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1. **Leadership and management of the University of Suffolk e-PASSPoRT pathway:**

The e-PASSPoRT pathway is led and managed by the University of Suffolk's Quality Assurance and Enhancement team. This includes:

a) Management of the e-PASSPoRT application, review and approval processes

b) Promotion of the PASSPoRT scheme and the UKPSF across the institution

c) Provision of an induction programme for new PASSPoRT mentors and e-PASSPoRT (internal and external) reviewers

d) Provision of an annual development event for all mentors and reviewers in which:

   i) e-PASSPoRT processes are reviewed, noting any changes or developments made since the last event to the pathway and/or to the UKPSF;

   ii) standardisation exercises in decision-making processes are undertaken;

   iii) any changes to HEA policy and guidance are outlined;

   iv) opportunities for networking among reviewers are promoted; and

   v) successes and achievements across the Scheme are noted and celebrated

e) Identification and recording of good practice in HE teaching and learning for dissemination within and outwith the institution

f) Identification of areas of practice in HE teaching and learning requiring enhancement and support across the institution

2. **Roles of key participants**

a) **External Reviewer**

The External Reviewer acts to ensure that the standards for the e-PASSPoRT and award of Fellowships are at the appropriate level, and meet the expectations of the HEA, and are comparable with those of other higher education institutions; and that the review/assessment processes measure participant achievement against the relevant Descriptor, and are fair and fairly operated. The External Reviewer is required to hold Senior/Principal Fellowship of the HEA and be actively engaged in their own pedagogic CPD aligned to the UKPSF. They are appointed for a period of four years.

The External Reviewer’s roles and responsibilities include to:

i) Participate in an induction to e-PASSPoRT, and attend the annual development event for reviewers and mentors

ii) Attend all panel meetings of e-PASSPoRT

iii) Sample the submissions for individual claims made against the UKPSF Descriptors (D1-D3) in advance of panel meetings and confirm that awards are at the appropriate level, meet the expectations of the HEA and are comparable with those of other higher education institutions

iv) Engage in review for any D3 submission in which the three reviewers have reached a split decision of two reviewers supporting the award and one proposing to refer
v) Lead discussion in panel meetings on any sampled applications raising concerns; or for any D3 applications with a split decision between reviewers. The External Reviewer makes the final decision to award or refer in any such cases.
vi) Provide a written record of any reviews that they have conducted or sampled using the e-PASSPoRT review pro formas
vii) Confirm that the appropriate level of scrutiny has occurred for all applications
viii) Contribute to ensure the quality and standards of the e-PASSPoRT pathway are upheld through annual monitoring and review
ix) Produce an annual report aligned to the requirements of the University's External Examiner policy

b) Internal Reviewers

Internal Reviewers review individual applications and participate in panel meetings at which decisions to award Fellowships (AFHEA, FHEA, SFHEA) are confirmed. In order to be eligible to be a reviewer, they must hold Fellowship, Senior Fellowship or Principal Fellowship of the HEA themselves, at least equivalent to the level for which they are reviewing. They must also demonstrate an active engagement in their own pedagogic CPD aligned to the UKPSF.

The Internal Reviewers’ roles and responsibilities include to:

i) Participate in an induction to e-PASSPoRT, and attend the annual development event for reviewers and mentors
ii) Review written submissions for individual claims made against the UKPSF Descriptors (D1/D2/D3) in advance of a panel meeting
iii) Record their review assessment decision and rationale using the relevant e-PASSPoRT review proforma (D1/D2/D3)
iv) Participate in the review panel at which the submission is approved
v) Review applications in a consistent way, following the protocols set and ensuring that criteria are applied with equity

c) e-PASSPoRT Lead

The e-PASSPoRT Lead chairs the panel meetings where applications which have been reviewed are considered against the relevant Descriptor (D1, D2 or D3). The e-PASSPoRT Lead holds Senior Fellowship of the HEA.

The e-PASSPoRT lead’s roles and responsibilities include to:

i) Chair the panel meetings at which decisions to award or refer applications for Fellowship are confirmed
ii) Contribute to decisions on claims requiring panel discussion, with clear reference to the UKPSF Descriptors and Standards
iii) Ensure the appropriate level of scrutiny occurs for all applications
iv) Ensure decisions from ratification or assessment are recorded accurately (in the panel notes)
v) Lead on the promotion of the PASSPoRT scheme and the UKPSF across the institution
vi) Lead on annual monitoring and review to ensure the quality and standards of e-PASSPoRT are upheld
vii) Provide summary written feedback to all applicants whose submissions have been considered at the panel meeting, whether award or refer, including both strengths, and areas for further development if applicable
viii) Identify good practice from evidence in applications and promote dissemination across the University of Suffolk, and broader as relevant
ix) Produces an annual monitoring and evaluation report of the e-PASSPoRT received by the University’s Learning and Teaching Committee at its October meeting

d) Administrator
The PASSPoRT administrator will be responsible for providing administrative support to the Chair and members of the review panel.

