

GOLD D3 Senior Fellow - Mentee Handbook

IMPORTANT INFORMATION – Please read before using this handbook

This Mentee Handbook is only for candidates using the Professional Standards Framework (PSF) 2023 and who enrolled onto our GOLD scheme **after** 1st September 2024.

If you enrolled onto the GOLD scheme before 11.59pm 31st August 2024 you will be developing and submitting your application using the UKPSF 2011 version. There is a separate Mentee handbook and application form for you to use, which our team can send to you if you do not have a copy.

If you are or think you are eligible to use UKPSF 2011 please **DO NOT** use this PSF 2023 version as it is different from UKPSF 2011. Please confirm with our GOLD team before going ahead via gold@gre.ac.uk.

Contents

Contents	2
1. Introduction	6
1.1 Welcome to GOLD PSF 2023	6
1.2 Higher education and eligibility for Senior Fellowship	7
2. Knowing if Senior Fellowship is right for you.....	9
2.1 D3 Senior Fellowship description and profile.....	9
2.2 Knowing if you are ready to start working on an application.....	11
3. The Professional Standards Framework 2023 (PSF 2023).....	12
4. Starting your journey with GOLD	15
Step 1.....	15
Fellowship Category Tool.....	15
GOLD D3 Senior Fellow Documents and Resources.....	16
Step 2	16
GOLD Introductory Mentee Development Workshop	16
GOLD Mentor.....	17
Enrolment.....	17
Step 3	18
GOLD Mentee guide to the PSF 2023 Dimensions – Fellowship	18
GOLD D3 Senior Fellow Mentee Handbook	18
GOLD D3 Senior Fellow – Application Form	18
Step 4	18
Pre-submission checklist.....	18
GOLD Mentor Supporting Statements.....	18
Submitting.....	19
5. Your GOLD mentor	20
5.1 Finding an approved GOLD Mentor	20
5.2 Mentor teaching observation.....	20
5.3 Supporting Statements	21
6. Enrolling onto our GOLD scheme.....	23
6.1 Registration of Intent (ROI) Form	23
6.2 Application Submission Points.....	24

7. GOLD D3 Application Form.....	25
7.1 Section 1 – Personal Information.....	25
7.2 Section 2 – Outlining your Professional Context (300 words).....	25
7.3 Section 3 – Your Reflective Account of Professional Practice (RAPP).....	27
Leadership Case Studies.....	28
7.4 Section 4 – Professional Development Action Plan (350 words)	32
7.5 Section 5 – Bibliographic reference list.....	32
7.6 Section 6 – Pre-submission checklist.....	32
8. Submission formats.....	33
8.1 Written submission.....	33
8.2 Screencast Submission	33
8.3 Submission Format requirements	34
9. Support with your application	35
9.1 Support provided by the GOLD team	35
GOLD 1-2-1 Drop-In session.....	35
GOLD Writing retreats.....	35
Additional Faculty Support for FES.....	35
9.2 Opportunities for development	36
CPD workshops	36
Conferences.....	36
Literature.....	36
10. Developing your SFHEA GOLD application	37
10.1 Content of your D3 application.....	37
10.2 Using a reflective voice – First person and being personal.....	37
10.3 Structuring your Reflective Account of Professional Practice (RAPP)	38
10.4 Going beyond the descriptive narrative	41
10.5 Evidence informed approaches as a basis for practice.....	41
10.6 Referencing and bibliography reference list.....	42
11. Presenting your evidence for D3.....	43
11.1 Evidencing Descriptor 3.....	44
D3.1 – A sustained record of leading or influencing the practice of those who teach and/or support high quality learning.	44
D3.2 – Practice that is effective, inclusive and integrates all Dimensions.....	46

D3.3 – Practice that extends significantly beyond direct teaching and/or direct support for learning.....	48
12. Developing your screencast application	50
12.1 Structuring your screencast.....	50
12.2 Using presentation slides in your screencast.....	50
12.3 Narrating your screencast.....	52
12.4 Making the screencast recording.....	52
13. Submitting your application.....	53
13.1 Application Screening.....	53
14. The GOLD Enrolment & Application Process.....	55
15. The reviewer panel composition.....	56
15.1 Independent review	56
15.2 Joint reviewer discussion.....	56
15.3 Use of a Third Reviewer.....	57
15.4 Review criteria for D3 Senior Fellowship applications.....	57
15.5 External Examiner Review & Feedback.....	58
16. Outcomes of the Review	59
17. GOLD Reviewing Process	60
18. Resubmission	61
18.1 Written resubmissions.....	61
18.2 Screencast resubmissions	61
18.3 Reviewing resubmissions	61
18.4 Claims not resubmitted.....	62
18.5 Unsuccessful resubmissions.....	62
19. Resubmission Review Process	64
20. Appeals.....	65
20.1 How to make an appeal.....	65
20.2 Processing an appeal	65
21. Quality Assurance.....	67
21.1 External Examiner	67
21.2 Quarterly GOLD Review Board and Steering Group meetings	67
22. Fees	69
22.1 University of Greenwich Staff.....	69
22.2 UK and TNE Partners.....	69

22.3 Advance HE fees.....	70
22.4 GOLD Recognition Fee.....	70
23. Confidentiality	72
24. GOLD scheme Privacy statement and EDI monitoring	72
25. Maintaining Good Standing.....	72
26. Contact our GOLD Team.....	73
Appendix 1 - Recommended reading to support your GOLD D3 claim	74
Appendix 2 - Code of Practice for Fellows.....	76

1. Introduction

1.1 Welcome to GOLD PSF 2023

The GOLD professional development framework provides a way of formally recognising your commitment to professionalism in teaching and learning in higher education, based upon authenticated evidence of your practice, values and knowledge. It is aligned to the Advance HE (AHE) Professional Standards Framework (PSF) 2023 (Figure 1). GOLD is a fully mentored scheme. You will work with a trained GOLD mentor throughout your journey towards recognition, as well as being able to engage in additional feedback and development opportunities that are provided by the GOLD team.

GOLD accredits three categories of fellowship (D1 to D3) and supports direct application to Advance HE for the fourth (D4). The ‘D’ refers to the Descriptor that is aligned with each particular category of fellowship. When you achieve your recognition, you will be entitled to use the relevant postnominal letters to signify your achievement.

Descriptor	Category of Fellowship	Postnominal letters
D1	Associate Fellow	AFHEA
D2	Fellow	FHEA
D3	Senior Fellow	SFHEA
D4	Principal Fellow	PFHEA

Figure 1: Categories of fellowship and their associated descriptors from the PSF 2023 and postnominal letters

In this case you will be able to use SFHEA once you’ve successfully gained recognition through GOLD. The Senior Fellow award is yours and is something you will have and be able to refer to, even if you leave Greenwich in the future. Senior Fellowship is the appropriate category of fellowship to professionally recognise individuals from a wide variety of different contexts whose **comprehensive understanding and effective practice** provides a basis from which they lead or influence those who teach and/or support high-quality learning. Senior Fellows **lead and influence teaching and learning practice** in many different settings. Working with and through ‘others’ (e.g. colleagues, peers, mentees, etc.) they operate to support, guide and initiate change or lead / influence enhancement of practice in a wide range of global contexts. Their contribution is effective, benefitting students and their learning experiences in a variety of ways. A Senior Fellowship application will demonstrate practice integrating **all the PSF 2023 Dimensions** enabling them meet the requirements of PSF 2023 Descriptor 3.

You can apply for SFHEA recognition through GOLD via two submission routes; written or recorded screencast. You should read this handbook in conjunction with

the other GOLD D3 Senior Fellow resources that are available on our GOLD webpage. You should explore the GOLD website to find out about the mandatory and optional CPD that is available to support you too.

If you have any questions, please contact the GOLD team gold@gre.ac.uk.

Good luck!

1.2 Higher education and eligibility for Senior Fellowship

The PSF 2023 sets out the **professional standards for higher education (HE)**. All the experience and evidence included in an application for any category of Fellowship **must** relate to teaching and/or support for learning practice related to **higher education** provision, such as:

- Level 4 or above within the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ) in England, Wales and Northern Ireland, or equivalent;
- level 7 or above within the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF) in Scotland on the Framework for Qualifications of Higher Education Institutions (FQHEIS) or equivalent;
- level 5 or above of the European Qualifications Framework;
- first cycle or above of the Qualifications Framework in the European Higher Education Area (QF-EHEA);
- level 5 or above of the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) or equivalent;
- level 5 or above of the New Zealand Qualification Framework (NZQF) or equivalent;
- Other equivalent higher education frameworks;
- Activity focused on supporting learners within a Higher Education context, providing the learner(s) are enrolled on a Higher Education Qualification may also be considered as evidence equivalent to the higher education frameworks above;
- Foundation Year programmes;
- Pre-sessional English courses for international degree students designed to develop academic skills;
- Professional CPD programmes that are designed to develop and extend existing graduate/postgraduate level skills, knowledge and understanding, e.g. GP training, etc.

Delivery of some **non-accredited continuing professional development** for academic and learning support staff may also be considered as evidence equivalent to the higher education frameworks.

The PSF 2023 acknowledges the wide variety of local and global contexts in which higher education operates, and the diverse practices and roles that contribute to high-quality learning.

In defining what constitutes higher education teaching and learning within different national contexts in order to determine eligibility for fellowship, Advance HE uses **UK ENIC** (UK National Information Centre) for information about global education frameworks and qualifications. Programmes will be defined as HE for the purposes of staff teaching and supporting learning on the programme being eligible for fellowship if they are an integral part of a programme defined as higher education within the context of the country of study. If you are employed by a UK/TNE partner where you are teaching UK levels 1 to 3 i.e. Further Education (FE), this is not appropriate in terms of applying for Senior Fellowship. All evidence and experience mentioned in an application must relate to higher education (foundation degree/degree etc.) in the terms specified above by Advance HE.

By applying to become a Senior Fellow you will have the opportunity to:

Demonstrate your commitment to teaching, learning, and the student experience, through engagement in a practical process that encourages research, reflection and professional development;

Gain professional recognition for your higher education teaching and/or support for learning practice that is increasingly recognised by international institutions;

Benchmark your practice against professional standards and sector expectations;

Identify and celebrate your strengths and achievements through reflecting on your experience.

2. Knowing if Senior Fellowship is right for you

2.1 D3 Senior Fellowship description and profile

Senior Fellows lead and influence teaching and learning practice in many different settings. Working with and through ‘others’ (e.g. colleagues, peers, mentees, etc.) they operate to support, guide and initiate change or lead / influence enhancement of practice in a wide range of global contexts. Their contribution is effective, benefitting students and their learning experiences in a variety of ways. Senior Fellowship is not role dependent and there are many different contexts in which you might be leading and/or influencing the practice of others. You will need to explore whether you have sufficient evidence to meet the requirements of Descriptor 3.

Ultimately, GOLD D3 Senior Fellowship claims are judged against the D3 Descriptor, therefore it is essential that your claim and evidence aligns with it in full. Individuals whose practice is aligned with Descriptor D3 will be able to demonstrate achievement and success in all the dimensions of the framework including the areas of activity, core knowledge and professional values. They are expected to incorporate relevant subject and pedagogic research and/or scholarship in their approaches. How this is evidenced will be dependent on the context in which the individual is working, nature of the subject, discipline or profession in which they teach, and the expectations of the institution in which the individual works. However, the expectation is that there will be some scholarly literature and evidence cited in order to demonstrate a clear pedagogic rationale for practice and leadership/influence approaches and practice.

Such individuals will be demonstrating engagement in continuing professional development (CPD) activities with specific regard to learning and teaching and educational leadership, which result in the enhancement of their leadership and influence practice. These activities are likely to be wide ranging, incorporating both formal and informal approaches to continuing professional development.

Your evidence against Descriptor 3 will be written into your Reflective Account of Professional Practice (RAPP) and two Case Studies. For Descriptor 3, the examples you select to write about need to demonstrate how your practice supports high quality learning through leading/ influencing the teaching and/or learning support practices of others (colleagues, peers, mentees, internal/external, etc.); this is illustrated in Figure 4.



Figure 2: Senior Fellow impact on HE learning through leading or influencing others' teaching and/or support for learning practices

'Others' might, for example, be colleagues who work alongside you, or colleagues who work in other teams. They could be mentees or fellow committee members. They could be based in higher education, or within your disciplinary field or a professional body. They might be individuals from industry or practice settings that have a role in HE teaching and/or supporting learning.

Senior Fellowship is not role dependent; there are many different contexts in which you might be leading and/or influencing the practice of others. Critically, while direct work with students is a vital part of higher education, it does not form the basis of a successful Senior Fellow claim. You may still be engaged with a substantive role in teaching or working directly with students to support learning; however, these are not examples that you should select to focus on in your application for Senior Fellowship.

Expectations for engagement with the PSF 2023 Dimensions at Descriptor 3 differ from that expected at Descriptor 2, which is focussed on direct work with learners. You may not have worked directly with students previously; for example, you might have departmental and/or wider teaching and learning support advisory responsibilities within an institution but not have worked as a practitioner directly with students. To evidence Descriptor 3 you will need to be able to demonstrate your 'comprehensive understanding and effective practice' that 'provides a basis' for your work in leading or influencing the teaching and/or support of learning practices of others.

