

Assessing the impact of accreditation on institutions

Literature review

University of Plymouth Enterprise Ltd:
Rebecca Turner and Lucy Spowart

Contents

1.	Introduction	3
2.	Search strategy	5
2.1	Search histories	7
3.	Overview of the literature	8
4.	Accounts of accredited CPD Schemes operating in UK universities	10
5.	Non-academic staff engaging in accredited CPD schemes	13
6.	Accounts of accredited CPD Schemes operating internationally	15
7.	Institutional practice to support accredited CPD schemes	16
8.	Support for those engaging with accredited CPD schemes	16
9.	Benefits of accredited CPD schemes	17
10.	Factors shaping the impact of accredited CPD	19
11.	Conclusion	20
11.1	Limitations in the research	20
11.2	Areas for future research	21
12.	Core references	22
13.	Supplementary references	24
14.	Appendix: Table 2: Overview of literature	26

1. Introduction

This literature review forms part of a project funded by Advance HE to assess the impact of its accreditation to award fellowships in the context of the UK Professional Standards Framework for Teaching and Supporting Learning (UKPSF). There has been substantial research examining the development, experiences and impact of accredited postgraduate teaching courses, both in the UK and internationally (eg Parsons et al, 2012). However, institutional accreditation has rarely been considered. Instead, it is often examined indirectly through studies centred on accredited continuous professional development (CPD) schemes designed to facilitate the professional recognition of individuals. Hence, the primary focus of this literature review will be on accredited CPD schemes. Where relevant, the implications for institutional accreditation practices will be drawn out explicitly, or used to frame the concluding recommendations/areas for future work.

Institutional accreditation is an integral part of moves to professionalise teaching and learning in higher education (HE). The agenda to professionalise teaching and learning seeks to address a number of concerns that became entrenched in the sector in the late 1990s: the dominance of research over teaching; the lack of appropriate rewards and recognition for teaching; the informal and peripheral nature of much teaching-related CPD in universities (Peat, 2014); and concerns over teaching quality (Kandlbinder and Peseta, 2009; Parsons et al, 2012; Shaw, 2018).

The Staff and Educational Development Association (SEDA) was an early advocate of accredited teaching courses through its Teaching Accreditation scheme (the precursor of their Professional Development Framework). This scheme developed a framework through which values identified as core to university teaching were embedded (Wisdom et al, 2013). The Teacher Accreditation process was taken up primarily by teaching-focused institutions, and SEDA's efforts were recognised in the Dearing Report (1997), which advocated the development of a professional body for HE teachers (NCIHE, 1997). Dearing's vision was for this professional body to define standards and accredit training for university teachers, with probationary lecturers expected to meet a minimum standard as part of their training (Wisdom et al, 2013). Although this was never enshrined in law, this recommendation has shaped the probationary practices used by many universities across the UK (Wisdom et al, 2013). Indeed, many of the recommendations proposed by Dearing shaped the agenda to professionalise teaching and learning in English HE, in particular, and still have an impact today.

Institutional accreditation is part of a suite of activities and initiatives that have, over the intervening time, sought to address these concerns, professionalise the practice of teaching in HE and give credence to teaching-related CPD (Clegg, 2003; Quinn, 2012). The overall goal of many of these activities is to promote a collegiate and collaborative environment that will ultimately enhance the student experience. In the UK, institutional accreditation has become firmly embedded in the sector, and gaining professional recognition aligned to the UK Professional Standards Framework (UKPSF) is now a prerequisite for many new lecturers, as well as for those seeking career progression (Peat, 2013). Accreditation with Advance HE is increasingly common globally with 26 international institutions accredited at the time of this research.

Although increasingly prevalent, accreditation is also contentious. Harvey (2004, 208-9) described accreditation as “highly political”, stating it was leading to a “shift of power [...] concealed behind new public management ideology cloaked in consumerist demand and European conformity.” Likewise, Locke (2014) described accreditation as enforced, imposed and prescriptive, whereas Spowart et al (2019) believe that, in the case of HE teaching, accreditation is part of wider moves to ensure that academics are as well qualified as educators as they are researchers. These diverse positions, and many in between, impact institutional and individual engagement with accreditation, and form part of the wider context that shapes accreditation practices.

Professional recognition can be gained through multiple routes, reflecting the complex landscape in which accreditation has both developed and currently operates. For the new lecturer, professional recognition has historically been associated with a teaching course such as a postgraduate teaching qualification. Increasingly though, both new teaching staff and established lecturers are seeking professional recognition via accredited CPD schemes, which represent an experiential route to gaining Advance HE Fellowship. Professional recognition is also increasingly being sought by those who support teaching and learning but perhaps do not have teaching as their primary focus (such as learning technologists, librarians and research students). For an institution to be able to award Fellowship through either route it needs to be a full member of Advance HE, and have its institutional provision (be it an academic taught programme, experiential or both) reviewed and approved by Advance HE.

The accreditation and reaccreditation process assesses an institution’s commitment to the UKPSF by considering the role of the UKPSF in institutional policies and strategies, and in the reward and recognition of staff. Institutions must demonstrate a commitment to the continual development of staff who teach and support learning. Accredited provision must be supported by adequate resource and there must be robust processes in place for making reliable and valid judgements against the criteria (Advance HE, 2019). This allows institutions to deliver an academic taught programme

or accredited CPD scheme and award HEA Fellowship in one of four categories, each aligned to the descriptors of the UKPSF.

Accreditation is an established feature of many professions, such as nursing and medicine (Clegg, 2003). However, in HE, both in the UK and internationally, it remains a relatively recent phenomena (Peat, 2013; Cardoso et al, 2015). Indeed, though new lecturers have, for some time, gained Fellowship through accredited courses dating back to the early days of SEDA's teaching accreditation scheme, the recognition of experienced academics through accredited CPD schemes has only gained momentum since the relaunch of the UKPSF in 2011. Institutions could then begin to provide recognition for established staff. Before this time, such recognition could only be gained through direct applications made on an individual basis to the Higher Education Academy. This change, as a number of authors comment (eg Spowart et al, 2016), represented a stepwise change in the significance of professional recognition, and therefore the importance of institutional accreditation. Once again, it reflected political moves to raise the status of teaching and learning (Browne, 2010; Gibbs, 2010). Consequently, the literature tracking the history, development and impact of accreditation on HE is somewhat scant.

2. Search strategy

A literature search was conducted across seven online databases containing content relevant to HE. The search comprised two blocks: terms for the accrediting body or scheme and terms for accreditation or fellowship. Terms were searched across fields including title, abstract and keywords. The searches were conducted on 11 April 2020 by an information specialist. Results were duplicated in EndNote.

