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1. Executive summary

Purpose
Launched in 2006 and last revised in 2011, the Professional Standards Framework for teaching and supporting learning in higher education (PSF) has global recognition for raising the profile of teaching and learning in higher education (HE). The PSF’s contribution to reward and recognition is unsurpassed, being used by individuals, institutions and national bodies. Its support for policy setting and strategic transformation is valued, as is its application to leadership, promotion, probation and professional development. As sector custodians of the PSF, Advance HE recognised that review of the PSF was an imperative to ensure it retains currency and relevance to practice in an ever-evolving environment.

Process
A sector-led and evidence-based tri-phased review process considered comprehensive and repeated consultation and co-creation with the sector to be fundamental. Phase one reviewed the existing evidence base and explored concepts, ideas and potential solutions through 28 online sessions, attended by 300 key stakeholders, of whom 24 participants (8%) were from nine countries outside the UK (Australia, Hong Kong SAR, Kingdom of Bahrain, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Republic of Fiji, United Arab Emirates and United States of America). Phase two undertook an open access, online survey to test proposed revisions, receiving supportive and constructive feedback from more than 500 respondents from 23 countries. Phase three’s focus was to sense check final revisions with the sector, prior to undertaking stakeholder engagement activities.

New features
Fully revised and streamlined, the PSF 2023 emphasises effectiveness and impact, inclusion and context, as fundamental aspects of practice. Retaining the familiar structure, together with an enhanced clarity of the relationship between Dimensions and Descriptors, new features include: the addition of stem statements to emphasise practice in each Dimension; prominence of Professional Values; the addition of collaborative practice; more explicit emphasis on student support and guidance; a stronger focus on leading and influence in Descriptor 3, and greater accessibility for those with strategic leadership and impact in Descriptor 4.

Intended outcomes
As a more inclusive Framework that recognises the critical role of context in which practice takes place, the PSF 2023 will be more accessible to all professionals with a role in teaching and/or supporting learning. Its focus on effectiveness and impact of practice drives attention to improved outcomes for learners across the global community. The concise, streamlined approach offers clarity and ease of use in professional development, leadership of teaching and learning, strategic enhancement and in Fellowship and accreditation settings.
2. Key features of the PSF 2023

The review process was strongly sector led and evidenced based. Comprehensive and repeated consultation facilitated a co-creative environment from which the PSF 2023 emerged. The revised Framework now contains many new features, of which the most prominent are presented below and are explored in further sections throughout this report. Their development is charted in appendix one.

**Effectiveness and impact:** phase one data strongly identified the importance of giving greater prominence to effectiveness and impact as an outcome of all practice. This was supported in phases two and three, in which the requirement to critically analyse and evaluate outcomes was emphasised as a feature that threads throughout all practice. Similarly, wherever feasible, practice based on a strong evidence base was recognised to be essential. Since effectiveness was considered relevant to all aspects of practice, it is now found in both Dimensions and all Descriptors. However, ‘impact’ was reported to be more challenging and favoured for strategic practice so was therefore reserved for use in Descriptor 4.

**Inclusion:** the fundamental importance of inclusive practice was another feature that emerged strongly in all three phases and has now been embedded as a key element of practice. The relevance of inclusion in the PSF is extensive since it needs to apply to the practice it references and to the language used to describe practice. Additionally, the PSF itself must be inclusive for practice in diverse, global HE contexts and hold relevance for all from a range of professions and disciplines which teach and/or support learning. The newly introduced requirement for practice to be inclusive now appears in the Areas of Activity as a Dimension and in all Descriptors.

A clear illustration of the importance of inclusion is in relation to Core Knowledge. This was first raised in the review by a group of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander colleagues who highlighted the idea that indigenous knowledge could be embodied. Initially, this led to a proposal in phase two to use the plural form of knowledges. Subsequent deep and extended discussions then took place in phase three concerning language, culture and meaning. It was concluded that multiple and diverse forms of knowledge, which inform practice and are connected to and shaped by communities and contexts, is more important than use of the plural term of ‘knowledge’, and this text was therefore incorporated into “What are Dimensions?”. The term Core Knowledge (PSF, 2011) was retained.
**Context:** the importance of context emerged from phase one data and stakeholder discussions of global perspectives and inclusive practice. In these, consideration of the range of diverse settings within which the PSF is now used led to a deeper appreciation of the situatedness of practice. This includes the rich variety of environments, circumstances, practices, norms, behaviours, peoples, countries and cultures that collectively constitute ‘context’, with regard to wherever and however HE is delivered.

The critical importance of context and the myriad ways in which it influences practice was identified as requiring a special place in the PSF. “In your context...” has therefore been adopted in the new stem statements within each set of Dimensions.

**Revised and streamlined:** throughout, the PSF 2023 has been updated. The need to revisit and refresh language and presentation was evident in findings from exploration of data in phase one of the review, and explored further in subsequent discussion in phases one, two and three. Strenuous efforts have been made to reduce repetition and overlap, to clarify information and to make the Framework more concise. To further explain the Framework, emphasis has been given to the inter-relationship between Dimensions and Descriptors. Additionally, the choice of language and selection of phrases received special consideration, recognising that language must be accessible to all, regardless of profession, academic discipline or first language.

**Professional Values:** although these were present in the two previous versions (2006, 2011) of the PSF, data in phase one and two recognised them as highly important elements of practice that deserve greater prominence within the Framework. They have therefore been repositioned as the first set of Dimensions. This amendment received strong support within phase two. Further, in addition to D2, D3 and D4 continuing to require all Dimensions to be met, D1 now requires specific Professional Values to be met.

**Student support and guidance:** data has consistently emphasised the necessity for supporting and guiding learners. This was evident in phase one, where the importance of learners’ health and wellbeing was also added as a significant and more contemporary concern. The decision to enable one entire Dimension (A4) to focus on this aspect was warmly received in phase two and was therefore adopted. This was achieved by moving reference to the learning environment into A2 with other aspects of teaching and supporting learning. This enhanced focus recognises the requirement for academics and those from professional and student services to support and guide learners.

**Collaboration:** was acknowledged to be an aspect of practice that had not previously been addressed in the PSF. This was noted in phase one and its adoption as a Professional Value was strongly supported in phase two and therefore became a new addition to the Framework. Consultation discussion and survey responses in phase two stressed the importance of defining collaboration in more detail, which has been incorporated into the new glossary that will support the PSF.
Descriptor 3 (D3): in common with revisions to all Descriptors, D3 now presents a new and concise introductory statement, replacing the previous “typical individual role/career stage”, which had been reported to be outdated and confusing. Three focused and succinct criteria remove repetition and overlap between Descriptors and Dimensions. These changes were strongly supported in phase two.

D3 introduces a requirement for greater emphasis on leading and influencing the practice of others who teach and/or support learning. This significant request in phase one was strongly supported in phase two. In addition, a shift in practice towards greater leading and influencing was reported, sometimes as the main focus of practice, while other practice balances leading and influencing with direct teaching roles. Further consultation in phase three was therefore essential to reach agreement on how best the criteria should capture the evolving nature of leading and influencing in practice, as it applies to those for whom D3 is applicable.

Descriptor 4 (D4): analysis of stakeholder consultation in phase one revealed numerous examples of individuals who, without institution-wide responsibility for teaching and learning strategy such as pro- or deputy vice-chancellor or director, were unable to recognise D4 as applicable to their practice and subsequently felt their leadership practice was excluded.

In response, D4 was revised to be more accessible for all who can evidence impact and effectiveness in strategic leadership, including those without formal strategic roles. This may include those with modest structural roles within institutions, and those who influence strategic direction of practice within their discipline or profession. To further enhance access, language has been revised to ensure equity between academics and those from professional/student services, and those who are not institution-based. Reference to practice on a national or international stage has also been removed.

Education for Sustainable Development (ESD): ESD was identified within phase one data as an emerging area of practice that warranted consideration as a potential new component of the PSF. However, its inclusion received very low support in phase two.

The concerns related to interpretation, assessment, the risk of dictating curriculum and one element of practice being prioritised over others. Although analysis identified slight variation in response according to profession and country, all indicated significantly low support. ESD was therefore removed from subsequent redrafts of the Framework, although to recognise its importance, reference to the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals has been made in the Purpose of the PSF. Advance HE will continue to support practice in this area, ensuring examples of ESD-related practice will appear in guidance materials.
Initially developed in the UK in 2006 (HEA, 2005), the PSF is now a globally recognised framework that supports and recognises the development of staff and benchmarks success within teaching and learning in HE. Bradley (2022) acknowledges the impact of the PSF in helping to raise the profile of teaching and learning, and has been used for purposes of professional development, reward and recognition, probation and promotion.

The PSF (Advance HE, 2011) presents two key components. Dimensions describe aspects of practice, grouped as Areas of Activity (A1-5), Core Knowledge (K1-6) and Professional Values (V1-4). Four Descriptors (D1-D4) define categories of practice. Since this version was introduced, the practice of teaching and learning, together with the environment within which it operates, has evolved considerably.

As custodians of the PSF, Advance HE introduced a strategic commitment (Advance HE, 2021) to review it and facilitated the 2021-2023 PSF Review Project on behalf of the sector. This was to ensure the PSF remains current, retains its strengths and builds on its positive impact on learning, teaching and the student experience across global settings.

## Sector-led governance

### PSF Review Steering Group

A sector-led PSF Review Steering Group (PRSG) oversaw the review.

The PRSG was chaired by Professor Helen O’Sullivan, Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor at the University of Chester.

The PRSG’s remit was to review and shape the PSF Review project and communication plans, while ensuring a member-led approach; monitor the project’s progress; consider Project Team recommendations; provide updates to key Advance HE member-led groups and committees; support and promote the review work and its outcomes; and provide advice and guidance to ensure the revised PSF is inclusive and impactful in the broadest of national and international contexts.