2.2 Knowing if you are ready to start working on an application

Ask yourself these questions:

- Am I effective at leading and inspiring others in the area of teaching and learning practice? Do I have evidence of sustained and effective practice from the last 5 years to demonstrate my effective practice? For example, am I familiar with current theories and practices of teaching and learning in Higher Education? Am I up to date in my approach to educational practice and leadership? Can I support learning using contemporary approaches and back this up with scholarship? Am I conversant with the current university/collaborative partner policies and strategies, and infrastructure (VLE, student management systems, etc)?
- Am I professionally self-critical? Do I reflect upon how I could do better, and how the things I am involved with could be more effective? Am I someone who changes things for the better?
- Am I active in pursuing continuing professional development (CPD) in teaching and learning?
- Have I engaged with some relevant (teaching and learning and/or discipline) CPD in the last 12 months, or attended a conference in the area of teaching, and learning?
- Do I have enough evidence of engagement with required/relevant areas of the PSF 2023 dimensions? Does this evidence align fully with Descriptor 3?

The GOLD framework expects you to be able to answer “Yes!” to all these questions – and give a reasoned evidential account of why your answer is “Yes!.” If your answer to any questions is “No,” then you may not be ready to embark on gaining D3 Senior Fellowship yet. If this is the case, you are advised to contact gold@gre.ac.uk for a discussion about your practice and experience. It might also be useful to talk to a prospective GOLD mentor about your experience and where and how any gaps might be addressed prior to beginning a GOLD application.

3. The Professional Standards Framework 2023 (PSF 2023)

The Professional Standards Framework 2023 (PSF 2023) for teaching and supporting learning in higher education provides a comprehensive set of professional standards and guidelines for all those who are involved in teaching and supporting learning in higher education. The PSF 2023 can be used by individuals to plan their development and evidence their practice to achieve professional recognition, by institutions as a basis for initial and continuing professional development and recognition programmes, and at a national level to improve teaching quality and celebrate success.

The PSF 2023 acknowledges the wide variety of local and global contexts in which higher education operates, and the diverse practices and roles that contribute to high-quality learning.

The Professional Standards Framework (PSF) 2023 consists of two components: **Descriptors and Dimensions**.




Figure 3: Professional Standards Framework (PSF) 2023

The PSF Descriptors are a set of criteria statements (referred to as Descriptor ‘criteria’). These define the key characteristics of four broad categories of practice. Incorporating the Dimensions, each Descriptor identifies the extent of practice required to meet it and recognises the variety of practice and roles undertaken by professionals who teach and/or support learning. Each Descriptor consists of an introduction and a set of three criteria statements.

The Dimensions of the Framework (PSF 2023) are arranged as **three related sets** of five **Professional Values**, five forms of **Core Knowledge** and five **Areas of Activity**.

Professional Values (V1-5): underpin all forms of Core Knowledge and Areas of Activity. They are the foundation of professional practice.

Core Knowledge (K1-5): informed by the Professional Values, representing key forms of knowledge required to undertake the Areas of Activity. There are multiple and diverse forms of knowledge which are connected to and shaped by communities and contexts.

Areas of Activity (A1-5): bring together the Professional Values and forms of Core Knowledge, showing the essential activities that support delivery of effective practice.

To achieve Senior Fellowship, you need to evidence that your teaching and/or support of learning practice demonstrates the requirements of the three Descriptor 3 (D3) criteria, which are as follows:

Descriptor 3 is suitable for individuals whose **comprehensive understanding** and **effective practice** provides a basis from which they **lead or influence** those who teach and/or support high-quality learning. Individuals are able to evidence:

- **D3.1:** a sustained record of leading or influencing the practice of those who teach and/or support high quality learning
- **D3.2:** practice that is effective, inclusive and integrates all Dimensions
- **D3.3:** practice that extends significantly beyond direct teaching and/or direct support for learning.

Descriptor 3 requires all 15 PSF 2023 Dimensions to be evidenced (Figure 4).




Figure 4: PSF 2023 Dimensions of the Framework

4. Starting your journey with GOLD

When starting out planning and developing your application, we recommend that you follow the initial sequence of activities below in figure 3.




Figure 5: Steps in starting your journey with our GOLD scheme and developing your application

Step 1

Section 3 above explains the Professional Standards Framework (PSF) 2023. Your application will be reviewed against Descriptor 3 of this framework.

Fellowship Category Tool

Before starting to use this handbook, we strongly recommend that you use the free Advance HE online Fellowship Category Tool (FCT) on their website here.

Answering the online questions about your higher education teaching and/or support for learning practice should:

- help you to check that Senior Fellowship is the best match for your current practice

- prompt your thinking about different aspects of your practice as you plan your application.

The Fellowship Category Tool (FCT) consists of a set of statements that are aligned to the different PSF 2023 Dimensions of the Framework and Descriptors. This self-analysis tool will ask about your professional activities in teaching and/or supporting learning in higher education (HE). By using the tool to consider your current and recent practice, your choice of statements as you progress should help to confirm that **Senior Fellowship** is the most appropriate category of fellowship for you. Please note that the accuracy of the tool depends on the choices you select as you work through it. As you look through the guidance documents, if you feel that you are not yet able to provide sufficient evidence for Descriptor 3 then you can use the report provided by undertaking the FCT to guide the development of your practice further before making a successful application. You are welcome to come and speak to a member of the GOLD team if the tool suggests you may need to develop your practice more. We can advise on potential activities/reading/CPD etc. you might engage with to help you prepare for a future GOLD SFHEA application.

GOLD D3 Senior Fellow Documents and Resources

You will require the following documents when preparing and developing your D3 Senior Fellow application:

GOLD D3 Senior Fellow - Mentee Handbook PSF 2023 (this document)

GOLD D3 Senior Fellow - Mentee Guide to the PSF 2023 Dimensions

GOLD D3 Senior Fellow - Application Form PSF 2023

GOLD D3 Senior Fellow - Supporting Statement Proforma PSF 2023

Professional Standards Framework (PSF) 2023

GOLD D3 Senior Fellow - Guidance for Referees (to be used by your GOLD mentor and your second supporter)

All of these can be downloaded from our GOLD webpage [here](#).

Step 2

GOLD Introductory Mentee Development Workshop

This is a mandatory workshop that must be attended by anyone wishing to apply through our GOLD scheme.

This workshop outlines our GOLD scheme, the application process and the Professional Standards Framework (PSF) 2023. It will help you establish which level of fellowship is most suitable and identify areas for professional development. The workshop provides practical opportunities for you to explore sources of evidence from your own practice to enable you to make a strong application with the PSF 2023. It also explores how to write applications in a scholarly and reflective style, and signposts to appropriate academic literature to underpin applications.

Before you attend the workshop, you should familiarise yourself with the Professional Standards Framework (PSF) 2023 and the descriptor for D3 Senior Fellowship. You are strongly encouraged to complete the Fellowship category tool on Advance HE website. The workshop facilitator will be better able to advise on your next steps if the category tool has been completed prior to attending the workshop. You are encouraged to discuss your teaching and learning approaches with colleagues as part of your wider reflections of your practice; it's often easier to work on this together.

The *GOLD Mentee Development* workshops run regularly throughout the year. These are usually monthly. Dates and bookings for these can be found via [Horizon here](#).

If it has been more than 12 months since you last attended this work (even if this was for a previous submission), you will be required to attend it again in order that you can get up to date before you start your application.

GOLD Mentor

GOLD is underpinned by a mentoring scheme to help you towards achieving fellowship recognition. You will be fully supported by a trained GOLD mentor throughout your journey towards submitting your application for D3 Senior Fellowship. Your GOLD mentor must be a current member of University of Greenwich staff who holds D3 Senior fellowship or higher category of Fellowship. All mentors are required to engage with the GOLD initial mentor training and subsequently engage with the annual mentor refresher training. Your mentor will be someone who knows your current professional practice and is usually someone from your department or who knows your practice.

More information about your GOLD mentor and how to find one can be found in Section 5.

Enrolment

It is important that you enrol onto our GOLD scheme before you start developing your application. We will only accept your submitted application if you have successfully enrolled. More information about this can be found in Section 6.

Step 3

GOLD Mentee guide to the PSF 2023 Dimensions – Fellowship

We recommend that you start by reading the ‘GOLD D3 Senior Fellow - Mentee Guide to the PSF 2023 Dimensions’. A copy of this can be downloaded on our GOLD webpage [here](#). This guide introduces and explains the PSF 2023 and then focuses on each of the fifteen PSF 2023 Dimensions to support you in thinking about your practice and identifying potential evidence appropriate to PSF 2023 Descriptor 3 (D3), which is the basis for the award of Senior Fellowship.

This Guide focuses on each Dimension in detail. It includes lots of different examples of practice to reflect the wide range of roles and contexts in which HE practitioners work within the global higher education sector. There are also prompt questions to help you to think about your practice in relation to each Dimension. The questions and examples provided are indicative only and may not be relevant to your practice; you may have different appropriate examples, depending on your own unique context.

You should discuss this with your GOLD Mentor. Once you have identified how **in your context** you use appropriate Professional Values and Core Knowledge, you will then be able to focus your use of *The GOLD Mentee Guide to the PSF 2023 Dimensions – Senior Fellowship* on the sections most relevant to you and your context, to start to identify evidence to use in your application. You are expected to refer to this guide extensively throughout your journey towards submission.

GOLD D3 Senior Fellow - Mentee Handbook

You should use this handbook to understand the format and requirements of the application as well as how to submit an application.

GOLD D3 Senior Fellow - Application Form

Use this application form to write and finalise your draft application. A copy of this can be downloaded on our GOLD webpage [here](#).

Step 4

Pre-submission checklist

When you have a finalised version of your application and before submitting it, you need to complete the pre-submission checklist in the final section of the application. See section 7.6 for more information about this.

GOLD Mentor Supporting Statements

You need to include TWO supporting statements in your D3 application. Your GOLD mentor must provide one of these. Another colleague who knows your practice

well can write the other for you. When you have a finalised version of your application you need to share it with your GOLD mentor and your second supporter for them to read before they write their supporting statements for you. They will then be able to use the *GOLD D3 Senior Fellow - Guidance for Referees PSF 2023* and *GOLD D3 Senior Fellow - Supporting Statement Proforma PSF 2023* to provide a supporting statement for your application.

See section 5.3 for more information about your supporting statement from your GOLD mentor.

Submitting

Once your application and supporting statement are ready then you can submit it to the GOLD team. See section 13.

Depending on your eligibility, you may also need to pay a fee. See Section 22.

5. Your GOLD mentor

You are encouraged to work closely with your mentor and to get regular feedback on your drafts (written drafts or draft recordings if you intend to submit via screencast). During your drafting stages you will be required to look closely at the Descriptor (D3) for SFHEA. This is what your application will be judged against, so you must make sure you provide evidence with mapping to the dimensions of PSF 2023 in your application to show that you meet D3 in full. Your application must make a case for you to be awarded i.e. you need to think carefully about the evidence to make it clear to reviewers that you have the requisite evidence, and that it aligns with relevant dimensions of the PSF 2023 and the Descriptor. You and your mentor should work through the Pre-submission checklist (section 6 in the application) and be sure that you are happy with your application before you submit.

5.1 Finding an approved GOLD Mentor

You can find a GOLD mentor by checking our up-to-date approved GOLD mentor list on our webpage [here](#).

It is important that your mentor has undertaken the required training and are up to date with the processes of our GOLD scheme and the PSF 2023. If a colleague offers to be your GOLD mentor, it is your responsibility to check that they are approved and trained by the GOLD team. If they are not, please ask them to contact the GOLD team. They will need to do the New GOLD Mentor initial training before they can be added to the mentor pool.

Your enrolment onto our GOLD scheme and your application will only be accepted if you are supported by an approved GOLD mentor. You are expected to have at least a minimum of 1 month's support from your GOLD mentor helping you develop your application. However, we would recommend that you have longer, as on average an application can take up to 6 months to fully develop.

Please note that this process is exactly the same for staff at UK and TNE partner institutions - **only** a Greenwich based, approved GOLD mentor can be used to formally support your application. This is most commonly a link tutor with your institution from Greenwich.

5.2 Mentor teaching observation

The focus of Senior Fellowship is about influence and leadership of colleagues, rather than on direct, student-facing teaching and learning activities (which is what Descriptor 2 is concerned with). As a result, there is no requirement for a D3 mentee to engage in any kind of teaching observation with their mentor.

5.3 Supporting Statements

To meet the requirements from Advance HE for D3 Senior Fellowship, your professional practice must be authenticated. Formal authentication of practice comes from your TWO supporting statements. The supporting statements will verify that your D3 application presents a fair and honest reflection of your practice in line with the category of fellowship you are applying for. Your application for Senior Fellowship must be endorsed by a supporting statement from your **GOLD mentor** and one other person who knows your practice well.

The supporting statement **endorses** your application and is used by GOLD reviewers to confirm that your application presents a fair and accurate reflection of your higher education practice. It is not used by reviewers to fill any gaps in the evidence you provide towards the Descriptor. The reviewers will need to see sufficient evidence of effective practice in your Reflective Account of Professional Practice (RAPP) and your two leadership case studies to meet Descriptor 3 for them to award Senior Fellowship.

When your GOLD mentor and second supporter writes their supporting statements for you, they must use the following resources;

GOLD D3 Senior Fellow - Supporting Statement Proforma PSF 2023
GOLD D3 Senior Fellow - Guidance for Referees PSF 2023

Both of these resources are available on our GOLD webpage.

