

THE UNIVERSITY *of York*

# The Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice (PGCAP)

Academic year 2011/12

Professional and Organisational Development  
[www.york.ac.uk/pgcap](http://www.york.ac.uk/pgcap)



# Contents

---

<b>Deputy Vice Chancellor's Welcome</b>	<b>2</b>		
<b>Section 1 – Background to the Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice</b>	<b>3</b>		
1.1 Introduction	3		
1.2 Local Context	3		
1.3 National Context	4		
<b>Section 2 – Programme Information</b>	<b>5</b>		
2.1 Requirements of the Programme	5		
2.2 Programme Aims and Learning Outcomes	5		
2.2.1 Aims	5		
2.2.2 Learning Outcomes	5		
2.3 Programme Delivery	6		
2.3.1 Workshops	6		
2.3.2 Online Learning Activities and Resources	6		
2.3.3 Supervisions	6		
2.3.4 Teaching Observations	7		
2.4 Recording Progress	8		
2.5 Leaves of Absence	8		
2.6 Extension to Period of Study	8		
2.7 Withdrawal	9		
2.8 Accreditation of Prior (Experiential) Learning and Exemption	9		
2.9 Programme Evaluation	9		
2.10 UK Professional Standards Framework	10		
<b>Section 3 – Module 1: Learning, Teaching and Assessment in Higher Education (20 Credits)</b>	<b>12</b>		
3.1 Introduction	12		
3.2 Aims and Learning Outcomes	12		
3.2.1 Aims	12		
3.2.2 Learning Outcomes	12		
3.3 Module Requirements	12		
3.4 Workshops and Online Activities	14		
3.4.1 Core	13		
3.4.2 Options	19		
3.5 Assessment	27		
3.5.1 Task	27		
3.5.2 Criteria	28		
<b>Section 4 – Module 2: Developing Academic Practice (20 Credits)</b>	<b>29</b>		
4.1 Introduction	29		
4.2 Aims and Learning Outcomes	29		
4.2.1 Aims	29		
4.2.2 Learning Outcomes	29		
4.3 Module Requirements	29		
4.4 Workshops and Online Activities	30		
4.4.1 Core	30		
4.4.2 Options	32		
4.5 Assessment	35		
4.5.1 Task	35		
4.5.2 Criteria	36		
<b>Section 5 – Module 3: Planning for Career Progression (20 Credits)</b>	<b>37</b>		
5.1 Introduction	37		
5.2 Aims and Learning Outcomes	37		
5.2.1 Aims	37		
5.2.2 Learning Outcomes	37		
5.3 Module Requirements	37		
5.4 Workshops and Online Activities	38		
5.4.1 Core	38		
5.5 Assessment	38		
5.5.1 Task	38		
5.5.2 Criteria	38		
<b>Section 6 – Assessment Submission and Marking</b>	<b>42</b>		
6.1 Assessment Presentation	42		
6.2 Assessment Submission	42		
6.3 Deadlines	42		
6.4 Academic Misconduct	43		
6.5 Moderation	43		
6.6 Resubmission	43		
6.7 Appeals	43		
6.8 Mitigating Circumstances	43		
6.9 Extensions	44		
6.10 Assessment Feedback	44		
6.11 External Exam Board	44		
<b>Section 7 – Resources</b>	<b>45</b>		
<b>Section 8 – The PGCAP Team, Responsibilities and Contacts</b>	<b>48</b>		
8.1 The PGCAP Team	48		
8.2 PGCAP Supervisor Responsibilities	53		
8.3 PGCAP Participant Representatives	53		

# Welcome from the University of York

October 2011

Dear Colleague

*The University of York is proud of its record as a leading teaching and research university. Student surveys generally give high ratings of the teaching and learning experience at York and five of our staff have been awarded National Teaching Fellowships over recent years and one an NTF project worth £200,000. We value our students and are concerned to ensure that we provide a first rate, intellectually stimulating and supportive learning experience for them. In part this has to do with the care we take in ensuring that our programmes are properly planned, adequately resourced and carefully monitored. More importantly, though, it has to do with the success of what goes on in the interaction between staff and students, the way learning is assessed and the feedback we provide. Making this happen isn't something we are born with, but something we acquire.*

*Many of us come into the profession thinking of ourselves as researchers; by the time we take up our first jobs we have mostly spent several years developing our research skills under close supervision. We are teachers as well, though, charged with training the minds of the next generation. At York we are proud of maintaining a balance between teaching and research. Indeed all of the National Teaching Fellowships were awarded to staff from departments rated very highly in the last RAE. You will find that in your first years as an academic you will spend considerable time learning about this aspect of the job, and about how we do things at York.*

*The Post Graduate Certificate in Academic Practice is a programme of study that is designed to help you to do this and support your development as a researcher. It is spread over two (or three) years and makes use in part of the teaching materials and practices you will be developing for the courses you teach and the research you may be undertaking. The programme also encourages you to reflect upon the optimal balance between your research and knowledge exchange activities, teaching and administration, as appropriate. You will have the support of a supervisor to whom you can turn for advice. We welcome you to this programme; we hope you enjoy it, and we are confident that we can rely on you to maintain York's outstanding teaching tradition.*

*Professor Trevor Sheldon  
Deputy Vice-Chancellor  
Chair, University Teaching Committee*

# Section 1 – Background to the Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice

## 1.1 Introduction

The Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice (PGCAP) is an initial professional development programme which aims to enrich and improve participants' engagement with higher education teaching and to offer support for new staff embarking on, or furthering, their career in higher education academic practice more generally. PGCAP adopts a scholarly approach, combining both intra- and inter-disciplinary study, and in so doing seeks to foster a supportive and challenging environment within which participants will learn and exchange thoughts and experiences. It achieves this through a combination of strategies:

- Identifying and discussing disciplinary approaches to, and convention in, academic practice
- Exploring essential general principles and issues in academic practice
- Encouraging considered reflection upon the application of (inter-)disciplinary and general principles and issues within both departmentally-specific environments and the particular context of the University of York.

PGCAP is intended to be completed part-time over a two year period. Completion is a contractual requirement for any member of staff with a significant teaching commitment (for this purpose that is taken to be more than 30 hours per year) who is taking up a permanent contract or a fixed-term contract of two years or more unless he or she has more than 3 years full-time (equivalent) experience of teaching in Higher Education. PGCAP welcomes other University of York staff providing they have support from their department to undertake the programme and their professional practice will allow them to achieve the module and programme learning outcomes as detailed in sections 2 to 5. Individuals are encouraged to contact the programme director if they wish to discuss or clarify this. Successful completion of PGCAP leads to the award of a Masters-level certificate.

PGCAP is co-ordinated through the Professional and Organisational Development Unit<sup>1</sup>. It comprises a range of workshops, online activities and supervisions, covering a broad spread of subjects delivered by a team of experienced and specialist staff from across the Institution.

As well as being internally accredited by the University of York, PGCAP is externally recognised by the Higher Education Academy (HEA)<sup>2</sup>. Successful completion of the PGCAP programme, therefore, will enable participants to register as Fellows of the Higher Education Academy (see section 2.10). For staff wishing to secure Nursing and Midwifery Council accreditation, this is provided via an option in Module 3 (section 5).

## 1.2 The Local Context

York is a comparatively young University but it has already established itself as a leading national and international higher education institution. The University as a whole consistently scores highly in national teaching and student experience assessments: it is ranked in the top 10 of UK institutions for

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.york.ac.uk/admin/hr/training/>

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/>

research quality<sup>3</sup> and in the top 10 of overall national university rankings<sup>4</sup>. Maintaining and enhancing this standing is a thread which runs through the University Plan 2009–19<sup>5</sup> and PGCAP is an important element in the promotion of the Institution’s expectations of quality in learning, teaching and research and its commitment to support its new staff in achieving to the best of their ability as articulated in the Learning and Teaching Strategy 2010 – 2015<sup>6</sup>.

### 1.3 The National Context

Twenty first century Higher Education in the UK is facing an unprecedented range of challenges which are likely to have a transformational impact over the years to come. Funding streams are changing, expectations and demands for accountability are rising and there is an increasing sense of market-place competition, both between institutions which receive public support and with an increasing proportion of private providers of higher education. Amidst this change, however, the traditional core business of the university: learning, teaching and research is expected to be maintained.

Learning and teaching has been at the forefront of the national higher education agenda since the Dearing Report into Higher Education (1997)<sup>7</sup>. Amongst other things, this report resulted in the formation of the Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education (ILTHE). In 2003, the Government made explicit its vision for all new lecturers in the sector to receive accredited training in learning and teaching by 2006 (DfES 2003)<sup>8</sup>, a proposition carried forward by Universities UK, the Standing Conference of Principals and the Higher Education Academy in their development of a framework of professional standards<sup>9</sup> (see section 2.10). More recently, the White Paper *Putting Students at the Heart of the System*<sup>10</sup>, purports to focus on increasing the quality and value of the educational experience by aspiring to further raise competitiveness and accountability in the sector. As well as expanding the range of higher education providers, the intention is to broaden significantly the type and range of information available to prospective students and their parents whose personal, financial stake in continuing study has inflated substantially with the tripling of tuition fees. Alongside these developments, the widening access agenda and the national review of skills, all highlight the need for quality assurance and quality development in learning and teaching within the sector.

Learning and teaching, however, is just one strand of an academic’s professional responsibility and the current research climate also presents numerous challenges to individuals entering the profession. There is increased pressure on funding and resourcing and a re-focusing in some areas towards large-scale and / or collaborative research, often involving inter-disciplinary or knowledge-transfer partnerships. Research is increasingly accountable and researchers must be able to forecast and demonstrate the impact of their work as well as an ability to successfully and professionally project manage finances, staff and other resources. This environment of competition is exacerbated by the global context within which higher education institutions now operate and a need to establish not just national, but international credentials. The pressure exerted by the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) and its successor, the Research Excellence Framework (REF), further emphasises the onus on new academics to establish themselves and their research profile as quickly as possible.

3 [http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/Journals/THE/THE/18\\_December\\_2008/attachments/RAE\\_2008\\_THE\\_RESULTS.pdf](http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/Journals/THE/THE/18_December_2008/attachments/RAE_2008_THE_RESULTS.pdf)

4 <http://extras.timesonline.co.uk/stug/universityguide.php>

5 <http://www.york.ac.uk/admin/po/documents/university-plan.pdf>

6 <http://www.york.ac.uk/admin/aso/teach/strategy2003.pdf>

7 National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education (1997) *Higher Education in the Learning Society*. NCIHE Report 1. London: HMSO.

8 Department for Education and Skills (2003) *The Future of Higher Education*. London: DfES.

9 <http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/York/documents/ourwork/professional/ProfessionalStandardsFramework.pdf>

10 <http://www.bis.gov.uk/assets/biscore/higher-education/docs/h/11-944-higher-education-students-at-heart-of-system.pdf>

## Section 2 – Programme Information

### 2.1 Requirements of the Programme

PGCAP is a part-time programme which participants are encouraged to complete within two years. Part-time staff should expect commensurate registration periods. A 60-credit programme carries with it the expectation of approximately 600 hours of study. PGCAP is designed to integrate into participants' daily professional practice and a substantial proportion of these notional hours will therefore comprise normal work-based activity.

Successful completion of PGCAP normally involves:

- Attendance of approximately 40 hours of face-to-face workshops over three 20-credit modules
- Completion of six online activities
- Having two episodes of teaching observed (one by the PGCAP Programme Director and one by a PGCAP peer)
- Regular attendance at supervisory meetings
- Satisfactory completion of all module assessment

For teachers of nurses and midwives the programme includes the 360 hours minimum work-based teaching and learning required by the NMC.

### 2.2 Programme Aims and Learning Outcomes

#### 2.2.1 Aims

To equip participants with the requisite pedagogic knowledge, skills and attitudes to become professional and effective educators

To assist participants in seeking the optimum balance between all areas of their professional practice

To support participants in their capacity for continuing professional development through critical reflection and a scholarly approach to their practice

#### 2.2.2 Learning Outcomes

On completion of PGCAP participants will be able to demonstrate a knowledge and understanding of:

- K1** how students learn
- K2** approaches to the design, delivery and assessment of student learning that are appropriate to the subject area and the level of the academic programme
- K3** approaches to the evaluation of practice
- K4** scholarship of relevant practice
- K5** the potential impact of learning technologies on teaching and learning.

Participants will also be able to:

- S1** select and apply design, delivery and assessment approaches appropriate to the subject and the stage of learners' development
- S2** employ appropriate methods to evaluate practice
- S3** act upon evaluation to demonstrate progression in practice
- S4** effectively employ critical reflection upon work-based experience to facilitate continuing professional development of practice
- S5** work collaboratively towards the development of practice
- S6** demonstrate a concern for, and commitment to, students' development
- S7** demonstrate attitudes consistent with a commitment to equity, inclusivity and ethical practice.

## 2.3 Programme Delivery

### 2.3.1 Workshops

PGCAP is divided into three consecutive modules, all of which are compulsory elements of the programme. Each module requires participants to attend a number of face-to-face workshops which are intended to deliver core principles of practice and policy and to provide an opportunity for participants to engage in interdisciplinary learning through engagement with a multidisciplinary group. Although all modules include core workshops which participants must attend, some allowance for interest and / or specific responsibilities is provided for in the availability of optional workshops from which participants must select a prescribed number. Precise details of module workshop requirements can be found in sections 3 to 5. Because some flexibility is offered in the choice of optional workshops it is essential that sessions are booked in advance by contacting the PGCAP Programme Administrator ([pgcap@york.ac.uk](mailto:pgcap@york.ac.uk)). At each workshop a signing in system operates for the purpose of recording attendance. Summaries of PGCAP workshop attendance are forwarded to all participants on a termly basis.

### 2.3.2 Online Learning Activities and Resources

PGCAP makes use of the University of York's virtual learning environment (VLE), *Yorkshare*, both to provide a range of resources and links which participants may find useful and to host a number of structured online activities which participants are required to complete. As well as facilitating the maintenance of contact between workshops, these online activities will allow participants to receive peer feedback on their thoughts on learning and teaching as well as providing an opportunity to engage in ongoing evaluation of the PGCAP programme. Details of the online activity requirements can be found in the relevant module sections below.

All participants will be enrolled on the PGCAP *Yorkshare* module prior to their engagement with the programme. Once registered, the module can be accessed from: <http://vle.york.ac.uk/>

### 2.3.3 Supervisions

Participants on PGCAP are allocated an experienced member of staff at the beginning of the programme who will act as a supervisor. It is not always possible to offer supervisors from the participant's own Department, indeed a cross-fertilisation between departments in this relationship can be very useful. Participants are asked to contact the Programme Director should they specifically prefer someone from outside their Department. It is anticipated that supervisory meetings will take place on a termly basis. During these meetings participants will have the opportunity to discuss PGCAP workshops, the development of their assessed work, their engagement with external accreditation criteria (see section

2.10) and any other issues relating to academic practice that they feel would provide useful discussion for PGCAP purposes. This is meant as a supportive and constructive opportunity.

Paul Evans in Health Sciences is the NMC nominated facilitator for those participants who teach nurses and midwives. This support is additional to that provided by PGCAP supervisors.