Eight PRSG meetings were held from January 2022 to January 2023.
Respecting the global nature of HE and the range of contexts within which the PSF is now recognised, the PRSG had proportional international representation and included colleagues from Australasia, as the next largest user of the PSF after the UK.

Similarly, the Project Team had international representation with members from the Kingdom of Bahrain and Australia. Membership across both the PRSG and the Project Team ensured representation by gender, and from ethnic minority groups and international colleagues.

**PSF Review Project Team**

The work of the PSF Review was undertaken by a Project Team of colleagues from across the sector.

Led by Dr Julie Baldry Currens, and project managed by Dallas Alexandrou, the Project Team’s remit was to analyse the existing evidence base of data; design and implement an extensive range of stakeholder consultation sessions; design an open-access online survey; evaluate findings from all feedback; undertake an iterative process of redesigning draft revised versions of the PSF for ongoing consultation; design the final revised PSF and support all communication and promotion activities.

To deliver Project Team objectives, regular liaison with key Advance HE colleagues was undertaken across the lifespan of the project.

Ten Project Team meetings were held, from January 2022 to January 2023. Eight additional meetings, with either pairs of Project Team members or individual Project Team members, were also held.
Timeline of the PSF Review

Phase 1
November 2021 – May 2022
- existing evidence base analysed
- literature review
- 28 consultation sessions
- creation of June Draft Revised PSF

Phase 2
June 2022 – August 2022
- open access online survey creation
- 15 sessions to encourage survey completion
- survey ran 13 June to 17 July
- survey responses analysed
- creation of September Draft Revised PSF

Phase 3
September 2022 – January 2023
- final consultation sessions
- stakeholder engagement sessions
- creation of September Draft Revised PSF
- creation of materials to support launch
- PSF Review Steering Group and Advance HE Board approval

January 2023
Revised PSF 2023 Launched with PSF Review Project Report

Pages 12 to 17
Pages 18 to 29
Pages 30 to 34
4. Phase one

Phase one review process: existing data

An evidence-based and data-led approach was adopted throughout each phase of the project. The PSF Review drew on a substantive, existing evidence base, which comprised published literature and feedback related to the Framework and data gathered from multiple sources since 2015. This included data from discussions that had taken place prior to the Review, held by Advance HE’s Fellowship team:

- 2015 open space consultation
- 2015 Principal Fellow review
- 2017-18 planned PSF refresh
- 2020 roundtable focus group discussions.

Each transcript was reviewed independently by the project leader and project manager, who separately identified key issues of concern and themes arising requiring further consideration. These were recorded in individual spreadsheets and then combined, noting areas of significance, overlap and discrepancy. An independent review of these was undertaken by another member of the Project Team.
A literature review was undertaken which incorporated commissioned reports and published literature. To keep a focus on the PSF, literature concentrated primarily on that which directly related to the Framework itself (see for example Law, 2011; Turner et al, 2013). The PSF’s application in the wider arenas of Fellowship, other recognition and accreditation activity or to continuing professional development (see for example Beckmann, 2019; Spowart et al, 2020; Cathcart et al, 2021; Greer et al 2021) was also recognised as subsidiary literature. Additionally, an online meeting was convened with a range of colleagues who had authored PSF-related literature to identify any further issues of relevance.

**Phase one review process: staff interviews**

Key members of Advance HE staff working closely with the PSF, including each member of the Fellowship team, were interviewed individually. Their views were explored, seeking to identify strengths and areas of perceived difficulty in the PSF’s application within the sector, any tensions existing in its use and views on modifications that might enhance the Framework.

**Phase one review process: initial findings from existing data and staff interviews**

Output from the data analysis showed strong agreement, and key issues were identified which were stable and triangulated well across all datasets, regardless of participant group and timeframe.

Broadly, a number of aspects of the Framework were identified as requiring further attention. These fell into three groups.

1. **Students**: student support, wellbeing, student outcomes, employability, enterprise, entrepreneurship.

2. **Practice issues**: scholarship, research, evaluation, evidence, literature base, reflective practice, continuing professional development, collaboration versus ‘silo-ism’, professionalism, pedagogic literacy and fluency, teaching/research nexus, expert practitioner, education for sustainable development (ESD).

3. **The PSF**: hierarchy within the Descriptors, educational development focus, relationship between Dimensions and Descriptors, ambiguity of language and terminology, overall presentation of the PSF, issues of repetition and overlap between Dimensions and Descriptors such as A5 and V3, or D2.i and D2.iv, outdated text within Descriptors including, “Typical individual role/ career stages”, greater emphasis on leadership within D3, words that need definition within the PSF context, lengthy and dense guidance documents and issues with version control, use of Roman numerals and ease of use for those whose first language is not English.
Within the data, the items above were clear and usually accompanied by proposed solutions, although some proposals were contradictory. Additionally, five substantial themes emerged within the data. These were complex, conceptual and multi-layered and therefore needed further exploration and clarification. They were:

1. Digital teaching and learning
2. Inclusion
3. International/global perspectives
4. Impact and effectiveness
5. Descriptor 4 (D4)

Phase one review process: stakeholder consultation

These five themes formed the basis for phase one consultation sessions with key stakeholders. The Project Team held a range of presentation and discussion sessions with individuals and groups. These included those from professional organisations linked to specific aspects of practice such as the use of technology and professional development, those with specific roles related to the PSF and accredited provision, groups of academic and other professionals with various levels of seniority, and those representing staff and students with disabilities.

Broad consultation questions were created to facilitate discussion and to create a consistent approach across all stakeholder groups. Within each session participants were invited to comment on each of the themes. Data for subsequent analysis was saved in the form of session recordings, transcriptions and online chat. Further comments were invited via use of a specially created Padlet wall which remained open for the duration of phase one.

All phase one review processes were presented to, discussed and approved by PRSG.

Phase one review process: findings from stakeholder consultations

Phase one consultation comprised 28 online sessions, attended by 300 key stakeholders of whom 24 participants (8%) were from nine countries outside the UK (Australia, Hong Kong SAR, Kingdom of Bahrain, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Republic of Fiji, United Arab Emirates and United States of America).
All participants were invited to provide equality monitoring data. Total responses received from the equality monitoring survey were 151 (50.3% of total participants); of these, 11 were Australasian and five were from other countries outside the UK. Further, 87.5% (n=132) were female and 10.6% (n=16) reported disabilities. Responses from ethnic minority groups (5.9%; n=9) appear low and informed discussions between the PSRG and the Project Team relating to how phase two could best reach the broadest range of stakeholders. Specific sessions for a broader range of international respondents were also agreed.

This work will now inform and provide a baseline for future work by Advance HE in relation to participation and representation in use of the PSF and its application to Fellowship and accreditation.

Returning to phase one stakeholder consultation data, a summary of emergent issues from thematic analysis is presented below, with the relevant questions.

1. HE is ever more digital. How can ‘digital’ be best represented in a revised PSF?

The use of technology was seen as integrated throughout practice, though benefits were recognised in maintaining K4 from the PSF 2011, with the addition of ‘resources’. Introduction of the term ‘digital’ alone was not favoured since examples were given such as artificial intelligence and simulation practices, which were not recognised as ‘digital’. Instead, ‘technology’ was preferred as a more inclusive term and thought to be less likely to become dated.

2. Given the criticality of inclusion for colleagues and students, how can ‘inclusion’ be better reflected in a revised PSF? Where is ‘inclusion’ best represented – eg in the Dimensions as a Value?

Inclusion and inclusive practice were considered to be of critical importance in contemporary practice. While global variations were acknowledged, the need to include all learners and promote equity of opportunity were regarded as fundamental and deserving of greater prominence throughout the PSF. An additional finding noted the importance of ensuring that all PSF language was relevant to all whose roles include teaching and/or the support of learning.

3. PSF continues to be adopted in a growing range of globally diverse contexts and, in each, it has to be relevant and useable. How and where can the revised PSF be enhanced to reflect this diversification?

The term ‘global’ was reported to be more appropriate than ‘international’ and the global growth in use of the PSF was recognised to be considerable. As a result, the unique influence of context, diversity and inclusion in these highly varied global contexts were considered critical and relevant throughout the PSF.
4. Impact and effectiveness are acknowledged in the sector as an essential, yet challenging, aspect of the Framework. Should impact/effectiveness be best represented as: an enhanced Dimension(s), or a concept in the Descriptors or another way and if so, what and how?

‘Effectiveness' emerged as the preferred term rather than ‘impact', which was felt to be less well understood or embedded. Recognised as another critically important consideration in practice, effectiveness was thought to be of relevance in both the Dimensions and the Descriptors, noting that evidence of effectiveness will vary in type and extent across Descriptors. In parallel, concepts such as evidence-based practice and critical evaluation of practice were recognised as essential elements of practice, contributing significantly to the concept of effectiveness.

5. Given the requirement for a sustained record of effective strategic leadership in (D4), how might a revised PSF enhance D4's relevance to appropriate individuals?

Numerous examples were cited in which individuals, without institution-wide responsibility for teaching and learning strategy, such as pro- or deputy vice-chancellor (or similar), were prevented from gaining Principal Fellowship. It was proposed that it was possible to be a strategic leader in a variety of roles, including dean or director for example, since their practice was more than merely operationalising another's strategy. Similarly, despite having relatively modest structural roles within their institutions, some colleagues had opportunities to influence the strategic direction of practice within their discipline or profession. Language in D4 that was overly ‘academic', together with the suggestion that practice needed to be on a national or international stage, were reported to be unhelpful and obstructive.