The supporting statements **must** be written on the *GOLD D3 Senior Fellow - Supporting Statement Proforma PSF 2023*. The *GOLD D3 Senior Fellow - Guidance for Referees PSF 2023* should be used to help your GOLD mentor/second supporters write their supporting statements. They will need to confirm that they have been **provided with the final draft of your application** to enable them to provide an effective reference. In their supporting statement the referee will confirm that in their professional opinion, you demonstrate the requirements of Descriptor 3 and should be awarded Senior Fellowship. Your GOLD mentor/second supporter will be asked to confirm that they have written the supporting statement themselves and that the information they provide has been written specifically for your application.

We follow Advance HE guidance regarding length i.e. 2 sides of A4 is normally sufficient for D3. The statement should also be mapped to relevant dimensions the PSF 2023/make reference to the Descriptor (D3), and it should fully corroborate claims made in your application. It should not be written as a more generic reference that might be used in a job application. All the documentation you submit, including the supporting statements, should be personal and unique to you. The GOLD scheme lead reserves the right to check that this is so. You may be asked to provide an alternative supporting statement for a variety of reasons when

reviewers of your application judge that the statement does not fully verify and endorse the evidence in your application.

6. Enrolling onto our GOLD scheme

Anyone wishing to submit an application through GOLD (Greenwich, UK and TNE partner staff) must enrol onto our scheme first. We will not accept or review your application if you have not enrolled. To do this, you must first attend the **mandatory** *GOLD Introductory Mentee Development Workshop* (2-hours online). After attending this you will be provided the link to our online Registration of Intent (ROI) form to complete. When you have submitted this you will receive an email from our GOLD team confirming your enrolment.

You are given 12 months to submit your application to our GOLD from the date of submitting your ROI.



Figure 6: Diagram to show steps required to be taken to enrol onto our GOLD scheme

6.1 Registration of Intent (ROI) Form

The Registration of Intent (ROI) is a form that signifies that you have institutional agreement to apply for fellowship through GOLD. After attending the GOLD Introductory Mentee Workshop, you will be provided a link to the online form. As part of the requirements by the form you must ensure that you have:

- attended our GOLD Introductory Mentee Workshop
- approval from your line manager
- confirmation from approved GOLD mentor to support you

If any of these are not fulfilled, then your ROI will be rejected and you will be asked to amend/provide further evidence. Once you have submitted a completed form, you will receive an email from our GOLD team who will confirm your enrolment onto our GOLD scheme. You have 12 months from the date of submitting your ROI to submit an application.

6.2 Application Submission Points

There are four submission points per year for our GOLD scheme, these usually take place in; September, December, March and June. At these points we undertake a reviewing process of any applications we have received. Each application is assigned to two GOLD reviewers. In addition to this a small sample is also sent to our external examiner.

In your ROI we ask that you inform us of the submission date you are intending on aiming for. This is important for our GOLD team to know so we can ensure that we have sufficient reviewers available to review your application.

The submission point you select is not final. If you wish to change your intended date of submitting, then please contact our GOLD team via gold@gre.ac.uk.

All applications received are reviewed at the next closest submission point. We do not accept any late applications submitted to be included as part of previous submission point.

Example:

March 30th Submission Point

April 1st Application submitted

Application will be reviewed at next submission point in June

You can view all the up-coming submission points on our webpage.

7. GOLD D3 Application Form

The application form is composed of 6 sections;

- Section 1 – Personal Information
- Section 2 – Outlining your professional context
- Section 3 – Reflective Account of Professional Practice
 - 3a.i Written submission
 - 3a.ii Leadership Case Studies
 - 3b Screencast submission
- Section 4 – Professional Development Action Plan
- Section 5 – Bibliographic reference list
- Section 6 – Pre-submission Checklist

7.1 Section 1 – Personal Information

This section requires to you to provide information about yourself and qualifications relevant to your application. This is where you also provide the name of your approved GOLD mentor that has supported you in developing your application. This section should be completed on the application form irrespective of which route you are following (written or recorded screencast).

7.2 Section 2 - Outlining your Professional Context (300 words)

Your **Professional Context Statement** provides a brief summary of your higher education roles, responsibilities and professional experience. This section should be completed on the SFHEA GOLD application form irrespective of which route you are following (written or recorded screencast). Any application form without this section being completed will be returned to the candidate. This section “sets the scene” for your Reflective Account of Professional Practice and the leadership case studies in Section 3 of the application form. **In no more than 300 words** your Context Statement should:

- Provide a **brief** summary of your teaching and/or support of learning experience, including the context in which you currently work, your current role and responsibilities in teaching and/or support of learning. Identify the type and location of institution(s) you work for, as this will help to set out the context for your work, but keep this brief and relevant to your role. Do not include details about the history and prestige of the institution(s), as your Account of Professional Practice is about you and your practice;
- identify the students/colleagues that you work with; for example, student level of study (e.g. year of study, undergraduate, postgraduate, etc.),

programme(s)/unit(s) of study, discipline/specialist area of work, number and types of learners, etc.

- For Senior Fellowship, your work with students may be more indirect, as you may work more closely with colleagues/teams/external organisations/professional bodies, etc.; in which case identify these aspects of your work.
- outline your current and recent role(s)/experience related to influence and leading the practices of others; for example, support, supervision, management, mentoring, etc.
- focus on your current and recent practice, which should be able to demonstrate your sustained impact at Descriptor 3, typically over the last 3-5 years;
- remember that your application for Senior Fellowship is based on your higher education practice.

As the Context Statement is not an assessed part of your application, you must not map this information to the PSF 2023. The reviewers will not take account of the information in the Context Statement when they assess your application; therefore, it **cannot** be used to provide supplementary information that would add evidence of effective practice to your 'claim' for Senior Fellowship in your Reflective Account of Professional Practice (RAPP) (i.e. it cannot be used to extend the word limit of your RAPP and/or your two Leadership Case Studies).

The two examples below illustrate the types of information that are useful to include in the Context Statement to set the background to your practice:

Example 1:

I am a Learning Skills Manager at a research-intensive university (25,000 students). I have worked in learning skills development for 8 years and now manage a team of six other tutors. Our team supports undergraduate and postgraduate students with the development of a range of skills to support their study on academic programmes.

One big area of our work is with students studying in their second language. I developed and now manage a student peer-mentoring system, currently in its fifth year of operation. This is designed to support new international students to settle into university life, promoting first year transition and progression. I work closely in partnership with the Student Union to select and train mentors. I also work with Heads of School to provide professional development for academic staff related to teaching international students and designing inclusive curricula.

In addition to leading staff development sessions, I have developed a range of online resources to support colleagues. I teach group workshops of 25-30 students and hold small group tutorials. I am an active researcher and regularly publish my work. External to the University, I am on the Professional Development Committee of the XX Association and take a role in planning the annual cycle of CPD activities, organising the annual Symposium and delivering face to face and online CPD sessions to members.

Example 2:

I am a Principal Lecturer at Y College of Art and Subject Leader of the postgraduate Graphic Design and Visual Communication Masters programmes. The College has 2,500 students, 150 FT staff, sessional lecturers and visiting artists. I have been teaching in HE for 10 years, having previously worked as a graphic designer. I still freelance, which enriches my teaching.

I hold a PhD in Visual Communication, having entered HE as a mature learner via a Foundation Program and studied part-time as an undergraduate. I have no formal line management responsibility for staff in my School but in my Subject Leader role for the Masters programmes, I co-ordinate the teaching of the four full time teaching staff, three sessional lecturers and two technicians that support the programmes.

I lead on curriculum development. I am also a member of the College's Learning and Teaching Committee and have worked on a number of cross-institution teaching and learning initiatives. I am an active researcher and have published in several journals in relation to teaching in my discipline. I am a member of a national subject network involving 20 HE institutions and have led a collaborative teaching project, which I discuss in Case Study 1.

I completed my PG Certificate in Learning and Teaching in HE five years ago and since then have acted as a mentor to three members of staff undertaking that programme each year. I focus on my mentoring role in Case Study 2. I normally supervise 2 or 3 PhD students and up to four undergraduate students undertaking final year projects. I teach six modules on the Masters programmes and I still carry out some undergraduate teaching (2-3 modules a year).

7.3 Section 3 - Your Reflective Account of Professional Practice (RAPP)

For Senior Fellowship (D3) you need to show a 'sustained record' of leading or influencing (D3.1); focus on identifying appropriate examples of your recent

practice, typically from the last 3–5 years. If you need to refer back to practice from more than 5 years ago, you need to ensure that you focus on how this now influences your current practice. You will also need to show that your practice is effective, inclusive and integrates all Dimensions (D3.2). For D3.3 your evidence will need to **show that your practice extends significantly beyond direct teaching** and/or direct support for learning.

Your reflective account of professional practice (RAPP) is organised around the five Areas of Activity (A1–A5) of the PSF 2023, the five Core Knowledge and the five Professional Values dimensions. In preparing your RAPP, you will likely refer to experience mentioned in your Professional Context Statement (section 2). Remember the RAPP is an explanation of how you go about your work; section 2 is a brief description/overview of what you do. It is not assessed and is not part of the overall word count/time limit. In the RAPP you need to explain the how and the why of your practice and professionalism in depth, rather than emphasise the extent of your professional practice.

The award of Senior Fellowship is based on **evidence of your effective and inclusive practice**; you might briefly mention future plans as part of identifying what has worked well and any changes you plan to make in future, however, your application will be judged on whether your evidence of current and recent practice meets the requirements of Descriptor 3.

In your reflective account of professional practice (RAPP) you should include appropriate rationale for the approaches you took and evidence the success and effectiveness of your teaching and/or supporting learning practice. Your RAPP should be based around real examples from your practice and should make clear **what** you did, **why/how** you did it that way and **how you know** that this was **effective**.

Provide **selective** examples of practice in your RAPP and ensure they have direct relevance to your claim for Senior Fellowship. The quality of the examples of evidence is much more important than the quantity.

Depending on the selected submission format, you are either required to provide a written narrative of up to 2500 – 3000 words, or a screencast recording of 20–25 minutes (of the 45-minute absolute maximum permitted for an SFHEA screencast). See section 8 for more information about submission formats.

Leadership Case Studies

In addition to your RAPP, you are required to present two Leadership Case Studies that showcase some of your particularly effective practice in leading and influencing others. Your case studies can help you to demonstrate your ‘sustained record’ of leading or influencing (D3.1). You are not required to include all 15

Dimensions in each of the case studies. Both should be written as a holistic account and should map to relevant Dimensions of PSF 2023.

The first stage in deciding the focus of each of your Case Studies is to choose the most appropriate two examples of your work (one for each case study) that provide you with the best opportunity to fully explore and evaluate your influence on the practices of others and on high quality learning as a result. Case studies are commonly complex in their different elements and take place over a period of time. We recommend that you choose two Case Studies that address two different aspects of your practice as this will give you opportunity to most effectively build evidence towards the three Descriptor criteria statement and to incorporate different PSF Dimensions; i.e. avoid choosing case studies which both focus on programme design, or mentoring, or teaching or assessment approaches, etc...

Your TWO Case studies should have a title and a clear focus. For each case study, you should discuss, in a reflective way, two contributions or roles which have had a significant impact on the teaching and learning practice of others. You should demonstrate your **sustained effectiveness** in relation to teaching and learning. The word limit is 1000 to 1500 words each or 10-15 minutes each if you do a screencast. You are advised to have a roughly equal word count for each one. If one is significantly longer, the shorter one might struggle to be a strong enough example to showcase your experience and the case you are making for D3 recognition.

Case studies should:

- **Elicit depth.** The focus on a single project/initiative allows you to go into more depth in terms of rationale (particularly your evidence base and relevant scholarship), and evaluation (both in terms of impact but also reflectively – what did you learn? How did your practice change/evolve?)
- **Distinguish your practice.** While many activities undertaken by academics are similar e.g. teaching, assessing, researching, the case study allows you to give a real flavour of your own individual practice. Your teaching philosophy, your disciplinary interests and your personal style are more in evidence.
- **Demonstrate the Dimensions of Practice (PSF 2023).** Focus on indicating how you understand and ‘live’ the dimensions as a leader and influencer. Each dimension should be signposted individually and explicitly within the text and should provide a clear example.
- **Demonstrate the Descriptor (D3).** The case studies should reflect the descriptor to reflect D3:
 - **Scope** e.g. own practice; practice of others; policy/strategy
 - **Scale and Reach** e.g. colleagues in your faculty/institution

- **Impact** e.g. improve individual student learning/experience; improve module or programme outcomes; improve subject or professional outcomes either.

Throughout your Case Studies, you should continue to reflect on your practice than just describe the action you took. Some key aspects for you to consider as you write are outlined below. The two short examples below are included to prompt your thinking around possible ways to approach your Case Studies;

- choose examples from your context that will make a strong claim against Descriptor 3;
- use a title that reflects the Senior Fellow focus on leading/ influencing others;
- provide a context for the case study so the reader understands what the issue was that required action;
- explain your aim/ goal – what you were seeking to achieve and why;
- discuss what you did and why you did it that way (include evidence base);
- outline the timescale and who you worked with (and why these people);
- explain what approach(es) you took. Include any problems/ challenges you experienced and how you managed them + discuss the outcome – what happened? Explain the impact(s). What was achieved? How do you know that what you did was effective?
- identify what you would do differently next time/ how you have adapted your approach in subsequent work.

