion and progress has in some cases led to 'quick wins', helped **structure logistics** and even fed changes to delivery management. One institution has introduced a **traffic light system** for managing progress. **Panel roles** are being clarified and while 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**. Alongside rationalisation, investment and resourcing, budgets emerge subtly as a concern with respect to securing future administrative resources.

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. There is evidence of **streamlining of processes** occurring .Cohorts are being used in a targeted way to

manage numbers, workloads and completions. This means mechanisms can be introduced to carry the process of application along. In many cases schemes appear to have developed to a point where dispersed and distributed support for fellowship is underway.

There is **targeting of specific groups** to meet institutional priorities and needs. There are several schemes introducing specific pathways, e.g. targeting Descriptor 1 or to support progression to Descriptor 3. For example, 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 leads highlight the coherence of, and complementarity between, PG certificate programmes and schemes for experienced staff.

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 and developing solutions pro-actively: **streamlining assessment; strengthening training and moderation; incorporating exemplars** in documentation and using dedicated panel VLEs.

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), accreditation; and they 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 - acting as a positive driver.

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.

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.

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'.

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.

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' or online formats. These 'retreats' are 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.

There is also a group of institutions that recognise issues of **reflective writing**, 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.

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**. It is discussed more extensively as an element within Section 3 in the context of 'impact' and embedding.

2.1.5 Training

Training of mentors and assessors is discussed positively. As an HEA requirement, it is linked to clear mechanisms and processes. 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 describe training as an important enhancement with staged and progressive involvement of Fellowship graduates as assessors and mentors respectively. They particularly highlight **panel shadowing and support for judgments**, hence addressing concerns voiced by scheme leaders in the first 2014-15 review.

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.

However Externality takes a number of forms. Some reports discuss involvement with the HEA and use of **HEA consultants** and training. **Externals** are described in reports as a source of supporting evidence and their strength and rigour as a resource in terms of establishing confidence, parity and confident 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 and dialogue.

There is also evidence that more institutions are sharing across networks and between institutions. The approach is valued : 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.

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, 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.

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.

General issues associated with resourcing such as VLEs etc. Where VLEs are mentioned, it is because they are under review, are 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, it seems, a less visible issue and most institutions talk positively about how they are using such resources rather than the problems they cause.

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).

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. More broadly, **evaluation** is being purposefully applied as an **enhancement and reporting tool**.

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. 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. 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 placing much **greater emphasis on data management and evaluation** from the outset. 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.

What is apparent, although not specifically acknowledged, is that institutions appear to have learnt from peers' experience of scheme management and benefitted from enhanced HEA guidance as expertise has grown.

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 (10), for whom **externality and partnering** has been a benefit if not an element of strategic choice. Another area of emphasis is working with non-UK institutions.

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:

- > Six 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 5 HEPs (24%)
- > Three institutions (14%) highlight the value of **visible recognition** by management in raising the profile of Fellowship

Collaboration has been mentioned previously and is reiterated in the way scheme leaders comment on synergies between experienced routes and PG Certificates - highlighting the coherence of schemes across career profiles.

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.

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.

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 are using templates, prompts and writing retreats as well as mentoring and peer input in response to such issues.

Institutions mention the value of **communities** and **sharing of practice** around scheme systems and processes, however, suggesting wider use of dialogue across schemes. 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).

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 they appear 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. These have been formulated into a table as a checklist of activities and issues over the introduction and embedding process (see main report for detail).

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. Strengths centre on establishment and enhancement of systems, processes, support and management tools. The sharing of practice across the sector also suggests that scheme leads are operating from a position of confidence and assurance in themselves as a group.

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. While 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.

3.0 Section 3 - impact on institutions

In Section 3 the review for 2015-16 focuses initially on a comparison with comments made in the original review. This explores whether the strong assertions of impact made by that original group are being sustained, and also explores how and where impact has strengthened. It allows conclusions to be drawn on the impact of introducing HEA Fellowship schemes more generally and to investigate how and where impact is being felt, as well as the form it takes.

A few institutions from the 2014-15 group report only briefly 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. 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. 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** suggesting 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. A growing number of institutions are using Fellows purposefully, alongside funding activity, and creating new roles around learning and teaching initiatives. 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**.

It is immediately apparent that concrete systematic changes have occurred. Impact through hard factors is identified by 69 of 88 institutions (78%). These divide into three main groups of impact suggesting 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.

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; to how **exchanges and discourse is being enacted**; and in a **re-profiling of teaching** with respect to **behaviour** and supporting practice - evidence, status and research.

