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1. Overview of roles

Thank you for being willing to act as a Mentor and/or Reviewer for the St Andrews Recognition Scheme (STARS). STARS is an Advance HE accredited scheme which allows participants to prepare a claim for recognition against the [Professional Standards Framework](https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/teaching-and-learning/psf) (PSF 2023) Descriptors D1 (Associate Fellow), D2 (Fellow), or D3 (Senior Fellow).

**Being a Mentor or Reviewer is an important role and carries a high degree of responsibility.** The University is accredited to verify claims for Fellowship on behalf of [Advance HE](https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/) and so it is essential that we have rigorous and consistent processes. You must follow the guidance and attend induction and refresher training to be able to continue your involvement. You can hold any category of Fellowship, but you will only mentor or review people who are working towards the same level of Fellowship as you hold or lower.

Being a **Mentor** is a great opportunity to contribute to colleague’s professional development and to the growth of teaching excellence across the institution. You may mentor people individually or in a group, and in-person or online.

As a **Reviewer** you will be acting on behalf of Advance HE to assess claims. You will review the applications submitted by colleagues to determine whether they have provided sufficient evidence to meet the PSF 2023 Descriptor criteria for the category of Fellowship sought. You will work with the highest level of integrity and accuracy and respect the confidentiality of your colleagues outside of the review process.

Becoming a Mentor/Reviewer on STARS provides evidence of your commitment to learning and teaching in higher education and of your willingness to share your experience, understanding and ideas with colleagues. Engaging with other people’s learning and teaching practices and thinking can also be an enriching and stimulating opportunity for critical reflection on your own practice. You can reflect on and write about mentoring/reviewing as part of your own submission when you seek your next category of Fellowship.

1. Key STARS Contacts

STARS is managed and supported by team of staff in the International Education and Lifelong Learning Institute (IELLI), formerly the Centre for Educational Enhancement and Development.

The STARS team is based in Hebdomadar’s Block in St Salvator’s Quadrangle (building 47, grid J2 on this [map of the University](https://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/media/university/maps/wwwmap.pdf)). We follow a hybrid working pattern with different on-campus working days, so please check availability in advance before dropping in.

Scheme Lead

Dr Heather McKiggan-Fee SFHEA (Head of Educational Development)

*Email*: [hcm@st-andrews.ac.uk](mailto:hcm@st-andrews.ac.uk)

Scheme Deputy Lead

Dr Eilidh Harris SFHEA (Educational and Student Developer)

*Email*: [ep28@st-andrews.ac.uk](mailto:ep28@st-andrews.ac.uk)

Scheme Administrator

Aqsa Ashraf – First point of contact for general enquiries

*Email*: [teachingdev@st-andrews.ac.uk](mailto:teachingdev@st-andrews.ac.uk)

1. Role requirements

Whether you are a Mentor or Reviewer (or both), you must already have a category of Fellowship, and a thorough understanding of the [Professional Standards Framework 2023](https://advance-he.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/professional-standards-framework-teaching-and-supporting-learning-higher-education-0?_ga=2.35477729.1116918794.1680180129-1582476696.1680180128) Dimensions and Descriptors D1 to D3. This is essential because you may be mentoring or reviewing someone who is seeking a different category of Fellowship than you have. If you are a Senior Fellow, you may be mentoring/reviewing prospective Associates or Fellows as well as prospective Senior Fellows. If you are a Fellow, you may be mentoring/reviewing either prospective Associates or Fellows.

You may have achieved your Fellowship through a different route (e.g. taught programme or direct application to Advance HE) than the STARS applicants. You may be mentoring or reviewing the work of a colleague outside of your subject or Faculty and whose teaching methods are different to yours.

You must also ensure that you are familiar with the following:

* The STARS Participant Handbook, which can be downloaded from the STARS Space in Moodle, along with other supporting documentation for the scheme.
* Advance HE applicant guidance for Associate Fellow, Fellow, and Senior Fellow (see *Making recognition judgements*, below)
* Section 12 of the [Advance HE Accreditor Handbook 2023](https://s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/assets.creode.advancehe-document-manager/documents/advance-he/Accreditor%20Handbook%20for%20review%20of%20fellowship%20applications%20-%20February%202023_1677673742.pdf) (if acting as a Reviewer).

As a **Mentor**, each academic year you will be expected to:

* Attend induction (if new) or refresher (if returning) training.
* Deliver at least one STARS workshop ***or*** facilitate at least one writing afternoon.
* Take on at least 2 mentees.