Case Study example 1 – leading an intervention to boost student resilience

Ali decides to focus one Case Study on the work he led in relation to boosting resilience in students. In the case study he summarises the background, rationale, development, evaluation process and subsequent process of embedding a new resilience unit within the curriculum.

As a senior member of a student services team, Ali was leading aspects of work around student well-being; at the time, one of the main priorities for the Engineering Faculty at his institution. Ali was aware that recent published research had found increased resilience to be linked to positive outcomes for student mental health, retention and academic performance (Bleasdale & Humphreys, 2018).

Drawing on the literature, Ali explains how he then undertook his own research with small student focus groups. Findings supported the importance of developing resilience in students and the need for structured support and resources to do this (V3). Ali explains how he then brought together and led an inter-disciplinary working group of staff, including both academic and support services staff, to develop, validate and deliver a 5 credit-unit designed to boost student resilience through a variety of evidence-informed approaches (A4, V3,

V5). The unit was piloted with one first year group and the outcomes were fully evaluated before being embedded across all first year programmes within the faculty (K3).

Ali organised a series of workshops, facilitated by members of the working group, to support programme team members and support service staff to develop the knowledge and skills required to deliver and assess the resilience unit. Ali also coordinated the development of online resources to provide additional support for staff (A2, V3, K4). Ali provides a range of evidence demonstrating positive impact on students associated with study on this unit and points to interest from staff in other faculties.

Reference list: Bleasdale and Humphreys. (2018). Undergraduate Resilience Research Project. Available at https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Lydia-Bleasdale2/publication/324866343_Undergraduate_Resilience/links/5ae88e5b45851588dd8144bd/Undergraduate-Resilience.pdf (date accessed).

Case Study example 2 – leading curriculum design

Mai is a Programme Lead within the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. She leads a team of staff (both academic and support) who work across nine programmes within the faculty. Mai chooses to base one of her case studies around leading the validation and professional body accreditation of the portfolio of undergraduate programmes that she leads. Mai discusses the rationale for the design of the curriculum, which included a key focus on employability; a university strategic priority (V4).

The programme design had to meet professional standards; i.e. the skills, knowledge and behaviours required in graduates by the professional body (K5). Mai discusses how she based her initial ideas for the curriculum design on her own educational research and other current evidence-informed approaches (V3). She formed and led a small Steering Group to support the development and redesign process, and in addition, set up a service user forum. She worked in collaboration with a range of stakeholders, including the professional regulator, students, inservice practitioners and service users, staff and employers (V5).

The group identified key principles to embed within the programme design including good pastoral support, partnership with service users and practitioners, team teaching and varied assessments. The successfully validated programme design was based around 'threads' of modules scaffolding learning across the three years (A1). Mai took a participative leadership approach (Mishra and Pandey, 2019) to work with her programme team to think creatively about how the programmes could be delivered and assessed in different ways (A2, A3) and how they could build on the identified strengths to acknowledge the diversity of their learners and develop skills to create a sense of 'belonging' across the

programmes (V1). Evidence of the effectiveness of the curriculum design was provided by student outcome and achievement data for the first set of graduates, feedback from service user forum and employment data (K3).

Reference List Mishra, M. and Pandey, A. (2019), "The impact of leadership styles on knowledge sharing behaviour: a review of literature", *Development and Learning in Organizations*, Vol. 33 No. 1, pp. 16-19.(date accessed).

7.4 Section 4 - Professional Development Action Plan (350 words)

In this section, you outline your Professional Development Action Plan for the next 12 months. This section should be completed on the application form irrespective of which route you are following (written or recorded screencast). It is not assessed and is not part of the overall word count (word limit is 350 words), but it must be included. Any application form without this section being completed will be returned to the candidate.

We encourage you to look upon this action plan as something you will do every year, to remain in good standing (see section 25). Please include some publicly shared professional development in the form of continuing professional development (CPD) or conferences you plan to attend/engage with. (see section 9.2)

7.5 Section 5 – Bibliographic reference list

Please collate all scholarship, research, professional practice, and/or evidence-informed references that you have cited in your application and list them in Section 5 of the application form. This is irrespective of which route you are following, either written or recorded screencast. Please double check that your citations do have a complete bibliographic reference listed in this section. We do not require a specific referencing convention to be used (though most GOLD mentees use Harvard), but we do insist that whatever you do use is used consistently and correctly. (See section 10.6)

7.6 Section 6 – Pre-submission checklist

In this final section of the application, there is a checklist to help ensure that you have completed and fulfilled all the requirements for your application form. We recommend going through this with your GOLD Mentor. If you have not completed one of the parts to this checklist, we **strongly recommend** that you do not submit your application and discuss this further with your Mentor to devise an action plan.

8. Submission formats

For all categories of fellowship, you have the choice of submitting in two formats:

1. written submission
2. screencast submission

To provide optionality and to adhere to Greenwich principles about inclusive assessment, we offer two submission formats. Some people may prefer submitting an application that relies much less on providing written evidence. Further, some may feel more confident and comfortable articulating their practice verbally as a recorded presentation, rather than as a purely written piece. Conversely, some individuals feel much happier to write about what they do, rather than go through the process of designing and setting up a recording. Whatever format you chose, you will have to submit a D3 Application form and ensure you meet the D3 Descriptor. In both formats there is no live, real-time Q&A with any reviewers; both formats are reviewed and judged solely on the basis of the written or screencast submitted. See section 11 for more information about how to present your evidence.

8.1 Written submission

The overwhelming majority of candidates who apply through our GOLD scheme choose to do so as a written submission.

Written submissions require you to provide a written narrative for your reflective account of professional practice (RAPP) and your 2 leadership case studies. For written submissions section 3a.i and 3a.ii of the application form must be completed.

8.2 Screencast Submission

A Screencast submission is a recorded video of you presenting your reflective account of professional practice (RAPP). We recommend that you do this by recording your narration accompanied by slides.

For screencast submissions section 3b of the application form must be completed. In this section you must include the URL link for your screencast. Please ensure that the permission settings allow access to the central GOLD team and reviewers. If you are unsure how to do this, please contact our team via gold@gre.ac.uk. If you send a file (rather than providing a link) this must be password protected. This file will be sent with the application form to the reviewers (and potentially the External Examiner).

If you decide you want to submit a screencast you are advised to discuss this with your mentor and book a drop-in with the GOLD team. This can help you to think about the practical and technical aspects this format can entail. Your screencast will be shared only with relevant GOLD administrators, reviewers (and potentially the External Examiner). There is further information about this to help you in section 12.

8.3 Submission Format requirements

Category of Fellowship	Written submission composition	Screencast submission composition
D3 Fellowship	<p>Outlining your professional context – 300 words (Section 2)</p> <p>Reflective Account of Professional Practice – 6000 words in total. (Section 3a.i and 3a.ii)</p> <p>2500-3000 words for RAPP (Section 3a.i)</p> <p>1000-1500 words for each of the 2 leadership case studies (Section 3a.ii)</p> <p>Professional Development Action Plan – 350 words (Section 4)</p> <p>Bibliographic reference list – Not included in the 6000-word limit of your RAPP. (Section 5)</p>	<p>Outlining your professional context – 300 words (Section 2)</p> <p>Reflective Account of Professional Practice – 46 minutes in total. 1 minute for the Introduction to your role and context, 25 minutes for your RAPP and 10 minutes for each Leadership Case study (Section 3b)</p> <p>Professional Development Action Plan – 350 words (Section 4)</p> <p>Bibliographic reference list – No word limit (Section 5)</p>

Figure 7: Table to show requirements for written and screencast format submissions for D3

Regardless of which format you choose to submit your application in, you must demonstrate engagement with Descriptor 3 (D3) in full.

9. Support with your application

9.1 Support provided by the GOLD team

In addition to the mentor, the GOLD team provide mandatory and optional workshops and sessions to support you to achieve recognition. All are provided online via Microsoft Teams. You can find a full list of these with links to bookings on our webpage.

Please note that UK and TNE partners can engage with all GOLD CPD without incurring any cost. If you are at a partner institution with no Horizon access, you can contact gold@gre.ac.uk to request to be booked onto any of these.

GOLD 1-2-1 Drop-In session

Our GOLD drop-ins are bookable 15-minute slots with a member of the central GOLD team. Within these appointments you can get feedback on a draft section of your Reflective Account of Practice (RAPP) or one of your leadership case studies. This can be in written or presentation form if you are opting for the screencast submission. Alternatively, you might use the time to discuss potential evidence or to get guidance on specific reading or CPD to engage with. The *GOLD 1-2-1 Drop-In sessions* run regularly throughout the year. These are usually monthly. Dates and bookings for these can be found via Horizon here.

GOLD Writing retreats

GOLD writing retreats are half day and full day opportunities for you to dedicate time to writing. Within the retreats there are spaces for you to write and talk to others about your progress and to give and receive feedback. Our half-day retreats run for 3 hours and are facilitated by members of our central GOLD team. The full-day retreats run for 6 hours. These are all online to enable flexible delivery and accessibility for our UK and TNE partner colleagues.

Both the half-day and full-day writing retreats run regularly throughout the year. These are usually every 2-3 months.

- For the half-day writing retreat, dates and bookings for these can be found via Horizon here.
- For the full-day writing retreats, please contact gold@gre.ac.uk for further information and dates.

Additional Faculty Support for FES

For Faculty of Engineering and Science (FES) staff at Medway campus, there are further optional GOLD briefing sessions facilitated by Professor Lauren Pecorino

PFHEA. These take place 4-5 times a year (usually a mix of on campus and online). These informal 1-hour briefings to introduce GOLD and recognition benefits. These sessions are supplementary to the central GOLD team support and does not replace the need to attend our GOLD Introductory Mentee Workshop. Dates are communicated to all FES staff via email from the Medway campus PVCs office.

9.2 Opportunities for development

You may want or need to update your teaching and learning knowledge through reading or through attending CPD courses or conferences. There is an explicit expectation that evidence from an evidence base (research, scholarship, professional practice, and other evidence-informed resources) is integrated into your application. You are advised to talk to your mentor about this.

CPD workshops

There are a number of Greenwich CPD workshops available throughout the academic year e.g. inclusive assessment, being an effective personal tutor, inclusive teaching, using Mentimeter, practical teaching course (PTC) etc. available to all staff (including UK and TNE partner staff).

Conferences

Throughout the academic year, there are various teaching and learning conference that take place at Greenwich, such as; SHIFT (usually in January), Medway Learning & Teaching Conference (usually in June), Greenwich Business School (GBS) L&T Festival (usually in June), and the Personal Tutoring Symposium (usually in November). These can be valuable to participate in or attend, as well as conferences and networks aligned to your subject specialism.

Literature

The GOLD Introductory Mentee Workshop provides a reading list of useful texts about HE teaching and learning, which might be useful to explore (see appendix 1).

In addition to this, Greenwich University has its very own learning and teaching journal, *Compass*, that publishes a variety of articles, opinion pieces, and reviews, that can provide further evidence to help with your application. You can view all the published *Compass* editions via their website here.

10. Developing your SFHEA GOLD application

Before you begin developing your application you should read this Mentee Handbook very carefully (including the Professional Standards Framework (PSF) 2023 and Descriptor 3). You should also read the accompanying *GOLD D3 Senior Fellow - Mentee Guide to the PSF 2023 Dimensions* and familiarise yourself with the *GOLD D3 Senior Fellow - application form PSF 2023*. These documents are available on the GOLD website.

10.1 Content of your D3 application

Your application should focus only on your work in higher education. It should be a reflection on selected elements of your practice, and not a narrated CV covering everything you do in your job. Some elements of description are needed to give assessors an idea of the context, but they should be complemented by a reflection on your practice. When reflecting on your practice, you should usually start by explaining the reasons behind certain decisions you made (the “Why?”), followed by the content of the innovation or change to practice put in place (the “What?” and “How?”) and the impact of this change on the intended audience (students, colleagues, stakeholders) and on yourself (the “So what?,” evaluative stage). You are strongly encouraged to discuss your practice with your mentor and see where your work and evidence align to the PSF 2023 and Descriptor 3.

The evidence/experience/practice that you include within your application should focus on the **last 5 years** of your practice in higher education (HE) teaching and/or supporting learning. Currency of your experience and evidence is important to maintain within your application. If you need to refer back to practice from more than 5 years ago, you need to ensure that you focus on how this now influences your current practice.

Your evidence/experience/practice can be from Greenwich, as well as practice from other HE roles within the last 5 years that you’ve developed at different institutions (or a composite).

10.2 Using a reflective voice - First person and being personal

Your application is a personal account of your practice, and it must be submitted in English. Think of your application as a ‘claim’; you are making a claim that your work is effective and has a positive impact on student learning. Your application will be reviewed by two experienced reviewers, and you need to show these reviewers that there is a clear rationale behind the way you work and the choices you make in your practice.