### 2.3.4 Teaching Observations

Module 1 requires a teaching observation to be carried out within the participants' home department by the PGCAP Programme Director<sup>11</sup> whilst Module 2 requires participants to both observe, and be observed by, a peer on the programme. It is to be emphasised that the focus of the observations is very much intended to be constructive and developmental rather than evaluative and judgemental.

The teaching observations will comprise a three-stage process:

#### 1. Pre-observation briefing

The observee should inform the observer in plenty of time when they would like their teaching to be observed. The session chosen for the observation can be set within any legitimate teaching context (e.g. lecture, seminar, tutorial, laboratory practical, clinic). The observee should produce a briefing document for the observer and forward it to him/her in advance of the teaching session that is to be observed. This briefing document should outline:

- Practical information (e.g. date, time, location etc. of teaching session)
- The teaching context (e.g. course/module, level, student background and learning needs, subject needs)
- The topic/theme being covered
- Aims/learning outcomes of the session
- Methods/techniques adopted and why
- Particular issues that the participant would like the observer to report back on

A pro forma (*Pre Observation of Teaching Briefing*) is provided within the PGCAP VLE site for this purpose. Opportunity should be provided for the observer to clarify and/or discuss points after receiving the briefing document, should they need to. This can be done face-to-face or via e-mail / telephone.

#### 2. Observation

The observer will sit in on the teaching session and record their observations (using the pro forma *Observation of Teaching* if required, available from the PGCAP VLE site). The observee should advise the observer if there is anywhere in particular they would like them to sit and whether they are happy for them to talk to the students should an appropriate opportunity arise.

As soon as possible after the observed session, the observee should reflect how they perceived the session to have gone. This reflection should relate back to the information provided in the pre-observation briefing (section A of pro forma *Post Observation of Teaching Reflection* can be used for this purpose available from the PGCAP VLE site).

#### 3. Post-observation de-briefing

A short time after the observation (normally within a week), there should be a 'de-brief' between the

<sup>11</sup> For a discussion on the philosophy of the observation of teaching, see Fullerton, H. 2003 Observation of teaching, in H Fry et al (ed) A Handbook for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: Enhancing Academic Practice (second edition), pp. 226 – 237. London, Kogan Page.

observer and the observee. This will include a discussion of issues that were raised within the pre-observation briefing and a discussion of the participant's views and perspectives on the teaching session. It will also allow for developmental issues to be raised and targets / goals to be set.

It is the responsibility of the observer to then provide the observee with a copy of their observation report. As soon as possible after the 'debrief' the observee should write a further reflective statement (section B of pro forma *Post Observation of Teaching Reflection* available from the PGCAP VLE site). This should discuss the de-brief session itself and whether the observee's original perceptions have stayed the same or changed, and what developmental points they would wish to take forward with regard to their teaching.

Observees are encouraged, where appropriate, to include the observation documentation, or elements of it, as evidence within their Module 1 and Module 2 assessed work. **Participants will be allocated a peer for the Module 2 observation, but it is essential that they inform the programme administrator when they have both undertaken an observation of, and been observed by, their colleague.**

## 2.4 Recording Progress

An agreed report of the meetings between participants and supervisors is forwarded to the Programme Director. These reports allow a brief memo as to the satisfactory / unsatisfactory progress of participants to be sent to Heads of Department on a regular basis. The purpose of this is solely to prevent any major contractual problems occurring and, where appropriate, to inform discussions relating to applications for promotion. The programme director is also required to forward a note to the Deputy Vice Chancellor on any participant who has been submitted to have their probation signed off. Details of personal progress will be distributed to participants on a termly basis; however, participants are also advised to familiarise themselves thoroughly with programme requirements and deadlines as responsibility for satisfying these requirements and meeting deadlines ultimately lies with the participants themselves.

## 2.5 Leaves of Absence

It is important that if a participant feels they will not be able to engage with PGCAP for a period of time that will mean they are unable to fulfill course requirements to the published timetable, they apply for a leave of absence. Securing a leave of absence will mean their registration upon PGCAP is suspended for the duration of the absence. Possible reasons for doing this may include maternity or extended paternity leave, research or other obligations, long-term personal and medical circumstances etc. Participants are advised to consult with Programme Director if considering a leave of absence. The relevant form, *Request for Change of Status to Period of Registration*, (available from the PGCAP VLE site) should be completed and returned to the PGCAP Programme Administrator.

## 2.6 Extension to Period of Study

Considerable flexibility is built into PGCAP in recognition that participants may face unexpected work pressures at specific points in time and therefore it is not expected that individuals will need to extend beyond their registration period to complete the programme. In the exceptional circumstance that an extension is needed, however, participants should consult with their supervisor at the earliest opportunity. Subject to the Programme Director's approval, it is possible to continue into a third year without resort to a formal request for an extension to study. Any continuation beyond the third year, however, will necessarily involve completion of the relevant section of the *Request for Change of Status to Period of Registration* form (available from the PGCAP VLE site) and approval by the Board of Studies for Academic Practice.

## 2.7 Withdrawal

If the circumstance arises when a participant needs to withdraw from PGCAP (for instance, if they are leaving the university), they should inform their supervisor as soon as possible in order that options can be discussed (for example, at times it may be beneficial to complete a particular module if time permits in order that the credit for that module can be awarded and, if appropriate, carried forward onto the PGCAP-equivalent programme run by another university). Participants who are intending to withdraw from the programme are asked to complete the relevant section of the *Request for Change of Status to Period of Registration* form (available from the PGCAP VLE site).

## 2.8 Accredited Prior (Experiential) Learning and Exemption

It is recognised that on occasion participants' prior experience or learning may mean that attendance at particular PGCAP workshops is inappropriate. In these situations participants may apply for accredited prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) to the Board of Studies using the *AP(E)L Application* form (available from the PGCAP VLE site).

On rare occasions it may be that a participant feels their experience / learning should be acknowledged through partial exemption of one or part of one of the PGCAP assessments. In these situations the participant should contact the Programme Director to discuss their case at the earliest possible opportunity and will be required to follow the university policy on applying for APL<sup>12</sup>. Where a participant believes their qualifications or experience should exempt them completely from undertaking PGCAP they will need to have the contractual requirement to complete the programme removed. This should be done via their Head of Department in consultation with the PGCAP Programme Director. In both partial and full exemption applications, the participant will be expected to demonstrate how their prior experience and/or learning maps on to relevant PGCAP learning outcomes to a satisfactory standard.

## 2.9 Programme Evaluation

Evaluation forms are collected after each PGCAP workshop and summaries sent to tutors for comment and action. Each cohort is asked to nominate a representative to sit upon the Board of Studies for Academic Practice and through whom comments and issues can be channelled for consideration. PGCAP is also subject to Annual Programme Review, Periodic Review and review by the Higher Education Academy and the Nursing and Midwifery Council.

In addition to these various formal mechanisms, a more responsive approach to evaluation has been adopted which is intended to give the programme team a rich longitudinal insight into participants' views of PGCAP, their expectations, their experiences of engaging with the programme and the impact that it has had. The approach is entirely participant-centred in that the evaluation 'questions' as well as the responses are generated by those who are actively involved with the programme. This activity, which commences at the start of PGCAP and is repeated during the course of the programme and after the programme has been completed, is undertaken in the PGCAP *Yorkshare* module. Full guidance will be provided prior to each evaluation episode.

---

<sup>12</sup> <http://www.york.ac.uk/media/staffhome/learningandteaching/documents/programmedevelopment/APL%20Guidance%20FINAL%2009%202010.pdf>

## 2.10 The UK Professional Standards Framework

In implementing the recommendations of the 2003 White Paper on the Future of *Higher Education*, the HEA, on behalf of the sector, developed a Professional Standards Framework<sup>13</sup>. The framework provides the principal means by which the HEA accredits professional development programmes in learning and teaching and its flexible descriptor-based approach allows individual institutions to locally articulate how their courses, and the participants on those courses, achieve the standards. The framework is structured around three broad interconnecting components of practice:

Areas of Activity	Design and planning of learning activities and/or programmes of study
	Teaching and/or supporting student learning
	Assessment and giving feedback to learners
	Developing effective environments and student support and guidance
	Integration of scholarship, research and professional activities with teaching and supporting learning
	Evaluation of practice and continuing professional development

Knowledge (and understanding of)	The subject material
	Appropriate methods for teaching and learning in the subject area and at the level of the academic programme
	How students learn, both generally and in the subject
	The use of appropriate learning technologies
	Methods for evaluating the effectiveness of teaching
	The implications of quality assurance and enhancement for professional practice

<sup>13</sup> <http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/York/documents/ourwork/professional/ProfessionalStandardsFramework.pdf>

Professional Values	Respect for individual learners
	Commitment to incorporating the process and outcomes of relevant research, scholarship and/or professional practice
	Commitment to development of learning communities
	Commitment to encouraging participation in higher education, acknowledging diversity and promoting equality of opportunity
	Commitment to continuing professional development and evaluation of practice

PGCAP, through its programme and module learning outcomes, assessment approach and assessment criteria is mapped onto standard 2 of the framework which requires individuals to:

*“ [demonstrate] an understanding of the student learning experience through engagement with all areas of activity, core knowledge and professional values... ”*

## Section 3 – Module 1: Learning, Teaching and Assessment in Higher Education (20 credits)

### 3.1 Introduction

This module will introduce participants to the major elements of higher education learning and teaching, from theories of learning, to session and programme design and assessment, to teaching in practice and supporting student learning, to the nature and impact of key policy initiatives.

### 3.2 Aims and Learning Outcomes

#### 3.2.1 Aims

- To expose participants to a range of research and good practice in higher education learning, teaching and assessment
- To provide participants with a framework that will support their reflection upon their own practice

#### 3.2.2 Learning Outcomes

By the end of this module participants should be able to reflect upon how to:

1. Effectively design teaching sessions and / or programmes of study that are appropriate to the students and subject being taught
2. Employ teaching and learning methods that will enable effective student learning
3. Provide effective pastoral support / guidance to students
4. Use assessment and feedback methods that are effective in informing and measuring student learning
5. Use an appropriate range of evaluation approaches to critically reflect upon their teaching and learning practice

### 3.3 Module Requirements

The attendance, online and assessment requirements of PGCAP Module 1 are as follows (up-to-date timetabling information can be found on the PGCAP webpage and in the VLE)

### Core Attendance

- What is PGCAP?
- Supporting Students at York
- Principles of Curriculum Design
- Principles of Assessment
- Principles of Effective Feedback
- Principles of Reviewing and Evaluating your Teaching
- Progress and CEA Assessment Support
- Micro Teaching
- PGCAP Observation (By PGCAP Director)
- Experience Evaluation (online) (Autumn Term)
- How Students Learn (online) (Spring Term)

### Options Attendance (4 required from the following)

- Teaching International Students
- PhD Supervision (Sciences / Humanities)
- Enhancing Small Group Teaching (Sciences / Humanities)
- Effective Lecturing (Sciences / Humanities)
- VLE / E-learning
- Using Your Voice Most Effectively
- Developing Information Literacy in the Digital Age
- Developing an Inclusive Curriculum
- Employability in the Curriculum

### Support

- Supervisory Meetings (one per term)

### Assessment

- CEA Portfolio (c. 2500 words)
- CEA Viva (up to 1 hour)

## 3.4 Workshops and Online Activities

### 3.4.1 Core

<b>What is PGCAP?</b>	<b>Tutor(s):</b> Duncan Jackson
<p><b>Outline:</b> This session will provide a brief introduction to PGCAP: its structure, expectations and requirements and how it fits with current national trends in learning and teaching in higher education. It will also outline the philosophy of the programme and provide an opportunity to engage in discussion on some of the key issues which currently impact upon UK higher education.</p>	<p><b>Learning outcomes:</b> By the end of this session, participants will be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Outline PGCAP content and requirements</li> <li>2. Define the philosophy underpinning the programme</li> <li>3. Articulate views on significant issues currently affecting UK higher education.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Reading:</b> Barnett, R. (2011) <i>Being a University</i>. Foundation and Futures of Education Series. London: Routledge. Brennan, J. (2010) <i>Improving What is Learned at University</i>. London: Routledge. Hussey, T. (2010) <i>The Trouble with Higher Education: A critical examination</i>. London: Routledge. Tennant, M. (2010) <i>Teaching, Learning and Research in Higher Education</i>. London: Routledge. Wilson, A. (2010) <i>Knowledge Power</i>. London: Routledge.</p>	

<b>Supporting Students at York</b>	<b>Tutor(s):</b> Steve Page (Student Support Services), Dr Sarah Thompson (Department of Physics), Rev'd Dr David Efird (Department of Philosophy), Heather Stout (Careers Service)
<p><b>Outline:</b> The University is a large and lively community of students and staff from diverse cultures and previous educational experiences, pursuing a wide variety of academic and professional studies. The University has a well-articulated infrastructure of student support services with staff employed to offer their expertise on matters ranging from the academic to the pastoral, including financial, psychological and future employment issues.</p>	<p><b>Learning outcomes:</b> By the end of this session, participants will be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Understand the role of different personnel involved in welfare support, particularly the student Supervisor, College Provost, student organisations and specialist services</li> <li>2. Understand the roles of different support agencies</li> <li>3. Guide students to appropriate support for different welfare needs.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Reading:</b> University of York 2011/12 <i>Student Support Services Handbook</i>. <a href="http://www.york.ac.uk/student-support-services/handbook/">http://www.york.ac.uk/student-support-services/handbook/</a> University of York Supporting Students web-pages: <a href="http://www.york.ac.uk/staff/supporting-students/">www.york.ac.uk/staff/supporting-students/</a> Wallace, J. (2002) 'Supporting and Guiding Students' in Fry, H., Ketteridge, S. &amp; Marshall, S. <i>A Handbook for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: Enhancing Academic Practice</i>. London: Kogan Page Grace, S. and Gravestock, P. (2008) <i>Inclusion and Diversity: Meeting the Needs of ALL Students</i>, London: Routledge Falmer.</p>	

<b>Principles of Curriculum Design</b>	<b>Tutor(s):</b> Duncan Jackson
<p><b>Outline:</b> This session will seek to throw light on issues that need to be considered when devising new teaching sessions, programmes and curricula: what are curricula? What types of curriculum design are there? What components make up curricula and what factors influence their construction? It will look at the notion of 'constructive alignment' in curriculum design, what it means and how it can be achieved in practice as well as concepts such as complexity and threshold.</p>	<p><b>Learning outcomes:</b> By the end of this session, participants will be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Distinguish the components and influences which shape curricula</li> <li>2. Describe different approaches to curriculum design</li> <li>3. Evaluate the currently favoured approach to curriculum design – constructive alignment</li> <li>4. Outline the process of programme approval at the University of York.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Reading:</b> Biggs, J. (2003) Constructing learning by aligning teaching: constructive alignment, in J. Biggs, Teaching for Quality Learning at University, pp. 11 – 32. Birmingham, Open University Press. Biggs, J. (2003) Aligning teaching for constructing learning [online]. Available at: <a href="http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/York/documents/resources/resourcedatabase/id477_aligning_teaching_for_constructing_learning.pdf">http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/York/documents/resources/resourcedatabase/id477_aligning_teaching_for_constructing_learning.pdf</a> (Accessed 29th July 2010) D'Andrea, V-M. (2003) Organising Teaching and Learning: Outcomes-based Planning, in H Fry et al (ed) A Handbook for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: Enhancing Academic Practice (second edition), pp. 26 – 41. London: Kogan Page. Land, R., Cousin, G., Meyer, J. and Davies, P. 2005. Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge (3): implications for course design and evaluation. In C. Rust (ed.) <i>Improving Student Learning Diversity and Inclusivity</i>, 53–64. Oxford: Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development. Available at: <a href="http://www.brookes.ac.uk/services/ocsl/isl/isl2004/abstracts/conceptual_papers/ISL04-pp53-64-Land-et-al.pdf">http://www.brookes.ac.uk/services/ocsl/isl/isl2004/abstracts/conceptual_papers/ISL04-pp53-64-Land-et-al.pdf</a> [Accessed 24th September 2010]. Tosey, P. 2002 <i>Teaching at the Edge of Chaos</i> [online]. Available at: <a href="http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/resources/detail/id111_Teaching_at_the_Edge_of_Chaos">http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/resources/detail/id111_Teaching_at_the_Edge_of_Chaos</a> York : Higher Education Academy. (Accessed 20<sup>th</sup> September 2009).</p>	