Table 1 summarises the stages of the review. This process generated 116 potential sources. Based on initial inclusion criteria (concerned with the impact or effects of accreditation), a review of abstracts by the authors resulted in the elimination of more than three quarters of these documents.

Table 1: Search results by database

Database	Interface	Results
British Education Index	EBSCOhost	25
ERIC	EBSCOhost	35
Educational Administration abstracts	EBSCOhost	7
Education abstracts	EBSCOhost	45
Australian Education Index	Proquest	5
Scopus	Elsevier	34
Web of Science	Clarivate Analytics	19
		Total results: 144 Total after deduplication: 116

2.1 Search histories

Search histories

Date of searches: 11 April 2020

British Education Index

TX ("Advance HE" OR "Higher Education Academy" OR HEA OR "UKPSF" OR "Professional standards framework") AND TX (accredit* or fellow*)

ERIC

TX ("Advance HE" OR "Higher Education Academy" OR HEA OR "UKPSF" OR "Professional standards framework") AND TX (accredit* or fellow*)

Educational Administration Abstracts

TX ("Advance HE" OR "Higher Education Academy" OR HEA OR "UKPSF" OR "Professional standards framework") AND TX (accredit* or fellow*)

Education abstracts

TX ("Advance HE" OR "Higher Education Academy" OR HEA OR "UKPSF" OR "Professional standards framework") AND TX (accredit* or fellow*)

Australian Education Index

("Advance HE" OR "Higher Education Academy" OR HEA OR "UKPSF" OR "Professional standards framework") AND (accredit* OR fellow*)

Scopus

(TITLE-ABS-KEY ("Advance HE" OR "Higher Education Academy" OR HEA OR "UKPSF" OR "Professional standards framework") AND TITLE-ABS-KEY (accredit* OR fellow*))

Web of Science

TOPIC: ("Advance HE" OR "Higher Education Academy" OR HEA OR "UKPSF" OR "Professional standards framework") AND TOPIC: (accredit* OR fellow*)

Indexes=SCI-EXPANDED, SSCI, A&HCI, CPCI-S, CPCI-SSH, ESCI

Timespan=All years

The resulting list of 116 texts was examined with reference to their aims, methods and findings, and screened for their relevance. This process led to further elimination, in particular due to screening out the large number of articles that were focused on the American Higher Education Act. A final group of 18 sources forms the basis of the findings outlined in the following sections. These 18 articles represent a mix of empirical research (12) and reflective accounts of CPD schemes (6) (see Table 2). Brief summaries of data collection methods, sample size, participants and other key information are provided in Table 2.

It should be noted that, since 2014, institutions operating accredited CPD schemes have been required to submit an annual CPD review. The latter outlines the institution's perceptions in relation to positive impacts on the institution running the experiential scheme, strengths and areas for development, and identified areas of good practice. For the 2018-19 review an additional question was added. This question, aimed specifically at the DVC/PVC (or equivalent) with institutional responsibility for learning and teaching, focused on how the experiential scheme supported strategic priorities around teaching and learning, and any resulting impacts. These institutional reports are collated into an Annual CPD Review and published on Advance HE's website, to which readers may wish to refer. While the project team drew on this grey literature in the framing of the online survey.

3. Overview of the literature

The literature represents a mix of empirical studies and scholarly reflections from relevant sector bodies that capture the development of institutional accreditation and the contribution it has made to the professionalisation of learning and teaching in HE. The paucity of research that has systematically explored institutional accreditation is immediately apparent. The majority of the empirical studies are relatively small scale, and / or based on a single institution. Hence the decision was taken to include reflective accounts, which are presented from the perspective of either a participant who has successfully engaged with an accredited CPD scheme and gained recognition, or an individual who has worked in an educational development capacity to develop / support an accredited CPD scheme. We also draw on a wider literature base, where relevant, to contextualise and frame the discussions of these articles, such as, for example, the Turner et al (2013) report commissioned by the Higher Education Academy. In general, these articles were all published since the relaunch of the UKPSF in 2011, a critical moment in the movement to professionalise teaching and learning (Peat, 2015).

The impact of institutional accreditation is often implicit rather than examined explicitly within the literature reviewed. The focus is primarily on the accredited CPD scheme, considering issues such as: the experiences of delivering the CPD scheme; support for the scheme (from the perspectives of academic departments, educational development units and institutional buy-in); institutional provision; and individuals' experiences of engaging with the accredited CPD scheme. There are no examples of systematic evaluation of CPD schemes or institutional accreditation. Indeed, much of the extant literature represents scholarly reflections or accounts of developing and implementing provision following accreditation, with the wider role of institutional accreditation rarely considered.

There are two routes through which assessment of an application for professional recognition via an accredited CPD scheme can be assessed: a traditional, paper-based application or portfolio, or through professional dialogue or a combination of both. Professional dialogue is becoming a more widely used method of evaluating Fellowship claims/applications. It is perceived as encouraging a respectful and collegiate approach to reviewing individual's practice, which can serve to foster an individual's pedagogic identity (Smart et al, 2019). Three empirical studies (Asghar and Pilkington, 2018; Pilkington, 2019; and Smart et al, 2019) have sought to examine the role and impact of professional dialogue on those engaged in the recognition process through this route. These studies were reviewed but have not been included here as they focused primarily on the processes of gaining recognition, the impacts on the individual, including their experiences of dialogic review and recommendations for the future development of dialogic assessment practices. This was identified as beyond the scope of this literature review and the overarching aims of the project.

The review that follows is structured around six key themes that emerged and which have relevance to factors influencing institutional accreditation, the potential benefits and some of the limiting factors. While there is a body of research that focuses on the impact of taught courses (such as Postgraduate Certificates and other initial professional development provision) that may also form part of an institution's accredited provision with Advance HE, these have also not been considered here. This is due to the search strategy employed, and the rather tenuous link with the overall aims of this project. As a reminder, the overarching aim of the project is to determine the impact of institutional Advance HE accreditation on institutions, rather than on individuals.

4. Accounts of accredited CPD Schemes operating in UK universities

Single institutional accounts (either reflective discussions or empirical studies) of accredited CPD schemes have been the primary focus of the majority of the empirical work, with 15 of the 18 articles falling into this category. As Table 2 demonstrates, these studies vary in scale, scope and the methods employed. The majority of these studies have been undertaken in the UK, although as institutional accreditation has extended globally, international studies have emerged. Both UK and international articles are reviewed below, as well as a range of institution-types. That said, the majority of the UK-based studies have been undertaken by teaching-focused universities. Twelve of these articles include a range of staff (eg academics, managers, and professional support staff) as participants in these studies. A further three articles explored the experiences of specific staff groups of gaining professional recognition through CPD Schemes.