Therefore, it is appropriate for you use the first-person form of writing/speaking throughout. Writing in the first person (use 'I') so it makes clear what **you** do/ have done. Try to avoid discussing teaching in general or abstract terms as this moves the application away from being about **you and your own personal practice** and will not help you meet Descriptor 3. The example below shows how you can do this:

I attended a university workshop about neurodiversity in order to better understand the challenges that one of my students faces (V1). I later read an article recommended by the workshop facilitator that was highly relevant to my disciplinary context (V3). I now approach the planning of my session activities and the learning environment to ensure that all my students can fully engage in the learning to reach their full potential (A1, V2). I have noticed how my neurodiverse students appear to be more comfortable to contribute to the small group discussions. I have been able to use this new learning to inform and empower my own programme team. As programme leader for BA Geography and Town Planning I used the workshop materials to help me create some of my own CPD resources to provide asynchronously to my staff to help them support their own neurodiverse learners more effectively.

If you want to include work you did as part of a team/with colleagues, you need to be clear what your personal contribution was.

You should share your reasons for your professional decisions – why you do things the way you do – and demonstrate that you reflect before, during and after. Explain what you do, how you do it, and why you do it that way. Also explain how you know it is effective. Effectiveness is essential to be able to demonstrate. This may involve quoting other stakeholders – students and colleagues, so module evaluations and student feedback are likely to provide useful material for you. You should share something of your personal teaching philosophy – your own values and how they align with PSF 2023 values.

10.3 Structuring your Reflective Account of Professional Practice (RAPP)

The written Reflective Narrative should be written as one, holistic narrative. You must not split it out into the Areas of Activity. You should provide evidence for the Areas of Activity and include evidence that you are effectively using all 5 Professional Values and all 5 Core Knowledge dimensions.

Your RAPP will provide an overview of your practice over the last 3 to 5 years using short examples to illustrate the effectiveness of your action. In contrast, the Case Studies provide the opportunity for you to explore and evaluate two examples (one

for each case study) in much greater depth. There are different ways in which you might choose to structure and write your Reflective Narrative. We recommend that you use around 2,500-3000 words in total (of the 6,000-word limit) for this part of your claim and you will need to decide how best to use this allocation.

One possible way (but there are others) is to identify ‘themes’ from within the examples of practice you have selected to use (Section 6.1 above). These themes could then be presented with sub-headings, creating a structure for you to organise and present your examples of your effective practice. To illustrate this further, some themes that might possibly emerge could be ones such as those below, but remember these are purely indicative suggestions:

- leading and influencing learning, teaching and assessment practice
- managing change
- collaborating with colleagues external to the university
- mentoring
- integrating technology into effective practice
- shaping inclusive practice; and many other possible themes.

If you take this thematic approach, your ‘themes’ will be unique to your context and the nature of your practice; your themes must emerge from your own personal examples of practice. You may prefer to use a different approach to structure your RAPP to suit your own writing style, context, etc.; however, if you do take this approach, you might choose 3 or 4 different themes and use each theme as a subheading. Under each subheading use succinct examples that together identify the effectiveness of your actions on the others’ practices and high-quality learning as you worked with, and through, your peers. Across your two Case Studies and RAPP, you need to evidence the integration of all the PSF 2023 Dimensions.

Below, an extract from a Reflective Narrative illustrates how one example under the theme of ‘Influencing through committee work’ incorporates evidence of some Dimensions.

Theme: Influencing through committee work

I have been effective in my influence on student learning through my active, engaged membership of the Learning and Teaching Committee for the last four years. The pandemic required the Committee to discuss and agree the smooth transition to online learning and the appropriate use of technology. Very early on in the pandemic multiple data sources – formal and informal – indicated that many staff were not ready to support fully online learning. I was known for my expertise in this area which was supported by my own formal learning; I completed a MSc Online Learning (A5). This led me to be identified as the lead designer of a short series of workshops for staff to build their confidence in and ability to use MS Teams as an effective environment for online teaching and/or support sessions (A1, K4). Although it was short notice, I was able to involve two

of my mentees in the project – both of whom wanted to develop their skills in leading change (V5).

Together we explored key literature looking to apply it into the workshops, deciding on the value of Salmon and Wright (2014) Carpe Diem model (V3, A2) as an effective approach. Supported by the two mentees, I led the design of 5 interactive, online workshops which recognised the individual starting points for each staff member and the need to be inclusive in our approach at the same time as building the academic community (V2). We aimed to model the intervention we designed so that staff members could take aspects of it, relevant to their discipline and learners, into their own practice (K1, K4).

Was it successful? Attendance was good with 87% of those attending, engaging in all five workshops. Feedback from the attendees on what they were able to learn was also positive, indicating the development of confidence. Subsequent feedback through to the Learning and Teaching Committee reported that student satisfaction with their learning had increased by 2%, up to 84%. Critically, module outcomes were broadly similar in terms of student success to those pre pandemic (K3). I have since led on the redesign of the 5 workshops enabling their incorporation into new staff induction (A1), a consequence of the value placed on their effectiveness by Committee members (K3).

Reference List Salmon, G. and Wright, R. (2014) Transforming future teaching through 'Carpe Diem' learning design. Available at <https://www.gillysalmon.com/journalarticles.html> (date accessed).

Please remember to continue to use the *GOLD D3 Senior Fellow - Mentee Guide to Understanding the PSF 2023 Dimensions* to support you in making links between your practice as you develop your narrative.

As you provide evidence against the Dimensions, you should highlight this where applicable. One way to do this is to refer to the Dimension in your text, e.g. (V1) or (K1) etc. Ensure that you only link to the most relevant Dimensions in each case (i.e. one or two that you have engaged with in a meaningful way in that specific example of practice) and avoid producing long lists of links to Dimensions (e.g. 'K1, K2, K4, V1, V2, V3') as this will not demonstrate your meaningful engagement with the Dimensions.

Within the limited words available you will not be able to write about everything you do and must be selective about the examples you choose to write about. Select examples that best exemplify your work in each chosen Area of Activity and which also allow you to demonstrate the specific elements of the Professional Values and Core Knowledge required.

10.4 Going beyond the descriptive narrative

When developing your RAPP and leadership case studies, you are encouraged to follow the suggested frame to help you to go beyond description in your narratives:




Figure 8: Diagram to show reflective questions to ask when developing your application

10.5 Evidence informed approaches as a basis for practice

To address the requirements of D3 Senior Fellowship you will demonstrate some understanding of effective approaches to teaching and learning. This means you will need to include reference to the evidence base that you draw on to help inform your practice. For SFHEA you are required to provide evidence for V3: *use scholarship, or research, or professional learning, or other evidence informed approaches as a basis for effective practice*. Literature around teaching, learning and assessing etc. is commonly cited in applications to demonstrate an evidence informed approach. If you have no citations in your application, your claim for recognition will not be accepted. You will be provided with a list of suggestions of reputable HE teaching and learning literature at the Mentee Development workshop (all of which are available in the Greenwich libraries). See appendix 1 for some recommended reading to help you to get started. Your mentor can also

advise on reading and indicative evidence bases to consider and include to help underpin your reflections.

10.6 Referencing and bibliography reference list

Throughout your Reflective Account of Professional Practice (RAPP) and leadership case studies you will refer to the sources of information that you have drawn on within your teaching and/or support for learning practice. For example, K2 requires that you bring to your practice a knowledge base of approaches to teaching and/or supporting learning, appropriate to your context. In evidencing K2, you might explain why you chose an approach and how you came to know about it (e.g. journal article, professional development, conference, mentoring from colleagues, etc.).

Where you do refer to a source of information that has influenced your practice, you should 'cite' the reference within your text to provide appropriate credit to the author(s)/organisation. This will enable those reviewing your application to be clear about which sources have influenced and inspired your practice. Whenever you cite in the text, you need to include the full reference in a list at the end of your RAPP.

The short excerpt of a Senior Fellowship application below illustrates how the applicant cites the journal article that inspired their design of a lecture and includes the full reference in their Reference List:

Having evaluated student feedback and outcomes from this initial year of online delivery for our business degree programmes, I identified a need to enhance the support in place for first year students as they transition into higher education (K3). I first researched the approaches taken by established providers in distance education and their success in providing pastoral and academic support to identify good practice and then led a team away day to consider how best to implement effective approaches within our own context (Hilliam and Williams, 2019) (V3).

Reference list: Hilliam, R. and G. Williams (2019). 'Academic and pastoral teams working in partnership to support distance learning students according to curriculum area', *Higher Education Pedagogies*, 4:1, pp. 32- 40.

11. Presenting your evidence for D3

Higher education takes many forms and there is considerable variation in the different roles higher educational professionals carry out; for example, in experience, disciplinary background, job role, institutional context, etc. Your application will include a professional context statement, your Reflective Account of Professional Practice (RAPP), 2 leadership case studies and your TWO Supporting Statements. Your application is a personal account and its focus throughout should be on your own professional practice; make it personal to your specific, individual and distinctive practice. Your Supporting Statements will verify and endorse that what you write about in your RAPP and leadership case studies represents your practice in a genuine way.

You should use the *GOLD D3 Senior Fellow - Mentee Guide to the PSF 2023 Dimensions* to identify where you use Professional Values and apply Core Knowledge within your practice. Across the 6,000 words of your RAPP and leadership case studies you need to ensure that your evidence includes use of all 15 Dimensions of PSF 2023.

The Dimensions are **inter-dependent and integrated** within the context of your professional practice; put simply, the Areas of Activity are what you do, you use the Professional Values to inform and underpin your work and the Core Knowledge is what you need to apply to effectively carry out this work.




Figure 9: Diagram to show how the dimensions are interdependent and integrated in making up D3

11.1 Evidencing Descriptor 3

The *GOLD D3 Senior Fellow - Mentee Guide to the PSF 2023 Dimensions* is your key source of information about what evidence of your **effective and inclusive practice (D3.3)** you might include in your application for Fellowship.

Descriptor 3 is suitable for individuals whose comprehensive understanding and effective practice provides a basis from which they lead or influence those who teach and/or support high-quality learning.

As highlighted earlier, there is considerable variation in the different roles and responsibilities individuals have from which they lead or influence the practices of their peers. Senior Fellowship is not restricted to those holding formal leadership roles. Some Senior Fellows are still involved in direct teaching and learning support activities with learners and others are not. You might still be carrying out considerable direct teaching and/or support for learning work with students, however, the focus of your Senior Fellow application will need to be on the parts of your practice where you influence and/or lead your peers' practice. The *GOLD D3 Senior Fellow - Mentee Guide to the PSF 2023 Dimensions* provides many different examples of practice from a variety of contexts; this should support you to understand what, in your context, might be appropriate evidence for you to include within your application.

D3.1 – A sustained record of leading or influencing the practice of those who teach and/or support high quality learning.

There is a strong link between D3.1 and D3.3 and together they act as a 'frame' for the characteristics of a Senior Fellow application. The focus of D3.1 is on describing and explaining the process and processes you have undertaken to lead or influence the practice of others who are teaching and/or supporting learning. Whereas the focus of D3.3 is about providing specific examples of your effective and inclusive practice, which go beyond your own direct teaching or support for learning, and the impact of this work on learners (see Section 5.3 below).

It is also important to evidence the sustained nature of your work leading or influencing others. You need to demonstrate that your record of leading or influence is 'sustained' through use of appropriate examples of your recent practice, typically from the last 3-5 years. If you do need to refer back to practice from more than 5 years ago, the focus needs to be on how this now influences your current practice. The experience of 'leading' or 'influencing' evidenced in Senior Fellow applications will vary greatly and could be either through formal roles and/or processes, or may be more informal in nature. You may be presenting evidence against D3.1 of leading or influencing the teaching and/or learning support practice of others from within a formal leadership role; for example, a team leader, head of a support service area or academic department, lead of an academic

subject or disciplinary area, professor/reader or as lead for one or more HE courses/programmes. You might hold other formal responsibilities such as a mentor for new staff, peer reviewer, thematic lead, personal tutor, External Examiner, etc. You may work in professional support areas where the central focus of your responsibility involves guidance and/or support for those who teach and/or support high-quality learning, for example as learning designers.

Evidence of your leading or influence might be less ‘formal’ in nature. For example, you might be recognised as an experienced colleague who is regularly consulted for your guidance and support. You might be someone with particular expertise in one or more aspects of teaching and/or support, and can evidence a sustained record of leading or influence related to this, impacting not only members of the team(s) you belong to, but also others within different roles and professional contexts; for example, as a professional working in industry that leads or influences others’ learning and teaching practice. You may be able to draw upon influence or leading in relation to innovative practice where you have been a key innovator. In explaining your own practice in leading or influencing others, you should draw on and integrate your appropriate use of scholarship, or research, or professional learning, or other evidence-informed approaches as a basis for effective practice (V3). You should also explain how you know that your approaches were effective (K3: critical evaluation as a basis for effective practice) and what happened as a result of your influence.

To meet the requirements of D3.1 you need to explain:

- the contexts in which you influenced or led the teaching and/or supporting learning practices of others over a sustained period
- the approaches you took to leading/ influencing and your rationale for taking these approaches, including the evidence-base you drew on
- how you ensured that your leadership or influence was effective
- how you evaluated the outcome and used this insight to shape your future practice.

Some short examples below are included to prompt your thinking about different ways in which you might be able to provide evidence of your sustained record of leading or influencing the practices of others in support of high-quality learning in line with D3.1. These are indicative only and you should select your own examples to provide evidence for D3.1 within your own context.

Mentoring

You may have experience of mentoring colleagues over a number of years and can explain the approaches to mentoring (including the rationale) you have taken in carrying out this work. In evidencing D3.1 it is likely that you will have carried out mentoring of others on multiple occasions, in different circumstances. Through this you should be able to demonstrate a sustained record of leading or

influencing those who teach and/or support high-quality learning and to identify how your influence on the enhancement of your different mentees' practices has benefitted their learners.