Additionally, within the stakeholder consultations, participants reported several aspects of concern, which triangulated with data previously explored in phase one:

• all Descriptors required revision especially Descriptor 3 (D3) and D4
• the relationship between Dimensions and Descriptors needed clarification
• existing repetition and overlap needed to be removed
• the PSF needed to be written in globally accessible language
• critical evaluation and evidence of effectiveness required greater emphasis
• ESD and collaborative practice were felt to be missing
• consideration to be given to the addition of a glossary
• the PSF needed to be more inclusive to enable all colleagues involved in teaching and/or supporting learning to appreciate the relevance and value of their practice, and to have that recognised by others.
Phase one summary of outcomes

Based on evaluation of all findings from the phase one key stakeholder consultation, combined with analysis of the existing evidence base, a draft revised Framework (June 2022) was produced. This served as the basis for phase two of the consultation process.

Key enhancements to the draft revised Framework (June 2022) at this stage were:

- a new Purpose section was written to update the Aims 2011
- a new Structure section was added to help navigate the revised Framework and understand its components
- to clarify the relationship between Dimensions and Descriptors, sections on “What are the Descriptors?” and “What are the Dimensions?” were added
- three new “critical strands” of “inclusion, context and effectiveness” were introduced in the Structure section as core considerations within the Framework, threading through all Dimensions and Descriptors
- Dimensions were maintained with considerable revisions and additions, numbering 15 in total, which included Collaboration (V5) as a new Professional Value and Education for Sustainable Development as a new Core Knowledge (K3)
- four Descriptors were maintained, each having had significant revision, especially D3 and D4
- introductory texts for Descriptors were revised, including the removal of information on “Typical individual role/career stage” since this had been reported to be outdated and confusing
- Attention was paid to the integration of Descriptors with Dimensions, scope of practice, evidence of effectiveness and avoidance of repetition
- Roman numerals were removed
- language was clarified significantly to be more inclusive, both globally and to non-academic colleagues whose roles involve teaching or supporting learning
- contemporary language was used which focused on learning rather than teaching, and learners rather than students and teachers.

Draft revised Dimensions and Descriptors (June 2022) compared to those in the PSF 2011 may be viewed in Appendix One.
5. Phase two

Phase two review process
The review process in phase two comprised a written consultation on the June 2022 revised draft PSF, facilitated via an online survey, promotion of the survey and analysis of survey findings.

Phase two review process: survey design and promotion
This was designed by the Project Team with specialist advice from Advance HE colleagues with experience in online surveys. It comprised three separate surveys, one for individuals, one for invited group responses from named organisations, and one for students. All surveys followed the same structure, modified according to relevance.
Sections included:

**Mandatory questions:**

- introduction and consent
- about you (individual and student survey): role, country of work or study, name of institution (if relevant), Fellowship status, other PSF related awards held and use of PSF in your work
- about you (group survey): name of organisation/institution; country in which the organisation/institution is based and how the organisation/institution uses the PSF.

**Optional questions:**

- about the draft revised PSF: purpose; structure; image, critical strands, individual Dimensions, individual Descriptors, student Descriptor, glossary and final comments.

Mandatory survey questions offered choice from a selection of answers and free text comments. Optional questions about the survey comprised Likert-type answers relating to satisfaction, clarity, helpfulness and usefulness and free text comments.

Initial survey design was piloted with members of the broader Project Team and Advance HE Fellowship team. Feedback suggested questions were relevant and clear but that a small number of technical amendments were required, including the addition of a progress bar. Character limits for free text comments were also reported to be too low. Appropriate amendments were made and the survey was launched.

Further feedback was then received from the first day following launch and was responded to immediately, in an attempt to maximise accessibility, inclusion and ease of use for the greatest number of respondents. Language within the introduction was made more welcoming and succinct, and character limits were further extended to 150 and 500 characters in mandatory questions. All questions about the draft revised PSF were made optional, enabling colleagues to answer either all or only a few questions, recognising that some colleagues may have limited time for survey completion or may join the survey wishing only to comment on certain aspects of the PSF. Character limits for final comments were also extended from 500 to 1000 characters.
To achieve both the greatest possible representation and high numbers of those completing the phase two survey, the draft revised PSF (June 2022) was made available to all who wished to provide feedback via open access online survey completion, regardless of role or country. Both staff and students were encouraged to complete the relevant survey, welcoming both those with and without Fellowship status or experience with the PSF. Individual responses from both staff and students, and group responses from key organisations were all encouraged. To view questions for all surveys, please see www.advance-he.ac.uk/sites/default/files/2022-06/Draft-revised-PSF-survey-questions.pdf

Promotional activities that encouraged completion of surveys were designed to address the actions identified in phase one to engage underrepresented voices. Invitations to individuals and groups were circulated to both include and extend beyond those who had participated in phase one. Particular attention was given to ensuring invitations were targeted to reach broad and diverse communities.

Additional activities included: briefing notes, bespoke communication via relevant networks, a blog within project web pages, media coverage, e-newsletters, a promotional video and slide presentation, pdf versions of the surveys and social media posts. To further promote participation, sessions were presented at Advance HE’s Teaching and Learning Conference 2022 and at the Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia.

Further, 15 virtual sessions were designed and delivered by the Project Team to promote and encourage survey completion, of which four were specifically offered to international colleagues. Sessions were successful in including participants from underrepresented communities, which was achieved via contact through individuals, networks and leaders of relevant groups.

PRSG members helped to promote the survey, disseminate publicity and provide relevant international contacts. Australian members of the PRSG were especially active in this regard, reaching several organisations and networks. Similarly, support was given by Advance HE’s Fellowship, international and marketing and communications teams.

Survey analysis

Survey questions were designed to elicit responses as quantitative and qualitative data. A question-by-question analysis was undertaken, and an 85% threshold was set for both individual and group surveys. Where respondents provided a less than 85% positive response rate to a question, all qualitative comments were explored. Separately, all questions were then reviewed, irrespective of positive response rates, as comments were often extremely helpful and critically constructive.
Initial analysis of all questions completed within the individual and group surveys was undertaken by members of the Project Team working in sets of three pairs using prepared datasets. Each looked at a set of questions relating to either Dimensions, Descriptors or all other questions, ie questions relating to the proposed PSF purpose, structure and critical strands sections, the image and final comments. Regular whole project team meetings enabled data to be systematically presented to the wider Project Team, facilitating in-depth consideration between and across pairs and as a group. This ensured concerns or issues were fully explored so that analysis retained rigour and data reporting was both comprehensive and consistent. Once the initial question analysis was complete, in order to further understand and consider responses, the project leader and manager, with statistical support, undertook further analysis of qualitative and quantitative evidence. This included comparison of individual and group data, analysis according to professional grouping, by country and across themes arising.

To better meet the needs of indigenous colleagues in Australasia, a roundtable discussion session for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders was convened and analysed as a group response.

Phase two findings and resulting actions

Survey findings – “about you” data

A total of 503 completed surveys were received, which comprised 492 individual surveys and 11 group surveys, including the roundtable discussion.

For the individual survey: 391 (79.5%) respondents worked in the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland, while 51 (10.4%) were from Australasia and 49 (10%) from other countries (Kingdom of Bahrain, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, Guernsey, Hong Kong, India, Republic of Ireland, Malaysia, Oman, Pakistan, Thailand, United Arab Emirates, United States, Taiwan, Saudi Arabia). One respondent did not declare the country in which they work.

That 20.4% of respondents were from non-UK countries was an important result. This exceeded Advance HE’s Fellowship statistics (reported in July 2022), which showed 87.8% of Fellows to be UK-based and 8.4% non-UK, with 3.8% in Australasia. While not entirely comparable, since some survey respondents were not Fellows, this data suggests that the Project Team’s efforts to gain broader international representation within the consultation had produced positive outcomes.

As anticipated, 10 group survey responses were from the UK (90.9%) and one, the roundtable discussion, was from Australia (9.1%).

Analysis by UK mission groups showed broad representation, with the five largest groups being: UUK (46.9%), Russell Group (25.5%), Million Plus (9.8%), Cathedrals Group (5.3%) and GuildHE (3.3%). However, it should be noted that some institutions are members of more than one mission group.
Analysis of respondents according to role indicated that the voices of colleagues involved in a range of teaching and/or supporting learning practice were appropriately represented. Academic staff were the largest group of respondents (76.6%), although professional services (9%) and senior management (7.5%) were also well represented. Further analysis of academic roles found the four largest groups to be: principal/senior lecturer/associate professor (20.8%); educational developer (20.2%); lecturer/assistant professor (17.7%) and professor/chair (8.8%).

Analysis of non-academic respondents found their top four groups to be: educational designer/technologist (2%); professional services – other (1.4%); professional services – manager teaching services (1.4%); professional services – organisational /staff developer (1%). While others included librarians, those from student services and human resources.

Analysis of Fellowship status of respondents found 53.9% were Senior Fellows (SFs); 20.3% were Fellows (Fs); 16.5% were Principal Fellows (PFs) and 5.3% were Associate Fellows (AFs). This shows a much higher representation of SFs and PFs when compared to the Fellowship statistics (July 2022), in which SFs comprised 11% and PFs 1% of the total number of Fellows. This is reassuring since D3 and D4 were the most revised Descriptors consulted on in the survey. In addition, SFs are most likely to lead accredited programmes and to have an in-depth knowledge of the PSF and be likely to influence colleagues’ use and understanding of the PSF.

Analysis of use of the PSF, reported through a ‘tick all that apply’ response, recorded a range of purposes, in which the two highest were to “support my own CPD” (19.7%) and “inform the CPD activities of others in my institution” (16.3%). Responses in the next three groups were to: “support my institution’s Accredited Scheme” (16.1%); “support appraisal and/or professional development planning” (12.2%) and “develop strategy/lead on learning and teaching across my institution” (11.4%). This indicates that survey findings were in keeping with the varied application of the PSF.