Spowart et al (2016) published the first of such studies. Interviews were undertaken with 19 staff, representing academics, professional support staff and managers of teaching and learning, to explore their motivations and experiences of gaining professional recognition. The study demonstrated the complex interplay of factors that impacted on individuals' experiences of gaining recognition. These included institutional and political drivers and the desire for recognition, as well as advocates realising the value of role modelling. The varying level of impacts on individuals' careers and professional development were also highlighted. These are themes that have been revisited and reported in subsequent work (eg Botham 2018a, 2018b; Shaw, 2018), with broadly similar methods used in each case (eg qualitative working using a combination of questionnaires/surveys to a wider population, with purposeful sampling used to identify interview participants who were the subject of more detailed analysis).

Botham's (2018a, 2018b) articles drew on data gathered to evaluate an accredited CPD scheme, considering issues such as reward and recognition, impacts on practice and professional development (2018a), as well as exploring factors that affect engagement with the CPD scheme (2018b). Botham's work was based on an initial questionnaire distributed to all staff who had submitted an application for recognition through the CPD scheme, and then interviews with a purposeful sample of six staff selected to be representative of the six faculties within the university. In particular, the latter paper explored patterns of engagement in the CPD scheme, including a consideration of applicants who had successfully gained fellowship, as well as those who had deferred their application.

The findings reported in the article exploring perceived impacts (2018a) again echoed those of Spowart et al (2016). Gaining recognition was regarded as beneficial to the institution to signify externally a commitment to learning and teaching. It was also seen as affording individual benefits, in that it provided formal recognition for a commitment to teaching and learning. This was cited as particularly important for those in support roles, conferring a sense of professional validation, giving individuals the confidence to share their work, engage in debates around teaching and learning, and further develop their practice. Again though, the extent to which practice changed depended on the individual, and though Botham (2018a) reported that, following recognition, individuals felt confident to undertake activities such as peer mentoring or pedagogic innovation, beyond this, wider impacts of gaining recognition through the CPD scheme appeared to be limited (Botham, 2018a).

The second Botham (2018b) article documented factors that both supported and also impeded the process of gaining fellowship. Though many of the issues highlighted were not new and were reported elsewhere in studies of teaching-related CPD (eg time, lack of support), here they were considered from the perspective of engaging with an accredited CPD scheme. At the study institution, there was an imperative for staff to gain a recognised teaching qualification, with some departments even setting targets around this. However, promotion pathways were yet to explicitly acknowledge this. Instead, the emphasis on research productivity over teaching achievements remained in relation to career advancement, and this was identified as “inhibiting engagement”. Local departmental culture was highlighted as determining whether individuals felt they were supported to gain recognition, and whether it was valued by the department and peers (Botham, 2018b). Intrinsic motivation to gain a teaching qualification, and effective mentorship, both emerged as promoting engagement and encouraging success for those engaged in the accredited CPD scheme. Support factors are explored in greater detail below, but from Botham’s (2018b) article these factors emerged as key to successful engagement with the CPD scheme.

The articles written by van der Sluis et al (2016, 2017) present the outcomes of an evaluation of the Kingston Academic Practice Standards framework (KAPS) operating at Kingston University. The 2016 article is a largely reflective piece, which presents an overview of KAPS and factors that supported its implementation, as well as describing the evaluation methodology. It presented a general discussion of data collected through a questionnaire to explore the motivations of participants for engaging with KAPS, and considered, through a series of interviews, how these findings were built upon. These interviews were held with a purposeful sample of six senior academics with managerial responsibility six months after they had gained recognition as Senior Fellows (SFHEA). The interviews revealed that although there was a strong institutional steer for participants to engage with KAPS, the majority of academics also participated to learn more about teaching and undertake CPD. Interestingly, they reported that many had engagement with KAPS embedded within appraisal objectives

or needed to gain accreditation to secure career progression (van der Sluis et al, 2016). In terms of identifying impacts on practice, a brief discussion of the survey responses highlighted common impacts such as engaging with scholarly literature, collaborating with peers and sharing practice.

Van der Sluis et al (2017) presented a more detailed account of the questionnaire responses, and discussed the outcomes of interviews undertaken with those who had obtained SFHEA through KAPS. Specifically, this article considered impacts on practice. Participants reported changes made to practice following engagement with the KAPS process, but these changes were centred on their own practice. Less than a third of (questionnaire) respondents felt they had been able to make changes to departmental or institutional practice through the KAPS. They concluded that KAPS was more relevant to individuals' professional role and reputation as teachers. A notable outcome reflected the profile of the interview participants in that they were in leadership positions and had gained SFHEA through KAPS. They felt that engagement in the scheme ensured the ethos of the UKPSF could be carried forward in departmental and institutional practice, as well as ensuring role models for teaching and learning were present across the institution.

Shaw (2018, 151) presented the outcomes of 19 in-depth interviews undertaken with teaching staff to examine "practices involved in participation" in an institutional CPD scheme, in the Faculty of Health and Social Sciences at Leeds Beckett University. These interviews demonstrated the impacts of institutional levers in engendering engagement. Appraisal processes were identified as both stimulating and shaping engagement with the accredited CPD scheme. Shaw reported that when respondents were required to engage in order to comply with a target, or as a gateway to promotion, they were strategic, focusing on the demands of the scheme and developing narratives, rather than developing practice. For these respondents, Shaw concluded that no real change in practice would result. However, other respondents spoke of the process of developing an application as enabling them to focus on aspects of practice, as well as identifying potential wider impacts. It was in these instances where development could occur. Shaw concluded that there was a need to refocus the CPD scheme, and recognition process, to allow it to be more forward thinking and developmental, rather than retrospective and affirmatory. The CPD scheme should be concentrated on how practices of reflection could be aligned more closely with everyday practice, alongside reinforcing the idea of remaining in good standing through CPD (Shaw, 2018).

Prince (2013) presented an autobiographical account of her experiences of writing and submitting a portfolio for recognition at the University of Cumbria. There was a strong sense of her developmental journey through the process of gaining recognition and this sought to humanise the experience of gaining recognition for others considering or engaged in the process. She captured both the practical aspects and the reality of the

process. Importantly, she documented the challenges she experienced in analysing and interrogating her practice, her experiences of referral and the learning that occurred through the recognition process.

The proliferation of single institutional case studies has provided a solid evidence base on which future practice and research can build. Indeed, the presence of these datasets created the opportunity for a collaborative and comparative study undertaken by Spowart et al (2019). This study drew on data collected at three universities, which explored the impacts of engagement with an accredited CPD scheme on participants' professional development, practices and beliefs, and the impact of institutional culture on engagement with the CPD scheme. This study involved a secondary analysis of interview transcripts originally collected through three individual studies.