<b>Principles of Assessment</b>	<b>Tutor(s):</b> Duncan Jackson, Linda Perriton (York Management School)
<p><b>Outline:</b> Assessment is a crucial element of teaching and learning in higher education that does not necessarily always receive the attention in thought and planning that it merits. This session will explore key concepts in assessment and how assessment practice should be integrated firmly into the design of the curriculum. It will also provide guidance and insight into the York approach to assessment design.</p>	<p><b>Learning outcomes:</b> By the end of this session, participants will be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Discuss the purposes and types of assessment</li> <li>2. Describe why assessment should be integral to broader curriculum design</li> <li>3. Define principles of good assessment practice.</li> </ol>

**Reading:**

- Bloxham, S. and Boyd, P. (2007) *Developing Effective Assessment in Higher Education: a practical guide*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Brown, G. (2001) *Assessment: a guide for lecturers*, Higher Education Academy Briefing on Assessment 3.
- Elton, L. and Johnston, B. (2002) *Assessment in universities: a critical review of research*, Higher Education Academy.
- Flint, N. and Johnson, B. (2011) *Towards Fairer University Assessment*. London: Routledge.
- Knight, P. T. (2002) Summative Assessment in Higher Education: practices in disarray, *Studies in Higher Education* 27(3), 275–286.
- Pickford, R. (2006) *Assessing Skills and Practice*. London: Routledge.
- Wakeford, R. (2003) Principles of Student Assessment, in H Fry *et al* (ed) *A Handbook for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: Enhancing Academic Practice* (second edition), pp. 42 – 61. London: Kogan Page.
- Yorke, M. (2003) Formative assessment in higher education: moves towards theory and the enhancement of pedagogic practice, *Higher Education* 45, 477–501.

**Principles of Effective Feedback****Tutor(s):** Duncan Jackson**Outline:**

Feedback enables teachers to inform students of their progress and how they might improve their performance in the future. It can be a means of motivating students and encouraging them to achieve their maximum potential. However, feedback can also serve to confuse, discourage and de-motivate. This session introduces the practice of giving effective and useful feedback as a skill that can be learned and introduced by teachers. It will also consider the York policy on formative assessment and feedback.

**Learning outcomes:**

- By the end of this session, participants will be able to:
1. Explain the purpose of giving feedback to enhance student learning
  2. Employ points of good practice in giving feedback that is useful to their students
  3. Consider the value of involving students in assessment and feedback.

**Reading:**

- Irons, A. (2008) *Enhancing Learning Through Formative Assessment and Feedback*. London: Taylor and Francis Ltd.
- Jawah, C, Macfarlane-Dick, D, Matthew, B, Nicol, D, Ross, D, Smith, B. 2004 *Enhancing student learning through effective formative feedback* [online]. Available from: [http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/York/documents/resources/resourcedatabase/id353\\_senlef\\_guide.pdf](http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/York/documents/resources/resourcedatabase/id353_senlef_guide.pdf) (Accessed 29<sup>th</sup> July 2010).
- Newstead, S.E. and Hoskins, S. 2003 Encouraging student motivation, in H Fry *et al* (ed) *A Handbook for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: Enhancing Academic Practice* (second edition), pp. v62 – 74, London Kogan Page.

<b>Principles of Reviewing and Evaluating your Teaching</b>	<b>Tutor(s):</b> Duncan Jackson
<p><b>Outline:</b> Evaluation is the process of gaining feedback from students on their learning, and using this information to think critically about your teaching and to make professional decisions about your approach. There are various methods of gaining an understanding of how students are learning, and participants are invited to explore the merits of these. The session considers how teaching staff can integrate evaluation into teaching activity in a way that can make a difference to the quality of student learning.</p>	<p><b>Learning outcomes:</b> By the end of this session, participants will be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Outline the reason(s) for evaluating learning</li> <li>2. Identify what can be evaluated</li> <li>3. Know the advantages and drawbacks of different forms of evaluation</li> <li>4. Consider how evaluation can be integrated into teaching.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Reading:</b> Housell, D. (2003) The Evaluation of Teaching, in H Fry <i>et al</i> (ed) <i>A Handbook for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: Enhancing Academic Practice</i> (second edition), pp. 200 – 212. London: Kogan Page. Kember, D. and Wong, A. (2000) Implications for evaluation from a study of students' perceptions of good and poor teaching, <i>Higher Education</i> 40(1), 69–97. Johnstone, A. (2005) <i>Evaluation of Teaching</i>, A Physical Sciences Practice Guide [online]. Available: <a href="http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/physsci/resources/detail/publications/practiceguides/evaluation_of_teaching">http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/physsci/resources/detail/publications/practiceguides/evaluation_of_teaching</a> (Accessed 29 July 2010).</p>	

<b>Progress and CEA Assessment Support</b>	<b>Tutor(s):</b> Duncan Jackson
<p><b>Outline:</b> This session provides an opportunity for the whole cohort to reconvene to discuss their experiences of teaching during the course of the year and to raise and explore key issues. It also aims to support and inform participants in the composition of their PGCAP Critical Experience Analysis portfolios. It will serve to both elaborate upon the nature of the reflective writing required in CEA and on the viva element of the module assessment. There will be an opportunity for participants to look at examples of CEAs and to raise issues and questions with the PGCAP programme director.</p>	<p><b>Learning outcomes:</b> By the end of this session, participants will be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Collegially share experiences and explore issues</li> <li>2. Describe the purpose of the CEA portfolio and the CEA viva</li> <li>3. Explain what is required in the CEA portfolio and viva</li> <li>4. Engage with a model of reflection upon specific incidents and experiences of their practice as appropriate to the CEA assessment.</li> </ol>

<b>Experience Evaluation 1 (online)</b>	<b>Tutor(s):</b> Duncan Jackson
<p><b>Outline:</b> The PGCAP programme as a whole is evaluated using a longitudinal approach that gives over authorship of the evaluation to its participants as well as completion of the evaluation. The intention is to provide every individual with the opportunity to raise an issue that is important to them personally which their peers can feedback upon. This first engagement with the 'PGCAP Experience Evaluation' is intended to provide insight into participants' thoughts right at the beginning of the programme.</p>	<p><b>Learning outcomes:</b> By the end of this session, participants will be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Explain how the PGCAP Experience Evaluation works</li> <li>2. Assess how their own thoughts and views of PGCAP compare with those of their colleagues on the programme.</li> </ol>

<b>How Students Learn (online)</b>	<b>Tutor(s):</b> Dr Jean McKendree (Hull/York Medical School)
<p><b>Outline:</b> We have all been learners and therefore it may seem that it is obvious how to teach: just do unto others as you were done to! However, while there are certain learning mechanisms that are common to everyone, there are also important differences among students and among academic disciplines. We also face a challenge in university teaching because we are at the transition for most students between the highly structured teaching in secondary school and the expectation of a more self-directed approach for university learning. This online activity will allow participants to explore: what we know about how students learn; different approaches to teaching to address different needs of students and of academic disciplines; and defining some of the educational terminology that you are likely to encounter on the way. Participants will be expected to contribute their own thoughts and ideas about teaching in their academic area and will be strongly encouraged to contribute to discussions in the Virtual Learning Environment.</p>	<p><b>Learning outcomes:</b> By the end of this session, participants will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Be introduced to basic concepts in learning theory</li> <li>2. Be aware of potential differences in student learning</li> <li>3. Consider how their own discipline shapes approaches to learning</li> <li>4. Be introduced to some principles of adult learning.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Reading:</b> Atherton, J. S. <i>Learning and Teaching: info</i> [online]. Available from: <a href="http://www.learningandteaching.info/">http://www.learningandteaching.info/</a> (Accessed: 29 July 2010). Fox, D. (1983) Personal theories of teaching, <i>Studies in Higher Education</i> 8(2) 151-163. Fry, H. et al (2003) Understanding Student Learning, in H Fry et al (ed) <i>A Handbook for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: Enhancing Academic Practice</i> (second edition), pp. 9 – 25. London: Kogan Page. Zinkiewicz, L. et. al. (2003) <i>Applying Psychology Disciplinary Knowledge to Psychology Teaching and Learning: A review of selected psychological research and theory with implications for teaching practice</i>. LTSN Psychology Report and Evaluation Series [online]. Available from: <a href="http://www.psychology.heacademy.ac.uk/docs/pdf/p20030321_r2p.pdf">http://www.psychology.heacademy.ac.uk/docs/pdf/p20030321_r2p.pdf</a> (Accessed 29 July 2010).</p>	

<b>Micro Teaching</b>	<b>Tutor(s):</b> Duncan Jackson
<p><b>Outline:</b> Constructive feedback within a supportive environment and personal reflection are an important means by which to improve upon teaching practice. After delivering a short session upon a subject with which they are comfortable, this session will provide an opportunity for participants to both engage with active reflection and to receive objective feedback on their teaching from a small group of peers and a PGCAP tutor.</p>	<p><b>Learning outcomes:</b> By the end of this session, participants will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Be more aware of their strengths and weaknesses in oral presentations</li> <li>2. Have some positive, practical ideas for enhancing performance, where appropriate</li> <li>3. Feel more confident about their skills</li> <li>4. Understand the sensitivities around giving appropriate and constructive feedback.</li> </ol>

## 3.4.2 Options

<b>Lecturing Skills (Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences)</b>	<b>Tutor(s):</b> Duncan Jackson
<p><b>Outline:</b> The teaching of large groups remains fundamental to the higher education teaching and learning experience despite the increasing, and often perceived contradictory, call for 'active' and 'student-centred' learning. Indeed, as student numbers increase, lecturing is becoming more rather than less prevalent. This session explores the particular role lecturing has in higher education and the various issues and problems that may arise. It will also seek to address key points in being an effective teacher of large groups through maintaining engagement and exploring ways of improving learning, understanding and the retention of knowledge.</p>	<p><b>Learning outcomes:</b> By the end of this session, participants will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Define the role of the lecture in higher education</li> <li>2. Analyse problems and issues which arise in large group teaching</li> <li>3. Identify points of good practice in presenting to large groups</li> <li>4. Discuss how research into student attention and knowledge retention impacts upon lecture design</li> <li>5. Identify points of good practice in structuring lectures</li> <li>6. Explain the reasoning behind various types of handout used in large group teaching contexts</li> <li>7. Critique your own lectures in the light of 'good practice'.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Reading:</b> Biggs, J. (2000) Enriching large class teaching, in J. Biggs <i>Teaching for Quality Learning at University</i>, pp. 97 to 120. Buckingham: Open University Press. Brown, S. and Race, P. (2002) <i>Lecturing: a Practical Guide</i>. London: Kogan Page. Exley, K. and Dennick R. (2004) <i>Giving a Lecture: From Presenting to Teaching</i>. London: Taylor and Francis Ltd. Race, P. (2007) <i>The Lecturer's Toolkit</i>. London: Routledge. Horgan, J. (2003) Lecturing for Learning, in H Fry <i>et al</i> (ed) <i>A Handbook for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: Enhancing Academic Practice</i> (second edition), pp. 75 – 90. London: Kogan Page. Jackson, M. and Prosser, M. (1989) Less Lecturing, More Learning, <i>Studies in Higher Education</i> 14(1), 55–68 Saroyan, A. and Snell, L. (1997) Variations in lecturing styles, <i>Higher Education</i> 33(1), 85–104.</p>	
<b>Lecturing Skills (Sciences, Social Sciences)</b>	<b>Tutor(s):</b> Tony Ward (Department of Electronics)
<p><b>Outline:</b> The Teaching Quality Assessment (Subject Review) process raised the level of thought given to the practicalities of lecturing in the minds of those who have been assessed. Modern practices require more than the technical content of the lecture or teaching event to be of high quality. Attention needs to be paid to planning, lecturing style, definition of objectives and methods of assessing lecturing quality. This session will consider lecturing skills from a Quality viewpoint. There will be the opportunity to discuss the teaching issues and to air past experiences and, if facilities are available, we hope to offer an opportunity to talk through and 'play with' some of the A/V equipment in a large lecture theatre.</p>	<p><b>Learning outcomes:</b> By the end of this session, participants will be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consider good and bad practice</li> <li>2. Review the guidelines on teaching quality</li> <li>3. Identify their own further training needs in relation to use of equipment.</li> </ol>

**Reading:**

- Biggs, J. (2000) Enriching large class teaching, in J. Biggs *Teaching for Quality Learning at University*, pp. 97 to 120. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Brown, S. and Race, P. (2002) *Lecturing: a Practical Guide*. London: Kogan Page.
- Exley, K. and Dennick R. (2004) *Giving a Lecture: From Presenting to Teaching*. London: Taylor and Francis Ltd
- Race, P. (2007) *The Lecturer's Toolkit*. London: Routledge.
- Horgan, J. (2003) Lecturing for Learning, in H Fry *et al* (ed) *A Handbook for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: Enhancing Academic Practice* (second edition), pp. 75 – 90. London: Kogan Page.
- Jackson, M. and Prosser, M. (1989) Less Lecturing, More Learning, *Studies in Higher Education* 14(1), 55-68
- Saroyan, A. and Snell, L. (1997) Variations in lecturing styles, *Higher Education* 33(1), 85-104.

### Enhancing Small Group Teaching (Sciences, Social Sciences)

**Tutor(s):** Dr Steve Hutchinson (Training and Development Consultant)

**Outline:**

York, which has an enviable reputation for teaching excellence, sees the small group format as a distinctive feature of the learning experience it provides. Small group teaching is central to most departmental teaching programmes. In this workshop we will consider why small group teaching is effective and discuss how we can provide a high quality learning experience for tutorials and small seminar groups. We will consider how we can develop our own current practices.

**Learning outcomes:**

By the end of this session, participants will be able to:

1. Review the conditions needed to create a good learning environment
2. Consider practical ways of enhancing our small group teaching.

**Reading:**

- Dennick, R & Exley, K (2004) *Small Group Teaching Tutorials: Seminars and Beyond*. Taylor & Francis Ltd.
- Griffiths, S. (2003) Teaching and Learning in Small Groups, in H Fry *et al* (ed) *A Handbook for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: Enhancing Academic Practice* (second edition), pp. 91 – 104. London: Kogan Page.
- Jackson, M. and Prosser, M. (1989) Less Lecturing, More Learning, *Studies in Higher Education* 14(1), 55-68.
- Livingstone, D and Lynch, K. (2000) 'Group Project Work and Student-centred Active Learning: two different experiences,' *Studies in Higher Education* Vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 325 – 345
- Wisker G., Exley K. and Antoniou, Ridley, P. (2007) *Working One-to-One with Students*, London: Routledge Falmer.