The Administrator’s roles and responsibilities include:
i) Inform reviewers of review timeframes, provide access to the relevant submissions and receive review reporting pro formas
ii) Arrange and inform panel members of panel meeting dates, times and locations, and of deadlines for their review processes, as relevant
iii) Minute all panel decisions to Award or Refer.
iv) Make notes of all panel discussions
v) Ensure all decision feedback pro formas are completed and retained in accordance with the University’s Data Protection and Data Security Policy https://www.uos.ac.uk/sites/default/files/Data-Protection-and-Data-Security-Policy.pdf
vi) Help distribute decision feedback sheets to the applicants
vii) Liaise with the HEA to arrange for successful applicants to be recorded by the HEA and be sent the appropriate HEA certificate
viii) Provide the chair with annual data for the annual quality report on, for example, applicant numbers, review processes, panel outcomes and moderation feedback

e) Additional responsibilities of all participants
In addition, all participants will:
i. Support the promotion of the University of Suffolk PASSPoRT scheme and the UKPSF across the institution
ii. Ensure the quality and standards of the University of Suffolk PASSPoRT scheme are upheld through annual monitoring and review
iii. Identify good practice from evidence in applications and promote its dissemination across the University of Suffolk, and broader as relevant

3. Review Processes

a) Review allocation

There will be two Internal Reviewers for D1 and D2 submissions. In the event of a split decision a third Internal Reviewer will also review the application, ideally in advance of the panel meeting.

There will be three Internal Reviewers for D3 submissions. Where the three Internal Reviewers reach a split decision with two reviewers supporting the award and one proposing to refer, the External Reviewer will also review the application.
In addition, the External Reviewer will review a sample of applications across D1, D2 and D3 including at least 25% of D3 applications annually. This will happen in advance of the panel meeting.

See also Figures 1-3 below for illustrations of the review and decision-making processes for D1, D2 and D3.

b) **Conflict of interest**

Each reviewer and panel member should declare any conflict of interest with any applicant at the commencement of review and/or a panel meeting. The Chair will consider and discuss the nature and severity of this conflict with the reviewer or panel member, and will decide whether the person should be excused from the review and/or from any discussions and decisions made related to this applicant.

Written submissions will normally be distributed to reviewers from a different School or professional area for the review process. However, if the reviewer or panel member feels they still have a conflict of interest, they should request the Chair distributes the application to an alternative reviewer/panel member.

c) **Review of written submissions**

Reviewers will access the application as a written submission from the e-PASSPoRT area of the University's online learning environment, Brightspace, in order to undertake each review activity in advance of the panel meeting. The submission will be made accessible to reviewers normally at least 10 working days prior to the panel date.

Submissions will be divided amongst relevant Internal Reviewers (excluding the Chair, who will normally have advanced view of all applications). Two Internal Reviewers will independently review each application for D1 and D2 and each complete a D1 or D2 review proforma. Three Internal Reviewers will independently review each application for D3 and each complete a D3 review proforma.

d) **Panel membership**

e-PASSPoRT panel meetings will be convened, normally three times per annum to consider applications mapped against D1-D3. This membership of this panel is:

i) The e-PASSPoRT Lead (Chair and SFHEA)

ii) The External Reviewer (SFHEA or PFHEA)

iii) The Head of Quality Enhancement (minimum FHEA)

iv) At least 2 Reviewers (FHEA/SFHEA/PFHEA – depending on whether applications are for D1/D2 and/or D3)

The PASSPoRT administrator will act as clerk to the panel.

Panels for D1 and D2 applications will not be quorate unless three members are present including the External Reviewer and at least one Senior Fellow. Panels for D3 applications will not be quorate unless four members are present including the External Reviewer and at least one Senior Fellow.

In exceptional circumstances should the External Reviewer be unable to attend at short notice, the panel present may make a provisional decision on submissions for D1-D3, and the Chair will then discuss the proposed decision with the External Reviewer. Should the External Reviewer agree with the decisions, Chair’s action may be taken to approve the panel decisions.