**Survey findings and resulting actions – “about the PSF” data**

Statistics presented below are from pooled responses from both individual and group surveys. Verbatim quotes are from those made by individuals unless specified as being from a group response.

**The purpose** was positively received since 92.3% of respondents were satisfied with it.

**The structure** section showed an overall response of 85.7%. This encompassed comments on both the proposed PSF image and the newly introduced critical strands, which both received negative reviews.
The PSF image was not well received. Only 60.1% of respondents found the image clear and comments suggested that while use of an image was welcomed, this particular image was felt to be unsuitable and potentially confusing. A main concern was that overlapping shapes and adjacent parts appeared to suggest specific links that were unintended by the project team.

Examples of free text comments by individual respondents included:

“The relationships between the three Dimensions are obscured by the strange interlocking of the circles...”

“I’m not clear if the ‘joining points’ are relevant.”

Similarly, one group commented:

“Ideally the final representation will have depth and interactivity, allowing users to click through and explore different areas in more detail.”

A revised image was clearly required.

The critical strands caused serious concerns among respondents. While the topics of ‘inclusion, context and effectiveness’ were welcomed, the concept of critical strands was considered to be useful by only 74.4% of respondents. Concerns regarded repetition with the Dimensions, uncertainty over the role that strands would play and whether they would be assessed separately.

Comments included:

“It potentially adds another layer of complexity which may be confusing, especially as these are evident in the dimensions already...”

“Are these aspirational or requirements?”

A decision was made to embed the topics throughout the PSF but to omit the critical strands as a Framework component.

A glossary received strong support (91%). Respondents offered many suggestions of words and phrases for which they felt the inclusion of a Framework definition within a glossary would support shared understanding and reduce potential uncertainties.
Dimensions of the Framework

Each Dimension was given a stem statement to emphasise and give prominence to the action required and the link to context. Each Professional Value needs to link with “In your context, enact...”; each Core Knowledge, “In your context, apply knowledge of...” and each Area of Activity, “In your context, apply effective and inclusive practice”.

Although only 78.8% of respondents considered the stems to be helpful, analysis of comments revealed considerable grammatical, rather than conceptual, concerns: verbs and Dimensions were mismatched, and some did not follow on appropriately.

Professional Values

These were placed first in the revised Dimensions, compared to the PSF 2011, in which they were placed last. This sought to afford greater prominence for the role of Professional Values in practice and this alteration in order was not reported to be especially problematic.

However, in the stem, review of comments revealed that the word “enact” was felt to be potentially confusing and so it was replaced by “In your context show how you”.

V1. was supported (clear 90.9%; useful 91.3%).

V2. responses fell just below the threshold (clear 84.7%; useful 86.6%) and analysis revealed it was not considered to be a Professional Value and overlapped with V2 and V3. It was therefore removed as a Professional Value, revised and placed in Core Knowledge as K3. A new V2 was added, which enabled greater emphasis on learner engagement and equity of opportunity.

V3. was supported (clear 90.7%; useful 88.9%) although scholarship, research and professional learning were requested to be explicit, and so these were added.

V4. received lower scores for (clear 82.6%; useful 82.3%) since the word “acknowledge” was disliked, it was replaced with “respond to”.

V5. this new Professional Value was supported (clear 87.6%; useful 86.1%). Comments stressed the importance of clarifying with whom collaboration could take place. This will be undertaken within revised Fellowship Guidance materials.
Core Knowledge

The stem, “In your context, apply knowledge of...” was well received and the critical importance of the phrase “in your context” was affirmed by colleagues at the roundtable event for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders who wanted the wider community to recognise that there are diverse forms of knowledge shaped by context, including indigenous knowledge.

Although not usually written as a plural, the term “Core Knowledges” was proposed in response to roundtable comments, in which the importance of respecting diversity within different forms of knowledge was raised, rather than privileging some forms of knowledge over others.

K1. this significantly revised Dimension, which focuses on learning rather than subject material, received positive responses (clear 93.8%; useful 92.7%). However, the word “occurs” was considered awkward and so was replaced with “how learners learn”.

K2. was found to be clear (92.1%) and useful (89.1%) though concern over whether the requirement for inclusive practice might be challenging for all colleagues prompted its relocation into the Descriptors.

K3. the introduction of “education for sustainable development” (ESD) received very low support (clear 50.1%; useful 49.2%). While some were very supportive, many did not understand what was meant or required, while others were familiar with ESD but nonetheless felt that assessment would pose problems. Comments included:

“I applaud this being here, but do not think it is core knowledge yet - it may be an aspiration, but we would struggle … to embody this as yet.”

Group comments raised additional concerns about curriculum:

“This is uncharacteristically specific in that it starts to dictate curricula.”

“ESD is important, but it is not clear why this activity is singled out above other priorities.”

Deeper analysis of the breakdown of colleagues over “clear” and “useful” identified that although senior managers were more positive than educational developers, all figures were significantly below the 85% threshold. Analysis by country also showed slight variation but all responses were still low. ESD was therefore removed from the Framework, although Advance HE will support practice in this area and examples of relevant practice for V4 will appear in guidance materials. K3 then became a Core Knowledge focused on critical evaluation, having moved from V2.
K4. “appropriate use” of technologies and the addition of “resources” were supported (clear 94.2%; useful 92.8%). In addition, the term “digital” was adopted in response to advice from groups with specific expertise in this area of practice.

K5. was supported (clear 84.1%; useful 87.1%) although as clarity fell just below the 85% threshold, wording was reduced to aid further clarity.

Areas of Activity

As phase one found fewer reports of issues arising with the Areas of Activity, amendments had been modest and support was high. However, the stem statement “In your context, apply effective and inclusive practice” was felt to be too complex and so was revised to: “In your context, demonstrate that you”. The concepts of both effectiveness and inclusion were retained in the Descriptors, while effectiveness also remained within appropriate Dimensions.

A1. was supported (clear 97.2%; useful 95.6%) and retains the word programmes, to refer to a variety of components such as units, modules, courses, learning packages etc which will be explained in the glossary.

A2. was supported (clear 89.6%; useful 90.5%), including the addition of “environments” from A4 (PSF 2011), although both academic and non-academic respondents requested a return to the language of “teach and/or support learning”.

A3. was supported (clear 95.8%; useful 92.9%).

A4. the reconfigured A4 was supported, enabling more focus on support and guidance for learners (clear 87.1%; useful 89.1%).

A5. the focus on CPD alone was supported (clear 93.4%; useful 92%), although clarification of ‘own CPD’ was requested and was added.

Descriptors

A strong attempt was made to distinguish the Descriptors from the Dimensions and also show their integration and interdependency. To clarify, the Dimensions describe the key values, knowledge and activities that are undertaken, while the Descriptors state how these need to be undertaken. For example, not merely to respect learners and promote equity of opportunity through design, teaching / supporting learning and assessment (V1, V2, A1, A2, A3), but do so in an inclusive and effective manner (D2). Similarly, not merely to be effective (V3, K3) but to have a sustained record of influence and effectiveness (D3). Survey responses evidenced appreciation of this approach, and while comments were broadly positive about the succinct style, considerable feedback was also offered on the specific wording of each Descriptor.
Descriptor One (D1):

Introductory statement: responses fell below the 85% threshold (clear 81.5%; useful 78.7%). Phrases such as “within a specific set of Dimensions”, “learners’ outcomes” and “scope of practice” were reported to be unclear and were therefore revised for clarity, emphasising the requirement for “some” Dimensions to be met.

- **D1.1:** was supported (clear 93.9%; useful 87.2%). The specific requirement for V1 and V2 was updated to V1 and V3 to reflect revisions to the Professional Values.
- **D1.2:** was supported (clear 95.7%; 91% useful). The requirement for K1 and K2 was updated to K1, K2 and K3 to reflect revisions made to these.
- **D1.3:** the added emphasis on effective and inclusive practice was supported (clear 95.1%; useful 89.7%).

Descriptor One (D2):

Introductory statement: phrases such as “scope of practice” and “learners’ outcomes” were reported to be troublesome and were therefore removed. “Substantive” was not supported (clear 88.4%; useful 84.6%) and so was replaced with “experienced”.

- **D2.1:** was supported (clear 95.5%; useful 93.6%) and was changed to reflect the revised Professional Values.
- **D2.2:** was supported (clear 97.1%; useful 93.9%).
- **D2.3:** was supported (clear 96.2%, useful 93.2%), supporting the addition of inclusive and effective practice.

Descriptor Three (D3):

This proved to be quite challenging. Even though comments were above 85% in all areas, feedback identified issues with phrasing, repetition and, crucially, requests to clarify whether the Descriptor referred to one’s own direct practice with learners or to practice through leading and influencing the practices of colleagues. One comment, for example, questioned:

“Does this need to be demonstrated in own practice, or through influence on others’ practice?”

Subsequent discussions with the Project Team and the Fellowship team explored the evolving nature of practice within D3. A shift in practice towards greater leading/influencing was reported, with many now leading as their main practice, while others balanced leading with direct teaching roles.
---

**Introductory statement:** despite positive response rates (clear 87.5%; useful 86.1%) this was reported to be overly long and potentially confusing so was sharpened to include the term “comprehensive understanding”.

**D3.1:** despite high support (clear 89.4%; useful 89%) the phrase “across applicable dimensions” was reported to be ambiguous and so was removed; the phrase “leading” was considered more appropriate than “leadership”.

**D3.2:** the phrase “inclusive and effective practice” received high levels of support (clear 92.8%; useful 91.1%). Clarity was offered regarding practice through the addition of “own and/or leading or influencing other”.

**D3.3:** although positive response rates were received (clear 87.1%; useful 85.3%), it was found to duplicate V3, so was replaced with the requirement to integrate all Dimensions across practice.