<b>Enhancing Small Group Teaching (Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences)</b>		<b>Tutor(s):</b> Dr Helen Smith (Department of English and Related Literature)
<b>Outline:</b> York, which has an enviable reputation for teaching excellence, sees the small group format as a distinctive feature of the learning experience it provides. Small group teaching is central to most departmental teaching programmes. In this workshop we will share our experiences of small group teaching and consider the approaches, activities and formats that we have found to be effective as well as the problems and difficulties we have faced. Particular emphasis will be placed on ways we can develop our own practices.	<b>Learning outcomes:</b> By the end of this session, participants will be able to: 1. Review the conditions needed to create a good learning environment 2. Consider practical ways of enhancing our small group teaching.	
<b>Reading:</b> Baume, C & Baume, D (1996) <i>Learning to Teach: Running Tutorials and Seminars</i> . Oxford Brookes University: Oxford Centre for Staff & Learning Development. Dennick, R & Exley, K (2004) <i>Small Group Teaching Tutorials: Seminars and Beyond</i> . Taylor & Francis Ltd. Griffiths, S. (2003) Teaching and Learning in Small Groups, in H Fry et al (ed) <i>A Handbook for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: Enhancing Academic Practice</i> (second edition), pp. 91 – 104. London: Kogan Page. Jackson, M. and Prosser, M. (1989) Less Lecturing, More Learning, <i>Studies in Higher Education</i> 14(1), 55–68. Livingstone, D and Lynch, K. (2000) 'Group Project Work and Student-centred Active Learning: two different experiences,' <i>Studies in Higher Education</i> Vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 325 – 345 Wisker G., Exley K. and Antoniou, Ridley, P. (2007) <i>Working One-to-One with Students</i> , London: Routledge Falmer.		

<b>International Students</b>		<b>Tutor(s):</b> Paul Roberts (Centre for English Language Teaching)
<b>Outline:</b> Establishing York as an international education institution is high on the University's agenda. Creating an international student community requires actions at all levels, particularly and crucially in teaching rooms. But what does it feel like to be marginal to the learning community and how can teaching staff help enhance interactions so that all students can benefit and contribute? Paul Roberts is a fellow of the Higher Education Academy with a special interest in Internationalisation at Home. This experiential workshop will examine the challenges for international learners and some possible teaching responses.	<b>Learning outcomes:</b> By the end of this session, participants will: 1. Raise their awareness of comprehension and spoken output issues for internationally-recruited students 2. Explore some practical suggestions for meeting the needs of internationally-recruited students.	
<b>Reading:</b> Carroll J. and Ryan J. eds. (2005) <i>Teaching International Students</i> . London: Routledge Falmer. Crosling G, Thomas L and Heagney M (2008), <i>Improving Student Retention in Higher Education</i> . London: Routledge Falmer Jones E. and Brown S. (2007) <i>Internationalising Higher Education: Enhancing Learning, Teaching and Curriculum</i> . London: Routledge Falmer Grace, S. and Gravestock, P. (2008) <i>Inclusion and Diversity: Meeting the Needs of ALL Students</i> , London: Routledge Falmer		

<b>PhD Supervision (Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences)</b>	<b>Tutor(s):</b> Dr Nicola McDonald (Department of English and Related Literature)
<p><b>Outline:</b> This workshop is intended for academic staff working in arts, humanities and social science disciplines who are relatively new to the role of PhD Supervisor. Other, more experienced staff who wish to find out more about current views on best practice in supervision are also welcome to attend. During the session reference will be made to the latest codes of practice and national policy papers on research supervision. The smaller group at this session creates an appropriate atmosphere for discussion and interaction.</p>	<p><b>Learning outcomes:</b> By the end of this session, participants will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Be in a position to review the roles and responsibilities of the PhD Supervisor;</li> <li>2. Have an increased awareness of what students expect of the Supervisors;</li> <li>3. Be able to consider some issues in the management of PhD Projects and students;</li> <li>4. Have gained an understanding of common problems in PhD supervision.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Reading:</b> Boud, D. and Lee A. (2009) <i>Changing Practices of Doctoral Education</i>. London: Routledge Falmer. Delamont, S., Atkinson, P. and Parry, O. (1998) <i>Supervising the PhD: A Guide to Success</i>. Open University Press and SRHE. Ely A. and Jennings R. (2005) <i>Effective Postgraduate Supervision</i>. Maidenhead: Society for Research into Higher Education/Open University Press. Hinchcliffe R., Bromley A. and Hutchinson S. (2007) <i>Skills Training in Research Degree Programmes</i>. Maidenhead: Society for Research into Higher Education/Open University Press. Lee, A. (2012) <i>Successful Research Supervision: Advising Students Doing Research</i>. London: Routledge. Kamler, B. (2006) <i>Helping Doctoral Students Write</i>. London: Routledge Falmer. Marshall, S. (2003) Supervising Projects and Dissertations, in H Fry <i>et al</i> (ed) <i>A Handbook for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: Enhancing Academic Practice</i> (second edition), pp. 105 – 120. London, Kogan Page. Phillips, E. and Pugh, D. S. (1994) <i>How to Get a PhD: A Handbook for Students and their Supervisors</i>. Open University Press. Taylor S. and Beasley N. (2005) <i>A Handbook for Doctoral Supervision</i>. London: Routledge Falmer. Tinkler, P and Jackson, C (2000) 'Examining the Doctorate: Institutional Policy, the PhD examination process in the UK' <i>Studies in Higher Education</i> 25(2) pp 167-180. Woolhouse, M. (2002) Supervising dissertation projects: expectations of Supervisors and students, <i>Innovations in Education and Teaching International</i> 39(2), 137-144</p>	

<b>PhD Supervision (Sciences, Social Sciences)</b>	<b>Tutor(s):</b> Duncan Jackson
<p><b>Outline:</b> This workshop is intended for academic staff working in science and social science disciplines who are relatively new to the role of PhD Supervisor. Other more experienced staff wishing to find out more about current views on best practice in supervision are also welcome to attend. During the session reference will be made to the latest codes of practice and national policy papers on research supervision</p>	<p><b>Learning outcomes:</b> By the end of this session, participants will be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Be in a position to review the roles and responsibilities of the PhD Supervisor</li> <li>2. Have an increased awareness of what students expect of their Supervisors</li> <li>3. Be able to consider some issues in the management of PhD Projects and students</li> <li>4. Have gained an understanding of some common problems in PhD supervision</li> </ol>
<p><b>Reading:</b> Boud D. and Lee A. (2008) <i>Changing Practices of Doctoral Education</i>. London: Routledge Falmer. Delamont, S., Atkinson, P. and Parry, O. (1998) <i>Supervising the PhD: A Guide to Success</i>. Open University Press and SRHE. Ely A. and Jennings R. (2005) <i>Effective Postgraduate Supervision</i>. Maidenhead: Society for Research into Higher Education/Open University Press. Hinchcliffe R., Bromley A. and Hutchinson S. (2007) <i>Skills Training in Research Degree Programmes</i>. Maidenhead: Society for Research into Higher Education/Open University Press. Lee, A. (2012) <i>Successful Research Supervision: Advising Students Doing Research</i>. London: Routledge. Marshall, S. (2003) Supervising Projects and Dissertations, in H Fry et al (ed) <i>A Handbook for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: Enhancing Academic Practice</i> (second edition), pp. 105 – 120. London, Kogan Page. Pearson, M. and Brew, A. (2002) Research training and supervision development, <i>Studies in Higher Education</i> 27(2), 135-150. Phillips, E. and Pugh, D. S. (1994) <i>How to Get a PhD: A Handbook for Students and their Supervisors</i>. Open University Press. Taylor S. and Beasley N. (2005) <i>A Handbook for Doctoral Supervision</i>. London: Routledge Falmer. Tinkler, P and Jackson, C (2000) 'Examining the Doctorate: Institutional Policy, the PhD examination process in the UK' <i>Studies in Higher Education</i> 25(2) pp 167-180. Woolhouse, M. (2002) Supervising dissertation projects: expectations of Supervisors and students, <i>Innovations in Education and Teaching International</i> 39(2), 137-144.</p>	

<b>Using Your Voice Most Effectively</b>	<b>Tutor(s):</b> Professor David Howard (Department of Electronics), Francis Newton (Independent Consultant)
<p><b>Outline:</b> As a lecturer one of your most valuable tools is your voice, and yet voice failure is common in the academic profession. How is voice produced? How can you improve your voice production/projection and avoid pitfalls that may damage your voice? This session will be run by an independent consultant with training in acting, and a practising academic whose academic research interest is in voice. It will look at the science of voice production in health and disease with practical guidance on optimising your voice performance.</p>	<p><b>Learning outcomes:</b> By the end of this session, participants will be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Understand how voice is produced</li> <li>2. Avoid errors in voice production</li> <li>3. Learn techniques to project and enhance voice</li> <li>4. Minimise the effects of disease on voice.</li> </ol>

<h3>Developing Information Literacy in the Digital Age</h3>	<p><b>Tutor(s):</b> Ned Potter, Kirstyn Radford (University Library and Archives)</p>
<p><b>Outline:</b> Today's students are exposed to more sources of information than ever before. Many sources are free-to-access, but crucially, much scholarly information is restricted to subscribers. Evidence suggests that today's "digital natives" expect to have unmediated access to all the information sources relevant to their academic discipline, and value Web 2.0 applications ("social networking") over passive exposure to content.</p> <p>This workshop will provide a forum for discussing these issues with academic liaison librarians, and an opportunity to reflect on the implications for pedagogic practice.</p>	<p><b>Learning outcomes:</b> At the end of the discussion, participants should be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Describe published models of information literacy for the higher education sector</li> <li>2. Articulate the value of information literacy in their academic discipline</li> <li>3. Explain some of the approaches that lecturers and librarians can take towards facilitating student development.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Reading:</b> JB Morrell Library, University of York: <b>Information Literacy Teaching</b> <a href="http://www.york.ac.uk/library/servicesandfacilities/informationliteracyteaching/">http://www.york.ac.uk/library/servicesandfacilities/informationliteracyteaching/</a> (Accessed 11 August 2011)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For some theoretical background, follow the links from this website to the reports from CILIP and JISC</li> <li>• For sample materials, take a look at some of the Library's <i>Information Literacy Workbooks</i> linked to this site.</li> </ul> <p>CIBER Briefing Paper: <b>Information behaviour of the researcher of the future</b>. JISC, 2008. <a href="http://bit.ly/16oT6s">http://bit.ly/16oT6s</a> (Accessed 11 August 2011)</p>	

<h3>Developing an Inclusive Curriculum</h3>	<p><b>Tutor(s):</b> Dr Phil Gravestock (University of Gloucestershire)</p>
<p><b>Outline:</b> How do we ensure that our students are all included in discussion in our classrooms? Can we say that our curricula are designed in a truly inclusive way? To date most of the initiatives looking at diversity have focused on particular groups of students (e.g. disabled students, international students), and have identified strategies that assist these students to participate to their full potential. Given the current student diversity in higher education it is appropriate to consider how these strategies can also have a positive impact on the wider student body. Through discussion, activity and presentation this session will explore such issues and will consider appropriate points for action.</p>	<p><b>Learning outcomes:</b> By the end of this session, participants will be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Evaluate their teaching, learning and assessment practices with regard to inclusive practice</li> <li>2. Develop strategies to support the development of inclusive curricula for all students.</li> </ol>

**Reading:**

Doyle, C. and Robson, K. (2002) *Accessible Curricula: Good Practice for All*, LTSN. [http://www.jjsctechdis.ac.uk/assets/Documents/investinyou/Accessible\\_Curricula.pdf](http://www.jjsctechdis.ac.uk/assets/Documents/investinyou/Accessible_Curricula.pdf) (Accessed 16 August 2011).

Gravestock, P. (2006) *Developing an Inclusive Curriculum: a guide for lecturers*, University of Gloucestershire, <http://www2.glos.ac.uk/gdn/icp/ilecturer.pdf> (Accessed 16 August 2011).

SWANDS, *SENDA Compliance in Higher Education: an audit and guidance tool for accessible practice within the framework of teaching and learning* (2002), University of Plymouth. <http://www.plymouth.ac.uk/pages/view.asp?page=3243> (Accessed 16 August 2011).

Teachability <http://www.teachability.strath.ac.uk/> (Accessed 16 August 2011).

**Follow up reading might also include:**

Adams, A. and Brown, S. (eds) (2006) *Towards Inclusive Learning in Higher Education*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Grace, S. and Gravestock, P. (2008) *Inclusion and Diversity: Meeting the Needs of ALL Students*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Riddell, S. Tinklin, T. and Wilson, A. (2005) *Disabled Students in Higher Education*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Seale, J. (2006) *E-Learning and Disability in Higher Education*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Traher, S. (2011) *Developing Cultural Capability in Higher Education*. London: Routledge.

**Employability in the Curriculum**

**Tutor(s):** Heather Stout (Careers Service),  
Duncan Jackson

**Outline:**

Preparing students for their future life, whether this is in employment, research or in some form of self-employment has always been a key part of Higher Education, but in a highly competitive labour market, and with more visible scrutiny on what our students do once they leave York, it is becoming increasingly important that we help students to consider their University education as an integrated component of their lifelong learning.

Universities have a responsibility to give their students the opportunity to equip themselves with the skills and attributes that will help them succeed in achieving their aspirations. Many of the skills that students will require once they leave university are integral to being an effective learner, but how can we enable our students to better understand the importance of these transferable skills through our teaching activities?

This session will show participants the importance of their teaching to students' post-degree activity and explore how to enhance the student learning experience within the context of lifelong learning.

**Learning outcomes:**

By the end of this session, participants will be able to:

1. Evaluate the significance of the degree programme and higher education in supporting students in their post-degree activity
2. Identify the key skills and attributes that students within their discipline should acquire through the course of their study
3. Describe possible techniques of delivery and assessment which will enable students to demonstrate their achievement of key skills and attributes, and consider the application of these skills in the wider employment context.

**Reading:**

Pool, L.D. and Sewell, P. (2007) *Education and Training* Vol.49 No.4, pp.277-289 [online]. Available from: <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/0040-0912.htm> (Accessed 29 July 2010).