The Head of Quality Enhancement or nominee will act as the quality officer for the panel, and will monitor the panel members’ adherence to the panel procedures and ensure applications are being assessed appropriately, consistently and equitably against the appropriate UKPSF Descriptors and standards. The Quality member will
monitor and ensure that due process is applied for all applicants. This information will be required for the annual PASSPoRT report and in any appeals made against panel decisions.

All reviewers and panel members will receive training prior to acting in the review process or sitting on the panel. The panel Chair must approve the suitability and appropriateness of all new panel members based upon their level of Fellowship.

4. Decision processes

The review proformas completed by the Internal Reviewers will be accessible to the panel members at or immediately prior to the panel meeting. Normally, discussions of individual submissions should not take place prior to the meeting. If all reviewers agree to accept at D1, D2 and D3, the panel meeting will act to approve the decision(s) and to confirm award of Fellowships of the HEA.

Panel decisions will be made by gaining consensus from the members (excluding the chair). If the panel finds it difficult to gain consensus, the Chair can also contribute to enable a decision to be made.

All decisions are based on the applicant evidencing that their practice aligns with the requirements of the appropriate UKPSF Descriptor including the appropriate dimensions of practice. Applicants must successfully meet all the criteria for the descriptor for which they have applied, to be awarded any HEA Fellowship.

If, for D1 and D2 written submissions, one reviewer accepts and one reviewer suggests refer, a third reviewer will be asked to review and the majority decision will stand. Wherever possible the third review will be carried out in advance of the panel meeting. Otherwise, the panel will approve this decision at the next available panel meeting.

The panel meeting also retains the option to award at D1 for a D2 submission, if they deem the application meets the criteria for D1 (but not for D2) and where the applicant does not already hold Associate Fellowship of the HEA.

If two reviewers accept but one refers for a D3 submission, the submission will be reviewed by the External Reviewer and discussed at the panel meeting. A decision will be made to Award or to Refer, informed by the reviewers’ feedback but led by the External Reviewer.

Review judgements and/or panel decisions on all written submissions will be notified to the applicant with developmental feedback, normally within 10 working days of the panel meeting.

See also Figures 1-3 below for illustration of review and decision-making processes for D1, D2 and D3.

5. Decision outcomes

The decision outcomes following the review process and panel meetings are to either Award or to Refer as detailed below:

**Award:** the relevant descriptor (D1/D2/D3) of the UKPSF has been fully met in order to:

i) **Award Associate Fellow:** meets the required standards for D1.i-vi (for Associate Fellow)

ii) **Award Fellow:** meets the required standards for D2.i-vi (for Fellow)

iii) **Award Senior Fellow:** meets the required standards for D3.i-vii (for Senior Fellow)
The feedback form will clearly indicate the strengths of the application, and may suggest areas for development with a view to the applicant applying, in future, to a higher level Descriptor. Applicants will receive a decision from the panel with the strengths and developmental feedback, normally within 10 working days of the panel meeting.

Refer: the submission does not meet the required standards for Award. Within this there are three recommendations possible:

i) **R1: Requires minor additional evidence to meet the required standard for the descriptor.** If the reviewers and panel members feel the applicant was missing or short on evidence for a maximum of one of the relevant Descriptor statements or sections of the application, they may recommend the applicant only resubmits further written evidence for this statement/section. In this case, once the evidence is provided within an agreed timeframe, it will be reviewed by the Chair and the External Reviewer. If successful at referral, the relevant Fellowship can be approved via Chair’s action.

ii) **R2: Requires a more significant amount of additional evidence but a further application is supported by the panel.** Generally unsuccessful applicants in this category should be encouraged to reapply within a 12 month period and ideally to the next panel. However, if the panel feel a D3 applicant may require a longer period to gain the required experience or evidence, more time may be permitted. The applicant makes a new submission but may use their original submission as the basis for the new application.

iii) **R3: The applicant’s level of experience will not enable achievement of the standard for the Descriptor in the near future and/or the applicant should consider applying for a different Descriptor and category of Fellowship (or it may be suggested they consider undertaking the Learning and Teaching in HE module / Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice (PGCAP)).** The applicant may be encouraged to apply for a more suitable level of Fellowship if possible, or to wait until they have gained sufficient experience to re-apply to the same Descriptor.

The feedback form will clearly indicate the strengths of the application, will suggest the areas requiring development, and will offer potential ways of addressing these areas and potential sources of support. If a referred applicant is required to gain more experience, the nature of this will be identified insofar as is possible.