As a **Reviewer**, each academic year you will be expected to:

* Attend induction (if new) or refresher (if returning) training.
* Deliver at least one STARS workshop ***or*** facilitate at least one writing afternoon.
* Review at least 8 Associate Fellow applications ***or*** 4 Fellow applications ***or*** 2 Senior Fellow applications (or an equivalent combination, e.g. 1 Senior + 2 Fellow).
* Attend at least one Recognition Panel.

If you have any questions or concerns at any point, please raise them promptly with the Scheme Lead or Deputy Lead. If you feel you cannot raise an issue directly with the Lead/Deputy, then please approach the IELLI Co-Director, Catriona Wilson.

1. Timeline of the STARS participant journey

**Semester 1 Intake**

Early to middle Semester 1

Semesters 1 + 2

S2 Week 6

S2 Week 9

**Semester 2 Intake**

End Semester 2 + early summer

Summer + Semester 1 next AY

S1 Week 6

S1 Week

1. Mentoring process

Before meeting with you for the first time, all participants on the scheme will have had a welcome briefing and a one-to-one meeting with a member of the STARS team. They should have completed their STAR Chart (see Appendix 1) and attended (or signed up for) the relevant STARS workshop for the category they are aiming for. There are two ‘intakes’ of participants into the STARS scheme per year, at the start of semester 1 and the end of semester 2 (see section 4).

For each mentee you are assigned, you will:

* Send a welcome email. (The mentee will organise the first meeting.)
* Meet with them two or three times during their time on the scheme.
* Read and provide feedback on one draft of their submission.
* If their application is referred, meet with them two more times, and read and provide feedback on one resubmission draft.

Your role is to support your mentee to make clear associations between their practice and the relevant PSF Descriptor, drawing on the support available via STARS. You should help them to reflect on how they might address any gaps identified in their STAR Chart and identify current and future development needs. For example, you might (this list is not exhaustive):

* Signpost your mentee to relevant developmental opportunities such as the [Academic Staff Development Programme](https://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/osds/my-development/academic-teaching-staff/asdp/), [Celpie](https://celpie.wp.st-andrews.ac.uk/), [the Hive](https://teams.microsoft.com/l/team/19%3adfd4735603fb4faa9c98e8829e90a76f%40thread.skype/conversations?groupId=c1480ceb-dc45-449f-9312-45316946aba5&tenantId=f85626cb-0da8-49d3-aa58-64ef678ef01a), etc.
* Encourage them to speak to their line manager about getting more experience in Areas of Activity that they are less familiar with.
* Help them to identify how they can gather evidence to support their claim or select effective teaching artefacts to include.
* Encourage them to write reflectively and integrate Professional Values and Core Knowledge.

Participants are advised to submit individual sections of their draft application to their mentor on a rolling basis, rather than the entire submission in one go. That gives them the opportunity to implement your feedback when they write the next section, so that each section will hopefully become progressively more effective.

We suggest that a good time to meet your mentee for the second time is after you have provided feedback on most/all sections of their application, so you can discuss any final improvements that you may recommend before they submit to the Recognition Panel.

If your mentee receives a referral from their Recognition Panel (see *Reviewing process* below and Participant Handbook section 5.4: *Refer for resubmission*), you will be informed of the outcome. They are entitled to two more meetings with you, and you should provide them with feedback on a full draft of their resubmission. So, the time in which you support a particular mentee may span two or three semesters, depending on their outcome.

1. Reviewing process

There are two main Recognition Panels each academic year. A third may be scheduled, if necessary, only to review deferred or referred submissions from the semester 2 Panel. In each semester there is a submission deadline in week 6, and the Recognition Panel meets to decide outcomes in week 9. If a third Panel is required to review deferrals or referrals, the submission deadline will be organised for mid-June, with the Panel taking place about three weeks later.

After the submission deadline, you and one other Reviewer will be allocated the same sub-set of applications to review, accessed via a secure link to Onedrive in the STARS Space in Moodle. The External Reviewer, Dr Tom Cunningham (Glasgow Caledonian University) will be third Reviewer for Senior Fellow applications. He is a Senior Fellow and an experienced Advance HE reviewer. You can find the External Reviewer terms of reference in the STARS Space Moodle.

