INTERNAL REVIEWERS’ INFORMATION GUIDE

Dr John Bostock
CENTRE FOR LEARNING AND TEACHING  Edge Hill University
**CLT have produced this guide to help Internal Reviewers with some of the key areas of internal reviewing on the EHU CPD Scheme (UKPSF)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentors</th>
<th>A mentor can be viewed more as a colleague or ‘buddy’ who may be undertaking an application to be a fellow of the HEA and with whom you can have conversations around the UKPSF. It is <strong>not a formal role</strong> and should be viewed as simply a means of collegial support. Applicants may work on their application on their own and will be offered support from a member of the CLT in drop in sessions details of which will be sent to prospective applicants.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal Reviewers</strong></td>
<td>In order to create a collegial climate for the CPD scheme we use the term ‘Internal Reviewer’. A review process implies development and dialogue. Each application is reviewed by <strong>two</strong> internal reviewers so normally between 2 and 5 applications are sent out for reviewing. For Associate Fellow D1 and Fellow D2: A minimum of two suitably trained and experienced reviewers, each with FHEA as a minimum requirement, are required. For Senior Fellow D3: A minimum of <strong>three</strong> suitably trained and experienced reviewers, each having FHEA status as a minimum, with <strong>at least two</strong> also having SFHEA. <em>(Where the award of SFHEA is new to the institution, it is a requirement that one of the reviewers is a suitably experienced External.)</em> For Principal Fellow: Minimum of <strong>three</strong> suitably trained and experienced reviewers, each recognised as minimum SFHEA, one of whom <strong>must be external</strong> to the institution and one of whom must be recognised as a PFHEA. Two Internal Reviewers review each application prior to a review meeting where there is an opportunity to read the applications together and discuss the outcomes in more detail. CLT will arrange and notify IRs of these meetings. Internal Reviewers (IRs) make decisions about the suitability of the applicants’ evidence (including references and referees’ contributions) for HEA recognition. Internal Reviewers (IRs) provide written feedback for applicants, identifying strengths of their evidence and areas for future development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referees and References</td>
<td>For Fellowship applicants need to supply details of <strong>two referees</strong> to provide an informed peer review of your eligibility for Fellowship using their knowledge of the applicant’s work and the context in which they teach and/or support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The applicant will forward the ‘Reference Template’ and ‘Guidance for Referees’ to their two referees.

Please note that once applicants have registered their interest on CLT@edgehill.ac.uk then they will be allocated an application form with their own specific reference number. They must not use the template forms from the CLT webpages.

Referees should be experienced staff and be able to comment knowledgeably, and from first-hand experience, on the applicant’s current role and any other relevant activities recently undertaken. At least one of the referees should normally be a Fellow of the Higher Education Academy, or an appropriate experienced member of staff working for a higher education provider. All referees need to be familiar with the UKPSF. External Examiners of EHU provision should not be used as referees.

**Applicants** must ensure that their referees have access to their application in good time (about 1-2 weeks before the submission deadline) to meet the submission deadline so they can complete their reference as fully as possible. They are corroborating the APPLICANT’S claim for Fellowship Status. The applicant should, therefore, be in a position to read the references and check that they support what they have presented in their application. It may well be that their referees have included something they may have overlooked and therefore they may wish to add this to their application. The applicant should not be in a position where referees are citing new information that has not been originally detailed by them in their original submission.

Once the applicant has completed their application form, they should save it along with their two completed references and email them as attachments to CLT at clt@edgehill.ac.uk using their institutional email address before or by the deadline of April 1st or December 1st. Failure to do this will result in an automatic deferral to the next submission deadline and Panel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UKPSF</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each application form contains the appropriate descriptor clauses for the category of fellowship and the full UKPSF. Applicants must give a clear rationale as to their choice of category i.e. why they have elected to do a particular category (D1 D2 D3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The UKPSF is a comprehensive set of professional standards and guidelines for everyone involved in teaching and supporting learning in HE, it can be applied to personal development programmes at individual or institutional level to improve teaching quality. The framework identifies the diverse range of teaching and support roles and environments. These are reflected and are expressed in the Dimensions of Professional Practice. The UKPSF clearly outlines the Dimensions of Professional Practice with HE teaching and learning support as: areas of activity undertaken by teachers and support staff,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The applicants should make sure that all the dimensions of practice are addressed explicitly and clearly throughout the application.

– See more at:

**Style of writing**

The External and Internal Moderation processes have identified that in certain instances many of the applicants’ accounts could be much more critical and reflective. They tended to stress achievements and there was only a limited sense of critique.

When writing the application, the Internal Reviewers will be looking for reflective writing in which the applicant stresses not only what they have done or achieved but why and how this is significant and impactful in terms of teaching and learning. There is no need to provide extensive or critical analyses of literature to support your application as this is not built into the UKPSF framework. Looking for awareness of research informed literature as a source of evidence for developing practice is important, particularly in relation to the Dimensions A5, K3 and V3 but an elaborated analysis of such literature is not required. The application is about effective practice and explicit engagement with the framework. In other words the expectation is that you will engage with the appropriate teaching and learning literature to theoretically underpin aspects of your practice which is depicted in the application.