The accredited CPD schemes in each of the three institutions were individually perceived as creating valuable opportunities for professional development. However, this development was mediated by the particular institutional culture, as this often drove engagement. Individuals were engaging because they felt they should be leading by example, or were obliged to gain recognition because of the role they held, yet undertaking the necessary work with little additional support (ie workload relief). Spowart et al (2019) concluded that, with the advent of the Teaching Excellence Framework and the increasing focus on staff credentials, there was a risk that engagement could become increasingly for the benefit of the institution rather than the individual, and there was a need to mediate this risk.

5. Non-academic staff engaging in accredited CPD schemes

Accredited CPD schemes are acknowledged to be avenues through which professional recognition can be achieved that is both inclusive and accessible (Beckmann, 2016; Peat, 2014; Shaw, 2018). Other forms of recognition, such as prizes or awards (eg National Teaching Fellowships or student nominated teaching awards) that have developed as part of moves to raise the status of teaching and learning are often competitive, selective and limited in their availability (Madriaga and Morley, 2016; Seppale and Smith, 2020). By contrast, individual recognition aligned to the UKPSF, and the associated categories of Fellowship, are designed to be non-hierarchical in that they recognise an individual's contribution to teaching, learning and the student experience, not solely the role they hold (Peat, 2014). This has afforded many individuals working in roles to support teaching and learning (such as learning technologists, librarians, specialist technicians) the opportunity to gain professional recognition that otherwise would not be attainable (Hall, 2017; George and Rowland,

2019; Savage, 2019). This echoes the findings of the work of Botham (2018a), Spowart et al (2016) and Shaw (2018).

Several small-scale studies and reflective accounts, presented by individuals from across a range of support roles, have explored both the opportunities for recognition and the impact of gaining recognition on individuals' professional standing and their sense of validation. George and Rowland's (2019) reflective article focused on librarians in health professions. They advocated accredited CPD schemes as providing external validation of librarians' work as educators, enhancing the status of librarians to academics and also providing access to a supportive community of practice. The article considered the need for librarians to work as dual professionals to maintain currency as both information specialists and educators, with Fellowship identified as the route to achieving this. Similarly, Hall's (2017) article was based on her experience of gaining recognition through Queensland University of Technology, thus representing an international perspective on professional services engaging with an accredited CPD scheme. Hall considered librarianship as a changing profession, creating the need for CPD as educators to ensure individuals were adequately prepared for teaching and supporting student learning. Professional validation and membership of a community of practice emerged as key benefits of gaining professional recognition, all of which were regarded as integral to supporting individuals' ongoing development as educators (Hall, 2017).

The small-scale study by Savage (2019), based on interviews with four creative arts technicians at the University for the Creative Arts, UK, reported similar findings. Enhanced professional standing, particularly with academics, was regarded by the participants as an important outcome of gaining recognition through the accredited CPD scheme, which for several of the participants stimulated further career development. Individuals' development as educators progressed faster as a result of engaging with literature and reflecting on their practice through the process of developing an application for Fellowship. This was identified as unlikely to have been achieved through other avenues. Savage (2019) highlighted the tensions that emerged with other technical colleagues who questioned the motivations of those seeking recognition through the accredited CPD scheme as there was a sense that those who achieved Fellowship became removed professionally from those who did not see the value in the process.

6. Accounts of accredited CPD Schemes operating internationally

Outside of the UK, in addition to the reflective piece by Hall (2017) (noted above), Buissink et al (2017) examined how the Māori value of *manaaki*¹ was embedded within the accredited CPD scheme (*Ako Aronui*) at Auckland University of Technology (AUT) in New Zealand. In developing this accredited CPD scheme the team sought to uphold Māori knowledge, values and perspectives, while also maintaining the integrity of the UKPSF. The resulting CPD scheme was described as a “fusion of the HEA, AUT and Māori” (p575). Buissink et al (2017) provide a useful account of the journey undertaken by both the HEA and the AUT academic development team. Core aspects of the UKPSF, and how this related to, or connected with Māori traditions were explored. In particular, they focused on how this shaped the organisation and management of the accredited CPD scheme, as well as the impact it had on the process of gaining professional recognition.

The development and implementation of the accredited CPD scheme at the Australian National University was explored by Beckmann (2016) who reflected on the inclusivity of the UKPSF, and the wide-ranging applicability of the Fellowship categories to those teaching *and* supporting learning (echoing the comments of Hall (2017), George and Rowland (2019) and Savage (2019)). In particular, Beckmann (2016) found that providing professional validation for those supporting learning was a significant strength of the accredited CPD scheme, and this was valued by those who felt their contribution to teaching and learning was overlooked. The individual developmental opportunities resulting from engaging in activities, such as reflective practice and peer review, encouraged a forward-thinking attitude to teaching and learning, which could benefit institutional practice. Sustained impacts were also reported, such as the development of a recognised community of educators brought together through the recognition process. The international esteem of the recognition afforded through the CPD scheme proved attractive to participants, and the UKPSF was perceived as providing a shared language to discuss teaching and learning beyond the UK.

¹ *Manaaki* is commonly described as hospitality or kindness to others. Buissink et al (2017) provide a detailed discussion of how this value can be understood in the context of HE.

7. Institutional practice to support accredited CPD schemes

A number of studies, such as Turner et al (2013), advocate the importance of institutional accreditation as legitimising teaching-related CPD. Institutions have been recognised as the main beneficiaries of institutional accreditation for this reason (Turner et al, 2013). To gain institutional accreditation, universities need to demonstrate they have the processes, support and leadership in place to deliver accredited provision (Advance HE, 2019). Institutional accreditation cuts across many facets of teaching and learning. Peat (2015) considered this in a reflective account of implementing a CPD scheme at the University of Roehampton, London. Productive working relationships were fostered across those working in areas such as educational development, human resources, and school and faculty management, as they all worked collectively to embed the systems and structures required to support institutional accreditation (Peat, 2015).

The change in institutional processes, particularly in relation to probation, promotion and career development is a theme visited elsewhere. Shaw (2018) and van der Sluis, Burden and Huet (2016, 2017) report changes to the institutional strategic plans to support institutional accreditation. Strategic change serves to embed and normalise institutional accreditation. However, it is a double-edged sword, as it has potential implications for the way accreditation, and associated CPD activities, are perceived and valued: whether they are viewed as developmental or as a requirement to be policed for an external body (Peat, 2011). This is an issue we will revisit below.