Membership of Committees

Membership of committees or working/task groups might provide the basis for evidence towards Descriptor 3 if you are able to evidence your own individual contribution to the work of that group and demonstrate how this has impacted on the teaching and learning practice of colleagues. For example, if you sit on a Support Service area or Departmental Teaching and Learning Committee, you might be responsible for heading up a task group which is looking at improving student induction processes. In such an example, you would discuss how you organised the work of that task group and also demonstrate how the findings of the group have influenced and shaped decisions and actions taken by the wider committee, influenced colleagues' practice and, by extension, enhanced the student learning experience.

Supervision Responsibilities

Direct supervision of postgraduate researchers as learners in the production of their doctorates aligns to Descriptor 2 practice. However, there are different ways in which your supervision responsibilities may provide appropriate evidence for Descriptor 3. For example, your work may involve responsibility as a mentor or supervisor of postgraduate researchers in their role as teaching assistants, which may provide examples of your sustained influence over time on these individuals' practice with learners. To give another example, you may be leading or influencing the instigation of new research supervision processes or protocols, which are adopted and impact on the teaching and learning practice of research supervisors; through this you should be able to demonstrate your personal role and contribution and identify the resulting enhancement for learners.

D3.2 – Practice that is effective, inclusive and integrates all Dimensions

You should continue to use the *GOLD D3 Senior Fellow - Mentee Guide to the PSF 2023 Dimensions* as you progress with your application. This Guide considers each of the 15 PSF 2023 Dimensions in turn to explain what each one is about and provides a wide range of typical examples of professional practice in HE teaching and/or supporting learning that are relevant to that Dimension as appropriate to Descriptor 3. The guidance should help you to make appropriate links between your practice and the PSF 2023 Dimensions and to identify relevant evidence to include in your application for Senior Fellowship.

Remember that an application for Senior Fellowship **must evidence D3.2: practice that is effective, inclusive and integrates all Dimensions**. There are prompt questions in each section of the Guide. Those questions should help you to consider and identify clear evidence of your own effective practice that might be used in your application for Senior Fellowship. Whilst each of the 15 PSF 2023 Dimensions represent distinct aspects of HE practice, the Dimensions are inter-related and inter-connected.

For example, in designing a programme (A1) you will need to consider the how learners learn appropriate to the subject and level of study (K1), the types of learners (V2), use of technology (K4), the evidence-informed approaches to be taken (V3), etc. Within an example of a specific aspect of your leading or influencing others, evidence for Professional Values, Core Knowledge and Areas of Activity might be found through the articulation of your aims, as part of your rationale for why you chose the approaches you did, in the explanation of how you know that your practice was effective and/or in how you plan to develop and enhance your practice in the future. As you provide evidence against the Dimensions, you should highlight this where applicable.

One way to do this is to map the Dimension in your text, e.g. (V1) or (K1) etc. Ensure that you only link to the most relevant Dimensions in each case (e.g. one or two that you have engaged with in a meaningful way in that specific example of practice) and avoid producing long lists of links to Dimensions (e.g. K1, K2, K4, V1, V2, V3) as this will not demonstrate your meaningful engagement with the Dimensions. A short example is given below to illustrate how Dimensions are integrated within practice.

One of the examples I used in my Senior Fellowship application was when, as a Head of Department, I set up a working group to look at departmental assessment and feedback practices (A3). My aims were to explore and adopt best practice, to achieve a greater consistency across all our programmes and to ensure that all learners had an equity of opportunity to be successful in assessment (V2). Initially I had researched current best practice in assessment within my discipline, also attending two conferences on assessment and feedback, and I had also considered different leadership techniques I could utilise to persuade and motivate colleagues to change their assessment practices (A5, V3). I then explained the approaches I took and my rationale for these (V3), finally providing evidence of the positive impact this had on my colleagues' practices and on the student learning experience in as a result (K3).

Please remember to continue to use the *GOLD D3 Senior Fellow - Mentee Guide to the PSF 2023 Dimensions* to support you in making links between your practice and

the most relevant Dimensions you evidenced in each example as you develop your narrative.

D3.3 – Practice that extends significantly beyond direct teaching and/or direct support for learning

As mentioned above in Section 5.1, there is a strong link between criteria D3.1 and D3.3 as the activities involved in leading or influencing others that teach and/or support learning (D3.1) involve practice that is situated beyond direct support for learning (D3.3), even where such practice may not be 'sustained'.

You need to explain your approaches to leading and influencing practice to satisfy D3.1 and this will act as a 'frame' for the examples you describe in some detail for D3.3; but to fully satisfy D3.3 you also need to show how the examples have enabled change, to the benefit of learners. The examples you use should show how you have worked with others (learner support, professional services, academic or teaching staff, employers or professionals) to enhance their learning and teaching practice and explain how this has been effective in promoting high-quality learning, making a positive difference to learners and their experience as a result (as indicated in Figure 4 above).

For D3.3 it is important to show how the practice you describe includes significant examples of situations where your work is influencing others and goes beyond your own direct teaching or your own direct support for learning. To explain this further, you might include evidence of your contribution to the development or implementation of local policies or strategies at a group/team/department/school or Faculty level, or to initiatives that aim to enhance practice across a team, context or profession. In discussing such activities, it is important that you clearly indicate your personal role in relation to the examples given and identify the impact and influence of your work on others.

Some short examples below are included to prompt your thinking about different ways in which you might be able to provide evidence of the scope and impact of your practice for D3.3. These are indicative only and you should select your own examples that provide evidence for D3.3 within your own context.

New approaches to teaching and/or support for learning

Development of new approaches to teaching and/or support for learning which stem from, and build on, your own direct practice with students (aligned to Descriptor 1 or 2) might form the basis for evidence appropriate to a claim for Senior Fellow if you can show how this practice is being used by others at a local or wider level to the benefit of their learners. For example, you might have experimented with innovative approaches to providing learners with feedback as part of an action research activity, disseminated at an internal/external

workshop or event and because of positive feedback from delegates, you were invited to present to a university committee. Following this, the approach is now included within university guidance and/or processes as an example of good practice and you have developed resources for staff development.

Project work on enhancing support for students

Project work related to enhanced support for students could provide the basis for appropriate evidence for Descriptor 3.3 of the PSF 2023 if you are able to demonstrate your individual contribution. You might have been invited to join this project team as an expert practitioner with specialist knowledge and relevant experience in this area of work. Project work is likely to involve a more collaborative approach (link to V5) so you will need to explain your contribution to the project. You might discuss how you facilitated related workshops to disseminate to colleagues and supported the implementation of the enhancement within their work with learners. Evaluation has demonstrated the positive impact of this work.

External Examining/ External Review of programmes

Experience of effective external examining or reviewing responsibilities might provide appropriate evidence for Descriptor 3.3. You will need to demonstrate how your work as a 'critical friend' or external reviewer has enabled you to share relevant expert knowledge and professional experience to identify areas for enhancement and support individuals/ programme teams to introduce positive changes to enhance student learning and/or ensure robust quality processes. You should not simply list your appointments, achievements or outputs, but need to give selected examples of recommendations and/or advice you have provided, across a range of contexts, and show how your interventions have been responded to.

12. Developing your screencast application

12.1 Structuring your screencast

The structure and content of your application submitted in screencast format should correspond with the guidance/information in this Mentee Handbook for the GOLD D3 Senior Fellow - Application Form PSF 2023. If you decide to make a screencast submission you should talk it through with your GOLD mentor and be clear and confident about what to do. We recommend that you read the information below as well as the guidance in section 8.2 and section 8.3 before you start developing your screencast application.

Your screencast should follow the basic structure of:

Section	Recommended length
Introduction	1 minute
RAPP	25 minutes
2 Leadership Case Studies	10 minutes for each case study

Figure 10: Table to show recommended times for each section of your screencast submission

You need to ensure that each section broadly corresponds to the required length required shown in the table above. You risk not meeting Descriptor 3 of PSF 2023 if you spend too long on one dimension/element of your recording.

For the content of your screencast, you should make the best use of your narrative and the slides to show that you meet Descriptor 3. Just like the written submission, the criteria you are working against are those of the relevant descriptor category, and you will be assessed in your ability to reach the threshold for each of these.

12.2 Using presentation slides in your screencast

You can have a screencast with slides and your narration i.e. your voice and slides only. Alternatively, you can have a screencast with slides and you appearing on screen within the recording. You do not have to have a video component with you appearing on screen; your voice and slides are perfectly acceptable.

Your slides should not contain very dense information or be too ‘busy’ or ‘wordy’. The screencast slides are there to augment and support your narrations, not to substitute your narrations and reflections. You are strongly encouraged not to simply read through your slides like a script. This can make narrations monotone.

Slides should meet the usual accessibility requirements. Think about background, colour, font size and type, how you use any images and screenshots etc. Please make sure the text is clear and easy to read. Similarly ensure any figures are also clear and easy to read.

Slides should be used to give the following information only:

Clear indication of the **structure** of your narrative, and where you are in your presentation as you speak. Slide headings should state clearly which section of the presentation you are at, e.g. “Case study 1”. Please do not leave the reviewers in any doubt of what dimensions you are claiming for.

Slides should present the **evidence** of your impact, e.g. quotations from students/colleagues/stakeholders, data and metrics presented in the form of graphs, tables, etc. If you decide not to read the full quotes or explain fully the tables/graphs, do pause for a few moments to give reviewers a chance to consider the evidence provided.

You can insert images, screenshots, etc., but do remember that reviewers will mainly pay attention to your personal reflection about what these represent, not on the actual images/ screenshots themselves. For example, you could insert a screenshot of a Moodle page that you created, but your focus should be on explaining why you created it, what specific features allowed your students to do certain things that made a positive difference, etc.

The **Dimensions of the PSF 2023** that you are claiming for a particular section of your presentation need to be stated on the relevant slides. For example, at the end of a 2-minute discussion on your introduction of Moodle quizzes to encourage students’ continuous learning and self-reflection, you should insert something like “A2-K3-K4” if you’ve focused your reflection on the use of learning technologies to increase the likelihood of more students learning effectively in your specific discipline.

Please avoid ‘overmapping’, i.e. including long lists of Dimensions on the same slide e.g. ‘A1-5, K1-5, V1-5’. Reviewers want to see that you can effectively and selectively align evidence with the most appropriate dimensions.

Do not insert videos, even if they are your own recordings of your teaching practice. Reviewers want to hear your narratives about your practices and your reflections about what you do and why.

Do not insert weblinks/URLs or other hyperlinks. Reviewers will not open them. This is the same for written submissions.

The bibliographic reference lists and the supporting statements must be submitted in writing, using the GOLD application form used for written applications.

12.3 Narrating your screencast

You are advised to rehearse your screencast presentation to ensure your final take is within the time limit, has covered all of the required areas and that it is relaxed and confident. You should share a final draft screencast with your mentor to enable them to give you feedback. Your mentor cannot write their supporting statement if they have not seen your screencast.

When you record your voice do ensure that you **do not speak too fast** and that the **sound quality** is good enough to hear your narration clearly. You may choose to add subtitles with your recording to help, however this is not a mandatory requirement. It is fine if you occasionally lose your train of thought, trip over your words or accidentally repeat part of a sentence. This is a personal presentation, not a professional broadcast recording! However, if your recording becomes very disjointed or unclear for more than 30 seconds, we recommend that you stop the recording and/or edit it.

Be kind to your audience when you use your slides: reviewers cannot read the slides and listen to you at the same time. If you have a lot of text (not recommended) on your slides, either read it out or give reviewers time to read it.

If you wish to personalise the screencast you could include a short clip of you looking directly into the camera as you introduce yourself or when you finish. However, it can be distracting for viewers to see a film of you reading from a script and not making 'eye contact' with the camera during the main narration.

12.4 Making the screencast recording

We strongly recommend that you use the University of Greenwich lecture capture system, Panopto, for your recording. There are guides on using Panopto on the Greenwich Portal [here](#). If you need further assistance with recording on Panopto you should talk to your departmental learning technologist or a member of the Greenwich I.T Service Desk (itservicedesk@gre.ac.uk).

We will accept your screencast through other means than Panopto (but please use Panopto if you possibly can). This is particularly if you are in a UK or TNE partner college that does not have Panopto. If you intend to do this, please let our GOLD team know in advance by emailing us via gold@gre.ac.uk. We can advise on alternative screencast recording options. Whatever you use you must ensure you provide a working link to the recording in your application and ensure that reviewers will be able to safely open the link and view your submission with no issue. It is your responsibility to check that your recording is complete and that the link is accessible. We recommend that you test it with a colleague in advance of the final submission.

13. Submitting your application

When you have finalised your application, you must send it to your GOLD mentor and second supporter so that they can write their Supporting Statement for you. Please direct your GOLD mentor and second supporter to the *GOLD D3 Senior Fellow - Guidance for Referees PSF 2023* for more information on writing a Supporting Statement. They must use the *GOLD D3 Senior Fellow - Supporting Statement Proforma PSF 2023* and return a completed copy to you. Both these documents can be found and downloaded from our GOLD webpage.