3.1 Key findings from reviewing Section 3 of reviews

Whereas in the previous review 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.

Explicit requirements for Fellowship incorporation (item 1, table 2) are identified by 49% (43 of 88) of institutions in changes to recruitment documentation and **job specifications** 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**. 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.

More widely within the comments, 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 HEA Fellows (10 institutions); 8 institutions mention Fellowship leading to recognition of Collaborative Awards for Teaching Excellence (**CATE**) and the National Teaching Fellowship Scheme (**NTFS**) candidates; 9 institutions list new roles emerging to complement Fellowship activity, and 3 further institutions discuss how schemes are attracting **new funding**. 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. 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.

Culture change is building momentum. 20% of institutions explicitly mention **culture change** as having occurred in this 2015-16 review suggesting sustained impact with over 30% of scheme leaders claiming that the profile of teaching has been raised across institutions. 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. Scheme leaders discuss embedded activity in the context of **wider CPD** use, closer liaison and **collaboration with partners**, Deans or heads showing how Fellowship is being embedded locally.

Institutions are extending CPD activity and mapping the UKPSF across CPD activity. This process now appears firmly in place within 31% of institutions but was only mentioned in previous 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 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; **standards of reflection** have improved and reflective approaches to teaching are listed as significant positives within applications; 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. As a final reflection of how institutions are changing with respect to schemes, a quarter of institutions mention '**excellence**', and of these at least a third of institutions describe the use and development of **internal excellence awards**.

In considering impact, therefore, 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 HEA Fellowship** has grown and acquired **credibility** across institutions with a consequent shift in how learning and teaching is being developed and talked about.

3.2 Examples of how hard factors are impacting on institutions

3.2.1 Impact on staffing, systems and processes

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 have affect the way professorial roles generally might conceptualise and articulate their strategic work, and in turn influence those at professorial level applying for fellowship insofar as fellowship may acquire the **status of an expectation or pre-requisite**. Fellowship is given 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.

This integration of scheme and process is emerging within the synergies within and between Fellowship pathways, as well as across wider HR activities. Reports draw attention to **synergies** between not only the **taught provision and experienced pathways** they offer too and they are **developing this purposefully** within schemes and seeing a corresponding **impact on behaviours**.

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.

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

3.2.2 Factors evidencing strategic links and impact

Strategy and targets continue to be mentioned across reports but in this iteration they are mentioned more rarely or spoken about more reflectively and with specific purposes in mind. 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.

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.

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. 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.

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. How Senior Fellows (Descriptor 3) are **profiled and used** influences culture change, wider awareness raising, status, and also concrete initiatives.

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 HEA Fellowship.

3.3 Examples showing impact on institutions through soft factors

In the 2015-16 review, raising the profile of teaching and learning appears frequently. It is 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.

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

There is much discussion of how **wider embedding and culture change** is occurring through institutional and individual behavioural change. A particular consequence is the higher profile given in reports to scheme-related activity at departmental levels - showing the trend toward 'bottom up' and purposeful activity locally for teaching and learning enhancement.

Soft factors on how learning and teaching is becoming a permitted and openly welcomed focus for sharing and discussion, are evident in how **discussion and dialogue** are being described. It is leading to staff thinking about educational roles and ideas and 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.

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

The emergence of **new roles** is an interesting trend for institutions. These new roles may be linked directly to schemes or form part of wider embedding. They include school directors of learning and teaching, student engagement champions, teaching scholars, leads, and faculty teaching fellows.

An important aspect within reports that heralds Section 4 on 'impact on teaching', is 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, reflection on practice prompted by HEA

Fellowship is described as leading to actual changes to teaching and even influencing new campus design.

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.

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 this year on their accredited scheme, most 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 already obvious with these newer schemes.

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 among comments that **hard culture change** impacts are prevalent across this group, reinforcing the wider findings from this review. For example, **systems 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 and the way it influences further cycles of activity.

In order to embed such **systematic changes** there is of necessity, closer collaboration with HR departments and academic units and **senior management involvement**. 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 reflects the contribution it initially makes as a scheme resource for mentors and panels and later, 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. Further systematic changes emerge around mentor use.

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 specifically report on such forms of impact. Examples include the broader **increase in engagement** and **growth in demand** for Fellowships. This includes the involvement of services that contribute to **exchange** and profile enhancement of teaching and learning across the service / academic boundary. Also 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 convincingly evidence this. 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. Cumulatively, this 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. This suggests a narrative that involves gradual embedding and culture change (See main report).

