

**Guidance** **Notes** **for** **GOLD Mentors**

**D2 Fellowship Mentees**

Thank you for agreeing to mentor your colleague during their application for D2 Fellowship through the University of Greenwich Gold scheme. If your mentee is successful they will be recognised as a Fellow of Advance HE (FHEA). If you have not done so already you must complete the NEW GOLD mentor CPD before you can mentor someone through GOLD. Dates for CPD are on Horizon. If you have any queries, please email [GOLD@greenwich.ac.uk](mailto:GOLD@greenwich.ac.uk) ASAP.

Your mentee should already be familiar with the GOLD process and have attended mandatory mentee development workshop (2 hours online). If they have not you should ask them to book onto this via Horizon ASAP. No claim can be accepted and reviewed if the claimant has not attended the mandatory mentee development workshop. In addition to the mandatory workshop there are optional development opportunities for mentees through GOLD 1-2-1 drop-in sessions and writing retreats. Dates and booking information are on Horizon.

Additional continuing professional development to help you develop as a mentor is available through the GOLD team. To remain compliant with our accreditation from Advance HE all mentors must engage in mandatory annual CPD. Any mentor who does not undertake this essential CPD will be removed from the approved GOLD Mentor pool. Details of CPD sessions for both mentors and mentees can be found at the main GOLD webpage [www.gre.ac.uk/learning-teaching/gold](https://www.gre.ac.uk/learning-teaching/gold)

**The** **role** **of** **the** **mentor** **in** **GOLD**

Your role as mentor is threefold. You are someone with whom your mentee can discuss their evidence development and presentation, and who can offer sensible advice and an independent viewpoint. You will be expected to look at a draft(s) of the submission. You will need to be conversant with the [UK Professional Standards](http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/ukpsf) [Framework (](http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/ukpsf)UKPSF) and Descriptor 2 in order to do this. You are encouraged to meet your mentee and work out a mutually agreeable plan regarding frequency of meetings and a target submission date.

All FHEA mentees must have a teaching observation done by the GOLD Mentor. This can be face-to-face or live online. This may be a lecture, a tutorial, a practical, a one-to-one supervision; in fact any session where they are interacting in real-time with a student or students and in which learning is taking place. The teaching observation is explored further on pages 5 and 6 of these guidance notes.

Finally, as mentor you will provide one of two independent supporting statements about the applicant’s professional practice, corroborating the information they provide in the application, focusing on the applicant’s professional role in relation to learning, teaching, assessment and student support against the six Criteria for Descriptor 2 (for FHEA) on Page 2.

You should only refer to any research activity and outputs insofar as these inform and improve their teaching/supporting of learning. If you undertake an observation of teaching, please include comments from it in your supporting statement, not only describing what the applicant did but also your discussion around it, and how both relate to the knowledge and value dimensions in the UKPSF.

Please complete your supporting statement on the GOLD reference supporting statement. This is available as a separate download on the GOLD website at: [www.gre.ac.uk/learning-teaching/gold](https://www.gre.ac.uk/learning-teaching/gold)

This is an open reference so please make sure it is electronically signed and e-mailed as a pdf to the applicant so it can be included with their application. The panel may wish to contact you about your supporting statement.

**Fellowship** **Criteria**

The GOLD Fellowship criteria align with Descriptor 2 (D2) of the [UK](https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/guidance/teaching-and-learning/ukpsf)

[Professional Standards Framework:](https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/guidance/teaching-and-learning/ukpsf)

For more info see [www.advance-he.ac.uk/guidance/teaching-and-learning/ukpsf](http://www.advance-he.ac.uk/guidance/teaching-and-learning/ukpsf)

**Descriptor 2 Fellows** demonstrate a thorough understanding of effective approaches to teaching and learning support as a key contribution to high quality student learning. They should be able to provide evidence of:

1. **Successful engagement across all five Areas of Activity**
2. **Appropriate knowledge and understanding across all aspects of Core Knowledge**
3. **A commitment to all the Professional Values**
4. **Successful engagement in appropriate teaching practices related to the Areas of Activity**
5. **Successful incorporation of subject and pedagogic research and/or scholarship within the above activities, as part of an integrated approach to academic practice**
6. **Successful engagement in continuing professional development activity related to teaching, learning, assessment and, where appropriate, related professional practices.**