*You will never be allocated an application for a participant that you are currently mentoring.*

In the STARS Onedrive folder you will find a Review Grid for each application you have been allocated. Without consulting the other Reviewer, you should assess each application against the criteria for the relevant category of Fellowship and fill in section 1 of the associated Review Grid. Indicate your judgement against each criterion and include explanatory notes and initial feedback in the spaces provided. These notes may then be used to form the basis of feedback to the applicant should the outcome be conditional award or refer. *After* the applications have been independently reviewed, both Reviewers should meet to discuss and agree the judgement for each application.

Reviewers will be designated as 1 or 2, with Reviewer 1 responsible for noting the consensus judgement in the Summary table of the Review Grid and writing the final feedback (in section 3) that will be sent to the applicant. If you and the other Reviewer do not reach a consensus judgement before the Recognition Panel, Reviewer 1 must notify the Scheme Lead. The Scheme Lead or Deputy Lead will review the application and make and record the final recognition judgement. If you have any questions or concerns about an application, you can flag it for discussion at the Recognition Panel. All Reviewers will be informed of flagged applications.

Please ensure you review all your allocated applications and complete the Review Grids within two weeks of the submission deadline. This is to ensure that the External Reviewer has time to moderate recognition judgements through sampling prior to the Recognition Panel (i.e. during the active decision-making process). The External Reviewer will select a sample (at least 20% of all applications, and a minimum of 5 applications) that reflects an appropriate range across the different Fellowship categories and different Reviewers. Moderation ensures that internal Fellowship judgements against the criteria of the relevant Descriptor are appropriate, reliable, and consistent.

* 1. Making recognition judgements

Your role in reviewing an application for Fellowship (D1-D3) is to make a judgement about whether the evidence in the application is sufficient to meet the requirements of the relevant PSF 2023 Descriptor.

You will receive training on making Fellowship judgements, but will also need to refer to Advance HE’s Applicant guidance (D1-3) and the relevant versions of the Guide to the PSF 2023 Dimensions (D1-3) to support you in making a judgement about the appropriateness and sufficiency of evidence of effective and inclusive practice provided in the application:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Associate Fellow (D1)** | [Associate Fellowship Applicant Guidance Notes](https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/psf-2023-associate-fellowship-applicant-pack) |
| [Associate Fellowship (D1) Guide to the PSF 2023 Dimensions](https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/psf-2023-associate-fellowship-applicant-pack) |
| **Fellow (D2)** | [Fellowship Applicant Guidance Notes](https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/psf-2023-fellowship-applicant-pack) |
| [Fellowship (D2) Guide to the PSF 2023 Dimensions](https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/psf-2023-fellowship-applicant-pack) |
| **Senior Fellow (D3)** | [Senior Fellowship Applicant Guidance Notes](https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/psf-2023-senior-fellowship-applicant-pack) |
| [Senior Fellowship (D3) Guide to the PSF 2023 Dimensions](https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/psf-2023-senior-fellowship-applicant-pack) |

Applicants’ examples should be drawn from recent practice (Associate Fellow or Fellow usually within the last 3 years, Senior Fellow usually within the last 3-5 years). If an applicant reflects on any historic professional practice beyond this timeframe as part of their evidence, they should explain how this has ongoing impact on their current practice. Applicants who have taken a career break for any reason (e.g. maternity leave, illness, etc.) or who work in fixed term/part-time contracts should not be disadvantaged with respect to time frames; please use your professional judgement in determining the appropriateness of the currency of practice and seek advice from the STARS team.

Your individual independent judgement of an application is based on the applicant’s *Reflective account of professional practice* and their *Authentications of practice*. They may also include one (for AF) or two (for F or SF) *Artefacts that highlight their practice*, but that is optional. There are three possible outcomes for each application. These are:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Award** | Evidence provided is sufficient to award Fellowship at the relevant category. |
| **Conditional**  **Award** | Evidence provided is very nearly sufficient; award is subject to submission of minor additional evidence for one criterion as specified in feedback. |
| **Refer** | Evidence provided is insufficient and the application does not currently meet the criteria. The applicant may revise and re-submit their application **one** further time. |

There is space in section 1 of the Review Grid for you to provide comments to support your judgement for each of the Descriptor criteria. You should highlight evidence that you find convincing against the Descriptor criterion (examples that meet the criterion) and identify any areas that you conclude need further evidence before you can confirm the criterion is met. Your comments should make clear the reasons for your judgement and support the other Reviewer(s) to understand your position.

For you to make your individual judgement that Fellowship should be **Awarded**, your review of the application needs to conclude that all Descriptor criteria are sufficiently evidenced to be judged as ‘Met’. In reaching this individual judgement, you should consider whether the Descriptor criteria have been met ‘holistically’. It is likely that some parts of the Descriptor will be met more convincingly than others and your overall judgement should take into consideration the evidence across the full application.