<b>VLE/E-Learning at the University of York</b>	<b>Tutor(s):</b> Dr Richard Walker (E-Learning Development Team Manager & VLE Service Group Leader)
<p><b>Outline:</b> As part of its Online Learning Strategy, the University has invested in a centrally supported Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) that will enable the delivery of teaching and training on line. This electronic media is intended to enhance the traditional and successful approaches to teaching and learning already in place at the University. The software package which has been selected for this purpose is the Blackboard Academic Suite.</p>	<p><b>Learning outcomes:</b> By the end of this session, participants will have:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Gained a knowledge of on-line learning models, trends in on-line course design and delivery and the current rationale for e-learning within HE</li> <li>2. Learned more about blended learning (combining face-to-face classes with on-line learning activities)</li> <li>3. Received an update on the Portfolio of IT tools and resources available to staff at York for on-line course design and delivery.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Reading:</b> Ellis, R. (2010) <i>Students' Experiences of e-learning in Higher Education</i>. London: Routledge. Garrison, D R and Anderson, T (2003) <i>E-learning in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century</i> London &amp; New York: Routledge Falmer. Herrington, J. (2010) <i>A Guide to Authentic e-learning</i>. London: Routledge. Inglis, A, Ling, P and Joosten, V (2002) <i>Delivering Digitally</i> London: Kogan Page Jolliffe, A, Ritter, J and Stevens, D (2001) <i>The Online Learning Handbook</i>. London: Kogan Page. Kear, K. (2011) <i>Online and Social Networking Communities</i>. London: Routledge. Ko, S. (2010) <i>Teaching Online – a Practical Guide</i>. London: Routledge. Salmon, G (2002) <i>E-tivities: The key to active online learning</i>. London: Kogan Page. Laurillard, D (2002) <i>Rethinking University Teaching (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition)</i> London &amp; New York: Routledge Falmer. Chin P, (2005) <i>Using C &amp; IT to Support Teaching</i>. London: Routledge Falmer. Seale J, (2006) <i>E-Learning and Disability in Higher Education</i>. London: Routledge Falmer. Vai, M. and Sosulski, K. (2011) <i>The Essential Guide to On-Line Course Design</i>. London: Routledge. Whitelock, D. (2011) <i>Digital Discourse</i>. London: Routledge.</p>	

## 3.5 Assessment

### 3.5.1 Task

The assessment for Module 1 comprises two elements: the submission of a written Critical Experience Analysis portfolio and a follow-up viva based upon the content of that portfolio. Both elements will be assessed holistically against the criteria detailed in section 3.5.2.

A Critical Experience Analysis, within the context of PGCAP, is a structured consideration of a particular event, incident or experience that has been encountered in teaching. It is often the case that the incident in question, for either positive or negative reasons, is one that has stood out and raised questions or issues or otherwise challenged views about practice. However, there is also value in subjecting more 'ordinary' experiences to examination, again in order to understand personal approaches to teaching, to identify assumptions about how teaching is undertaken and how students learn and to determine whether these assumptions are safe.

#### Critical Experience Analysis Portfolio

Participants are required to write a Critical Experience Analysis for each of the five module learning outcomes. The intention is that this will familiarise participants with the process of reflective writing and prepare them for the more extended reflective assessment of Module 2.

The reflection required in the Critical Experience Analysis portfolio should be a deliberate and thought-through investigation of practice rather than a purely descriptive account of an incident or event. Consequently, participants may find the following structure useful:

1. **Description:** What was the event and when did it happen? Who was involved? Why has it been chosen as the focus of the Critical Experience Analysis?
2. **Observation:** What happened? What were your feelings / reactions and, if known, those of the other individuals involved?
3. **Analysis:** Why might the incident have developed as it did? Has the incident made you question your practice or any assumptions you have about teaching and learning (if so why)? Are there alternative interpretations for why the incident evolved as it did and how people reacted?
4. **Conclusion:** What have you learned from the incident? If the situation arose again would you address it in the same or a different way? If different, how and what would you hope to achieve?

The critical experience analysis for each learning outcome is likely to be not less than 500 words long. The combination of these analyses, submitted together with the Assessment Cover Sheet (which can be downloaded from the PGCAP VLE site <http://vle.york.ac.uk>) and contents page, will constitute the Critical Experience Analysis portfolio which should be submitted by the due date at the end of year 1 of PGCAP (see section 6.3)

#### Critical Experience Analysis Viva

Participants' critical experience analysis portfolios will be anonymised and considered by two markers. The markers at this stage will not be summatively judging the participants' work but will identify any areas of weakness and/or particular interest in the portfolios. These areas will form the basis of a reflective discussion between both markers and the participant during the CEA viva. The viva will last up to one hour and in addition to providing participants with the opportunity to address areas of weakness, it aims to explore the incidents in the CEA portfolio in more detail and to enable further professional development through constructive dialogue.

### 3.5.2 Criteria

Summative assessment of the participants' work will be undertaken only after the viva has taken place. Assessment will involve combining the CEA portfolio and the proceedings of the CEA viva discussion and judging them holistically against the module criteria.

In order to pass PGCAP module 1 participants will demonstrate within their CEA assessment:

- 1. Clear and coherent coverage of all five Module 1 learning outcomes**  
Assessors will expect the portfolio to be clearly and appropriately organised and to include a genuine CEA attempt for each of the module's five learning outcomes although not all five will necessarily be considered during the viva. The written (portfolio) and spoken (viva) English should be of a good standard.
- 2. The ability to reflect effectively and convincingly upon practice**  
Assessors will expect the reflection to be credible, involving a genuine consideration of practice where conclusions are reasonable and logically derived from the preceding analysis of experience.
- 3. The capacity to recognize and consider the needs of students in teaching**  
Assessors will be looking for evidence that participants' practice has been influenced, to an appropriate level, by explicit consideration of the students that they are teaching.
- 4. The capacity to adopt approaches that are appropriate to the subject matter and level of learning**  
Assessors will expect to see that participants' approaches to teaching have taken account of, and are appropriate to, the specific nature of the subject matter being covered and the level at which it is being taught.
- 5. The ability, as appropriate, to evaluate the applicability of higher education learning and teaching principles to practice**  
Assessors will not necessarily expect participants to have engaged fully with educational literature and research in the CEA portfolio, but they will expect an awareness, and ability to consider the relevance, of key theories and ideas addressed within the core PGCAP sessions as and when appropriate.

## Section 4 – Module 2: Developing Academic Practice (20 credits)

### 4.1 Introduction

This module will progress from Module 1 by providing the opportunity to expand beyond learning and teaching in higher education to consider the concept of academic practice more generally and how the different responsibilities inherent to the academic profession are interlinked.

### 4.2 Aims and Learning Outcomes

#### 4.2.1 Aims

- To provide participants with the opportunity to explore all areas of their professional practice and, where appropriate, the links between them
- To enable participants to show they have developed in their professional practice.

#### 4.2.2 Learning Outcomes

By the end of this module participants should be able to:

1. Demonstrate development in one or more areas of their teaching and learning practice  
*And any **two** of the following four learning outcomes*
2. Explain progression in a key aspect of their research practice
3. Explain how they have successfully engaged in a key administrative responsibility allocated to them within their department
4. Explain how their research and teaching practice are linked
5. Explain how their engagement with their own personal professional development has impacted upon their practice.

### 4.3 Module Requirements

<p><b>Core Attendance</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction PGCAP Module 2</li> <li>• Contemporary Academic Practice</li> <li>• Reciprocated PGCAP Observation (with PGCAP peer)</li> <li>• Experience Evaluation (online) (Autumn Term)</li> <li>• Critical Reading Activity (online) (Autumn term)</li> <li>• Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (online) (Spring term).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Options Attendance</b> (2 required from the following)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing your Research Career</li> <li>• Linking Teaching and Research</li> <li>• Understanding your Market: Recruiting New Students</li> <li>• Approaching Ethics in Academic Practice</li> <li>• Issues of Academic Conduct.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supervisory Meetings (one per term)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Assessment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Academic Practice Portfolio (c. 3,500 words)</li> </ul>

## 4.4 Workshops and Online Activities

### 4.4.1 Core

<b>Introduction to PGCAP Module 2</b>	<b>Tutor(s):</b> Duncan Jackson
<p><b>Outline:</b> This session introduces PGCAP module 2, elaborating on module intentions and requirements. Particular support will be provided on compiling the academic practice portfolio by which module 2 is assessed. The intention will be to provide participants with a clear awareness of what is meant by critical reflection and how this might differ from the CEA reflection written as part of the module 1 assessment. There will be an opportunity to ask questions and receive personalised guidance and also to look at examples of portfolios submitted by past PGCAP participants. The session is also intended to provide an opportunity for the cohort to re-engage with their thinking about higher education academic practice within the context of a multi-disciplinary group.</p>	<p><b>Learning outcomes:</b> By the end of this session, participants will be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Articulate the learning intentions behind PGCAP Module 2</li> <li>2. Describe PGCAP module 2 attendance and assessment requirements</li> <li>3. Reflect upon their views and thoughts on academic practice and the PGCAP programme.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Reading:</b> Bradbury, H. (2010) <i>Beyond Reflective Practice – New Approaches</i>. London: Routledge. Brookfield, S (1995) <i>Becoming a Critically Reflective Practitioner</i>. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Moon, J. (2004) <i>A Handbook of Reflective and Experiential Learning: theory and practice</i>. London: Routledge. Moon, J. (2010) <i>Reflection in Learning and Professional Development</i>. London Routledge. Schon, D. (1993) <i>The Reflective Practitioner</i>. London: Temple Smith.</p>	

<b>Contemporary Academic Practice</b>	<b>Tutor(s):</b> John Issitt (Education and Chair of FELT), Duncan Jackson, Kelly Redeker (Biology)
<p><b>Outline:</b> Perceptions as to the purpose of higher education over recent years have, and continue to be, subject to the whims of a rapidly changing national and international environment. The role of the academic and the nature of academic work has likewise been in a state of flux for sometime with multiple priorities and demands from a diverse range of stakeholders requiring attention. The collection of discussions in this session aim to explore particular policy issues within contemporary higher education and to clarify to some extent both the role of the modern academic and the practicalities of coping with academic life.</p>	<p><b>Learning outcomes:</b> By the end of this session, participants will be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Articulate their understanding of how key current policy will impact upon their own practice</li> <li>2. Argue a reasoned perspective on the role and responsibilities of the academic in modern society</li> <li>3. Identify key points of tension in academic life and potential ways of addressing them.</li> </ol>

**Reading:**

Barnett, R. (2011) *Being a University*. Foundations and Futures of Education Series. London: Routledge.

Harland, T. and Pickering, N. (2011) *Values in Higher Education Teaching*. London: Routledge.

Hussey, T. and Smith, P. (2010) *The Trouble with Higher Education: a critical examination of our universities*. London: Routledge.

Molesworth, M., Cullion, R. and Nixon, E. (eds.) (2011) *The Marketisation of Higher Education and the Student as Consumer*. London: Routledge.

Taylor, P. G. (1999) *Making Sense of Academic Life: academics, universities and change*. The Society for Research into Higher Education. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Wilson, A. (2010) *Knowledge Power: interdisciplinary education for a complex world*. London: Routledge.

**Experience Evaluation 2 (online)****Tutor(s):** Duncan Jackson**Outline:**

The second experience evaluation follows the same format as the first but the focus is on participants' thoughts after having progressed through the first year of the programme.

**Learning outcomes:**

By the end of this session, participants will be able to:

1. Judge how their views on PGCAP compare with those of their colleagues after one year on the programme.ial ways of addressing them.

**Critical Reading Activity (online)****Tutor(s):** Duncan Jackson**Outline:**

The purpose of this activity is to encourage participants to engage with both generic and discipline-specific literature and resources on a particular aspect of teaching relevant to their practice. Participants will be required to produce a critical précis of what literature and research says about this aspect of teaching practice. It is envisaged that this activity will inform the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (online) activity and map onto learning outcome 1 of the portfolio and is therefore an opportunity for participants to develop a piece of work which can be incorporated into their final Module 2 assessment.

**Learning outcomes:**

By the end of this session, participants will be able to:

1. Identify literature, research and resources relevant to a particular aspect of teaching practice
2. Critically evaluate the value of this material in informing their own understanding of learning and teaching practice.

<b>Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (online)</b>	<b>Tutor(s):</b> Duncan Jackson
<p><b>Outline:</b> This session will explore what it means to take a scholarly approach to teaching and why it might be important for an academic to do so. It will offer participants the opportunity to investigate an area of their practice, challenge assumptions about what they teach, the way they teach it and the way they conceptualise and represent their subject discipline to students. This investigation is intended to contribute towards learning outcome 1 of the portfolio.</p>	<p><b>Learning outcomes:</b> By the end of this session, participants will be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Employ a scholarly critique of a course or curriculum in which they play a key role</li> <li>2. Demonstrate an individual interpretation of the professional standards framework</li> <li>3. Evaluate their practice against the professional standards framework.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Reading:</b> Barnett, R (Ed.) (2005) <i>Reshaping the university: new relationships between research, scholarship and teaching</i>, Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill/Open University Press</p> <p>Boyer, E (1990) <i>Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities for the Professoriate</i>. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Princeton, NJ.</p> <p>Healey, M. (2000): Developing the scholarship of teaching in higher education: a discipline-based approach, <i>Higher Education Research and Development</i>, 19 (2), 169-189.</p> <p>Lueddeke, G. 2003: Professionalising teaching practice in higher education: a study of disciplinary variation and 'teaching-scholarship', <i>Studies in Higher Education</i> 28(2), 213-228.</p> <p>Martin, E., Benjamin, J., Prosser, M., &amp; Trigwell, K. (1999). Scholarship of teaching: A study of the approaches of academic staff. In C. Rust (Ed.), <i>Improving student learning: Improving student learning outcomes</i> (pp. 326-331). Oxford: Oxford Centre for Staff Learning and Development, Oxford Brookes University.</p> <p>Wilson, A. (2010) <i>Knowledge Power</i>. London: Routledge.</p>	

#### 4.4.2 Options

<b>Linking Teaching and Research</b>	<b>Tutor(s):</b> Duncan Jackson
<p><b>Outline:</b> There can be little doubt that one of the key characteristics of the University of York is its emphasis on research-led teaching. The student experience is one that should be enriched through the research carried out by academic and research staff. This session explores some of the ways that the relationship between teaching and research can be articulated and what impact it may have on students.</p>	<p><b>Learning outcomes:</b> By the end of this session, participants will be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Outline why research-led teaching is important</li> <li>2. Articulate ways in which teaching and research can be linked</li> <li>3. Describe a number of examples of research-led teaching.</li> </ol>

**Reading:**

Barnett, R (Ed.) (2005) *Reshaping the university: new relationships between research, scholarship and Brew*, A (2006) *Research and teaching: beyond the divide*. London: Palgrave Macmillan

Elton, L (2001) Research and teaching: what are the real relationships? *Teaching in Higher Education* 6 (1), 43-56

Hattie, J. and Marsh, H.W. (1996) The relationship between research and teaching: A meta-analysis, *Review of Educational Research* 66(4), 507-542

Healey, M. and Jenkins, A. (2007) *Case studies linking discipline-based research and teaching in disciplines, departments, institutions and national systems*. Enhancement Themes resource. Available at: [http://www.enhancementthemes.ac.uk/documents/eventDocs/ResearchTeaching\\_Case\\_Studies\\_AJenkins.pdf](http://www.enhancementthemes.ac.uk/documents/eventDocs/ResearchTeaching_Case_Studies_AJenkins.pdf) [Accessed 18th November 2009].

Higher Education Academy *Evidence Net Resources: Research Teaching Nexus* [online]. Available at: <http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/EvidenceNet/home> [Accessed 17<sup>th</sup> August 2010].

Jenkins, A (2004) *A guide to the research evidence on teaching-research relationships*. York: Higher Education Academy

Jenkins, A, Breen, R, and Lindsay, R with Brew, A (2003) *Re-shaping higher education: Linking teaching and research*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Robertson, J. and Bond, C. (2001) Experiences of the Relation between Teaching and Research: what do academics value? *Higher Education Research and Development* 20(1), 5-19.