The Dimensions of the [**UK Professional Standards Framework**](https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/guidance/teaching-and-learning/ukpsf) are organised as follows:

• **Areas** **of** **Activity** ***(What*** ***they*** ***do)***

• **Core** **Knowledge** ***(What’s*** ***in*** ***their*** ***head)***

• **Professional** **Values** ***(What’s*** ***in*** ***their*** ***heart)***

**Areas** **of** **Activity**

**A1** Design and plan learning activities and/or programmes of study

**A2** Teach and/or support learning

**A3** Assess and give feedback to learners

**A4** Develop effective learning environments and approaches to student support and guidance

**A5** Engage in continuing professional development in subjects/disciplines and their pedagogy, incorporating research, scholarship and the evaluation of professional practices

**Core** **Knowledge**

**K1** The subject material

**K2** Appropriate methods for teaching, learning and assessing in the subject area and at the level of the academic programme

**K3** How students learn, both generally and within their subject/disciplinary area(s)

**K4** The use and value of appropriate learning technologies

**K5** Methods of evaluating the effectiveness of teaching

**K6** Implications of quality assurance and quality enhancement for academic and professional practice with a particular focus on teaching

**Professional** **Values**

**V1** Respect for individual learners and diverse learning communities

**V2** Promote participation in higher education and equality of opportunity for learners

**V3** Use evidence-informed approaches and the outcomes from research, scholarship and continuing professional development

**V4** Acknowledge the wider context in which higher education operates recognising the implications for professional practice

**Mentee** **Overview** **of** **the** **GOLD** **Recognition** **Process**

As a mentor it is important to understand the process your mentee needs to go through to gain recognition. The following stages are explained at the mandatory Mentee Development Workshop and are in the D2 FHEA Participant Handbook.

**Stage 1- Understand the GOLD process**

• Explore GOLD webpages [www.gre.ac.uk/learning-teaching/gold](http://www.gre.ac.uk/learning-teaching/gold) including familiarising yourself with the UKPSF and Descriptor 2

• Attend the mandatory GOLD Mentee Development workshop. In preparation you should complete the AHE Fellowship category tool before attending. This is available at [www.advance-he.ac.uk/form/fellowship-decision-tool](http://www.advance-he.ac.uk/form/fellowship-decision-tool)

• Identify your GOLD mentor from the current pool of trained, approved GOLD mentors within your faculty (talk to your line manager about this in the first instance)

• Obtain your line manager’s signature on the Registration of Intent (RoI) form and submit the RoI to the GOLD team via [GOLD@greenwich.ac.uk](mailto:GOLD@greenwich.ac.uk)

**Stage 2- Develop your claim for D2 Associate Fellowship**

• Undertake an observation of teaching with your Mentor. This should be within 12 months of submitting your RoI to ensure it reflects current practice

• Prepare your GOLD claim (via the written or via a recorded screencast)

• Take advantage of optional GOLD drop-in and /or a GOLD writing retreats for further feedback and development opportunities

• Draft your claim. Share your GOLD claim with your Mentor for feedback. Go through the D1/D2 pre-submission checklist with your mentor

**Stage 3- Submit your claim for D2 Fellowship**

• Share your final version with your mentor and second referee to allow them to confirm it before they write their supporting statements

• Submit your claim with your 2 supporting statements via [GOLD@greenwich.ac.uk](mailto:GOLD@greenwich.ac.uk)

• There are 4 submission points per year (September, November, April and June) for reviewing

• Your claim is sent to 2 trained, approved GOLD reviewers for them to review

**Stage 4- Panel decision on your evidence**

* There are 2 reviewers in a panel. Each reviewer reviews your claim independently before convening to share their judgement with the other
* In very rare cases where consensus cannot be reached a 3rd trained, approved GOLD reviewer from the Academic & Learning Enhancement (ALE) team will be used to review and provide a casting vote, with a majority decision being used to determine the final outcome
* Candidates using the recorded screencast option will have their recording made available to 2 reviewers for them to view. The same judgement process is used as for written applications i.e. against the Descriptor for FHEA (D2)
* The review panel determines the outcome: Recognised or Not yet recognised (same for written and screencast formats)
* A sample of reviewed claims are sent to the External Examiner for moderation after each submission point i.e. 4 times throughout the year
* Following moderation and approval of the judgments made by the reviewers by the External Examiner, the review outcome of Recognised or Not yet recognised is communicated to candidates in a letter along with feedback and recommendations

If your mentee is unsuccessful, they will have the opportunity to resubmit. Reviewer feedback will be specific and actionable. Your mentee will have 6 weeks to do this. They will be required to meet the specific feedback provided by the reviewers i.e. not to start a new claim from scratch. The word limit is increased to enable candidates’ space to provide the additional evidence required in their revised application. Resubmissions for D2 claims are permitted an additional 300 words for the reflective commentary.