Applicants will receive the decision from the panel, with the strengths and developmental feedback, normally within 10 working days of the panel meeting. A referred applicant will also have the opportunity to discuss the feedback in more depth with the Chair.

6. **Moderation**

a) **Internal moderation**

Internal moderation will take place to ensure parity of the decision-making process between panels. Following four panel meetings, an internal moderator will review a sample of the written submissions/applications from each panel. A moderation form will be completed and returned to the panel Chair for collation within the annual quality report.

b) **External moderation**

External moderation will be enabled via the External Reviewer, who will review a sample across all applications (D1-D3) ahead of the panel meeting, including at least 25% of D3 applications on an annual basis.
7. Appeals and Complaints

a) Appeals

An applicant can appeal against the decision of the Panel if they feel the process of scrutiny of their application has been unfair and the designated procedure or protocols have not been followed.

Appeals will not be accepted that challenge the professional judgement of the reviewers or Panel members.

Appeals should be made using the University of Suffolk Academic Appeals Procedure
https://mysuffolk.uos.ac.uk/Students/Policies-and-Procedures/Academic-Appeals-Policy.pdf

b) Complaints

Applicant complaints should be made using the University of Suffolk Staff Grievance Procedure
https://my1.ucs.ac.uk/system/files/grievance_procedure_v1.0_aug_2016.pdf

8. Further Information

Further e-PASSPoRT information is at: www.uos.ac.uk/passport and in Brightspace area for e-PASSPoRT at: https://uostest.brightspace.com/d2l/home/11396

You can contact the PASSPoRT Lead, Dr Christine Smith at: christine.smith@uos.ac.uk or the PASSPoRT Administrator, Helen Smith at h.smith4@uos.ac.uk
Review and decision-making processes in e-PASSPoRT pathway for D1 (AFHEA)

**Figure 1: Review and decision-making for Descriptor 1**

Written application of 2000 words + 2 references from Fellows or above

- Both reviewers assess as meeting sufficiency level for D1
- One reviewer assesses as sufficiency level for D1
- One reviewer assesses NOT meeting sufficiency level for D1

Third reviewer appointed and assesses as sufficient for D1

PASSPoRT panel approves review assessments
Decision = Award D1/AFHEA

OR

Application accessed in e-PASSPoRT online space by 2 approved reviewers, both F/SF/PF.
External Reviewer samples D1 applications as part of QA processes ahead of panel and makes final decision in panel to A/R if needed

- Both reviewers assess as NOT meeting sufficiency level for D1
- Third reviewer assesses as NOT sufficient for D1

Panel approves review assessments.
Decision = Refer with feedback (R1/R2/R3)
Review and decision-making processes in e-PASSPoRT pathway for D2 (FHEA)

**Written application of 3000 words plus 2 references from Fellows (D2 or above)**

Application accessed in e-PASSPoRT online space by 2 approved reviewers, both F/SF/PF. External Reviewer samples D2 applications as part of QA processes ahead of panel and makes final decision in panel to A/R if needed

**Both reviewers assess as meeting sufficiency level for D2**

- One reviewer assesses as meeting sufficiency level for D2
- One reviewer assesses as NOT meeting sufficiency level for D2

**Third reviewer appointed and assesses as sufficient for D2**

**Panel approves review assessments**

**Decision = Award D2/FHEA**

**Both reviewers assess as NOT meeting sufficiency level for D2**

**Third reviewer assesses as NOT sufficient for D2**

**Panel approves review assessments**

**Decision = Refer with feedback (R1/R2/R3)**

**May consider award of D1**
Figure 3: Review and decision-making for Descriptor 3

Review and decision-making processes in e-PASSPoRT pathway for D3 (SFHEA)

Written application of 6000 words + 2 references from Fellows (D3 or above)

Application accessed in e-PASSPoRT online space by 3 approved reviewers, all SF/PF. External Reviewer samples D3 applications as part of QA processes (at least 25%) ahead of panel and makes final decision in panel to A/R if needed

All 3 reviewers assess as sufficient for D3

2 reviewers assess as sufficient for D3

1 reviewer assesses NOT meeting sufficiency level for D3

External Reviewer also reviews such split reviews

1 reviewer assesses as sufficient for D3

2 reviewers assess as NOT meeting sufficiency level for D3

Panel approves review assessments
Decision = Refer with feedback (R1/R2/R3)

PASSPoRT panel approves review assessments
Decision = Award D3/SFHEA

All reviewers assess as NOT meeting sufficiency level for D3

OR

OR