**Developing your Research Career**

**Tutor(s):** Professor John Local  
(Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Research)

**Outline:**

The central role that research plays in developing an academic career at the University of York is the core of this session. What the University expects of its staff in respect of research activity, and how it supports them in that and what personal targets staff might have. The impact of the Research Assessment Exercise / Research Excellence Framework on staff early in their careers may be considered. This informal discussion with the Pro Vice-Chancellor for Research considers possible problems, strategies and benefits of life as a researcher. Participants are encouraged to indicate in advance particular areas that they would like covered.

**Learning outcomes:**

By the end of this session, participants will be:

1. more aware of the role of research in career development and the opportunities and general support for enhancing their research careers.

**Understanding your Market – Recruiting New Students**

**Tutor(s):** Simon Willis (Director, International Office)

**Outline:**

The session will provide a guide to the market intelligence available to departments and how it can be used to inform recruitment policy and practice.

**Learning outcomes:**

By the end of the session participants will be familiar with:

1. the market intelligence available on demand for particular subjects at different levels (undergraduate, postgraduate taught and postgraduate research) both at York and at comparator institutions
2. how to interpret the information and translate it into effective recruitment action

And will have considered:

3. the drivers to new programme development
4. best practice in promoting programmes and handling enquiries and applications .

**Reading:**

Crosling G., Thomas L. and Heagney M. (2008) *Improving Student Retention in Higher Education*, London: Routledge Falmer.

### Approaching Ethics in Academic Practices

**Tutor(s):** Dr Pat Coulson (Biology), Charles Fonge (Borthwick Institute for Archives), Anna Grey (Research and Enterprise), Duncan Jackson

**Outline:**

The question of ethics and the adoption of an ethical approach to practice has always been fundamental in safeguarding the integrity and credibility of academic work in the eyes of both professional colleagues and the public. Over recent years this issue has become more explicit due to the emphasis that has been placed on formalising procedures within the higher education sector to ensure that research is pre-defined as operating within an approved ethical framework. The work of ethics committees and the securing of ethical approval is perhaps often seen as being particularly integral to certain disciplines – for example health, medicine and social work. The purpose of this session is to provide some philosophical insight into the importance of ethics in academia, but also to highlight how the application of an ethical approach to working applies to all disciplines and all facets of academic practice.

**Learning outcomes:**

By the end of this session, participants will be able to:

1. describe the historical importance of ethics to academic practice
2. discuss critically, through case studies, various ethical issues that may arise in different aspects of academic practice
3. identify what facets of their own practice need to be considered within the context of adopting good ethical standards.

**Reading:**

Gallant, T. B. (ed.) (2011) *Creating the Ethical Academy: A systems approach to understanding misconduct and empowering change in higher education*. London: Routledge.

Macfarlane, B. (2009) *Researching with Integrity*. London: Routledge.

McGinn, M., Shields, C., Manley\_Casimir, M., Grundy, A. and Fenton, N. (2005) Living Ethics: a narrative of collaboration and belonging in a research team, *Reflective Practice* 6(4), 551-567.

Johnson, J. M. and Altheide, D. L. Hoonard, W. C. van den (ed) (2002) *Walking the tightrope: ethical issues for qualitative researchers*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Various articles from: *Journal of Academic Ethics*

### Issues of Academic Conduct

**Tutor(s):** David Duncan (Registrar and Secretary), Charles Fonge (Borthwick Institute for Archives), Anna Grey (Research and Enterprise), Duncan Jackson

**Outline:**

The expectation of how members of the academic community should conduct themselves in their day-to-day work is increasingly subject to both statutory and non-statutory guidelines and rules. This emphasised and formalised definition of what might be called professional practice coincides with a rise in the ways by which academic staff can and are held accountable for their actions. This session aims to explore the expectations (and the rules) of good academic conduct, for example in data management and data protection, and to explore how this might impact upon all areas of academic practice as well as what the repercussions could be for failing to abide by those expectations and rules.

**Learning outcomes:**

By the end of this session, participants will be able to:

1. Describe the requirements of academic conduct with relation to key areas of practice such as data management and data protection
2. Explore through critical discussion what issues with respect to academic conduct might arise in practice
3. Identify potential repercussions of academic misconduct
4. Define more precisely personal professional standards in academic practice.

**Reading:**

Gallant, T. B. (ed.) (2011) *Creating the Ethical Academy: A systems approach to understanding misconduct and empowering change in higher education*. London: Routledge.

Macfarlane, B. (2009) *Researching with Integrity*. London: Routledge.

## 4.5 Assessment

### 4.5.1 Task

Assessment for Module 2 is by a reflective portfolio on academic practice. Portfolios are used increasingly to evidence and assess continuing professional development both inside and outside of the higher education sector<sup>14</sup>. They provide the flexibility demanded by a work-based programme in which participants are drawn from a variety of backgrounds and where there may be considerable diversity in responsibility between one individual and another.

The PGCAP Module 2 portfolio should represent a development of the reflective writing that was undertaken in the Module 1 CEA assessment. As with the CEA assessment it is likely that participants will address each pertinent learning outcome (outcome 1 and any two of outcomes 2 to 5) in turn. Each outcome should comprise two key elements:

#### Evidence

Evidence included within the portfolio will primarily derive from work developed during the participant's academic practice and is, on the whole, unlikely to have been produced specifically for inclusion within the portfolio. There is no prescription on what constitutes evidence and it may include anything from, for example, lecture PowerPoint slides, to handouts, samples of assessment, e-mails, funding applications, committee meeting minutes or examples of academic research. It is important to emphasise, however, that the evidence included within the portfolio must have a reason for being there; evidence which is not relevant and which does not inform coverage of the outcome should not be included. To reinforce this, the evidence should be clearly labelled and cross-referenced with the second element of the portfolio, the reflective account. In most cases, four or five items of evidence per learning outcome should be sufficient.

#### Critical Reflection

The reflection will have been produced specifically for inclusion within the portfolio. This element provides coherence to the document and gives the evidence meaning by establishing its context and explaining what it has been included to show. The reflective account should therefore refer to the evidence and the evidence should support the reflective account: the two need to be explicitly and closely linked.

The reflection in the Module 2 portfolio should involve a process of conscious (re-)examination of current knowledge, understanding and assumptions through the structured consideration of experience (and other inputs) **after the fact**. This is what has been defined as 'reflection-on-action' as opposed to 'reflection-in-action' which characterises spontaneous adjustment in accordance to immediate and present experience and observation<sup>15</sup>. The Module 2 reflection will have similarities to the writing undertaken for the Module 1 CEA assessment; however, it should be extended and demonstrate more reflexive depth. It should be critical in nature which will require participants to consider the broader

14 For additional discussion, see Fry, H. and Ketteridge, S. 2003 Teaching portfolios, in H Fry et al (ed) *A Handbook for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: Enhancing Academic Practice* (second edition), pp. 242 – 252. London, Kogan Page.

15 Schön, D. 1983 *The Reflective Practitioner*. London: Temple Smith.

context within which their practice takes place. This may involve engaging with pertinent social and economic issues, local and national political and policy opportunities/constraints and the influence of tradition and culture on practice. There should be a clear indication in the portfolio of 'reflective scepticism' which is the ability to identify and understand personal assumptions and presumptions about practice, to explore what has contributed towards these assumptions, to challenge their validity if appropriate and imagine ways of thinking about issues that are 'different'<sup>16</sup>. There should also be engagement with relevant and appropriate literature, theory and pedagogical research.

Participants should aim to make the reflective account as genuine and honest as possible. It is inevitable that, given the portfolios are to be assessed by third parties, a degree of artificiality and 'distance' will intrude upon the writing. However, for it to be useful as a developmental exercise, participants should be aware of this tendency and as far as possible maintain a personal and exploratory perspective as opposed to a detached and justificatory one.

As a guideline **the reflective component** for learning outcome 1 will be between 1,500 and 2,000 words and that for the remaining two outcomes not less than 1,000 words in length. The critical reflection and evidence should be accompanied by the Assessment Cover Sheet (available on the PGCAP VLE site) and contents page.

#### 4.5.2 Criteria

In order to progress through PGCAP module 2 participants will need to demonstrate:

- 1. Clear and coherent coverage of three Module 2 learning outcomes (including learning outcome 1)**  
Assessors will expect the portfolio to be well organised and to address the requisite number of learning outcomes in depth through reflection and the effective integration of evidence. The written English should be of a good standard.
- 2. The ability to be consistently and critically reflexive**  
As well as being credible, reflection in the Module 2 portfolio should be critical. It should not rely on description or unsupported statements; it should demonstrate an awareness of how practice is situated in broader (social, historical, economic, political and policy) frameworks and further it should provide evidence of an ability to identify personal assumptions on practice and to consider whether these are justifiable.
- 3. The capacity to implement change and develop as a result of effective evaluation of practice**  
Assessors will be looking for a genuine engagement with evaluation and a willingness to change practice when appropriate. This will include discussion of the ways participants have considered changing, or actually have introduced change, why and what the intended benefit of the change was.
- 4. The ability to engage with, and evaluate the usefulness of, relevant research, theory and literature in their practice**  
Participants must be able to demonstrate that they are aware of relevant generic / discipline-specific pedagogical theory, research and literature and are able to evaluate its applicability and/ or accuracy with relation to their own experience. This need not occur continuously throughout the portfolio, but it must be evident and well integrated in at least learning outcome 1.

---

<sup>16</sup> Brookfield, S. (1988) *Developing Critically Reflective Practitioners: A Rationale for Training Educators of Adults*. In S. Brookfield (ed.) *Training Educators of Adults: The Theory and Practice of Graduate Adult Education*. New York: Routledge.

## Section 5 – Module 3: Planning for Career Progression (20 credits)

### 5.1 Introduction

This module allows participants to build upon their work in Module 1 and Module 2 by moving beyond reflection of past and present practice to considering future activity. It encourages participants to review their academic profile as a whole, to consider this against career progression parameters (institutional and disciplinary), to identify an area of academic practice that would benefit from some strategic planning and to engage in activity that will enhance that area of practice against the progression parameters identified. This module is in the most part self-directed with academic supervisors providing support.

### 5.2 Aims and Learning Outcomes

#### 5.2.1 Aims

- To allow participants to reflect upon their professional profile
- To provide participants with an opportunity to identify, or where appropriate implement, strategies that will enable them to enhance their professional profile

#### 5.2.2 Learning Outcomes

By the end of this module participants should be able to:

- Critically appraise their current level of professional practice against institutional and / or disciplinary progression expectations in order to identify an area for development
- Constructively engage in a process by which they will be able to enhance their standing in **one** of the following areas of their professional practice:
  - o Research and Scholarship
  - o Teaching and the Promotion of Learning
  - o Departmental and other Leadership / Administration
  - o Nursing and Midwifery Council Accreditation.

### 5.3 Module Requirements

<p><b>Core Attendance</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction PGCAP Module 3</li> <li>• Academic Staff Progression</li> <li>• Experience Evaluation (online) (Autumn Term)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Options Attendance</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• n/a</li> </ul>
<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supervisory Meetings (one per term)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Assessment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategic Planning Assignment (c. 2,000 words)</li> </ul>

## 5.4 Workshops and Online Activities

### 5.4.1 Core

<b>Introduction to PGCAP Module 3</b>	<b>Tutor(s):</b> Duncan Jackson
<p><b>Outline:</b> This session introduces PGCAP module 3, elaborating upon the change of focus from reflection on past and recent practice to considering future practice and career progression. The session is also intended to provide an opportunity for the cohort to re-engage with their thinking about higher education academic practice within the context of a multi-disciplinary group.</p>	<p><b>Learning outcomes:</b> By the end of this session, participants will be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Articulate the learning intentions behind PGCAP Module 3</li> <li>2. Describe PGCAP module 3 requirements</li> <li>3. Reflect upon their views and thoughts on academic practice and the PGCAP programme.</li> </ol>

<b>Academic Staff Progression</b>	<b>Tutor(s):</b> Professor Trevor Sheldon (Deputy Vice Chancellor)
<p><b>Outline:</b> This session will offer an informal opportunity for staff to explore the promotions systems and realities. Information about systems and procedures will be explained by a member of Promotions Committee and more personal views from a recently promoted member of academic staff will also be offered.</p>	<p><b>Learning outcomes:</b> By the end of this session participants will be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Describe the University's academic promotion procedures</li> <li>2. Clarify questions and issues relating to promotion at the University of York</li> <li>3. Begin to identify personal goals for achieving promotion.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Reading:</b> University of York academic promotions guidance and procedures – <a href="http://www.york.ac.uk/admin/registrars/acadprom/">http://www.york.ac.uk/admin/registrars/acadprom/</a></p>	

<b>Experience Evaluation 3 (online)</b>	<b>Tutor(s):</b> Duncan Jackson
<p><b>Outline:</b> The third experience evaluation follows the same format as the previous two with the focus now turning to a consideration of the PGCAP programme as a whole.</p>	<p><b>Learning outcomes:</b> By the end of this session, participants will be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Judge how their views on the PGCAP programme compare with those of their colleagues having undertaken all the requirements of the programme.</li> </ol>

## 5.5 Assessment

### 5.5.1 Task

#### For Staff **not** Seeking Nursing and Midwifery Council Accreditation

The assessment for module 3 revolves around the construction of a strategic plan for career development within the context of academic practice. Early consideration of career trajectory in the light

of key criteria is important for progressing within the higher education environment. The intention here is to encourage participants to begin to reflect upon their medium term aspirations and to undertake some analysis of the steps required to move from their current position in one key area of their academic practice to a position where those aspirations may become realised. In this way the module is intended to complement, by reflexive analysis, the career development activity that individuals will be undertaking within their departments through, for example, the probationary process, mentoring schemes and annual performance review. Because the strategic plan is likely to be particularly individualised, the role of PGCAP supervisors in this instance will be to act as a 'critical friend' and to provide guidance and advice with regard to the assessment of the plan rather than with regard to the career planning activity itself.

Participants should build their strategic plan as follows:

1. Construct a statement describing where you would envisage or hope your career being in up to five years' time. For many participants this may orientate around progressing towards, or achieving, promotion within the higher education sector, but it could involve other academic and non-academic aspirations. You should include within this statement an explanation of the professional motivations and/or personal philosophy that provide the basis for your career ambitions.
2. Consider the pre-requisites for progress as detailed in (1). Often this will be the appropriate university promotions criteria (for instance to senior lecturer) but there may be other/alternative parameters or structures which participants operate to and which are relevant. Where the requirements are not stated in discipline-specific terms (e.g. promotions criteria) you should ensure you have achieved a full understanding of what they mean within your discipline and have explained this in your strategic plan.
3. Select one area of your academic practice (research and scholarship, teaching and the promotion of learning or departmental and other leadership / administration) to focus upon and provide a reasoned explanation as to why you have chosen this particular area of practice. In order to ensure that the strategic planning process is as useful as possible, it is advisable that participants select that area where they think they may be weakest or require most professional development or which they believe is most important for their career progression prospects.
4. Undertake a gap analysis by comparing where you believe you are now to where you want to be, as identified by the requirements / criteria you identified in (2) above (this should include articulation, as appropriate, of where you think you meet the relevant requirements / criteria as well as where you think work remains to be done).
5. Identify and explain what steps need to be undertaken and what objectives met in order to close the 'gap' between your current position and the position you need to have reached to allow your career aspirations for this area of academic practice to be achieved. It is important that as well as simply stating these steps and identifying relevant objectives, you should also detail timescales, resources needed and any factors which would threaten your achievement of them.