**Descriptor Four (D4):**

Proposals to enhance accessibility for potential D4s delivering strategic leadership received positive responses, although some phrases required clarification.

**Introductory statement:** with mixed responses (clear 88%; useful 84.7%) the expression “sphere of influence” was reported to be vague and so was removed.

**D4.1:** the phrase “across a range of Dimensions” and use of the word “across” in “extensive influence: within, across or beyond an institution” were removed to improve clarity and emphasis (clear 86.2%; useful 83.5%). Profession was added to enhance inclusion.

**D4.2:** the broader range of practice was supported (clear 91.2%; useful 86.8%). For clarity, reference to the “learning experience” was replaced with “outcomes for learners”.

**D4.3:** responses were mixed (clear 87.2%; useful 81.9%) and comments indicated that the duplication of D3.3 in D4.3 was problematic. It was replaced with a new statement that clarified the requirement for all Dimensions to be integrated in practice.

**D4.4:** was omitted since it was reported to overlap with A5 (clear 88.5%; useful 83.3%).

**Student Descriptor**

Support for consideration of a Student Descriptor was low at 54%. Those who supported the idea felt that:

“it would be good for students involved in schemes like peer mentoring to be recognised”

---
Others felt that a Student Descriptor would cause unnecessary overlap with the existing D1:

“*I’m not sure how this would differ from D1? We already have students who successfully demonstrate D1...*”

Some felt that this form of recognition might be better as a separately targeted scheme or framework, noting the need for distinction between undergraduate students involved in supporting their peers, and postgraduate and doctoral students involved in teaching and therefore eligible to apply for recognition in the D1 category.

Although this data did not provide a mandate for development of a Student Descriptor, Advance HE will continue its work with students and their representatives. This ensures that further need or opportunity to progress work in this area will be identified, should it be required.

**Phase two summary of outcomes**

Based on evaluation of all findings from the phase two survey consultation, and with PRSG endorsement, a further draft revised Framework was produced (September 2022). This served as the basis for phase three of the consultation process.

Key enhancements to the draft revised Framework (September 2022) at this stage were:

- revisions to purpose
- removal of structure section including the critical strands as a separate element, although the topics of inclusion, context and effectiveness were maintained
- stem statements for Professional Values and Areas of Activity amended
- 15 Dimensions of the Framework were retained, although ESD was removed
- further refinements were made to some Dimensions
- introductory statements for all Descriptors were refined
- four Descriptors were retained, with amendment and refinement, most significantly in D3 and D4
- further clarification was made to the relationship between the Dimensions and the Descriptors
- agreement to create a glossary as an accompanying document to the PSF.

Revised Dimensions and Descriptors (September 2022) compared to those offered at the completion of phase one of the Review (June 2022) may be viewed in Appendix One.
6. Phase three

Phase three review process

Phase three provided essential opportunities for a further and final consultation stage, prior to completing the final revised PSF, together with additional stakeholder engagement.

Phase three review process: consultation

Following the redrafted revised PSF produced at the end of phase two (September 2022), further consultation was undertaken. It was critically important to conduct a targeted review of these changes with members of communities that would use the PSF directly. Three large online group discussions were held in late September and early October 2022 with those closely involved with the PSF for the purposes of Fellowship and accreditation.

These in-depth discussions enabled sense checking the changes in terms of appropriateness of interpretation, feasibility of the proposed amendments and clarification of transition arrangements for phasing in use of the new PSF 2023 with minimum disruption. Discussions also enabled initial exploration of opportunities for collaboration between Advance HE and the sector in the co-creation of the various guidance and support materials that would be required to support the successful implementation of the revised PSF.
Phase three stakeholder engagement

Engagement with UK and international stakeholders offered vital opportunities to share the final draft Framework with the broader community. This provided opportunities to introduce the revised PSF to groups who were both familiar and unfamiliar with the Framework. This facilitated greater global connection for the Framework and enabled needs arising in relation to PSF implementation to be identified and explored. In turn, these enabled a feedforward into the creation of guidance and support materials.

The conversations also allowed further consideration and clarification of transition arrangements, particularly with groups such as senior managers of institutions, various groups of those leading teaching and learning and those leading programmes linked to the PSF and accredited by Advance HE.

Phase three findings and resulting actions

Following phase three discussions focused on a small number of key issues, PRSG provided additional opportunities to examine proposed amendments to the PSF, which included the following.

Purpose

Following removal of ESD as a specific Dimension, as an outcome of phase two and to reinforce the importance of ESD within the global context in which the PSF operates, reference to the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (United Nations, 2015) was added to the Purpose section.

The commitment of Advance HE to continue to support practice related to ESD was also reiterated. Examples of relevant practice for V4, in which wider context HE operates, will be produced and broader materials supporting understanding of the role of ESD within HE are also being prepared.

PSF image

Further consultation with external designers enabled a new diagram to be created. Guided by both feedback on the original proposed image provided in the survey, and discussions within phase three, the new diagram was felt to be more easily understood and more appropriately represented the PSF as it includes both Dimensions of the Framework and its Descriptors. It now presents the four Descriptors encompassing the three sets of Dimensions: Professional Values, Core Knowledge and Areas of Activity, which are positioned centrally within the PSF 2023.
Dimensions of the Framework

**Professional Values**

V3: was reordered, placing examples of evidence-informed practice first, to enhance clarity and place greater emphasis on purpose.

**Core Knowledge**

Adding an ‘s’ to Core Knowledge was considered at length with both stakeholders and the PRSG. The shared objective was to ensure that the PSF 2023 unambiguously evidenced that there are multiple and diverse forms of knowledge and that these are connected to and shaped by communities and contexts. Discussions explored the advantages and disadvantages of adding an ‘s’ to Core Knowledge in detail. For example, an advantage of adding an ‘s’ would reinforce the global nature of the PSF. Disadvantages included the potential challenge for users of the PSF 2023 for whom English is not their first language, and that the added ‘s’ could distract from, rather than emphasise, recognition of the importance of context and the multiple and diverse forms of knowledge that contribute to practice.

Agreement was reached to remove the ‘s’ from Core Knowledge but to simultaneously add a sentence to “What are Dimensions?”, clearly stating the existence of multiple and diverse forms of knowledge. The following sentence was therefore added to the Core Knowledge section of “What are Dimensions?”:

“There are multiple and diverse forms of knowledge which are connected to and shaped by communities and contexts.”

**Descriptors:**

**D2:** the Introduction had previously included “substantive” and then “experienced”. These had been found to be unhelpful. For example, use of “experienced” suggested that the length of time dedicated to practice may be perceived as a primary feature for D2 whereas it was felt use of the phrase “whose practice with learners has breadth and depth” was a more appropriate description of what is expected at D2.

**D3 Introduction and D3.1:** “others” was removed to enable and clarify that it is the practice of those who teach and/or support learning that should be led or influenced.

**D3.2:** an emphasis on integration of all Dimensions was re-introduced. This had been included in the draft revised PSF produced at the completion of phase one (June 2022). Despite receiving strong support in survey responses, as D3 was more substantially revised, the draft produced at the end of phase two (September 2022) no longer contained reference to all Dimensions. However, discussions within phase three confirmed the importance of retaining reference to all Dimensions and therefore it was reinstated.
D3.3: clarity was provided here (rather than in D3.2) to emphasise, “practice that extends significantly beyond direct teaching and/or direct support for learning”. This revision was in response to discussions within phase three, which highlighted the importance of capturing the extent to which evidence to achieve D3 would need to incorporate practice beyond one’s direct teaching and/or direct support of learners. The degree to which leading and/or influencing those who teach and/or support learning was deemed to be more accurately captured through use of the phrase “practice that extends significantly beyond direct teaching and/or direct support for learning”. Further explanation of this will be provided in the glossary.

D4 Introduction and D4.1: the word “impact” returns to replace “influence”, which enables greater emphasis on outcomes and enhances differentiation between D3 and D4. A preference for use of the word “impact” had been noted from more senior colleagues during phase one. It was therefore deemed appropriate to respond to the request to use “impact” made during phase three, to better meet the requirement of evidencing strategic leadership at D4.

PSF 2023 support materials
A range of materials and formats, including online and interactive materials, were necessary to support both launch and subsequent use of the PSF 2023.

Launch materials
The key items created by the Project Team comprise this project report, a key changes document, presenting the PSF’s Dimensions and Descriptors 2011 and PSF 2023 (see Appendix Two), an online presentation and associated video. In addition, to support shared understanding of Framework terminology, a glossary will be produced to support the PSF 2023.

Implementation materials
Revised guidance and support materials related to use of PSF 2023 for the purposes of Advance HE accreditation and Fellowship were required; for example, significant revision and updating of the Dimensions of the Framework guidance documents and other key Advance HE resources such as the Fellowship Category Tool, applicant guidance, reviewer guidance, etc. These activities have been led by colleagues from Advance HE in consultation with the broader sector. The ongoing custodianship of the PSF by Advance HE will ensure its supporting materials are monitored and further developed, and PSF 2023 is implemented, embedded and evaluated.
Phase three summary of outcomes

Key enhancements to the final revised Framework (October 2022), which resulted in creation of the PSF 2023:

- addition of United Nation Sustainable Development Goals into the Purpose and a reiteration of the commitment to include reference to sustainability in support and guidance documentation
- redesigned PSF image now represents both Dimensions and Descriptors
- minor revision of V3 by re-ordering text to enhance clarity and place greater emphasis on purpose
- removal of ‘s’ from Core Knowledge, while retaining a clear emphasis on multiple and diverse forms of knowledge that contribute to practice, through the inclusion of additional text within the Core Knowledge section of “What are Dimensions?”
- D2 introduction amended to emphasise that practice with learners must contain “breadth and depth”
- further revisions to D3 to clarify that it is the practice of those who teach and/or support learning that should be led or influenced; that all Dimensions should be integrated into practice and the extent to which practice must extend beyond direct teaching and/or direct support for learning
- minor amendment to D4, replacing “influence” with “impact”.