On the whole, the more mature schemes appear to be flourishing and while 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 of impact - that change has happened. Institutional CPD schemes have become an established component within the institutional

landscape. In particular, they are providing a focus for substantive and substantial change within the systems and processes.

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 contributes to the accumulation of qualitative evidence in this regard.

It seems appropriate 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 newly accredited schemes in 2015-16. Here while 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, organisational - and they are seeking evidence for each aspect.

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, for example, from staff on a learning experience and changes to perceptions. More embedded factors incorporate changes to institutional systems, processes and modes of operating around teaching as well as changes to staff behaviours and ultimately – the most impactful – changes to student learning outcomes/experiences.

Student learning change is rarely evidenced explicitly although references to impact on the student experience or NSS scores were made within selected reports.

How the institutional context was reported to be changing for teaching and learning has to a large extent, been addressed under Section 3 above.

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; Scheme leaders for the original group of 88 institutions now suggest it has been realised and sustained. There is an 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 (5 institutions). Where detailed and lengthy comments are provided there is also recognition that impact is difficult to measure. 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.

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' and 'review of practice'**. This was identified as an impact in 36 (41%) schemes. The suggestion is the process of Fellowship engages staff in ways that lead them to review and appraise practice and, within supported processes such as 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.

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 also encourages exchanges on practice across institutions and a shift in attitudes toward their own CPD – both influence learning about teaching.

Furthermore, reflection has reportedly contributed to changes in perception 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

Impact on teaching and self-efficacy beliefs is also reported widely as being experienced by support service groups and among those acting as leaders and gaining Senior Fellowship.

There are substantial claims and comments across reports that suggest impact is 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 and had resulted in reports of enhanced module and **student evaluations** as well as shifts in **NSS results** and recognition through **student-led awards** (24%).

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

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 a **raised profile** for teaching and value perceptions, such as being recognised for their work, being voiced by staff. 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 represents a shift in how teaching is being profiled and valued.

4.2 Changing practice and behaviours of staff

In Guskey's model this impact measure 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 implies that staff become empowered to transform practice and transform how they teach through processes of reflection.

As a consequent impact from Fellowship engagement, 24% of scheme reports specifically mention **changes to behaviours**. 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** through buddying, sharing within and between teams and individuals and around mentoring. Occurrences of this form of impact are suggested in 35% of reports.

The changes outlined for GTA-type roles across reports are important as they reinforce reflections made in 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 HEA Fellowship across teaching-related activities.

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) but is also 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**. Scheme leaders claim the influence of schemes and fellowship on the changes to behaviour and practice, **arguing cumulative impact on teaching**.

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

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**. Section 4 provides numerous examples of how Senior Fellows **are being used to influence teaching**. 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 leads 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**.

4.4 Changes to learning and teaching environments

Impact is evolving around **changes in organisational systems, processes and policy linked to teaching and learning**. 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 emerge in this section, there is further evidence to support this shift in the reports of how peer observation is being shaped (13%). 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.

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. 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. Comments within this section were also short and frequently supported by anecdote and comments from participants.

Institutions discuss reflection and impact on individuals. 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 involve exchange. This 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).

Reports also 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).

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**.

4.6 Summary for section 4 of reports

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.

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 to enable schemes to learn from practice beyond their institutions is essential, and these reports provide an invaluable resource 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.

Both the new and established cohort of institutions provide large numbers of 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 anecdotal, 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 suggestion is Fellowships and scheme activity are supporting colleagues, through reflection, to initiate and engage in change in what they do with students and that these have proven potential to impact on the student experience.

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 HEA 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 mention 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 HEA 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 specific need for long-term approaches to impact and that embedding should be viewed as a long-term process evaluated with a view to its relationship/relevance for wider policy, localised goals, and sustainability
- > There has been significant change in respect of how HEA Fellowship is now linked to academic roles and profiles
- > Schemes from mature group are being reviewed strengthened and rationalized
- > 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.

Discussion increasingly, identifies the transformational value of Fellowship, especially in Section 4,. This is largely a product of mentoring and exchange alongside the use of standards to focus reflection and interrogation of practice. This strongly positions scheme activity 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, 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

Guskey, T.R. (2000) *Evaluating Professional Development* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press

Hattie, J. (2012) *Visible Learning for Teachers: maximizing impact on learning* Routledge

Contact us

+44 (0)1904 717500 enquiries@heacademy.ac.uk

Innovation Way, York Science Park, Heslington, York, YO10 5BR

Twitter: [@HEAcademy](https://twitter.com/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.

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 Higher Education Academy logo should not be used without our permission.