If you judge one or more Descriptor criteria to be clearly ‘Not Met’ then your individual judgement is **Refer** (see section 6.4).

There may be occasional cases where in your judgement an application would need very minor additions to evidence all the criteria. If two of the three criteria are clearly Met and a *single* criterion is *very nearly* sufficient (ie a single one of the 15 dimensions is not evidenced), you may judge the outcome as **Conditional Award** (tick ‘Partial’ for the relevant criterion to indicate this). You must explain your reasoning in the table cell for that criterion, and in the section for initial feedback to the applicant you must specify the sort of additional evidence the applicant must provide for the criterion to be achieved, and in what time frame (usually 4 weeks). This outcome should only be used if you are you are confident the applicant will be able to meet the Descriptor and the evidence will be readily available.

* 1. Authentications of practice

Each submission will be accompanied by an *Authentication of practice*; please see the STARS Participant handbook for the expectations at each level. This will consist of either Teaching Observation reports or Supporting Statements (at D1/D2), or two Supporting Statements (D3). In *exceptional* circumstances an applicant may be allowed to submit even if the application is missing an authentication of practice. The outcome would be Conditional Award at best, with the condition being receipt of the missing supporting statement or teaching observation.

The Authentications of practice should verify and endorse that the applicant represents their practice in a fair and genuine way throughout the application, in line with the requirements of the relevant Descriptor. You should review the Authentications of practice to confirm that the applicant has represented their practice accurately and that the referees/observers have provided their unique opinion that the applicant has demonstrated the requirements of the relevant Descriptor (D1-D3) of the PSF 2023.

Your options in your review of the Authentications of practice are ‘Yes’ or ‘No’. The Authentications of practice cannot be used to compensate for significant issues with an application or to contribute to an overall Award, Conditional Award or Refer decision. It is the applicant’s responsibility to make a sufficient claim against the relevant Descriptor criteria (D1-D3). They cannot be judged to have met the requirements for the relevant category of Fellowship unless they have done so themselves through their Reflective Account of Professional Practice.

If your judgement for the Authentications is No, or if you have any concerns about the Authentications (e.g. issues relating to sufficiency, currency, similarity to other Statements), you should raise this at the Recognition Panel.

* 1. Recognition Panel

The Recognition Panel includes:

* STARS Lead/Deputy Lead (Chair)
* Scheme Administrator (minute-taker)
* Reviewers of all applications submitted to that Panel
* External Reviewer

Each application will be considered in turn: Reviewer 1 will present the associated Review Grid and report the consensus judgement of the reviewers for ratification by the Recognition Panel. The Scheme Administrator will complete Section 2 of the Review Grid, noting key observations from the reviewers (and External Reviewer if applicable). In cases where the reviewers were unable to reach consensus and the Scheme Lead or Deputy Lead was required to make the final recognition judgement, this will be noted in Section 2 of the Review Grid.

After all applications have been ratified the External Reviewer will comment on the overall fairness and consistency of the decision-making process based on the moderated sample. They will also comment and give advice on the content, structure, and delivery of the scheme.

The reports and minutes of the QuaSaR Board (see section 7) will be discussed at the semester 1 Panel.

Reviewer 1 is responsible for writing the final feedback which will be sent to the applicant, drawing on the notes in section 1 of the Review Grid and from the External Reviewer (if applicable). You should write the feedback as soon as possible after the Recognition Panel (and no later than 10 days after the Panel). For successful applicants, write the feedback in section 3 of the relevant Review Grid. If the outcome was Refer (see section 6.4) or Conditional Award, complete the Panel Outcome and Feedback template for that applicant.

After the Panel the Scheme Lead will upload the status of successful applicants to Advance HE. The Scheme Administrator will notify all applicants of their outcome by email within two weeks of the Recognition Panel, using the feedback written by Reviewer 1**.**

Process for confirming conditional award:

If the outcome was Conditional Award, the Scheme Administrator will alert the Scheme Lead once the applicant submits their additional evidence and will record the date of submission in section 2 of the associated Review Grid.

If the evidence is submitted later than the specified deadline, the application will be automatically referred to the next Recognition Panel (see section 6.4). The Scheme Administrator will notify the applicant and will record this in section 2 of the Review Grid and section 1 of the Panel Outcome and Feedback template.