8. Support for those engaging with accredited CPD schemes

Through the literature reviewed, support emerged as a key theme in ensuring recognition could be gained through accredited CPD schemes (Botham, 2018b). However, discussion of support was often nested within the individual studies, and unless focused on specifically, there is a risk that the lessons learned could be overlooked. In part of the framing of the research studies all the empirical articles, and several of the reflective accounts (eg Beckmann, 2016; Buissink et al, 2017), detailed institutional context (eg policy / institutional levers to promote engagement), as well as centralised provision (eg workshops) and department level support (eg mentoring). In particular, several of the reflective pieces provide practical insights into support that is offered and consider how this promoted engagement (eg Beckmann, 2016; Buissink et al, 2017; Peat, 2014; Peat, 2015).

All the accredited CPD schemes require participants to explicitly engage with the UKPSF, in addition to engaging in critical reflection on their teaching practice. For many experienced academics, this is neither regular nor common practice. This reflects the ongoing legacy of the research assessment exercise (the precursor to the Research Excellence Framework) during which time teaching-related CPD was both undervalued and underplayed (Henkel, 2005). Accounts are presented in the following studies of the use of interventions such as writing groups, workshops, peer support / action learning sets (Beckmann, 2016; Peat, 2015) and mentoring (Ashgar and Pilkington, 2017; Beckmann, 2016; Peat, 2015) to support reflective practice. Prince's (2013) autobiographical account, in particular, captures the developmental journey of gaining professional recognition, and the value of skilful support in this process. Experts were identified as integral to participants' success in gaining Fellowship, creating developmental opportunities and stimulating the use of reflective practice.

In particular, Shaw's (2018, 151) account of "zooming in and zooming out" demonstrates how practices of reflection can be fostered that may be both sustained and developed. Likewise, Botham's (2017a, 171) interviewees identified the value of "going backwards to go forward". Overall, participants in the empirical studies reported making changes to their practice following engagement with a CPD scheme. However, what is unclear is the extent to which these changes extend beyond the individual, or whether the practices of reflective practice are sustained once professional recognition is successfully achieved. The approaches discussed by Shaw (2018) and Botham (2017) may provide useful frameworks for this to be promoted within other CPD schemes.

9. Benefits of accredited CPD schemes

Across all of these articles there is a clear sense that gaining professional recognition is beneficial to the majority of participants' practice but the extent to which they promote wider development or enhancement activity is still under debate (Shaw, 2018; Botham, 2017b). Several articles documented the emergence of communities of practice around teaching and learning once an accredited CPD scheme has become established and embedded within institutional structures (eg Beckmann, 2016; Peat, 2015). These communities are proposed as having considerable potential in terms of future pedagogic innovation and development work as they bring together experienced educators. However, discussion or critical examination of these communities in the research literature is limited. Instead they are considered primarily in the reflective articles. Beckmann (2016) observed these communities to be non-judgemental, built on a culture of sharing and therefore having the potential to persist long after participants gained individual recognition. They were cited as developing through a variety of routes; some organically as individuals who were always

interested in teaching and learning become recognised as Senior Fellows and are drawn together through this shared title; or purposefully as institutions draw together a recognised community of teaching experts made visible through an accredited CPD scheme. Regardless of how these develop, the presence of such communities creates a critical mass of recognised teachers on which an institution can draw to support and sustain future innovation. These communities can provide a valuable source of ongoing CPD for members through the practice sharing and networking associated with membership (Peat, 2015).

Accredited CPD schemes were also identified as enabling those that have developed as leaders in teaching and learning, but who may not be working at the level or position traditionally associated with leadership (ie head of department or professor), to gain recognition as leaders in teaching and learning through the award of SFHEA/PFHEA (Beckmann, 2016). Gaining recognition provided what Savage (2019) referred to as “pedagogic credentials” that can enhance the status of those not in traditional academic roles (eg professional support staff) or, as Beckmann (2016) observed, was important for those often overlooked by the traditional systems of reward and recognition used within universities.

These are all important individual benefits that may, either directly or indirectly, result from the recognition process. Many of these benefits are intangible, hard to measure or capture in a way that can be evidenced, and in many cases take substantial time to be realised. In the case of developing communities of practice, they are dependent on a critical mass, or key figures emerging to take on a leadership role or engender participation. Equally they can be shaped by the stance taken by the individual participating in the recognition process, and the extent to which they value and feel the process is valued (as explored by Botham, 2018b). Hence why many (eg Turner et al, 2013; Van der Sluis et al, 2017) feel that while there are numerous individual benefits, the main beneficiaries of accreditation are the institutions.

We cannot discuss these benefits without highlighting what many perceive to be the potentially flawed assumption that gaining professional recognition ensures high-quality teaching. Indeed, this is not an assumption particular to the UK, but is reflected internationally, as similar moves to professionalise teaching and learning are replicated globally (Cardoso, Tavares and Sin, 2015; McAleese et al, 2013). As Thornton (2014) acknowledges, there is no simple correlation between reflective practice and being a good practitioner, but there is evidence to suggest there are benefits from reflection. As reflective practice underpins the recognition process, the benefits highlighted to individual practice should hold true. Nevertheless, several other factors can work to mediate the impact of engagement in institutional accredited provision, positively or negatively, both at the level of the individual and at the level of the institution.

10. Factors shaping the impact of accredited CPD

Primarily, the stance taken by an institution is a significant factor, determining both institutional support and also the level of buy in and engagement with accreditation activities across all staff groups. This is an issue that has persisted in the literature following the early moves to introduce accreditation since the Dearing Report, and persists today (eg Botham, 2018b; Spowart et al, 2019). It partly reflects the external drivers shaping the professionalisation of teaching and learning (eg the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) and the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) in the UK) and how institutions respond to these (Spowart et al, 2019). For example, the requirement for institutions to report to HESA on the number of staff possessing a 'teaching qualification' has resulted in many universities mandating engagement in CPD to gain a teaching qualification and/or Fellowship (eg Botham, 2018b). While this has been commonplace for those new to university teaching, the requirement for established staff to gain Fellowship following the relaunch of the UKPSF in 2011, saw practices relating to teaching-related CPD change.

Changes to institutional policies relating to probation and promotion were reported in several articles (eg Peat, 2015). Indeed, several universities set institutional targets, which then require the development of processes to ensure that these are adhered to (Botham, 2018b, Spowart et al, 2019; van der Sluis et al, 2017). While for some this represented a positive move, as it ensured teaching-related CPD was engaged with on an ongoing basis (eg Peat, 2015), for others the move was treated with caution. It was seen to represent the domestication of CPD, resulting in a tokenistic view that engagement in CPD was required to pass probation or gain promotion (Peat, 2015). For these individuals, there is a risk the learning and developmental impacts of accredited CPD were potentially lost or overlooked.