The strategic plan should equate to not less than 2,000 words and should be submitted with the Assessment Cover Sheet (available on the PGCAP VLE site) by the due date at the end of year 2 of PGCAP.

#### **For Staff Seeking Nursing and Midwifery Council Accreditation**

For participants wishing to seek teaching accreditation by the Nursing and Midwifery Council, Module 3 is structured by a Learning Contract. The learning contract is an agreement between the participant, their facilitator (this is a Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) accredited teacher from the same professional discipline as the participant) and their PGCAP supervisor. These individuals will support participants throughout the programme to pursue certain goals to further develop their competence,

role and expertise.

The scope of the contract must be sufficient to warrant 200 hours of work and be worded in such a way as to reflect M level study.

A suggested distribution is:

Supervision	20 hours
Negotiated work	180 hours

For nurse and midwifery teachers, a log of hours engaged in workplace related activities must be kept and incorporated into the Portfolio of evidence (a minimum of 72 hours is recommended).

**Note: in order to fulfil the requirements of NMC accreditation, participants choosing this option are advised to work outside the normal PGCAP timetable and begin to engage with Module 3 at the start of their second year on the programme.**

The Contract is made up of learning outcomes, specific activities to be completed to achieve those outcomes and how both participant and facilitator will evaluate learning. The Contract is a formal agreement and both participant and supervisor should hold copies. The Contract constitutes the participant's PGCAP Module 3 assessment submission.

The following process should be followed in the development of the contract:

1. Discuss the learning outcomes, clarify what they mean and identify appropriate activities/opportunities related to the achievement of each outcome.
2. Review existing knowledge and skill in relation to each outcome.
3. Plan and agree what activities need to be undertaken to develop the knowledge and skills necessary to achieve each learning outcome.
4. Agree the roles and responsibilities of both learner (PGCAP participant) and facilitator. Within the contract it is important to make the specific roles explicit. General roles and responsibilities can be summarised as follows:
  - **The facilitator** is responsible for helping participants to identify and negotiate appropriate learning opportunities, to act as a resource and to provide support and encouragement to the participant. It is also the facilitator's role to assess achievement of the outcomes summatively.
  - **The participant** is responsible for making use of learning opportunities and resources identified to achieve outcomes and to seek feedback on the learning process regularly.

It is also essential to agree that participant and facilitator will communicate with each other during the Module.

- **The PGCAP supervisor** acts as a critical friend/mentor within this Module focussing on the PGCAP requirements.
5. Agree time frames and review dates. It is important to maintain contact with the facilitator and build in supervision sessions to review progress, assess achievement and renegotiate activities if necessary. These should all be documented appropriately. There is a PGCAP Supervision Summary form to summarise termly meetings with PGCAP supervisors. The Learning Contract is the form to be used with the NMC facilitator.

Further details and guidance are provided in the Learning Contract Handbook which the NMC facilitator will give to participants.

## 5.5.2 Criteria

### For Staff not Seeking Nursing and Midwifery Council Accreditation

To pass module 3 participants' strategic plan assessment must demonstrate:

- 1. Clear and coherent structure and communication**  
It is expected that, within the guidelines provided in section 5.5.1, participants may exercise considerable flexibility in constructing their strategic plan. However, a good standard of English and a logical and coherent structure is expected throughout.
- 2. An ability to engage with critical self-evaluation of professional practice**  
Assessors will be looking for participants to reflect honestly upon both their current strengths and weaknesses with regard to their professional practice generally and with regard to one strand of practice in particular.
- 3. A clear vision and understanding of career development opportunities and obstacles within their discipline / field of work**  
Assessors will expect participants to show personal insight into the nature of their particular discipline / field of work in terms of how they may progress their career within it and what the potential difficulties with doing so may be. Where appropriate, participants might also choose to discuss the opportunities and obstacles they envisage characterise career progression at the University of York.
- 4. A realistic and achievable strategy for medium term personal and professional development**  
It is to be anticipated that the strategies participants propose for moving along a career trajectory will be highly personalised. However, assessors will expect to see that the plan for development appears reasonable, credible and is clearly thought through.

### For Staff Seeking Nursing and Midwifery Council Accreditation

Participants must:

- 1. complete the six outcomes as set out in the Learning Contract Handbook**
- 2. provide evidence to support each outcome**
- 3. organise and present the material in a competent and clear manner**
- 4. demonstrate enhancement of professional skills in the planning and execution of the activities appropriate to each outcome**
- 5. employ a high standard of English grammar and spelling**

## Section 6 – Assessment, Submission and Marking

### 6.1 Assessment Presentation

All assessment should be typed and organised so as to allow the assessors to easily navigate contents. Submissions should contain a PGCAP assessment cover sheet (available from the PGCAP VLE site) and, where appropriate, include a contents page. Full citations in the format most familiar to the participant should be given for referenced work.

It is essential that the names of third parties, whether they are referred to in the main text of the assessment or, with regard to Module 2, where they appear in the evidence section, are anonymised.

### 6.2 Assessment Submission

It is expected that all assessment will be submitted electronically by the due through the *Yorkshire* VLE. In exceptional circumstances, where electronic submission is not possible (for instance where there is difficulty scanning paper-based evidence for inclusion in the Module 2 portfolio), it will be possible to submit two hard-copies of the assessment to the PGCAP programme administrator in the Professional and Organisational Development offices, Heslington Hall.

### 6.3 Deadlines

The deadlines for the submission of assessment for participants beginning PGCAP in the 2011/2012 academic year are no later than **5.00 pm** on the following dates:

	Submission Date	Viva Date	Resubmission Date (see section 6.4)
Module 1 CEA Portfolio and Viva	26th September 2012	By 21st November 2012	19th December 2012
Module 2 Academic Practice Portfolio	24th April 2013		25th September 2013
Module 3 Strategic Career Plan (two-year completion)	25th September 2013		4th December 2013

Because PGCAP operates a pass/fail grading scheme there is no provision for penalising late submissions through the deduction of a percentage of marks and therefore the above deadlines are absolute. Any submission received after these deadlines will be awarded a fail unless mitigating circumstances are presented (see section 6.8).

## 6.4 Academic Misconduct

PGCAP operates to the University of York's definition of academic misconduct<sup>17</sup> and abides by its procedures for investigating suspected, and penalising confirmed, instances of malpractice (as detailed in the booklet *Academic Misconduct: Policies, Guidelines and Procedures for taught programmes of study*<sup>18</sup>).

## 6.5 Moderation

All written assessment submissions are subject to anonymous blind double-marking<sup>19</sup> by two members of the Board of Studies for Academic Practice (not your own supervisor or anyone in your department). In the event that a decision as to whether a submission is a pass or fail cannot be resolved between the two markers, the submission will be further moderated by a third marker whose judgement will be final. A selection of submissions is monitored by the External Examiner and the process as a whole is overseen by the Board of Studies for Academic Practice. Appropriate staff members also form the PGCAP Board of Examiners.

## 6.6 Resubmission

If, after an assessment has been submitted and marked, it is decided any of the criteria have not been sufficiently addressed to allow it to pass and it receives a 'fail' grade, the participant will receive an explanatory report. On receiving this feedback, participants will be offered a resubmission deadline (see section 6.3) *providing they have not been offered a resubmission opportunity for an earlier failed module*. If, after the resubmission, the assessment is still judged unsatisfactory, this will constitute a final fail of the module in question.

Please note that the resubmission opportunity is not offered to participants who fail to submit their assessment by the specified deadline, or an agreed extension date, unless mitigating circumstances explaining the lack of submission are provided and accepted by the Board of Studies (see section 6.8).

## 6.7 Appeals

Where an assessment submission is judged a fail by the examiners, participants do have the right of appeal in accordance with University Regulation 2.9:

<http://www.york.ac.uk/admin/aso/ordreg/r2.htm#2.9>

## 6.8 Mitigating Circumstances

In the event that a participant feels there are personal circumstances, medical or other, that may impact upon their ability to successfully complete PGCAP assessment they should make contact with their supervisor as soon as possible. Any consideration of mitigating circumstances will normally require some form of evidence to be produced to substantiate the claim. This may result in the participant being encouraged to apply for an extension (section 6.9) or a leave of absence (section 2.5) rather than submit work they feel is sub-standard. If work is submitted it will be assessed without regard to the submitted mitigating circumstances. These circumstances will subsequently be considered by a special meeting of the Board of Examiners and a decision made as to what to recommend to the formal Board of Examiners' meeting.

<sup>17</sup> <http://www.york.ac.uk/admin/aso/ordreg/r5.htm#5.4>

<sup>18</sup> <http://www.york.ac.uk/admin/eto/exams/AcademicMis.htm>

<sup>19</sup> Obviously, in Module 1, anonymity ends at the point of the viva.

If a participant is wishing to have mitigating circumstances taken into account that were not disclosed before the submission of a piece of assessment, it is essential that they discuss the issue(s) with their supervisor prior to the Board of Examiners meeting. Appropriate evidence should be produced to support the claim for mitigating circumstances. The application will be considered by a special meeting of the Board of Examiners and a decision made as to what to recommend to the formal Board of Examiners meeting. The normal compensation following acceptance of mitigating circumstances that are disclosed after the date of assessment submission is for the participant to be permitted to resubmit the work in question.

## 6.9 Extensions

Although it is expected that participants will operate to the deadlines of the programme, it is recognised that situations can arise which may on occasion make this difficult. In this situation, extensions to submission deadlines can be negotiated within a specified framework.

Participants should formally submit for an extension using the form *Request for Extension to Assessment Submission Date* (available from the PGCAP VLE site) to the Programme Administrator.

The Board of Studies has responsibility for accepting or rejecting the application and will inform the participant once a decision has been made. An extension request will not normally exceed 20 working days. If a participant feels they need a longer extension they should consider whether applying for a leave of absence would be more appropriate (section 2.5)

## 6.10 Assessment Feedback

Participants may take the opportunity to receive formative feedback on drafts of assessed work through the supervisory process. There will also be an opportunity for participants to receive peer feedback on work that can contribute towards final assessment in the module 2 Scholarship of Teaching and Learning online activity.

Participants will receive the collated feedback from both markers on summative assessment within six weeks of submission. Where a piece of work has been failed, the feedback will include an explanation for the fail grade and, in the event that the participant is eligible for a resubmission opportunity, guidance on what needs to be done to achieve a pass.

Full details of the PGCAP feedback policy can be found on the PGCAP webpage.

## 6.11 External Exam Board

The PGCAP External Examiner will have responsibility to monitor standards across the programme and to ensure that assessment systems are fair and equitable. This will involve inspection of a sample of participant portfolios in advance of the Board of Examiners' meeting. The External Examiner for the 2011/2012 academic year is Ali Cooper, Centre for the Enhancement of Learning and Teaching, University of Lancaster. The PGCAP Board of Examiners meets once every academic year.

## Section 7 – Resources

Resources to support specific PGCAP workshops are provided in the preceding section. Additional resources, as appropriate, will be provided during the workshops in question. Further information on relevant subjects will be available from the University Library which holds a large number of books and journals about higher education and the PGCAP office also holds a selection of resources which participants may consult by appointment.

***The following is a brief list of titles, which are suitable for further reading on University learning and teaching and academic practice.***

Banks S, Lally V and McConnell D (2002) *Collaborative E-learning in Higher Education Issues and Strategies*: University of Sheffield School of Education

Biggs, J. and Tang, C. (2007) *Teaching for Quality Learning at University* (3<sup>rd</sup> edition). Maidenhead: SRHE and Open University Press.

Boud, D. and Falchikov, N. (eds.) (2006) *Rethinking assessment in higher education: learning for the longer term*. London: Routledge.

Brookfield, S.D. (1995) *Becoming a critically reflective teacher*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brookfield, S.D. (2006) *The skillful teacher: on technique, trust and responsiveness in the classroom* (2nd edition). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass  
Brown, G. & Atkins, M. (1998) *Effective teaching in Higher Education*, London: Routledge.

Brown, S. and Pickford, R. (2006) *Assessing Skills and Practice*. London: Routledge.

Butcher, C., Davies, C. and Highton, M. (2006) *Designing Learning: From module outline to effective teaching*. London: Routledge.

Campbell, A. and Norton, L. eds. (2007) *Learning, Teaching and Assessing in Higher Education: Developing Reflective Practice*, Exeter: Learning Matters.

Crosling G and Webb G eds (2002) *Supporting Student Learning – Case Studies, Experience and Practice from Higher Education*: Kogan Page.

Fry, Ketteridge and Marshall (1999) *A handbook for teaching and learning in Higher Education*, London: Kogan Page

Haines, C. (2004) *Assessing Students' Written Work: marking essays and reports*. London: Routledge.

Hunt, L, Bromage, A. and Tomkinson, B. (eds.) 2007 *The Realities of Change in Higher Education*. London: Taylor and Francis

Irons, A. (2007) *Enhancing Learning Through Formative Assessment and Feedback*. London: Routledge.

Jackson, N., Oliver, M., Shaw, M. and Wisdom, J. (eds.) (2006) *Developing creativity in higher education: an imaginative curriculum*. London: Routledge.

Jaques, D. (2001) *Learning in Groups*. London: Kogan Page.

Kahn, P. and Walsh, L. (2006) *Developing your teaching: ideas, insight and action*. London: Routledge.

Ketteridge S, Marshall S and Fry, H (2002) *The Effective Academic – A Handbook for Enhanced Academic*

Practice: THES/ Kogan Page

Knight, P. (2002) *Being a Teacher in Higher Education*. Buckingham: SRHE & OUP

Light, G. & Cox, R. (2001) *Learning and Teaching in Higher Education*. London: Sage Publications

McLean, M. (2008) *Pedagogy and the University: Critical Theory and Practice*. London: Continuum.

Norton, L. (2009) *Action Research in Teaching and Learning*. London: Routledge.

Prosser, M. & Trigwell, K. (2001) *Understanding Learning and Teaching. The Experience in Higher Education*. Buckingham: SRHE & OUP

Race P (ed) (1999) *2000 Tips for Lecturers*: THES/ Kogan Page

Ramsden, P. (1992) *Learning to teach in Higher Education*, London: Routledge

Rowland, S. (2000) *The Enquiring University Teacher*, Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press

Walsh, L. (2010) *Collaborative Working in Higher Education*. London: Routledge.

***In addition, the Main library holds many higher education based journals, several of which are available via online subscription. Examples include:***

*Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*

*Association for Learning Technology Journal*

*Higher Education Research and Development*

*Innovations in Education and Teaching International*

*International Journal of Academic Development*

*Open Learning*

*Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*

*Studies in Higher Education*

*Teaching in Higher Education*

Many disciplines also have their own specialist educational journals which can be searched through the e-journal catalogue.