If the evidence is submitted within the deadline, the Scheme Lead or Deputy Lead will review the entire application alongside the additional evidence and will make the final judgement as to whether the criteria have been achieved. If the Conditional Award is confirmed as successful, the Lead records this in section 2 of the Review Grid. If the criteria are not achieved the application will be referred to the next Recognition Panel. The Lead records this in section 2 of the Review Grid and section 1 of the Panel Outcome and Feedback template. The Scheme Administrator will inform the applicant of the outcome.

* 1. Process for referred applications

If you are Reviewer 1, complete the Panel Outcome and Feedback template for that applicant (which the Scheme Administrator will add to the Reviewer Section of STARS Space). Your feedback should indicate which of the Descriptor criteria the application has met and explain how the application needs to be strengthened to provide the evidence for the criteria that have not been met. You can draw on the Review Grid notes and Recognition Panel discussions; Authentications of practice may also include useful information to inform your feedback to a referred applicant. You should consult the guidance on providing effective feedback in [Section 12 of the Advance HE Accreditor Handbook for review of direct applications for Fellowship](https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/fellowship-judgement-resources-accreditors).

Please complete the Panel Outcome and Feedback template as quickly as possible, and no more than 10 days after the Recognition Panel. The Scheme Administrator will email it to the applicant along with an explanation of what happens next.

The applicant will have until the submission deadline for the next Recognition Panel to revise their application and resubmit. They will have the opportunity to have two more meetings with their Mentor, who will also provide written feedback on the revised application before it is resubmitted. Applicants use the same application template for re-submissions, but they are allowed an additional 500 words for their *Reflective account of professional practice*. They will highlight all substantive changes they made to this version of their application.

The same Reviewers as before will assess referred submissions at the next Recognition Panel and come to a consensus judgement. There are three possible outcomes:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Award** | Evidence provided is sufficient to award Fellowship at the relevant category. |
| **Conditional Award** | Evidence provided is very nearly sufficient; award is subject to submission of minor additional evidence for one criterion as specified in feedback. |
| **Unsuccessful** | Evidence provided is insufficient and the application is unsuccessful. |

If the Reviewers agree that despite revisions, the resubmission does not fully meet the requirements of the relevant Descriptor then the final judgement is **Unsuccessful**. Reviewer 1 will explain the reasons for the unsuccessful judgement in Sections 4 and 5 of the Panel Outcome and Feedback template. The Scheme Administrator will email the whole form (including the original feedback) to the candidate within 2 weeks of the Panel.

If a resubmission is unsuccessful this concludes the applicant’s journey on the scheme.

* 1. Ethical issues

In an institution as small as St Andrews, you may well be reviewing the work of someone you know. You should declare any conflict of interest as a Reviewer to the Scheme Leads when applications are allocated to you, so that they can allocated to a different Reviewer.

In exceptional cases you might believe that what you are reading is not true; for example, that the applicant’s claim to a certain activity was carried out or initiated by someone else. This should be extremely rare because of the requirement for Authentication of practice, where this would be picked up by the referee/observer who knows the applicant’s work. There may be other reasons why knowledge of an applicant might influence your judgement – or might be seen to do so. In such an event, you should discuss this with the Scheme Leads in advance of the Recognition Panel.

Another ethical dilemma might relate to practices which you consider to be unsafe, unsound, or contravening the University’s policies or an external or professional code of ethics. You should raise such concerns at the Recognition Panel. Again, this should be very rare due to the involvement of referees and Mentors.

* 1. Diagram of review process and outcomes

1 indicates first resubmission process; 2 indicates ‘unsuccessful’ outcome after resubmission.

Application reviewed by Reviewers

Consensus judgement reached

Descriptor criteria achieved

Descriptor criteria not achieved

Resubmission unsuccessful

Fellowship awarded

End of STARS place

Resubmit to next Recognition Panel

**1**

**2**

* 1. Further advice on reviewing applications

Detailed guidance on reviewing submissions and making recognition judgements is given during the Reviewer training. In general, these are the main points you will be looking for:

**Appropriate for category of recognition**

Is what the claimant is doing in their role appropriate to the category of fellowship?

**Links to specific Descriptor criteria as well as Dimensions of practice**

This is essential to ensure that the Dimensions are being demonstrated at the appropriate category to the fellowship sought.

**Clear focus**

Is the focus clearly on providing evidence for and reflecting on the PSF2023 Dimensions and Descriptors?

**Demonstrates candidate strengths**

You should be able to identify good practice and sound understanding of higher education learning and teaching.