Studies documenting individual experiences of gaining recognition through accredited CPD schemes have noted the differing intrinsic and extrinsic motivators that have driven engagement, with authors commenting that where institutional drivers are the driving force, the value attached to the award of Fellowship was limited (eg Botham, 2018b; Spowart et al, 2019; van der Sluis, 2017). However, this position is complex and multi-faceted and is shaped by the level of support and local culture surrounding accreditation. The University of Roehampton used probation and promotion policies to stimulate engagement with its accredited provision, with engagement monitored and reviewed through probation and appraisal processes (Peat, 2014, 2015). Monitoring was highlighted as essential to ensuring cohesion across the university. However, the team supporting accredited provision were aware that monitoring could engender a culture of compliance rather than development (Peat, 2014). Therefore, the Educational Development team worked synergistically with local departments to create

a positive culture around teaching-related CPD and accreditation. They sought to develop local action learning sets, which allowed colleagues to work collectively and collegially on their applications for recognition. Peat (2014) also highlighted the need for connections to be fostered between systems of reward and career progression, as well as attention being paid to workload remission. Such actions signal institutional commitment to ongoing teaching-related CPD.

11. Conclusion

In this literature review we have presented succinct summaries of the outcomes of 18 articles that have offered reflective accounts, descriptions of institutional practice and/or empirical studies of activities related to institutional accreditation. We have provided a snapshot of the scale and scope of this work and the geographic location as well as briefly detailed the main methods used (see Table 2). Overall, the published literature seeks to describe or present institutional case studies of CPD schemes, considering issues such as impacts on individuals' practice, career development and sense of professionalisation. These articles provide useful insights into support systems as well as key success factors. They also highlight the barriers or challenges individuals may experience in engaging with institutional accreditation activities. This is a valuable body of work which should be drawn upon to direct future innovations in institutional accreditation practice, to ensure practice is informed by evidence building on the lessons learned from extant work.

11.1 Limitations in the research

The current literature suggests several weaknesses in recent empirical work, including small sample sizes, varying methodological frameworks and overly localised contexts, all of which hinder generalisability. More widely, the current literature base focuses primarily on the experiences of engaging in, and gaining recognition through, institutional accredited CPD schemes. The research reported does not attempt to capture longer term impacts, either at the individual or the institutional level.

There is not a sufficient body of research on the complexities and range of contexts (eg institutional, disciplinary) and the way in which 'impact' of accreditation might be both determined and evaluated in relation to context.

There appears to be relatively little work on how students directly experience the impact of accredited CPD undertaken by teachers. Studies that focus on student perspectives and experiences would be a valuable addition to the literature.

11.2 Areas for future research

Based on this review, we feel future research should address, or consider, the following areas:

1. Systematic evaluation of institutional accreditation practices in order to ascertain long-term impacts. Such work could be integrated into the accreditation cycle, to allow for data to be collected for the duration of the accreditation period, and across different stakeholders (academics, professional support staff, senior managers and inclusive of groups such as students, human resources/organisational development staff, educational developers, heads of schools etc). This would enable institutions to gain contemporary intelligence over time that highlights larger and smaller scale impacts, tracking engagement as well as impacts across key groups/stakeholders, and considering impacts on institutional processes, policies and strategic working. Such work could draw on the methodology developed by Kneale et al (2016) which provided a toolkit to evaluating teaching-related CPD, capturing soft and hard outcomes over different timescales.
2. The majority of the published research has centred on case studies of single-institutions; in particular the UK work is centred on those institutions classed as 'teaching focused.' Future work could build on the outcomes of the work by researchers such as Botham (2018b); Shaw (2018); Spowart et al (2016), and include a greater diversity of institutions (eg college-based, research intensive, private) to work collaboratively to undertake work that is inclusive of a greater range of institutions and contexts.
3. There is scope to consider the impact of culture on institutional accreditation as the numbers of accredited institutions outside of the UK increase.
4. Connected to the above, there are further opportunities to work collaboratively on global initiatives that would enable the sharing of best practice and enhance our understanding of the barriers and enablers of sustained impact.
5. The majority of the single-institution studies were undertaken as part of the set up and development of their scheme (eg Spowart et al, 2016). It is unclear from these studies whether long-term monitoring was planned. It may be timely for researchers undertaking this early work to revisit their participants, considering specifically changes in the roles and responsibilities, as well as looking at institutional practices and policies, examining how these may have developed to be inclusive of accreditation. This could provide valuable information on longer term impacts of accredited CPD schemes, specifically on institutional practice.

6. Though students have increasingly called for staff to be appropriately qualified (eg Turner et al, 2017), they are a group notable by their absence across all these articles. Not one study makes more than a passing reference to students, nor are they included in any way in the research. Future research should aim to be inclusive of them; students have a poor understanding of teaching-related CPD and their participation could serve to enhance not only their knowledge of teaching-related CPD, but also ensure students value the CPD staff engage with.
7. Several articles documented the emergence of communities of practices around teaching and learning as a consequence of accredited provision. However, discussion or critical examination of these communities in the research literature is limited. Future research could usefully consider the enablers for the development of such communities and the long-term impacts to both individuals and institutions.
8. The interest in dialogic assessment is growing. That said, the papers reviewed here focused primarily on the processes of gaining recognition, the impacts on the individual, and recommendations for the future development of dialogic assessment practices. Future research could consider if there are any longer-term, institutional impacts of this particular approach.

12. Core references

Asghar, M and Pilkington, R (2018) 'The relational value of professional dialogue for academics pursuing HEA fellowship', *International Journal for Academic Development*, 23 (2): 135-146.

Beckmann, E A (2016) 'Teaching excellence: Recognising the many as well as the few', in Davis, M and Goody, A (eds) *Research and Development in Higher Education: The Shape of Higher Education*, 39. Refereed papers from the 39th HERDSA Conference, Fremantle, Western Australia, 4-7 July 2016. Hammondville: Melissa Davis and Allan Goody. Available at: www.herdsa.org.au/publications/conference-proceedings/research-and-development-higher-education-shape-higher-1

Botham, K A (2018a) 'An analysis of the factors that affect engagement of Higher Education teachers with an institutional professional development scheme', *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 55 (2): 176-189.

Botham, K A (2018b) The perceived impact on academics' teaching practice of engaging with a higher education institution's CPD scheme. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 55 (2): 164-175.

Buissink, N, Diamond, P, Hallas, J, Swann, J and Sciascia, A D (2017) 'Challenging a measured university from an indigenous perspective: Placing "manaaki" at the heart of our professional development programme', *Higher Education Research and Development*, 36 (3): 569-582. Available at: doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2017.1288706

George, S and Rowland, J (2019) 'Demonstrating the impact of your teaching: Benefits of Higher Education Academy Fellowship for librarians', *Health Information and Libraries Journal*, 36 (3): 288-293.

Hall, J (2017) 'Developing Teaching Best Practice—Pedagogy, Preferences, and Professional Development', *International Information and Library Review*, 49 (1): 59-64.