So in completing the application for Fellowship the applicant should not just state what they do but **how and why** it is important or significant in terms of teaching and learning.

The whole application whatever the category should incorporate the UKPSF dimensions of practice clearly showing, through examples and case studies, how these are met. This was noted by the External Examiner that use of referencing was inconsistent.

CLT does not supply examples of writing although one slide in the briefing sessions is devoted to this. CLT emphasises the individual and personal nature of the application and due to diverse backgrounds and discipline areas accepts that there is no one way of completing the form. It is a personal reflective narrative which pertains specifically to the individual applicant.
**Submission deadlines**

- **December 1st** and **April 1st** in any academic year. Feedback is provided within four working weeks.

**Resubmissions (R1)**

Applicants can resubmit their application either before the panel meets usually 3-4 weeks after the feedback deadline or at the next submission date.

Applicants need only address the specified conditions which are found in the ‘actions for future development’ boxes against the specified Dimension of Practice e.g. A1 V2 K3 and they may choose to represent these **highlighted in red** so that internal reviewers can confirm more readily that they have been met. The applicant may resubmit their application on the original application form with your unique reference number. They need not re-submit references unless specifically asked to do so.

If you resubmit your application in the time allowed (usually within another 3 to 4 weeks following the initial feedback date) and you have successfully met the Internal Reviewers’ conditions, the recommendation for fellowship will still be subject to External Moderation and Accreditation Panel approval.

However if your resubmission R1 does not meet the requirements, the next official submission date and panel will be offered. This will be called an R2.

**IR Decisions**

The Internal Reviewing process can make the following recommendations:

- The evidence **meets the required standard** for recognition for the appropriate category of Fellowship,

- Or the evidence **does not meet the required standard**, and the applicant will need to apply for a different category

- Or the applicant will need to **re-submit for the same category** and continue to work on the application.

**Development Vivas**

For **D1 and D2** the role of the development viva is offered as evidence in the spirit of providing an alternative assessment/reasonable adjustment for colleagues who may, through a specific learning difficulty or other disability, be disadvantaged by a solely paper-based application. For D1 and D2 it would normally be the exception.
For D3 and D4, in addition to corroborating and expanding on the depth of evidence in the application, the development viva process further engages the applicant in dialogue about their own progress and contribution to leadership and the development of others. D3, in particular, also constitutes a target setting exercise with the aims of sustaining a trajectory towards D4. It is our intention, at all D levels, to inculcate a culture of aspiration for using the UKPSF as a framework for development. As such the development viva contributes to the evidence base for alignment with the UKPSF, in a summative assessment fashion, but also provides a strong formative component to the process. The accreditation panel thus use the development viva to add value to the process and to reinforce decisions made about the evidence base presented in the application and case studies. The deployment of a development viva for D3 and D4 also serves as a vehicle to identify examples for dissemination, and individuals who can actively contribute to and grow the capacity of the university’s infrastructure to support others engaging in the Framework.

The development viva is an opportunity for the applicant to discuss their written application with their two Internal Reviewers and it is normally chaired by Dr John Bostock from CLT. The applicant may bring a copy of their application for reference and anything which they feel will support their development viva. They may also bring any ancillary notes, books, journal articles which they feel will help them in their conversation. The Internal Reviewers will have prepared a number of questions relating to the themes emerging from the applicant’s written application and the event will be digitally recorded (audio) for External Moderation purposes only. It should last no more than 50 minutes in total.

The applicant will need to have a successful development viva to qualify for HEA status D3 and D4. Feedback will be given following the development viva usually at the same time as the written application feedback and further guidance offered if unsuccessful.

The development viva will take place within the 4 week feedback period if the IRs deem the written application successful. If further work is needed for the written application then the applicant will be informed but a provisional date for the development viva will be set to take place at a mutually convenient point between the feedback date and the panel date (usually 3-6 weeks). This ensures that all applicants are given an opportunity to resubmit work and undergo a viva prior to the accreditation panel.

**Development Action Plan**

The Internal Review including the Internal and External Moderation processes noted that Action plans were very uneven. Some did not have real objectives and some were rather bland/not very focused.

It is suggested that the objective should come first on the form in section 4 and that the activities should follow from these – the applicant can envisage several activities linked to a single objective. This has now been applied to all newly issued application forms. It is also necessary for applicant to include a
‘timeline’ for their objectives and this should be indicated in the additional column on the development plan entitled ‘target dates’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Reviewer Feedback form</th>
<th>The External Moderator noted that reviewers do not seem to be using the whole IR feedback form - often short on suggestions for further development. It is therefore important to give full and rigorous feedback and ensure that all aspects of the form are completed as appropriate.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Links for reference</td>
<td>CPD Scheme: <a href="http://www.edgehill.ac.uk/clt/professional-development/edge-hill-university-cpd-scheme-ukpsf/">http://www.edgehill.ac.uk/clt/professional-development/edge-hill-university-cpd-scheme-ukpsf/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>