A resubmission 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 (D2) 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. A covering letter (email) indicating these changes should also accompany the resubmission to indicate where/how changes have been made. Unless the feedback specifically requires it, your mentor Supporting Statement would not have to be written again.

**Teaching Observation**

Teaching observation is acknowledged as a developmental, formative process which can provide valuable feedback and opportunities for reflection on teaching. It can also be used to demonstrate that particular standards or criteria have been met. Both of these aims apply in the context of the GOLD scheme for Advance HE accreditation. Specifically, the purpose of the observation session is to:

1. Provide a basis for a reflective discussion with the mentor on how the mentee’s teaching practice meets the UKPSF three strands of professional activity, knowledge and values.
2. Provide the mentor with an appropriate example of the candidate’s teaching practice in order to inform the mentor reference.
3. Substantiate the candidate’s claim to meet the UKPSF

**Before** **the** **Observation**

You will need to agree a suitable teaching session for the observation with the mentee. A choice will need to be made as to which type of teaching is to be observed (eg a lecture, a laboratory session, a one-to-one supervision) in order to best demonstrate the claims being made.

We recommend that you establish protocols on the following, as each case may be different:

1. What information will be given to students regarding your presence as an observer
2. How and when you will give feedback to the applicant.

Sometime before the observation, your mentee should communicate their plan for the teaching session to you. This need not involve a formal lesson plan (although that is best practice) but should tell you *the* *aim* of the session, *what* *learning* will take place (*learning* *outcomes* are good for this), and some notion of *the* *session’s* *structure*. Do comment on the plan if appropriate – it is often the best time to suggest improvements.

**During** **the** **observation**

You are encouraged to make your own notes about your mentee and their teaching. These observation notes are not required as part of the submission process, but you may seek to incorporate them as examples or as part of a broader narrative in your supporting statement. Remember we are looking for effective teaching, not perfect teaching. The bottom line: Is it working? Are the students learning? The process is quite informal, so there is no need for an “official” observation proforma.

**After** **the** **observation**

Try to meet up to discuss the session as soon as possible afterwards. Begin by asking the applicant how they thought the session went. Give them space to share their reflections with you. Share your own perceptions and suggestions with them. Engage them in critical but supportive discussion.