Peat, J (2014) 'UKPSF: A vehicle for development or hierarchical ladder?', *Educational Developments*, 15 (2): 16-18.

Peat, J (2015) 'Getting down to the nitty-gritty: The trials and tribulations of an institutional professional recognition scheme', *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, 19 (3): 92-95.

Pilkington, R (2019) 'Investigating the use of "professional dialogues" when assessing academic practice: Revealing learning, managing process, and enabling judgements', *International Journal for Academic Development*, 24 (1): 47-60.

Prince, H (2013) 'Writing for the UK Professional Standards in Higher Education: An Autobiographical Narrative', *Practitioner Research in Higher Education*, 7 (1): 4-10.

Savage, T (2019) 'Challenging HEA Fellowship: Why should technicians in creative arts HE be drawn into teaching?', *Art, Design and Communication in Higher Education*, 18 (2): 201-218.

Shaw, R (2018) 'Professionalising teaching in HE: The impact of an institutional fellowship scheme in the UK', *Higher Education Research and Development*, 37 (1): 145-157.

Smart, F, Asghar, M, Campbell, L-A and Huxham, M (2019) 'Electing to speak: Professional dialogue in the context of Fellowship of the Higher Education Academy', *International Journal for Academic Development*, 24 (3): 232-245.

Spowart, L, Turner, R, Shenton, D and Kneale, P (2016) "'But I've been teaching for 20 years...": Encouraging teaching accreditation for experienced staff working in higher education', *International Journal for Academic Development*, 21 (3): 206-218.

Spowart, L, Winter, J, Turner, R, Burden, P, Botham, K A, Muneer, R, van der Sluis, H and Huet, I (2019) "'Left with a title but nothing else": the challenges of embedding professional recognition schemes for teachers within higher education institutions', *Higher Education Research and Development*, 38 (6): 1299-1312.

van der Sluis, H, Burden, P and Huet, I (2016) 'The evaluation of an institutional UKPSF recognition scheme', *Educational Developments*, 17 (1): 5-9.

van der Sluis, H, Burden, P and Huet, I (2017) 'Retrospection and reflection: The emerging influence of an institutional professional recognition scheme on professional development and academic practice in a UK university', *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 54 (2): 126-134.

13. Supplementary references

Advance HE (2019) *Advance HE Accreditation Policy 2019-20*. www.advance-he.ac.uk/sites/default/files/2020-02/Advance%20HE%20Accreditation%20Policy%202019-20.pdf [accessed 12 July 2020].

Browne, J (2010) *Securing a sustainable future for higher education: An independent review of higher education and student finance* [The Browne Report]. London: Department for Business, Innovation and Skills. Available at: www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-browne-report-higher-education-funding-and-student-finance

Cardoso, S, Tavares, O and Sin, C (2015) 'The quality of teaching staff: Higher education institutions' compliance with the European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance', *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 27 (3): 205-222.

Clegg, S (2003) 'Problematizing ourselves: Continuing professional development in higher education', *International Journal for Academic Development*, 8 (1-2): 37-50.

Gibbs, G (2010) *Dimensions of Quality*. York: Higher Education Academy. Available at: etico.iiep.unesco.org/sites/default/files/dimensions_of_quality.pdf

Harvey, L (2004) 'The power of accreditation: Views of academics', *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 26 (2): 207-223.

Henkel, M (2005) 'Academic identity and autonomy in a changing policy environment', *Higher Education*, 49: 155-176.

Kandlbinder, P and Peseta, T (2009) 'Key concepts in postgraduate certificates in higher education teaching and learning in Australasia and the United Kingdom', *International Journal for Academic Development*, 14 (1): 19-31.

Locke, W (2014) *Shifting academic careers: Implications for enhancing professionalism in teaching and supporting learning*. York: Higher Education Academy.

Madriaga, M and Morley, K (2016) 'Awarding teaching excellence: "What is it supposed to achieve?" Teacher perceptions of student-led awards', *Teaching in Higher Education*, 21 (2): 166-174.

McAleese, M (Chair), Bladh, A, Berger, V, Bode, C, Muehlfeit, J, Petrin, T, Schiesaro, A and Tsoukalis, L (2013) *Improving the quality of teaching and learning in Europe's higher education. Report to the European Commission*. Luxembourg: High Level Group on the Modernisation of Higher Education. Available at: ec.europa.eu/education/higher-education/doc/modernisation_en.pdf

Parsons, D, Hill, I, Holland, J and Willis, D (2012) *Impact of teaching development programmes in higher education*. York: Higher Education Academy. Available at: www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/resources/HEA_Impact_Teaching_Development_Prog.pdf

Quinn, L (2012) 'Understanding resistance: An analysis of discourses in academic staff development', *Studies in Higher Education*, 37 (1): 69–83.

Seppala, N and Smith, C (2020) 'Teaching awards in higher education: A qualitative study of motivation and outcomes', *Studies in Higher Education*, 45 (7): 1398-1412.

Thornton, T (2014) 'Professional recognition: Promoting recognition through the Higher Education Academy in a UK higher education institution', *Tertiary Education and Management*, 20 (3): 225-238.

Turner, N, Oliver, M, McKenna, C, Hughes, J, Smith, H, Deepwell, F and Shrives, L (2013) *Measuring the impact of the UK Professional Standards Framework for Teaching and Supporting Learning (UKPSF)*. York: Higher Education Academy.

Turner, R, Spowart, L, Winter, J, Muneer, R, Harvey, C and Kneale, P (2017) "The lecturer should know what they are talking about": Student Union Officers perceptions of teaching-related CPD and implications for their practice', *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 54 (2): 143-151.

Wisdom, J, Lea, J and Parker, P (2013) *A Short History of SEDA*. London: SEDA. www.seda.ac.uk/history-of-seda

14. Appendix: Table 2: Overview of literature

Overall focus of the article	Article	Reflective/ scholarly account of institutional practice	Empirical research			Geographic focus		Staff group focused upon (eg academics, librarians)
			Single HEI	Multiple HEI	Methods used	UK	International	
Review of institutional accreditation	Beckmann, E A (2016) 'Teaching excellence: Recognising the many as well as the few', in Davis, M and Goody, A (eds) Research and Development in Higher Education: The Shape of Higher Education, Volume 39. Refereed papers from the 39th HERDSA Conference, 4-7 July 2016. Hammondville: Melissa Davis and Allan Goody.	X	N/A	N/A	N/A		X	All
Accredited CPD scheme	Botham, K A (2018a) 'An analysis of the factors that affect engagement of Higher Education teachers with an institutional professional development scheme', Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 55 (2): 176-189.		X		Questionnaires (online) to all staff who had submitted to the CPD scheme (including those who deferred submission). Interviews (6) purposeful sampling (FHEA-PFHEA). Thematic analysis of all data.	X		Not stated, though implied academic staff
	Botham, K A (2018b) The perceived impact on academics' teaching practice of engaging with a higher education institution's CPD scheme. Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 55 (2): 164-175.		X		Questionnaires (online) to all staff who had submitted to the CPD scheme (including those who deferred submission). Interviews (6) purposeful sampling (FHEA-PFHEA). Thematic analysis of all data.	X		Not stated, though implied academic staff