Your completed application must be accompanied with your supporting statements. These must be converted into PDF format. Please make sure that the names of both documents contain:

- Category of fellowship you are applying for (i.e D3, SFHEA)
- PSF 2023
- Your First name and Surname
- Date you are submitting your application

Example:

GOLD D3 Application PSF 2023 – John Smith 14-09-23

[Your application and supporting statement must be uploaded and submitted to our GOLD team via our online route here.](#)

Our GOLD team monitors submissions only during usual working hours and days (9am to 5pm, Monday to Friday). It is not monitored on Bank Holidays nor when the university closes during the winter break. Any applications received outside of these times will be picked up on the next working day.

13.1 Application Screening

Once you have submitted your application, it will be screened by a member of the GOLD team before it is sent for reviewing.

This screening process checks:

- All relevant sections of the application have been fully completed
- All written sections of the application with word counts are met (All word counts are maximums, there is no “+/-10%” rule)
- Screencast recordings are within time limit (the time limit is a maximum)

- Your RAPP and Leadership Case Studies contains referencing to any scholarship, research, professional-learning, or other evidence-informed resources
- Your RAPP and Leadership Case Studies contain mapping to the PSF 2023
- No additional attachments or hyperlinks are included
- Evidence of teaching observation having been conducted by your GOLD mentor
- Your ROI is still valid
- You have been supported by an approved GOLD mentor
- Your supporting statements have been mapped to the PSF 2023

If your application does not fulfil all these requirements, then it will be returned to you. You will be notified of what needs to be addressed before you can submit it again. Applications that require amendments are not exempt from the submission review deadlines (see [section 6.2](#)).

You will receive an email confirmation from the GOLD team informing you that your application has been accepted. Please allow for 1 working day. If you do not receive an email confirmation, please contact our GOLD team urgently via gold@gre.ac.uk.

14. The GOLD Enrolment & Application Process

A summary of the enrolment and application process for our GOLD scheme is shown below.




Figure 11: The 4 stages of the enrolment and application process for our GOLD scheme

15. The reviewer panel composition

The GOLD review panel is comprised of 2 reviewers. All GOLD reviewers are drawn from an approved active pool and all hold at least the category of fellowship of that which they are reviewing. Those in the reviewer pool have all received initial and annual refresher GOLD reviewer training and will have shadowed a review panel before being able to review applications themselves. Any reviewer who has not participated in annual refresher reviewer training is removed from the pool until they have undergone the annual training. Reviewers can judge an application to be:

Recognised – awarded on the basis of a unanimous decision having been made by the 2 reviewers

Not Recognised – not awarded on the basis of a unanimous decision having been made by the 2 reviewers

All review outcomes are **provisional** until the External Examiner has moderated a sample (section 14). To come to this provisional decision the reviewers undertake a two-part reviewing process and are required to complete corresponding documentation. The two parts are:

1. Independent Review
2. Joint Reviewer Discussion

15.1 Independent review

Each reviewer assigned to an application, undertakes an independent review first using the GOLD Independent review form. The reviewer assesses the application according to the D3 Descriptor of the PSF 2023 and the required criteria. The reviewer determines if the dimensions and criteria have either been “met” or “not met”. They then provide a brief statement to justify their reasoning for their decisions for each dimension.

Once a reviewer has completed their independent review, a copy of their independent review form is sent to the GOLD team. The reviewer arranges with the other assigned reviewer to the application to meet (either in person or online) to carry out a joint reviewer discussion.

15.2 Joint reviewer discussion

Once all the assigned reviewers have undertaken an independent review, they then meet to discuss their decisions and reasoning if each dimension to the D3

Descriptor have either been “met” or “not met”. The reviewers must come to a unanimous decision for each one.

If all the dimensions to the Descriptor have been met, then a provisional outcome of “Recognised” is selected.

If any of the dimensions to the Descriptor has not been met, then a provisional outcome of “Not recognised” is selected. The reviewers complete a joint review form together and provide specific and actionable feedback for each of the dimensions/parts of Descriptor 3 that have not been met. A copy of this completed form is sent to the GOLD team. A joint review form is only completed if the reviewers select an application as being “Not recognised”.

15.3 Use of a Third Reviewer

In very rare cases where consensus between the two reviewers cannot be reached during the joint reviewer discussion, a third trained, approved GOLD reviewer from the Academic & Learning Enhancement (ALE) team or the Education Pro-Vice Chancellor (PVC) will be used to review and provide a casting vote. A majority decision being used to determine the final provisional outcome. This will only be pursued as a last resort option when extensive discussion between the two reviewers does not lead to a unanimous decision. The External Examiner would automatically see applications using a third reviewer as part of the sample.

15.4 Review criteria for D3 Senior Fellowship applications

GOLD applications are reviewed against the Descriptor (D3). The Descriptor is a threshold judgment; as such, it is simply a met or not met. There is no grading for Senior Fellowship. As part of the review process reviewers will look to ensure evidence of:

- **Breadth:** required dimensions of PSF 2023 covered in the evidence, including core knowledge and professional values
- **Descriptor:** the evidence provided is aligned to the appropriate Descriptor (3). Evidence of appropriate impact and effectiveness is demonstrated, either explicitly or implicitly, in the evidence presented. The Supporting Statement corroborates practice and evidence. The candidate is consistently operating at the desired descriptor
- **Evidential clarity and self-awareness:** the evidence is aligned to PSF 2023. The applicant demonstrates appropriate awareness of the dimensions and categories of the PSF 2023

- All parts of Descriptor 3 must be met for the recommendation of an award to be made by the reviewer panel. If any parts of Descriptor 3 are not met a recommendation of an award cannot be made.

Any application submitted with omissions e.g. missing supporting statements, missing reference list, or errors e.g. has exceeded word count, will not be reviewed (see section 13)

15.5 External Examiner Review & Feedback

To assure the quality of the GOLD scheme, a sample of applications received at each submission point is reviewed by our external examiner (see section 21.1). In this sample it usually consists of;

One of each category of fellowship application (AFHEA, FHEA, SFHEA), that have a provisional outcome of “Recognised” – if available
All applications with a provisional outcome of “Not recognised”
All resubmitted applications

Along with the applications, a copy of their corresponding supporting statements, and independent and joint review forms completed by the reviewers are provided to the external examiner to review. They are given 2-3 weeks to complete this.

The external examiner provides brief feedback about each application and if they agree or disagree with the reviewer’s provisional outcome.

If the external examiner does not agree with a provisional outcome made by reviewers, they are invited to discuss with the reviewers about this. The external examiner cannot override any decisions made by the reviewers, and the final outcome is decided by the GOLD reviewers only.

The outcomes for all the applications received at each submission point are finalised once the reviewer has completed their review and provided feedback about the application sample.

16. Outcomes of the Review

Whichever submission option you choose (written or screencast), the decision of the review panel is made in accordance with the submission point schedule (See section 6.2). The GOLD team aim to review and publish outcomes within 8 weeks of submission. Following review and external moderation, you will receive a formal letter from the GOLD scheme lead with the decision, along with feedback and recommendations from the two reviewers from your review panel. Following the joint review made by the GOLD reviewers and the External Examiner moderation process, there are two possible outcomes of your application:

- **Awarded** – All the dimensions to D3 have been fully met
- **Not Awarded** – All the dimensions to D3 have not been fully met

If your application for Senior Fellowship is “Awarded”, the GOLD team will notify Advance HE and provide them with your name and e-mail. Advance HE will then send you an e-mail (using the e-mail you provide on your application form) inviting you to set up an account and/or log in to My Advance HE website here.

Once logged in to My Advance HE you will find your certificate ready to be downloaded. You can then begin using the post-nominal letters SFHEA.

For UK/TNE partners you will be required to pay the relevant fees at the point of submitting your claim (see section 22.2). Your outcome will not be released until these payments have been made.

If the outcome to your claim is “Not awarded” you are eligible to resubmit your claim within a specified time period included in your outcome letter (section 18).

If you have any concerns or questions about the outcome of your application, please contact our GOLD via gold@gre.ac.uk. Please see Section 20 for more information about making an appeal.

17. GOLD Reviewing Process

A summary of the reviewing process for our GOLD scheme is shown below




Figure 12: The 5 stages of reviewing applications in our GOLD scheme

18. Resubmission

All unsuccessful candidates will be provided with an outcome letter from the GOLD team with detailed feedback from the reviewers stating what changes are required. You will only be required to resubmit for dimensions/parts of the descriptor that have not been met. The letter will include the deadline date for the resubmission to be submitted for review. This is usually a 6-week deadline from the date of receiving the outcome letter. However, the GOLD team may specify longer if the reviewers believe that 6 weeks would not be sufficient time for the mentee to have a realistic chance of achieving a different outcome. This is usually when not enough evidence has been provided and would benefit from more time to gather and develop the right kind of evidence.

Upon receipt of your feedback letter, you will work with your mentor to action the feedback and develop your resubmission. During this time, you are encouraged to take advantage of the GOLD 1-2-1 Drop-In sessions and writing retreats that are offered by the GOLD team (see section 9.1).

If you feel a chat with an academic from the GOLD team would be useful, but you cannot attend any of 1-2-1 Drop-in sessions, you can email gold@gre.ac.uk to make an appointment to speak to a member of the GOLD team.

18.1 Written resubmissions

For written submission, the word limit is increased to provide more space for you to include additional evidence required in your revised application. Resubmissions for D3 claims are permitted an additional 500 words across the reflective commentary (RAPP) and two case studies.

18.2 Screencast resubmissions

For a screencast, you can either resubmit your original recording and include new sections within it or record a new screencast which specifically addresses the feedback from the reviewers.

If you decide for new content added to your original recording, it must be made clear to the reviewers by specifying the times in the recording where the new content features. You are given an additional 5 minutes for your recording to provide space to include this additional evidence.

18.3 Reviewing resubmissions

A resubmission (as opposed to a new, fresh claim) will be reviewed on the basis of the **original reviewer feedback**. Reviewers will use this feedback to check

that the key actions identified have been addressed and that the Descriptor (D3) has been met in full. They will not complete a new review of the whole application. A resubmission should make it explicitly clear to reviewers where and how the feedback actions have been addressed within the application. This should be using highlighted/different coloured text to make it explicitly clear which parts are new. A covering letter (email) indicating these changes should also accompany the resubmission to indicate where/how changes have been made.

If both reviewers agree that all feedback has been addressed and the Descriptor (D3) has been met in full, the resubmission will be awarded subject to moderation. All resubmissions (provisionally recognised/not recognised by reviewers) are moderated by the External Examiner. If the reviewers both agree that the claim has not satisfactorily addressed the original feedback, and does not meet the descriptor, the candidate will not be awarded D3 Senior Fellowship.

The GOLD team will always endeavour to use the original reviewer team to review a resubmission. However, there may be rare instances when this is not possible i.e. reviewer illness, emergency leave of absence, sabbaticals, research leave, no longer working at Greenwich, no longer acting as a GOLD reviewer etc. In this case an alternative reviewer would be used. They would have access to the feedback provided in the original submission and would be reviewing on the basis of the original feedback. Please note that having a change in the original review team would not constitute grounds for making an appeal (Section 20).

18.4 Claims not resubmitted

Assuming the typical 6-week deadline has been imposed, any resubmission not received by the deadline will result in the candidate being able to submit a new fresh claim at a future time. This will not be deemed to be a resubmission; it will be classed as a new claim and will be with a new reviewer team.

If there are extenuating circumstances and you are unable to resubmit your claim within the specified deadline, this should be put in writing in good time to the GOLD team for consideration of granting a short extension. The decision for granting an extension is made by the GOLD Scheme Lead.

18.5 Unsuccessful resubmissions

If your resubmitted claim is unsuccessful (having an outcome of 'not awarded'), the reviewers will provide further feedback that is specific and actionable to the dimensions that have not been met.

The same processes as to an initial resubmission will take place, with the addition of sending your final draft to our GOLD team and book onto a GOLD 1-2-1 drop-in session before making another resubmission ([Section 9.1](#)). Our GOLD team will be able to provide further feedback and guidance on your claim. The member of the GOLD team providing additional support will not be involved with the reviewing of this application if/when it is resubmitted.

There is no limit to the amount of times an unsuccessful claim can be resubmitted. However, if a claim continues to be unsuccessful on consecutive resubmissions, then the GOLD team may recommend a prolonged break (e.g. 6 months) and that your application is submitted as a new claim ([section 18.4](#)). The GOLD team can support you and your mentor devise an action plan to help address the dimensions of the descriptor that have not been met.

19. Resubmission Review Process




Figure 13: The Resubmission processes for our GOLD scheme

20. Appeals

As with academic assessment of students, you cannot appeal against the academic decision of the review panel. Every effort has been made to ensure that reviewing of GOLD claims is carried out fairly and consistently by trained and suitably qualified GOLD reviewers. If your claim has followed due process, the decision of the review panel will stand, and the academic judgement of the GOLD reviewers cannot be the object of an appeal. As such appeals can only be made about matters of process and procedure, **not** about the decision of the reviewers and the final judgment on a claim.

20.1 How to make an appeal

Unsuccessful candidates do have the right to appeal if they can produce evidence that the review panel did not follow the correct process and/or adhere to GOLD review procedures. Unsuccessful GOLD applicants wishing to appeal are required to submit their appeal in writing within 14 calendar days of the result letter being made available to them. The written appeal and any evidence should be sent to the GOLD scheme lead via email to gold@gre.ac.uk. The email subject header should indicate the nature of the correspondence i.e. that it is an appeal. An acknowledgement letter via email will be issued upon receipt of the appeal. Any appeals received after the 14-calendar day deadline will be deemed out of time for consideration and will not normally be considered.