**Ample evidence**

Which supports and authenticates the different elements of the claim. The evidence should be appropriate to the category sought.

**Reflective, not just descriptive**

Although the submission is designed to assess whether the claimant has met a set of standards, it is not a competency framework. It should demonstrate critical reflective practice in the presentation of evidence. This will include a sense of how the claimant intends to develop in the future.

A handy way to think about what you are reviewing is to ask the questions: What? So what? Now what?

1. Quality Standards and Review Board

There is a STARS Quality Standards and Review (QuaSaR) Board once a year where the operation of the whole scheme is monitored and evaluated, and decisions are made about any significant developments/changes to the scheme. The Board is chaired by the Co-Director of IELLI (or delegate) and includes one or both of the STARS Lead and Deputy Lead, the STARS Administrator (minute-taker), one or both of the Associate Deans Education (Arts/Science), an Academic Policy Officer (Quality), at least one STARS Mentor/Reviewer, and at least one successful scheme participant. (See Terms of Reference in STARS Space.)

The Board meets after the final Recognition Panel of the academic year, in August/September at the latest. (But if there is no Summer Recognition Panel, the Board may meet as early as June.)

After the final Recognition Panel for the academic year, the External Reviewer will produce a written report on the reliability and validity of the recognition review process, the quality of the decisions and feedback and the quality of the claims as well as any feedback or suggestions for enhancement. This is submitted into the QuaSaR Board section of STARS Space (visible only to QuaSaR Board members).

The Scheme Lead will write a report which outlines the operation of the scheme for that academic year (e.g. numbers of trained mentors/reviewers, number of applications, summary of Recognition Panel outcomes, etc.) and responds to any feedback or concerns raised by the External Reviewer. This is submitted into the QuaSaR Board section of STARS Space.

The Board will consider both reports and agree the priorities for the scheme in the year ahead. The reports and Board minutes go to [Education Strategic Management Group](https://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/education/staff/committees/esmg/) for information. STARS is part of IELLI’s provision which is reviewed by [Academic Monitoring Group](https://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/education/staff/committees/amg/) via annual academic monitoring and the sexennial university reviews of learning and teaching.

The Scheme Lead annual report will be discussed at the semester 1 Recognition Panel so that the External Reviewer can consider the response to their report.

1. Appendix 1: STAR Chart

Use the template below to chart your practice against the dimensions of the PSF using the Descriptor relevant to your category of Fellowship. Briefly indicate the examples and evidence you have for each dimension.

**In your context:**

**D1 Associate Fellow must evidence (in your work with learners):**

1. use of appropriate Professional Values, including at least V1 and V3
2. application of appropriate Core Knowledge, including at least K1, K2 and K3
3. effective and inclusive practice in **two** of the five Areas of Activity

**D2 Fellow must evidence (in your work with learners):**

1. use of all five Professional Values
2. application of all five forms of Core Knowledge
3. effective and inclusive practice in all five Areas of Activity

**D3 Senior Fellow must evidence (through the lens of leadership working with your colleagues):**

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

**When using the STAR chart it might be helpful to consider the following questions with the appropriate category of Fellowship in mind:**

1. What evidence do I currently have of effective and inclusive practice across the relevant dimensions?
2. How might I go about sourcing further evidence of my practice in the relevant dimensions?
3. What professional development might I need to support my practice in any of the dimensions?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | A1: design and plan learning activities and/or programmes | A2: teach and/or support learning through appropriate approaches and environments | A3: assess and give feedback for learning | A4: support and guide learners | A5: enhance practice through own continuing professional development |
| V1: respect individual learners and diverse groups of learners | |  |  |  |  |  |
| V2: promote engagement in learning and equity of opportunity for all to reach their potential | |  |  |  |  |  |
| V3: use scholarship, or research, or professional learning, or other evidence-informed approaches as a basis for effective practice | |  |  |  |  |  |
| V4: respond to the wider context in which higher education operates, recognising implications for practice | |  |  |  |  |  |
| V5: collaborate with others to enhance practice | |  |  |  |  |  |
| K1: how learners learn, generally and within specific subjects |  |  |  |  |  |
| K2: approaches to teaching and/or supporting learning, appropriate for subjects and level of study |  |  |  |  |  |
| K3: critical evaluation as a basis for effective practice |  |  |  |  |  |
| K4: appropriate use of digital and/or other technologies, and resources for learning |  |  |  |  |  |
| K5: requirements for quality assurance and enhancement, and their implications for practice |  |  |  |  |  |