**Mentor:** **Mentee** **Pre-submission** **checklist** **for** **D2** **GOLD** **applications**

Before your mentee submits their GOLD application, mentors and mentees are strongly recommended to run through this checklist together to ensure both parties are happy with the application, and to check that all of the required elements of the application are complete before sending off for review. If there are any questions that you give a NO to, you are recommended to discuss this with your mentee and devise an action plan with your mentee to resolve any outstanding issues before final submission. If you have any queries you are encouraged to contact one of the GOLD team for advice ([GOLD@gre.ac.uk](mailto:GOLD@gre.ac.uk)).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Questions to ask** | **What to check** | **Y/N** |
| **Supporting statement**  NB. The supporting statements are there to support the application, not to fill in any gaps in the application itself. They provide evidence of authentication of practice.  NB. Both supporting statements should ideally broadly align with each other, not contradict each other | - Are there 2 supporting statements? (one from the mentor, one from a referee)  - Are they both on the GOLD supporting statements template?  - Are they the right length (1 side A4 for FHEA)  - Are the supporting statements mapped to the UKPSF/relevant descriptor?  - Do they corroborate and positively support the application?  - Does the mentor supporting statement specifically talk about the observation of teaching? |  |
| **Is it a personal account?**  NB. The application is supposed to be a personal account of the mentees practice as a teacher/supporter of learning in HE, not an academic essay | - Is the application written in the first person e.g. “I did, I think, I wondered, I reflected, I thought, I realised, I felt…”  - Does it contain personal practices and experiences of the mentee?  - Does the application show a range of examples and/or experiences about the mentees teaching practice? |  |
| **Is it individual?**  NB. The application should be individual and not too general about their team/department/practice education setting | - Is the application focused on how the mentee teaches/supports HE learning?  - If collaborative activities are mentioned, does it explicitly emphasise the particular role/contribution of the mentee? |  |
| **Is it reflective?**  NB. Strong applications often use a reflective model style of narrative e.g. Rolfe “What? So what? Now what?”  NB. Check that it is not a ‘shopping list’ of what the mentee does without any reflections | - Does the application go beyond describing practice?  - Does the application spell out what the mentee does and why?  - If the mentees practice has changed over time, does it say how and why and what informed any change?  - Does it spell out how the mentee knows that their practice is effective?  - Is it professionally self-critical? |  |
| **Impact?**  Good applications include evidence of impact e.g. evasys data? EE comments? Student or colleague feedback/testimonial? Feedback from a validation panel report? Change in pass rates/student performance following an intervention they designed? Nominations/winner of teaching awards? | - Does the application show evidence of impact of their practice? |  |
| **Is** **it** **scholarly?**  NB. All applications must include some relevant learning and teaching literature citations. It is likely that these will be up to date and/or come from well-respected authors and thinkers in the HE pedagogy/education literature corpus  Good applications demonstrate understanding and do not merely slot in a few key names/theories without really demonstrating understanding/correct application | - Does the application show how the mentees teaching and learning practices have a rationale and are informed by pedagogic research/ theory/concepts/evidence?  - Does the application justify their practice pedagogically? |  |
| **Is** **it** **evidence-based?**  NB. Examples could include professional bodies, discipline research, learned societies, UoG policy e.g. A&F, inclusivity etc., NSS, TEF, OfS, QAA subject benchmarks, SEEC level descriptors etc. | - Does the application show how the mentee evaluates their own practice?  - Does the application include evidence from the sector/HE T&L landscape to support the narratives? |  |
| **Does** **it** **meet** **Descriptor** **category** **requirements?** | - Does the application align to D1?  - Is the evidence provided at the appropriate level for the Descriptor? |  |
| **Is** **it** **aligned** **to** **the** **UKPSF?**  NB. The evidence being presented to claim for all dimensions of the UKPSF must be **explicit**. | - Are **all** appropriate dimensions covered in sufficient depth?  - Does the application articulate the connections with the UKPSF effectively and appropriately to the descriptor level?  - Are **all** required dimensions correctly mapped within the narrative for the Areas of Activity?  - Is the mapping in the narrative in situ and not overmapped? e.g. one big bracket at the end with many/all dimensions) |  |
| **Is** **evidence** **current** **and** **sufficient?**  NB. It is generally recommended that 3 years is OK for currency. Candidates might refer to older experiences, but this must be relevant to the practice that they are talking about now. Be wary of including evidence that is too recent; it can be harder to evaluate impact | - Does the application include evidence from the last 3 years of practice? |  |
| **Commitment** **to** **on-going** **development** **and** **maintaining** **good** **standing**  Is it a ‘shopping list’ of courses/CPD attended, or have they made connections between it and their own practice (actual or intended)? | - Does the application show engagement with relevant, L&T related CPD in the recent past?  - Does the application talk about how the mentee has used the CPD to inform their L&T practice?  - Does the application indicate a clear commitment to on-going development as a teacher and/or supporter of learning in HE? (this could include HE CPD or CPD from practice/discipline with a L&T emphasis) |  |
| **Overall** | - Does the application meet the descriptor and all of the relevant dimensions (Core Knowledge and Values)?  - Is there sufficient range and breadth of evidence, specifically for Areas of Activity?  - Is the evidence provided at the appropriate level for the Descriptor?  - Are appropriate **impact** and **effectiveness** demonstrated, either explicitly or implicitly, in the evidence presented?  - Are these qualities addressed by the supporting statements?  - Is the application within the word limits/time limit (for a screen cast)? This includes filling in every word count box on the application form  - Has the password and a correct working link been supplied for accessing a screen cast recording?  - Has it got everything (supporting statements? Signature?)  - Is the application on the correct and current version of the application form?  - Are there any attachments that are not required? (appendices, CVs. etc. should NOT be attached. Only the form and the x2 supporting statements). Anything appended that is not required will NOT be opened/read  - Has the context statement been provided. Remember this must not have mapping to any dimensions  - Has the action plan been completed? |  |