Revised Dimensions and Descriptors (PSF, 2023) compared to those offered at the completion of phase two of the Review (September 2022) may be viewed in Appendix One and Appendix Two as a key changes document, presenting the PSF’s Dimensions and Descriptors 2011 and PSF 2023.
This section identifies the most significant changes, intended outcomes of the revised PSF 2023 and final reflections.

**Significant changes**

Significant changes within the Framework include:

- stronger emphasis given throughout the PSF to:
  - effectiveness and impact
  - inclusion
  - context of practice
- new stem statements for all Dimensions
- updated and inclusive language throughout
- reduction of repetition
- revised and streamlined Dimensions and Descriptors
- clearer relationship between Dimensions and Descriptors
- greater prominence of Professional Values
- stronger focus on student support and guidance
- collaboration with others as a new Dimension
- clarified requirements for D1 based on revised Dimensions
- D2 now requires breadth and depth of practice
- leading and influencing the practice of others emphasised in D3
- broader access for those with strategic impact in D4

**Intended outcomes**

The PSF 2023 offers a range of benefits to the sector, including enhancement of:

- inclusion, now firmly embedded in practice, and making the Framework more relevant to the increasingly diverse HE community
- relevance, through significantly greater emphasis on the importance of context as a major influence on practice
• effectiveness and impact, recognising the criticality of examining and articulating practice and its outcomes for learners and colleagues
• leadership and professional development, foregrounding their importance for all those involved in teaching and/or supporting learning
• support for the development of teaching, learning and assessment strategies and policies
• clarity and efficiency, enabling ease of use in its application to Fellowship and accreditation, professional development, probation, progression and promotion.

Final reflections

Being aware of the post-Covid HE landscape, and the increased global participation in the use of the PSF, the Project Team recognised the need to strive to reach even higher and further to update and enhance the PSF. An essential requirement was to ensure that it would continue to be fit for purpose for the next decade, wherever and however HE is provided, enabling the Framework to embrace further evolution and diversity in practice.

The Project Team was critically aware that a basic tenet had to be 'do no harm' to the thousands of Fellows and institutions who are understandably proud of the recognition and accreditation that their engagement with the Framework has afforded them.

The importance of including the broadest voices and perspectives was apparent, as was a methodology that prioritised rigour through layered, extensive and repeated sector-wide consultation. This was essential for the review to achieve legitimate co-creation of a revised Framework that would support learners and colleagues, cultures and practices, professions and disciplines. It was therefore particularly gratifying that participants from 24 countries contributed to the review, as did a wide range of colleagues such as academics, those from professional/student services and senior leaders. Advance HE will continue to engage with a broad range of stakeholders and, informed by the equality monitoring findings in phase one, will develop further relationships, including those with underrepresented communities.

The starting point was to explore the rich data relating to the PSF and its use that was already in existence. This had been gathered and held by Advance HE following consultations, roundtable events and discussions during 2015-20 regarding the future of teaching and/or supporting learning in HE. Analysis of these, together with existing literature from commissioned reports and peer-reviewed publications, revealed several powerful messages which triangulated well and were stable across both the timeframe and datasets.
These considered aspects of practice, both current and future, challenges and potential solutions. In addition, five complex, conceptual and multi-layered issues emerged that needed greater exploration. Subsequent key stakeholder consultations helped to illuminate a deeper understanding of these issues. This understanding, together with findings within initial data, was sufficient to provide a strong basis from which to propose revisions for sector-wide comment via the open access online survey.

The Project Team was greatly reassured by the thoughtful and considered responses provided by survey respondents. The data yielded rich comment alongside clear response results. These gave a strong indication that the proposals were in keeping with the broader mood of the sector. Of note was the strong agreement across most issues, with unequivocal support for many aspects of the revised Framework in relation to the Dimensions and Descriptors. Similarly, the sector offered a clear rejection of other aspects such as the proposed ‘critical strands’, the newly created PSF image and the inclusion of ESD as a Core Knowledge. The Project Team especially appreciated the wide-ranging free-text commentary provided by respondents. This offered particularly helpful feedback that extended and deepened understanding of the issues raised, and frequently introduced a level of criticality and nuance to even the most positive responses.

Following extensive analysis, the next step was to sense check the subsequent revisions with those most directly involved with use of the Framework. Once again, these consultations were invaluable and led to further intense debate and discussions, such as those with members of Advance HE’s strategic advisory groups and the PRSG. This again facilitated deeper exploration of issues being raised, especially in relation to Descriptor 3. This, as described previously, required considerable thought and discussion to agree the most appropriate wording for the criteria. An example of this may also be seen in the careful and nuanced consideration related to issues of inclusion, perspective and the nature and representation of Core Knowledge.

Extensive support from both the Project Team and the PRSG was especially valuable across the lifespan of the review since these environments offered ‘safe spaces’ in which to raise challenging issues for consideration. The variety of perspectives in both groups gave a fuller, broader quality to the discussion and enabled questions to be raised, issues to be shared and potential solutions to be developed and challenged. Although numerous examples could be cited here, this quality of contribution was especially valuable when issues of how best to achieve broader representation were explored with the PRSG, and when the Project Team offered in-depth analysis of findings and considered how best to apply them to Framework revisions.

The Project Team’s primary focus was to understand and address sector feedback which resulted in a range of significant revisions to the Framework. These included a more streamlined document, with updated, succinct and inclusive language throughout, avoiding overlap, repetition and ambiguity. Special attention has also been given to introducing both the Dimensions and Descriptors and providing an explanation of the relationship within and between them.
Acknowledging the continually evolving nature of practice, far stronger emphasis has been placed throughout the PSF 2023 on the importance of effectiveness and impact, inclusion and the context in which practice is situated. Dimensions have been re-ordered and revised and each set has received a new stem statement that clarifies the practice to which each refers. Professional Values have been given greater prominence and a new value of collaboration is now added.

Descriptors have also been revised and streamlined, receiving new introductory statements and clearly focused criteria. In D1, criteria requirements have been clarified and D2 now requires breadth and depth of practice. Greater emphasis on leading and influencing the practice of others who teach and/or support learning is foregrounded in D3, and opportunities for broader access to D4 have been created for those able to evidence impact of strategic leadership.

The Project Team has been honoured to have had the opportunity to participate in the process of revising the PSF. We are proud that, to date, survey responses and numerous stakeholder consultations and engagement sessions indicate that our efforts to facilitate a sector-led collaborative review process that is ‘of the sector, for the sector’ have been successful. We trust that as the PSF 2023 is launched, it will be welcomed and prove to be truly fit for a global future.
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Further Reading


## Professional Standards Framework

### Versions of Framework across review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>PSF 2011</th>
<th>Output of phase 1 draft (June 2022)</th>
<th>Output of phase 2 redraft (September 2022)</th>
<th>PSF 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Values</td>
<td>Professional Values</td>
<td>Professional Values</td>
<td>Professional Values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your context, enact</td>
<td>In your context, show how you</td>
<td>In your context, show how you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1 Respect individual learners and diverse learning communities</td>
<td>Respect individual learners and equity of opportunity for all to reach their potential</td>
<td>Respect individual learners and diverse groups of learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2 Promote participation in higher education and equality of opportunity for learners</td>
<td>Critical evaluation to enhance the effectiveness of practice</td>
<td>Promote engagement in learning and equity of opportunity for all to reach their potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3 Use evidence-informed approaches and the outcomes from research, scholarship and continuing professional development</td>
<td>Evidence informed approaches as a basis for practice</td>
<td>Use evidence informed approaches, including research, or scholarship, or professional learning, as a basis for effective practice</td>
<td>Use scholarship, or research, or professional learning, or other evidence-informed approaches as a basis for effective practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4</td>
<td>Acknowledge the wider context in which higher education operates, recognising the implications for professional practice</td>
<td>Acknowledge that the wider context in which higher education operates influences practice</td>
<td>Respond to the wider context in which higher education operates, recognising implications for practice</td>
<td>Respond to the wider context in which higher education operates, recognising implications for practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5</td>
<td>Collaboration with others to enhance learning</td>
<td>Collaborate with others to enhance practice</td>
<td>Collaborate with others to enhance practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Core Knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011 Current version</th>
<th>Draft (released June 2022)</th>
<th>Output of phase 2 redraft (September 2022)</th>
<th>PSF 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Knowledge</td>
<td>Core Knowledge</td>
<td>Core Knowledge</td>
<td>Core Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1 The subject material</td>
<td>In your context, apply knowledge of</td>
<td>In your context, apply knowledge of</td>
<td>In your context, apply knowledge of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2 Appropriate methods for teaching, learning and assessing in the subject area and at the level of the academic programme</td>
<td>How learning occurs, both generally and within specific subjects</td>
<td>How learners learn, generally and within specific subjects</td>
<td>How learners learn, generally and within specific subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K3 How students learn, both generally and within their subject/disciplinary area(s)</td>
<td>Inclusive approaches to facilitate learning, suitable for subject and level of study</td>
<td>Approaches to teaching and/or supporting learning, appropriate for subjects and level of study</td>
<td>Approaches to teaching and/or supporting learning, appropriate for subjects and level of study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4 The use and value of appropriate learning technologies</td>
<td>Education for sustainable development to inform practice</td>
<td>Critical evaluation as a basis for effective practice</td>
<td>Critical evaluation as a basis for effective practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriate use of technologies and resources to enhance learning</td>
<td>Appropriate use of digital and/or other technologies, and resources for learning</td>
<td>Appropriate use of digital and/or other technologies, and resources for learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K5</td>
<td>Methods for evaluating the effectiveness of teaching</td>
<td>Requirements to assure quality and enhance the learning experience, and their implication for practice</td>
<td>Requirements for quality assurance and enhancement, and their implications for practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K6</td>
<td>The implications of quality assurance and quality enhancement for academic and professional practice with a particular focus on teaching</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Areas of Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSF 2011</th>
<th>Draft (released June 2022)</th>
<th>Output of phase 2 redraft (September 2022)</th>
<th>PSF 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Activity</td>
<td>Areas of Activity</td>
<td>Areas of Activity</td>
<td>In your context, demonstrate that you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your context, apply effective and inclusive practice</td>
<td>In your context, demonstrate that you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and plan learning activities and/or programmes of study</td>
<td>Design and plan learning activities and/or programmes</td>
<td>Design and plan learning activities and/or programmes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach and/or support learning</td>
<td>Facilitate learning through relevant approaches and environments</td>
<td>Teach and/or support learning through appropriate approaches and environments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess and give feedback to learners</td>
<td>Assess and give feedback for learning</td>
<td>Assess and give feedback for learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop effective learning environments and approaches to student support and guidance</td>
<td>Support and guidance for learners</td>
<td>Support and guide learners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Engage in continuing professional development in subjects/disciplines and their pedagogy, incorporating research, scholarship and the evaluation of professional practices</td>
<td>Continuing professional development to enhance practice</td>
<td>Enhance practice through own continuing professional development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Descriptors