## Useful Web Sites

### University of York pages

Academic Support Office

<http://www.york.ac.uk/about/departments/support-and-admin/academic-support/>

Careers Service

<http://www.york.ac.uk/about/departments/support-and-admin/careers/>

E-Learning Development Team

<http://vlesupport.york.ac.uk/webapps/portal/frameset.jsp>

Equality and Diversity Office

<http://www.york.ac.uk/admin/eo/>

ERIC educational database / e-journals

<http://www.york.ac.uk/library/electroniclibrary/databases/>

Forum for the Enhancement of Learning and Teaching (FELT)

<http://www.york.ac.uk/felt/>

Professional and Organisational Development

<http://www.york.ac.uk/admin/hr/training/>

Research and Enterprise

<http://www.york.ac.uk/staff/research/>

### National sites

Deliberations JISCMail discussion

<http://www.londonmet.ac.uk/deliberations/>

Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE)

<http://www.hefce.ac.uk/>

Higher Education Academy (including subject centres)

<http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/>

The Quality Assurance Agency for HE

<http://www.qaa.ac.uk/>

Staff and Educational Development Association (SEDA)

<http://www.seda.ac.uk/>

Universities UK

<http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/>

## Section 8 – The PGCAP Team, Responsibilities and Contacts

### 8.1 The PGCAP Team

#### **Dr Duncan Jackson**

**PGCAP Programme Director, Professional and Organisational Development**

**E-mail: [duncan.jackson@york.ac.uk](mailto:duncan.jackson@york.ac.uk)**

**Ext: 4843**

Duncan is an archaeologist by background, specialising in the later prehistory of western England and Wales. However, after breaking briefly from academia to teach in the secondary sector, he returned to join the University of Sheffield as an Educational Development Adviser and became Programme Director for the Postgraduate Certificate in Learning and Teaching as well as taking on responsibility for co-ordinating centrally-delivered professional development activity across the institution. Duncan joined the University of York as Programme Director for PGCAP and Senior Academic Staff Developer for Learning and Teaching in 2009.

#### **Lesley Catt**

**PGCAP Programme Administrator and Secretary to the Board of Studies, Professional and Organisational Development**

**E-mail: [lesley.catt@york.ac.uk](mailto:lesley.catt@york.ac.uk)**

**Ext: 4844**

Lesley is the Administrator for the PGCAP and Secretary to the Board of Studies for Academic Practice. Originally from a business background, she studied Archaeology at York and decided to stay on at the University. Lesley is in the PGCAP office ready to answer any queries or questions you may have about the programme.

#### **Dr Rob Aitken**

**PGCAP Supervisor, Senior Lecturer in the Department of Politics**

**<http://www.york.ac.uk/politics/our-staff/rob-aitken/>**

Rob Aitken is a social anthropologist who studied at the London School of Economics and University College London before receiving his doctorate from Leiden University. His doctoral research focussed on political culture, local identities and state formation in Mexico. His current research focuses on the transformation and politicisation of culture and identities, in particular on the comparative study of processes of ethnicization in conflicts and post-conflict situations.

### **The Rev'd Dr David Efirm**

#### **PGCAP Supervisor, Senior Lecturer in the Department of Philosophy**

**<http://www.york.ac.uk/philosophy/about/staff/david-efird/>**

David has been a lecturer at the University since 2002. During that time, he has held a variety of administrative posts in the Department of Philosophy and also the University, including Chairing the Graduate School Board of Philosophy and the University's Standing Committee on Assessment.

He has also been involved in learning enhancement, having been awarded funding for a variety of projects, and was one of the first recipients of a Vice Chancellor's Teaching Award. In addition to his departmental responsibilities, David is also Provost of Vanbrugh College. Outside of his work at the University, he is Assistant Curate at York Minster.

### **Paul Evans**

#### **NMC Supervisor, Department of Health Sciences**

Paul brings to PGCAP a wealth of teaching and practice based experience in nursing, particularly around the area of Learning Disability. He is a registered nurse with the professional regulatory body the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) in the areas of Adult and Learning Disability Nursing. With his MA being in Disability Studies he is primarily a lecturer in learning disability nursing but contributes across a range of programmes within the department. He is presently vice chair of the Departmental Board of Studies and sits on the Department's Teaching and Learning Quality Committee. In relation to monitoring teaching quality Paul has acted as a NMC visitor which involved assessing the structure and processes of validated nursing courses within other Universities to ensure they were adhering to professional body regulatory requirements. His experience in teaching on health related courses has given him insight into the needs and support required for newly appointed staff. This is important in relation to lecturers teaching on Nursing and Midwifery courses where they are required to be registered with the NMC.

### **Mr Ben Fitzpatrick**

#### **PGCAP Supervisor, Lecturer in the York Law School**

**<http://www.york.ac.uk/law/staff/staffprofile%20BF.htm>**

Prior to joining York, Ben taught law at the University of Birmingham, the University of Leeds, the Open University and as an academic visitor to the University of Louisville, Kentucky. Both his research and his teaching is mostly concerned with the areas of criminal law, criminal justice, human rights and legal philosophy. Ben has served on the Editorial Boards of the *Journal of Criminal Law* and the *Journal of Commonwealth Law and Legal Education* and is currently Director of Undergraduate Programmes and Chair of Board of Studies in the York Law School.

### **Dr John Issitt**

**PGCAP Supervisor, Lecturer in the Department of Education**

**<http://www.york.ac.uk/education/our-staff/academic/john-issitt/>**

John is a National Teaching Fellow and Provost of Langwith College. He has taught in schools, prisons, further education colleges and with the Open University for many years. He teaches extensively on the undergraduate programme in the Department of Educational Studies and supervises students at Masters level. He has developed innovative approaches to learning in higher education particularly in collaborative writing and peer assessment.

John's main interests are in the structure and presentation of knowledge and he pursues this interest through the study of educational media and through the history of ideas as related to education and learning. John also studies the micro-politics of educational engagement in a range of learning situations and is an aspiring novelist.

### **Dr Tim Kelly**

**PGCAP Supervisor, Senior Lecturer in the Department of Computer Science**

**<http://www.cs.york.ac.uk/people/?group=All%20Staff&username=tpk>**

Tim has been a lecturer in the Computer Science department since 1999, and Senior Lecturer since 2006. He teaches on the undergraduate computer science degree programmes and the postgraduate MSc programmes in Safety Critical Systems Engineering and Software Engineering. In addition, he has significant experience of teaching Continuing Professional Development (CPD) courses in system safety to industry. His research interests are in High Integrity Systems Engineering, particularly safety critical systems, and has been Principal Investigator on projects totalling approximately £3M of funding in this area. He has also served in various administrative roles in the Computer Science department, including six years as undergraduate admissions tutor, and postgraduate admissions tutor for the MSc Software Engineering programme.

### **Dr Samer A Kharroubi**

**PGCAP Supervisor, Senior Lecturer in the Department of Mathematics**

**<http://maths.york.ac.uk/www/sak503>**

Samer is a senior lecturer in Statistics and has been in the Mathematics Department since 2006.

Prior to joining York, Samer got his PhD degree in Statistics from the University of Surrey. He then worked as a post-doctoral research associate in the Department of Probability and Statistics at the University of Sheffield, studying the formulation of prior knowledge for use in Bayesian statistical analysis of clinical trials.

Samer's research interests are in Bayesian Statistics – methodology and applications.

Principal research areas are asymptotic techniques for Bayesian computation and Bayesian methods in Health Economics.

### **Dr Jason Lynam**

#### **PGCAP Supervisor, Lecturer in the Department of Chemistry**

**<http://www.york.ac.uk/chemistry/staff/academic/h-n/jlynam/>**

Jason Lynam graduated from the University of York in 1993 and then undertook a D. Phil. with Dr Roger Mawby at the same institution. He then moved to the University of Bath to take up a Post-Doc position with Professor Michael Green and Dr Andrew Burrows. In 2000 he moved with Professor Green to the University of Bristol and was awarded a Ramsay Memorial Fellowship in 2001. In 2003 Jason took up a position of Lecturer in Inorganic Chemistry at York. His research interests are based around the interaction of transition metal compounds with alkynes and the therapeutic applications of metal carbonyl compounds. He completed the PGCAP programme in 2005 and offers his experience of this to his supervisees after becoming a supervisor on the programme in 2008.

### **Dr Nicola F McDonald**

#### **PGCAP Supervisor, Senior Lecturer in the Department of English and Related Literature**

**<http://www.york.ac.uk/english/our-staff/#M>**

Nicola is a medievalist whose current research focuses on Middle English romance, the most audacious and compendious testimony to the imaginary world of the Middle Ages. Educated at the Universities of Toronto and Oxford, with extensive experience of research, teaching and administration at both Oxford and York, she brings to PGCAP a commitment to the integration of research and teaching in the Humanities and a belief in the necessity of constructive critique.

Her teaching, like her research, strives to challenge conceptual and disciplinary boundaries and to convey to students the intellectual excitement of academic inquiry. She sees PGCAP as a productive space for sharing experiences across disciplines but at the same time for recognising, and responding to, their individual subject specificity. Here at York she has taken a lead in the innovation of new teaching programmes at both undergraduate and postgraduate level, including the complete overhaul of the CMS MA's interdisciplinary core teaching programme (co-taught by staff from English, History, History of Art and Archaeology) and the English Department's MA in Medieval English Literatures which uniquely requires students to engage in multilingual work across the Norman Conquest. In PGCAP she is committed to maintaining programme flexibility and to responding to the development needs of individual participants.

Nicola is particularly interested in supporting excellence in PhD supervision and in preparing postgraduate students to succeed in a highly competitive academic environment. She has recently been awarded a WUN International Research Mobility Scheme Award to explore, with medievalists at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, ways of professionalizing PhDs more effectively and of preparing them better for the demands of an international academic future. In 2008, Nicola won a Vice-Chancellor's Teaching Award and in 2010 was shortlisted for a Times Higher Education Award as the most innovative teacher of the year.

**Dr Peter Mayhew****PGCAP Supervisor, Senior Lecturer in the Department of Biology**

<http://www.york.ac.uk/biology/research/ecology-evolution/peter-j-mayhew/>

Peter is an evolutionary ecologist with a special interest in insects. He joined the Department of Biology as a lecturer in 1998 and was amongst the first cohort to complete YCAP, the precursor to PGCAP in 2000. He was awarded a Vice-Chancellor's teaching award in 2008 for his successful engagement with the VLE and contribution to writing skills teaching. He is the author of an introductory textbook in Evolutionary Ecology, and achieved notoriety in 2007 through discovering a link between past episodes of global warming and mass extinction, for which he was nominated as one of the Great Britons of that year. He is currently associate director of the Biology Graduate School Board.

**Dr Mark Nicholson****PGCAP Supervisor, Department of Computer Science**

<http://www-users.cs.york.ac.uk/~mark/>

Mark Nicholson is a Research and Teaching Fellow in the Department of Computer Science. He is the co-ordinator of the Masters Programme in Safety-Critical Systems, which is a part-time Masters course for the Continued Professional Development (CPD) of Safety Engineers. He has been involved in the development of two further Masters level Teaching programmes. He also teaches on CPD courses for industrial clients throughout the world. His research interests are in high integrity systems in the civil aerospace and other domains (such as the health service). He has 17 years of teaching experience mainly at Masters level. He is a member of the HEA, the IET and Safety and Reliability Society and secretary of a European civil aerospace standards committee.

**Dr Stephen L Smith****PGCAP Supervisor, Senior Lecturer in the Department of Electronics**

[www.elec.york.ac.uk/staff/academic/sls.html](http://www.elec.york.ac.uk/staff/academic/sls.html)

In addition to his varied teaching experience, Steve brings to PGCAP considerable research experience in applying technology to both the health and cultural sectors. Steve is Graduate Admissions Tutor for the Department and has previously organised placements in industry for dozens of students. Steve is also Chair of University Computing Committee and a member of the Information Strategy Group.

**Dr Karen Spilsbury****PGCAP Supervisor, Senior Lecturer in the Department of Health Sciences**

<https://hscweb.york.ac.uk/research/public/Staff.aspx?ID=1447>

Karen offers PGCAP her experience as a health care researcher and nurse having developed a programme of research on important clinical and policy problems in the area of the healthcare workforce and its impact on service delivery and patient care. She has experience as a lecturer and supervisor for undergraduate and postgraduate students. She is a postgraduate programme leader, undergraduate module leader, contributes to module development and the MSc Health Services Research Course Management. In particular, she offers PGCAP her personal experience of successfully completing the course in 2007.

## 8.2 PGCAP Supervisor Responsibilities

PGCAP Supervisors work together as members of the Board of Studies for Academic Practice which monitors the PGCAP programme. They also have responsibility for overseeing and supporting the progress of PGCAP participants in their discipline area, with particular respect to the meeting of assessment requirements. More specifically they are committed to:

1. being an active member of the Board of Studies for Academic Practice.
2. providing support and encouragement to the PGCAP participants as necessary and meeting with supervisees at least once per term or “as per mutual agreement”.
3. informing the PGCAP Programme Director regarding participant progress.
4. supervising the development of PGCAP Portfolios and other submissions.
5. ensuring participants are fully acquainted with procedures for submission of work.
6. liaising where necessary, and within the agreed boundaries of professional confidentiality, with the PGCAP Programme Director where participants are experiencing problems.
7. appraising the PGCAP Programme Director of any pertinent feedback or issues to be discussed at regular reviews between the PGCAP Programme Director and the Chair of Board of Studies for Academic Practice.
8. acting as internal examiner for PGCAP candidates where necessary. Such candidates are not likely, under normal circumstances, to be the same individuals as the supervisees.
9. attending both the PGCAP internal examiners’ meeting and external examiner’s meeting
10. participating in an Annual Programme Review.
11. attending extra-curricular PGCAP functions where possible.
12. contributing to the workshop programme where appropriate.

## 8.3 PGCAP Participant Representatives

A PGCAP participant is elected from each cohort in January to sit on the Board of Studies and to represent the participant views. This is a real opportunity to help shape PGCAP in the direction that will best help present and future participants. Please volunteer for your year group! Specific responsibilities include:

- attending Board of Studies for Academic Practice each time it meets (normally in week 5 of every term for approximately two hours) or arrange for appropriate reserve cover
- e-mailing participants before Board of Studies meetings to request items for discussion
- e-mailing participants after Board of Studies meetings with any feedback

The current PGCAP participant representatives are:

Dr Kelly Redeker ([kelly.redeker@york.ac.uk](mailto:kelly.redeker@york.ac.uk)) from the Department of Biology (2008-09 Cohort)

Dr Kerri Woods ([kerri.woods@york.ac.uk](mailto:kerri.woods@york.ac.uk)) from the Department of Politics (2009-10 Cohort)

Dr Mike Freeman ([mike.freeman@york.ac.uk](mailto:mike.freeman@york.ac.uk)) from the Department of Computer Science and

Dr Paul Pryor ([paul.pryor@york.ac.uk](mailto:paul.pryor@york.ac.uk)) from the Hull York Medical School (HYMS) (2010 Cohort)

Please note that a ‘reserved’ business system operates should there be the need to discuss individual participants e.g. for examination purposes.

## NOTES

## NOTES

THE UNIVERSITY *of York*

12479 / Design by Campus Copy & Print: [www.york.ac.uk/designcopyandprint](http://www.york.ac.uk/designcopyandprint)





# THE UNIVERSITY *of York*

## CONTACT DETAILS

The University of York  
The Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice (PGCAP)  
Professional and Organisational Development  
Heslington Hall  
Heslington  
York YO10 5DD

Director: Dr Duncan Jackson  
Administrator: Lesley Catt  
Tel: 01904 324844

Fax: 01904 433636  
Email: [pgcap@york.ac.uk](mailto:pgcap@york.ac.uk)  
[www.york.ac.uk/pgcap](http://www.york.ac.uk/pgcap)