Buissink, N, Diamond, P, Hallas, J, Swann, J and Sciascia, A D (2017) 'Challenging a measured university from an indigenous perspective: Placing "manaaki" at the heart of our professional development programme', Higher Education Research and Development, 36 (3): 569-582.	X	N/A	N/A	N/A		X	Reflective account from the Academic Developers involved in the development and implementation of the CPD Scheme
George, S and Rowland, J (2019) 'Demonstrating the impact of your teaching: Benefits of Higher Education Academy Fellowship for librarians', Health Information and Libraries Journal, 36 (3): 288-293.	X	N/A	N/A	N/A	X		Librarians
Hall, J (2017) 'Developing Teaching Best Practice—Pedagogy, Preferences, and Professional Development', International Information and Library Review, 49 (1): 59-64.	X	N/A	N/A	N/A		X	Librarians
Peat, J (2014) 'UKPSF: A vehicle for development or hierarchical ladder?', Educational Developments, 15 (2): 16-18.	X	N/A	N/A	N/A	X		N/A

Peat, J (2015) 'Getting down to the nitty-gritty: The trials and tribulations of an institutional professional recognition scheme', Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education, 19 (3): 92-95.	X	N/A	N/A	N/A	X		All staff groups
Prince, H (2013) 'Writing for the UK Professional Standards in Higher Education: An Autobiographical Narrative', Practitioner Research in Higher Education, 7 (1): 4-10.		X		Self-reflective account developed using autobiographic narrative.	X		An outdoor studies lecturer, gained SFHEA
Savage, T (2019) 'Challenging HEA Fellowship: Why should technicians in creative arts HE be drawn into teaching?', Art, Design and Communication in Higher Education, 18 (2): 201-218.		X		Semi-structured interviews to explore participants' motivations for gaining FHEA, experience of engaging with the process and reflecting on impacts on practice. Self-reflections of the researcher also included in the analysis, as they had also gained FHEA through the same route.	X		Four creative arts technicians gaining FHEA

Shaw, R (2018) 'Professionalising teaching in HE: The impact of an institutional fellowship scheme in the UK', Higher Education Research and Development, 37 (1): 145-157.	X			In-depth interviews with 19 staff from the Faculty of Health and Social Sciences who had completed an application through the CPD Scheme between late 2014 and early 2016. The interviews sought to capture the nature of practices in engagement and the extent of their engagement in practices relating to teaching and learning. All Schools within the Faculty were represented in the sample, though not all staff roles (e.g. PhD students). Thematic analysis was completed, focusing on patterns of engagement, motivations for engaging and perceptions of impact.	X		Academic staff with a range of teaching and learning responsibilities
Spowart, L, Turner, R, Shenton, D and Kneale, P (2016) "But I've been teaching for 20 years...": Encouraging teaching accreditation for experienced staff working in higher education', International Journal for Academic Development, 21 (3): 206-218.		X		Online survey to all staff who had participated in the scheme in the 2012 and 2013 academic year; from these respondents a purposeful sample of 20 participants was selected. 19 agreed to semi-structured interviews with 19 academics who had engaged with an institutional CPD scheme. The interviews explored participants' motivation for gaining recognition, experience of the process and the support / reaction of colleagues to accreditation. The research was framed from a socio-cultural perspective with activity theory used to frame the analysis.	X		Academic and professional support staff, managers of T&L. Included those who volunteered as well as contractually obliged to gain a teaching qualification

Spowart, L, Winter, J, Turner, R, Burden, P, Botham, K A, Muneer, R, van der Sluis, H and Huet, I (2019) "Left with a title but nothing else": the challenges of embedding professional recognition schemes for teachers within higher education institutions', Higher Education Research and Development, 38 (6): 1299-1312.			X	Three post-1992 HEIs, secondary analysis of interview data collected as part of institutional evaluations of CPD schemes. In total, 32 interview transcripts from across all HEIs were included, with the number of transcripts included reflecting the scope of the original work. Focus on those staff who had gained SF/PFHEA.			Not explicitly stated, but assumed all academic staff. SF/PFHEA
van der Sluis, H, Burden, P and Huet, I (2016) 'The evaluation of an institutional UKPSF recognition scheme', Educational Developments, 17 (1): 5-9.		X		Online questionnaire. Semi-structured interviews. See next row for details.	X		Academic staff
van der Sluis, H, Burden, P and Huet, I (2017) 'Retrospection and reflection: The emerging influence of an institutional professional recognition scheme on professional development and academic practice in a UK university', Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 54 (2): 126-134.		X		Online questionnaire disseminated to all scheme participants actively engaged between March 2015 and January 2015 (52% response rate). Captured quantitative data around prof backgrounds, influence of CPD / academic practice. Semi-structured interviews using Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis to explore meaning attached to gaining fellowship. Purposeful sample of six SFHEA six months after recognition gained.			Academic staff; most questionnaire respondents were FHEA (56%). Interviews were with associate professors/ SFHEA



Contact us

General enquiries

+44 (0) 3300 416201

enquiries@advance-he.ac.uk

www.advance-he.ac.uk

Media enquiries

+44 (0) 1904 717500

communications@advance-he.ac.uk

www.advance-he.ac.uk/contact-us

   @AdvanceHE

Advance HE enables excellence in higher education, helping it shape its future. Within the UK and globally, Advance HE supports institutions in the areas of excellence in education, transformative leadership, equity and inclusion and effective governance. This is delivered through membership benefits (including accreditation of teaching, equality charters, research, knowledge and resources), programmes and events, Fellowships, awards, consultancy and enhancement services and student surveys.

Advance HE is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales no. 04931031. Registered as a charity in England and Wales no. 1101607 Registered as a charity in Scotland no. SC043946. The Advance HE logo should not be used without our permission.

© 2020 Advance HE. All rights reserved.

The views expressed in this publication are those of the author and not necessarily those of Advance HE. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any storage and retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. Such permission will normally be granted for non-commercial, educational purposes provided that due acknowledgement is given.

To request copies of this report in large print or in a different format, please contact the Marketing and Communications Team at Advance HE:

+44 (0) 3300 416201 or publications@advance-he.ac.uk