### Descriptor 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSF 2011 Draft (June 2022)</th>
<th>Output of phase 2 redraft (September 2022)</th>
<th>PSF 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Descriptor 1</td>
<td>Descriptor 1</td>
<td>Descriptor 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intro**

Demonstrates an understanding of specific aspects of effective teaching, learning support methods and student learning. Individuals be able to provide evidence of:

*is suitable for individuals whose scope of practice with learners occurs within a specific set of Dimensions. Effectiveness of practice to support high quality learning is demonstrated in learners’ outcomes. They are able to evidence:*

**D1.1**

Successful engagement with at least two of the five Areas of Activity

Commitment to relevant Professional Values, including at least V1 and V2

*Use of appropriate Professional Values, including at least V1 and V3*

Use of appropriate Professional Values, including at least V1 and V3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>D1.2</th>
<th>D1.3</th>
<th>D1.4</th>
<th>D1.5</th>
<th>D1.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Successful engagement in appropriate teaching and practices related to these Areas of Activity</td>
<td>Application of appropriate Core Knowledge, including at least K1 and K2</td>
<td>Application of appropriate Core Knowledges, including at least K1, K2 and K3</td>
<td>Application of appropriate Core Knowledge, including at least K1 and K2</td>
<td>Application of appropriate Core Knowledge, including at least K1 and K2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.3</td>
<td>Appropriate Core Knowledge and understanding of at least K1 and K2</td>
<td>Effective and inclusive practice in at least two of the five Areas of Activity</td>
<td>Effective and inclusive practice in at least two of the five Areas of Activity</td>
<td>Effective and inclusive practice in at least two of the five Areas of Activity</td>
<td>Effective and inclusive practice in at least two of the five Areas of Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.4</td>
<td>A commitment to appropriate Professional Values in facilitating others' learning</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.5</td>
<td>Relevant professional practices, subject and pedagogic research and/or scholarship within the above activities</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.6</td>
<td>Successful engagement, where appropriate, in professional development activity related to teaching, learning and assessment responsibilities</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical individual role/career stage” text</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptor 2</td>
<td>PSF 2011</td>
<td>Draft (June 2022)</td>
<td>Proposed redraft (September 2022)</td>
<td>PSF 2023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intro</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrates a broad understanding of effective approaches to teaching and learning support as key contributions to high quality student learning. Individuals should be able to provide evidence of:</td>
<td>is suitable for individuals whose scope of practice with learners is broad, substantive, and involves all Dimensions. Effectiveness of practice to support high quality learning is demonstrated in learners’ outcomes. <strong>They are able to evidence:</strong></td>
<td>is suitable for individuals whose practice with learners has breadth and depth, enabling them to evidence all Dimensions. Effectiveness of practice in teaching and/or support of high quality learning is demonstrated through evidence of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D2.1</strong></td>
<td>Successful engagement across all five Areas of Activity</td>
<td>Commitment to all five Professional Values</td>
<td>Use of all five Professional Values</td>
<td>Use of all five Professional Values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D2.2</strong></td>
<td>Appropriate knowledge and understanding across all aspects of Core Knowledge</td>
<td>Application of all five Core Knowledges</td>
<td>Application of all five Core Knowledges</td>
<td>Application of all five forms of Core Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D2.3</strong></td>
<td>A commitment to all the Professional Values</td>
<td>Effective and inclusive practice in all five Areas of Activity</td>
<td>Effective and inclusive practice in all five Areas of Activity</td>
<td>Effective and inclusive practice in all five Areas of Activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D2.4</strong></td>
<td>A commitment to all the Professional Values</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.5</td>
<td>Successful incorporation of subject and pedagogic research and/or scholarship within the above activities, as part of an integrated approach to academic practice</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.6</td>
<td>Successful engagement in continuing professional development in relation to teaching, learning, assessment and, where appropriate, related professional practices</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Typical individual role/career stage” text</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Descriptor 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSF 2011</th>
<th>Draft (June 2022)</th>
<th>Proposed redraft (September 2022)</th>
<th>PSF 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intro</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates a thorough understanding of effective approaches to teaching and learning support as a key contribution to high quality student learning. Individuals should be able to provide evidence of:</td>
<td><em>is suitable for individuals whose own practice provides a basis from which they lead and influence colleagues’ practice in facilitating and supporting learning. Their practice is comprehensive and shows a sustained record of effectiveness. Effectiveness is demonstrated through individual practice and that of others, in support of high quality learning. They are able to evidence:</em></td>
<td><em>Is suitable for individuals whose comprehensive understanding and effective practice provides a basis from which they lead or influence others’ practice in high quality teaching and/or supporting learning. Individuals are able to evidence:</em></td>
<td><em>is suitable for individuals whose comprehensive understanding and effective practice provides a basis from which they lead or influence those who teach and/or support high-quality learning. Individuals are able to evidence:</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D3.1</strong> Successful engagement across all five Areas of Activity</td>
<td>Sustained leadership or influence on colleagues’ practices in facilitating and supporting learning across applicable Dimensions</td>
<td>A sustained record of leading or influencing others’ practice in support of high quality learning</td>
<td>A sustained record of leading or influencing the practice of those who teach and/or support high-quality learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D3.2</strong> Appropriate knowledge and understanding across all aspects of Core Knowledge</td>
<td>Sustained record of effective and inclusive practice across all Dimensions</td>
<td>A sustained record of effective and inclusive practice (own and/or leading or influencing others’)</td>
<td>Practice that is effective, inclusive and integrates all Dimensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D3.3</strong> A commitment to all the Professional Values</td>
<td>Application of an evidence based and analytical approach to leadership, academic and/or professional practices</td>
<td>Integration of all Dimensions across own practice and/or leading or influencing others’ practice</td>
<td>Practice that extends significantly beyond direct teaching and/or direct support for learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.4</td>
<td>Successful engagement in appropriate teaching practices related to the Areas of Activity</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.5</td>
<td>Successful incorporation of subject and pedagogic research and/or scholarship within the above activities, as part of an integrated approach to academic practice</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.6</td>
<td>Successful engagement in continuing professional development in relation to teaching, learning, assessment, scholarship and, as appropriate, related academic or professional practices</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.7</td>
<td>Successful co-ordination, support, supervision, management and/or mentoring of others (whether individuals and/or teams) in relation to teaching and learning</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical individual role/career stage” text</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Descriptor 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PSF 2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>Draft (June 2022)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed redraft (September 2022)</strong></td>
<td><strong>PSF 2023</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intro</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates a sustained record of effective strategic leadership in academic practice and academic development as a key contribution to high quality student learning. Individuals should be able to provide evidence of:</td>
<td>is suitable for highly experienced individuals whose practice involves a sustained record of impact in strategic leadership of high quality learning. Their sphere of influence is extensive. Effectiveness and impact are demonstrated through:</td>
<td>is suitable for highly experienced individuals whose practice involves a sustained record of effectiveness in strategic leadership of high quality learning. Their influence is extensive. Individuals are able to evidence:</td>
<td>is suitable for highly experienced individuals whose practice involves a sustained record of effectiveness in strategic leadership of high quality learning. Their impact is extensive. Individuals are able to evidence:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D4.1</strong></td>
<td>Active commitment to and championing of all Dimensions of the Framework, through work with students and staff, and in institutional developments</td>
<td>Sustained record of effective strategic leadership of practice across a range of Dimensions, with extensive influence: within, across or beyond an institution; or across a discipline</td>
<td>Sustained and effective strategic leadership of higher education practice, with extensive influence on high quality learning: within or beyond an institution, or across a discipline or profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.2</td>
<td>Successful, strategic leadership to enhance student learning, with a particular, but not necessarily exclusive, focus on enhancing teaching quality in institutional, and/or (inter)national settings</td>
<td>Development and implementation of effective and inclusive policy, procedures, initiatives or strategies, that have significantly enhanced practice and the learning experience</td>
<td>Development and implementation of effective and inclusive strategies, or policies, or procedures, or initiatives, to enhance practice, and outcomes for learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.3</td>
<td>Establishing effective organisational policies and/or strategies for supporting and promoting others (e.g. through mentoring, coaching) in delivering high quality teaching and support for learning</td>
<td>Application of an evidence based and analytical approach to leadership, academic and/or professional practices</td>
<td>Active commitment to, and integration of, all Dimensions in the strategic leadership of academic or professional practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.4</td>
<td>Championing, within institutional and/or wider settings, an integrated approach to academic practice (incorporating, for example, teaching, learning, research, scholarship, administration etc.)</td>
<td>Commitment to, and application of continuing professional development of own leadership, academic and/or other professional practices.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Successful, strategic leadership to enhance student learning, with a particular, but not necessarily exclusive, focus on enhancing teaching quality in institutional, and/or (inter) national settings</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.5</td>
<td>“Typical individual role/career stage” text</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Professional Standards Framework PSF 2011 – PSF 2023 key changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Values</th>
<th>Professional Values</th>
<th>Further information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STEM</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>In your context, show how you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[New] Professional Values now placed first for added emphasis. Stem statement added to clarify and give prominence to the actions associated with the Professional Values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PSF 2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>PSF 2023</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V1</strong></td>
<td>Respect individual learners and diverse learning communities</td>
<td>Respect individual learners and diverse <strong>groups of learners</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Minor change] Phrase revised to aid clarity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V2</strong></td>
<td>Promote participation in higher education and equality of opportunity for learners</td>
<td>Promote <strong>engagement in learning</strong> and equity of opportunity for all to <strong>reach their potential</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Minor change] Words added and phrases revised to aid clarity and strengthen emphasis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V3</strong></td>
<td>Use evidence-informed approaches and the outcomes from research, scholarship and continuing professional development</td>
<td>Use scholarship, or research, or professional learning, or other evidence-informed approaches <strong>as a basis for effective practice</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Minor change] Revised to aid clarity and emphasise purpose.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V4</strong></td>
<td>Acknowledge the wider context in which higher education operates recognising the implications for professional practice</td>
<td>Respond to the wider context in which higher education operates, recognising implications for practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Minor change] Proactive verb added to emphasise required action.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborate with others to enhance practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[New] Professional Value introducing the importance of collaborative practice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Knowledge</td>
<td>Core Knowledge</td>
<td>Further information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM N/A</td>
<td>In your context, apply knowledge of</td>
<td>[New] Stem statement added to clarify and give prominence to the actions associated with the Core Knowledge criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1 The subject material</td>
<td>How learners learn, generally and within specific subjects</td>
<td>[Major change and relocated] Emphasis changed and relocated from former K3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2 Appropriate methods for teaching, learning and assessing in the subject area and at the level of the academic programme</td>
<td>Approaches to teaching and/or supporting learning, appropriate for subjects and level of study</td>
<td>[Minor change] Revised to aid clarity and explicitly include non-academic colleagues who support learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K3 How students learn, both generally and within their subject/disciplinary area(s)</td>
<td>Critical evaluation as a basis for effective practice</td>
<td>[Major change and relocated] Former K3 revised and relocated as new K1 (see above). Emphasis changed, purpose clarified and relocated from former K5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4 The use and value of appropriate learning technologies</td>
<td>Appropriate use of digital and/or other technologies, and resources for learning</td>
<td>[Minor change] Expanded to include digital technologies and resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K5 Methods for evaluating the effectiveness of teaching</td>
<td>Requirements for quality assurance and enhancement, and their implications for practice</td>
<td>[Minor change and relocated] Shortened to aid clarity and relocated from former K6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K6 The implications of quality assurance and quality enhancement for academic and professional practice with a particular focus on teaching</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>[Now K5] Relocated to K5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Activity</td>
<td>Areas of Activity</td>
<td>Areas of Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STEM</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>In your context, demonstrate that you</strong> [New]</td>
<td>Stem statement added to clarify and give prominence to the actions associated with the Areas of Activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PSF 2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>PSF 2023</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A1</strong></td>
<td>Design and plan learning activities and/or programmes of study</td>
<td>Design and plan learning activities and/or programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A2</strong></td>
<td>Teach and/or support learning</td>
<td>Teach and/or support learning through appropriate approaches and environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A3</strong></td>
<td>Assess and give feedback to learners</td>
<td>Assess and give feedback for learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A4</strong></td>
<td>Develop effective learning environments and approaches to student support and guidance</td>
<td>Support and guide learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A5</strong></td>
<td>Engage in continuing professional development in subjects/disciplines and their pedagogy, incorporating research, scholarship and the evaluation of professional practices</td>
<td>Enhance practice through own continuing professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptor 1</td>
<td>Descriptor 1</td>
<td>Further Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PSF 2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>PSF 2023</strong></td>
<td><strong>[Minor change]</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intro</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrates an understanding of specific aspects of effective teaching, learning support methods and student learning. Individuals be able to provide evidence of:</td>
<td>Revised introduction which also replaces “Typical individual role/career stage” text to aid clarity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D1.1</strong></td>
<td>Successful engagement with at least two of the five Areas of Activity</td>
<td>Use of appropriate Professional Values, including at least V1 and V3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D1.2</strong></td>
<td>Successful engagement in appropriate teaching and practices related to these Areas of Activity</td>
<td>Application of appropriate Core Knowledge, including at least K1, K2 and K3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D1.3</strong></td>
<td>Appropriate Core Knowledge and understanding of at least K1 and K2</td>
<td>Effective and inclusive practice in at least two of the five Areas of Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D1.4</strong></td>
<td>A commitment to appropriate Professional Values in facilitating others’ learning</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D1.5</strong></td>
<td>Relevant professional practices, subject and pedagogic research and/or scholarship within the above activities</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**[Minor change]**