20.2 Processing an appeal

A written appeal will be considered by the GOLD Framework Appeals Panel. The panel only has a remit to make a decision on whether the appeal submitted by the appellant is valid or not. It does not have any remit to make any pronouncements or recommendations regarding the academic judgement of the claim in question. This is because the appeals policy states that the academic judgement of the GOLD reviewers cannot be the object of an appeal.

The Panel will be provided with the original GOLD application, the GOLD Mentor supporting statement, the feedback from the review panel, and the reasons for appeal given by the appellant. This is chaired by the Associate Director of Library Services and Academic Enhancement (or their appointee) and includes the Head of Academic & Learning Enhancement (or their appointee), the GOLD scheme lead and two Principal or Senior Fellows (PFHEA/SFHEA) who are trained GOLD reviewers with knowledge and experience of both the PSF 2023 and of the GOLD scheme. The GOLD scheme administrator (or their appointee) will take the minutes.

Following a review of the appeal, the GOLD Framework Appeals Panel will respond to the appellant in writing with its final decision. The written response from the GOLD Framework Appeals Panel will be provided within 28 working days of the original appeal being submitted. If the Panel cannot consider the evidence within this time period, the appellant will be informed, and a new date will be convened as close to the original 28 working day window as possible.

If the GOLD Framework Appeals Panel does not agree that any process and/or procedural breaches/irregularities have been made, the original decision of the review panel i.e. not to award, will be upheld. This will be recorded as the final decision made by the GOLD Framework Appeals Panel and there is no appeal possible following this final decision.

If the GOLD Framework Appeals Panel finds in favour of the appellant the claim will go through the normal review process. As with any GOLD claim, the subsequent review can be subject to an appeal, but only on the grounds of process and procedure **not** about the decision of the reviewers and the final judgment on a claim.

21. Quality Assurance

21.1 External Examiner

To assure the quality of the GOLD scheme, reviewed claims are sampled and moderated through a process of external examination. As a provider of accredited provision on behalf of Advance HE, the GOLD scheme adheres to Advance HE Policy which states that the External Examiner is required to sample during the active decision-making process i.e. *before* any outcomes are communicated to the candidate. The External Examiner for the GOLD scheme is Juliet Eve PFHEA (University of Brighton).

The External Examiner is provided with a sample of provisional claims (Recognised and not recognised) four times per year (four moderation points approximately 4 weeks after the initial submission of the application). They moderate a sample from each submission point. This always includes a range of successful claims from all categories and well as all unsuccessful claims, resubmissions and any claims that used a third reviewer.

For resubmitted applications, these will be reviewed in the same manner (i.e. by the original reviewer panel). All 6-week resubmitted claims are sent to the External Examiner for moderation. This may be at one of the scheduled quarterly moderation points. Otherwise, the moderation will take place on an ad hoc basis so as not to leave the candidate waiting more than 6 weeks for the outcome of their resubmission. Fellowship is not awarded until the External Examiner is satisfied that the reviewer outcomes are fair and consistent. The External Examiner submits an annual report to the GOLD scheme lead, the Head of Academic & Learning Enhancement and the DVC (Academic) which provides an assessment of the scheme in terms of quality and consistency of review judgements, as well as recommendations for enhancements and actions for the GOLD team to respond to.

21.2 Quarterly GOLD Review Board and Steering Group meetings

The GOLD Review Board and Steering Group meets 4-times a year (October, January, April and July). The purpose of the GOLD Review Board and Steering Group is twofold; firstly, to receive and note confirmed externally moderated outcomes on D1, D2 and D3 claims of Greenwich and UK/TNE partner staff made since the previous Board; secondly to function as a steering/oversight group for the GOLD scheme.

The Steering Group function provides on-going continuous improvement of the GOLD scheme through the provision of reviewer and mentor updates from the GOLD team, Advance HE and the wider sector. Part of this includes on-going informal CPD and sharing of practice amongst the reviewers and mentors present. Should the External Examiner have any concerns or recommendations these are discussed and appropriate actions taken. The External Examiner is invited to attend all GOLD Review Board and Steering Group meetings. However, they must attend the July board to provide a summary and overview of their year in office and to provide feedback on the claims sampled throughout this time (or provide a written report *in absentia*). Minutes of these meetings are shared with all current members of the review team as a mechanism for receiving on-going updates and CPD.

The standing members of the GOLD Review Board and Steering Group are:

- GOLD scheme lead (Chair)
- GOLD Administrator (Officer)
- GOLD reviewer from the Academic & Learning Enhancement (ALE) team
- GOLD External Examiner
- Head of Academic & Learning Enhancement (or designate)
- Reviewers of the claims being confirmed and ratified at that Board
- Representatives from the GOLD Mentor team
- Associate Director Library Services and Academic Enhancement (*ex officio*)

22. Fees

22.1 University of Greenwich Staff

If you are employed by the University of Greenwich – permanent or temporary, full-time, fractional, or hourly-paid – or if you are a postgraduate research (PGR) student at the University of Greenwich, you are eligible to apply for and gain D3 Senior Fellowship recognition through GOLD without paying any fee. This is because Greenwich is a subscribing institution to Advance HE.

To remain eligible with our GOLD scheme, you must hold a valid contract of employment with the University of Greenwich (or a partner institution) throughout the full enrolment, application and reviewing process. This includes the point of:

- submitting your Registration of Intent (ROI) form;
- submitting your application (this applies to both initial and resubmitted applications);
- receiving your result letter;
- being awarded a category of recognition with Advance HE.

If you leave your employment/contract ends with Greenwich (or a partner institution), you will no longer be eligible to enrol, submit an application, or be awarded by our GOLD scheme. Our GOLD scheme will not review any applications from candidates who are no longer employed by Greenwich or with a partner institution.

If you are currently developing your application and know that your employment with Greenwich will be ending (i.e. leaving or contract ending), please contact our GOLD team at the earliest convenience to discuss your options.

22.2 UK and TNE Partners

If you teach on a Greenwich programme at one of our collaborative partner institutions you will be required to make a financial payment to apply through our GOLD scheme. This payment may be made of up to two different fees:

- Advance HE Fee
- GOLD Recognition Fee

These fees are payable for each applicant, whether or not you are eventually recognised at the GOLD fellowship category you apply for.

Subscribing institution to Advance HE	Advance HE Fee (per applicant)	GOLD Recognition Fee (per applicant)
Yes	None	Up to £150
No	£330 (50% of fee for direct application to Advance HE)	Up to £150

Figure 14: Table to show the various fees for UK and TNE Partner applications through our GOLD scheme

22.3 Advance HE fees

For our UK or TNE partners, depending on your institution's membership status with Advance HE, you may be required to pay a fee to Advance HE. Advance HE state:

“Staff employed by collaborative partner institutions are entitled to access accredited provision but will need to pay an additional fee (one-off not annual) for Fellowship to Advance HE if they are not employed by an Advance HE Member Institution when they complete the programme. This fee is 50% of the direct application fee and this fee needs to be highlighted within the guidance participants receive”.

If your employer is a subscribing institution of the Advance HE then you do not need to pay any fee. If your employer is not a subscribing institution of the Advance HE then you will be required to pay £150 (correct March 2024). The Advance HE fees are subject to change and may be checked here.

All Advance HE fees must be paid directly to Advance HE at the point of submitting an application. Confirmation of this payment must be provided to the GOLD team. The GOLD team may contact Advance HE directly to confirm that this is correct.

If you are unsure if your Institution is a subscribed member to Advance HE, please either check with your institution or contact Advance HE directly to confirm.

22.4 GOLD Recognition Fee

If you are a member of staff in a UK or TNE partner, teaching on University of Greenwich approved programmes you *may* be liable to pay an additional fee to the Advance HE fee, in the form of the GOLD recognition process fee. This can be up to £150 per applicant. This process fee entitles you to one submission for recognition through GOLD, and one further resubmission. Please be aware that this fee is payable whether or not you are eventually recognised at the GOLD fellowship category you apply for.

All GOLD recognition fees must be made directly to the University of Greenwich. Please contact our GOLD team for further details on how to do this.

You are advised to check with our GOLD team of the GOLD recognition fee *before* you start your application by emailing gold@gre.ac.uk.

23. Confidentiality

The application and review process is confidential and only relevant colleagues will have access to your claim. Your application form and supporting statements are only made available to the reviewers and relevant GOLD scheme/administrative colleagues. The External Examiner may see your application as part of their on-going sampling which takes place after each submission point throughout the year. This all applies for recorded videos for screencast submissions as well.

24. GOLD scheme Privacy statement and EDI monitoring

The retention period for this data is the current annual year plus one additional year. Retention periods are based on our retention schedule. This data is used in order to make a decision on your GOLD application and is shared with a small number of GOLD reviewers and administrators. Your application may also be selected for moderation by our external examiner. Our GOLD administrators, reviewers and the external examiner are bound by confidentiality obligations. If your application is successful, we will share your name and email address with Advance HE for the purposes of registering you as a Fellow of Advance HE. For more information about how Advance HE will collect, generate and use personal information about you please visit their privacy webpage [here](#).

You have rights as a Data Subject. You can see more information about those rights on our website. To contact the University of Greenwich Data Protection Officer and University Secretary, email: compliance@gre.ac.uk.

To support the University in meeting the aims and commitments set out in its equality policy, we seek to collect EDI information from all GOLD candidates. Completion of the EDI monitoring form is voluntary, and data collected is treated confidentially and in accordance with GDPR regulations.

25. Maintaining Good Standing

Anyone that holds a category of fellowship with Advance HE are required to maintain their good standing in accordance with the 2023 Advance HE Fellowship Code of Practice. Upon successful achievement of gaining SFHEA recognition, GOLD participants agree to adhere to the Fellowship Code (Appendix 2).

26. Contact our GOLD Team

If you have any questions or concerns, then please contact our GOLD team via email gold@gre.ac.uk

Appendix 1 - Recommended reading to support your GOLD D3 claim

Ashwin, P. (2015). *Reflective teaching in higher education*. London: Bloomsbury.

Biggs, J and Tang, C (2011) *Teaching for Quality Learning at University: What the Student Does*, 4th edn, Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press, Berkshire.

Biggs, J. B, and K. F Collins (2014) *Evaluating the quality of learning: The SOLO taxonomy* (Structure of the Observed Learning Outcome). New York: Academic Press.

Brookfield, S (1995) *Becoming a critically reflective teacher*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bryan, C. and Clegg, K. (Eds.) (2006) *Innovative Assessment in Higher Education*, London: Routledge

Campbell, A and Norton, L (2007) *Learning, Teaching and Assessing in Higher Education: developing reflective practice*. Sage

Chiu, T., C., Murray, O. M., & Coispeau, M. (2022) Student-staff partnership: what is the key to success? Advance HE. <https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/news-and-views/student-staff-partnership-what-key-success>

Fry, H, Ketteridge, S, and Marshall, S (Eds.) (2020) *A Handbook for Teaching & Learning in Higher Education: Enhancing academic practice*. 5th edition. Routledge

Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Kolb, D. A., & Kolb, A. Y. (2017). *Experiential educator. Principles and practices of experiential learning*. EBL Press.

Moon, J. (2006). *Learning Journals. Handbook for reflective practice and professional development*. Routledge.

Petty, G (2009) *Teaching Today*. 4th edn. Cheltenham.

Race, P (2015) *The Lecturer's Toolkit: A Practical Guide to Assessment, Learning and Teaching*, 4th edn, Routledge, London and New York.

Sambell, K., McDowell, L. & Montgomery, C. (2012) *Assessment for Learning in Higher Education*. London: Taylor & Francis

Appendix 2 - Code of Practice for Fellows

This Code of Practice is a set of principles and expectations for individuals gaining any category of Fellowship with Advance HE. Advance HE defines ‘maintaining our professional practice’ as continuing to work in accordance with the Professional Standards Framework (PSF 2023) for teaching and supporting learning in higher education. The term “Fellow” in this code of practice applies to anyone that holds any category of fellowship.

In our professional practice, as Fellows we will:

1. Act with respect, integrity and honesty.
2. Monitor and critically evaluate our practice to maintain effectiveness in line with the Professional Standards Framework (PSF) 2023.
3. Engage in appropriate activities to remain up to date with knowledge of learning and teaching, subject matter and assessment.
4. Be open to, and conscientious in, responding to feedback from appraisals, peer and student observations.

For the benefit of learners, as Fellows we will:

1. Demonstrate our respect for learners by paying due regard to the way we conduct ourselves in our professional lives.
2. Be fair, impartial and intentionally focused on equitable outcomes in our engagement with learners.
3. Encourage the free exchange of ideas between learners and ourselves.

For the benefit of colleagues, as Fellows we will:

1. Show due respect for the opinions of colleagues in the exchange of constructive criticism and ideas.
2. Support and actively assist in the professional development of colleagues to ensure effective practice is developed, maintained and enhanced.
3. Be aware and take account of, the educational goals, policies, standards and regulations of our employing institution and wider context.

Source: [Advance HE](#)

To help to enable you to think about how you will do this, the GOLD D3 Senior Fellow - Application form asks you to provide a Professional Development Action Plan. This plan is for you to propose your on-going commitment to remaining in good standing for the following 12 months (and beyond).