**[Major change and relocated]**

**[Major change and relocated]**

**[Major change and relocated]**

**[Minor change]**

**[Incorporated in above]**

**[Incorporated in above]**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Successful engagement, where appropriate, in professional development activity related to teaching, learning and assessment responsibilities</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>[Incorporated in above] Removed to avoid duplication with A5.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Typical individual role/career stage” text</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>[Removed] Removed to aid clarity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptor 2</td>
<td>Descriptor 2</td>
<td>Further Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSF 2011</td>
<td>PSF 2023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro</td>
<td>Demonstrates a broad understanding of effective approaches to teaching and learning support as key contributions to high quality student learning. Individuals should be able to provide evidence of: is suitable for individuals whose practice with learners has breadth and depth, enabling them to evidence all Dimensions. Effectiveness of practice in teaching and/or support of high-quality learning is demonstrated through evidence of:</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Minor change] Revised introduction which also replaces &quot;Typical individual role/career stage&quot; text to aid clarity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.1</td>
<td>Successful engagement across all five Areas of Activity</td>
<td>Use of all five Professional Values</td>
<td>[Minor change and relocated] Action required has been strengthened. Relocated from former D2.iii.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.2</td>
<td>Appropriate knowledge and understanding across all aspects of Core Knowledge</td>
<td>Application of all five forms of Core Knowledge</td>
<td>[Minor change] Revised to strengthen activities related to Core Knowledge. Reduced to aid clarity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.3</td>
<td>A commitment to all the Professional Values</td>
<td>Effective and inclusive practice in all five Areas of Activity</td>
<td>[Minor change and relocated] Addition of “effective” and “inclusive” as clear indication of their criticality. Relocated from D2.i Combines former D2. i and D2.iv to aid clarity and avoid duplication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.4</td>
<td>Successful engagement in appropriate teaching practices related to the Areas of Activity</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>[Incorporated in above] Relocated into D2.3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.5</td>
<td>Successful incorporation of subject and pedagogic research and/or scholarship within the above activities, as part of an integrated approach to academic practice</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>[Incorporated in above] Removed to avoid duplication with V3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.6</td>
<td>Successful engagement in continuing professional development in relation to teaching, learning, assessment and, where appropriate, related professional practices</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>[Incorporated in above] Removed to avoid duplication with A5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical individual role/career stage” text</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>[Removed] Removed to aid clarity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Descriptor 3 | Descriptor 3 | Further Information |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSF 2011</th>
<th>PSF 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intro</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrates a thorough understanding of effective approaches to teaching and learning support as a key contribution to high quality student learning. Individuals should be able to provide evidence of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D3.1</strong></td>
<td>Successful engagement across all five Areas of Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D3.2</strong></td>
<td>Appropriate knowledge and understanding across all aspects of Core Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D3.3</strong></td>
<td>A commitment to all the Professional Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Successful engagement in appropriate teaching practices related to the Areas of Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D3.4</strong></td>
<td>Successful incorporation of subject and pedagogic research and/or scholarship within the above activities, as part of an integrated approach to academic practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D3.5</strong></td>
<td>Successful engagement in continuing professional development in relation to teaching, learning, assessment, scholarship and, as appropriate, related academic or professional practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D3.6</strong></td>
<td>Successful co-ordination, support, supervision, management and/or mentoring of others (whether individuals and/or teams) in relation to teaching and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D3.7</strong></td>
<td>“Typical individual role/career stage” text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptor 4</td>
<td>Further Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSF 2011</td>
<td>PSF 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro</td>
<td>Demonstrates a sustained record of effective strategic leadership in academic practice and academic development as a key contribution to high quality student learning. Individuals should be able to provide evidence of: is suitable for highly experienced individuals whose practice involves a sustained record of effectiveness in strategic leadership of high-quality learning. <em>Their impact is extensive.</em> Individuals are able to evidence: [Minor change] Revised introduction which also replaces “Typical individual role/career stage” text to aid clarity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.1</td>
<td>Active commitment to and championing of all Dimensions of the Framework, through work with students and staff, and in institutional developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.2</td>
<td>Successful, strategic leadership to enhance student learning, with a particular, but not necessarily exclusive, focus on enhancing teaching quality in institutional, and/or (inter)national settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.3</td>
<td>Establishing effective organisational policies and/or strategies for supporting and promoting others (e.g. through mentoring, coaching) in delivering high quality teaching and support for learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>