

LEPDU

Learning Enhancement & Professional Development Unit



**POST GRADUATE CERTIFICATE IN
TEACHING AND LEARNING IN
HIGHER EDUCATION**

Mentor Guide

**Supporting Development through
Mentor Review of Practice:
Teaching and Supporting Learning in
the Professional University**

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
REVIEW OF PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE (RPP): TEACHING AND SUPPORTING LEARNING IN THE PROFESSIONAL UNIVERSITY	4
1 The Principles Informing Review of Professional Practice	5
1.1 Reflection and Scholarship in Learning and Teaching	5
2 FRAMEWORKS FOR THE RPP PROCESS.....	5
2.1 What is Meant by Professional Practice in RPP: Teaching and Supporting Learning?	5
2.2 What Does it Mean to 'Review' Professional Practice?	6
2.3 Deciding the Focus of the Mentor Review	6
2.4 What Makes for a Good Focus?.....	7
2.5 Focusing the Review	7
2.6 What are the Outcomes of the Process?.....	8
2.7 Mentor Review Selection, Preparation and Induction	8
2.8 Commitment Implications	8
2.9 In summary.....	9
PART TWO.....	10
3 THE MENTOR REVIEWER AND PARTICIPANT RELATIONSHIP	10
3.1 The Function of the Mentor Reviewer	10
3.2 Lead Mentor	10
3.3 Mentor Reviewer Responsibility	11
3.4 The Participant's Responsibility is to:	11
3.5 Protocol for Matters of Concern/Issues:	12
3.6 A Note About Confidentiality.....	12
4 MENTOR REVIEW OF PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE MEETINGS.....	13
4.1 Meeting One: Mentor Review Meeting.	13
Complete form 1	13
4.2 Meeting Two: Agreeing the Focus for the Review	14
Complete Form 2	14
4.3 Meeting Three: Conducting the Review	14
Complete form 3	14
4.4 Meeting Four: Evaluation and Action Plan Agreed.....	15

Complete Form 4	15
4.5 Further meetings	15
4.6 Final Meeting.....	15
Form 1 The Mentor Reviewing Contract	16
Form 2 Agreeing the focus for the review	17
Form 3 The review	18
Form 3a and 3b Conducting the review (continued)	19
Form 4 Evaluations and Action Plan	20
APPENDICES.....	24
Code of Conduct.....	24
Video/DVD-Recordings for Review of Professional Practice - Guidance	26
Form 5 Video/DVD recordings for Review of Professional Practice - Proforma .	29
References and Further Reading.....	30
Web Sites	31

INTRODUCTION

This guide is designed for mentor reviewers and participants of the Post Graduate Certificate in Teaching and Learning in Higher Education at the University of Bolton. The Mentor reviewer has **five** aspects to their role:

- 1 To support reflection and review of the participant's professional practice
- 2 To provide ongoing mentorship and support to the participant
- 3 To support the participant in their engagement with the UK Professional Standards Framework
- 4 To encourage a scholarly approach to learning and teaching
- 5 To support the participant in their endeavours to contribute to meeting the strategic aims of the University of Bolton

These guidelines support the procedures that are found in the Reflection and Review documents which are found in the appendices and can also be found on the Mentor Moodle site available at:

<http://elearning.bolton.ac.uk/course/view.php?id=3511&edit=0&sesskey=7jCtEp9DNc> (keyword: Scaffell)

Please contact the Lead Mentor or Programme Leader if you have any comments, queries or suggestions about this guide.

Lead Mentor:

Gill Whittaker

Senior Lecturer in Academic Development

01204 903797

g.whittaker@bolton.ac.uk

Developed and written by: Sue Burkinshaw, Academic & Professional Development Unit, (Jan 2009) inspired from the University of Gloucestershire's Review of Professional Practice (Christine O'Connor and David Gosling) and revised by Gill Whittaker (July 2010)

PART ONE

REVIEW OF PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE (RPP): TEACHING AND SUPPORTING LEARNING IN THE PROFESSIONAL UNIVERSITY

Mentoring is considered to be a highly effective tool for continuing professional development; providing opportunities for sharing best practice and developing effective subject pedagogy.

Those who are new to teaching in Higher Education or who are engaged in up-dating and refreshing their practice may be better able to formulate their own concepts of, and approaches to, teaching when they have had the opportunity to review aspects of their practice with a mentor. This review of practice may be in the form of recorded observations of learning and teaching; recorded discussion either face-to-face or on-line; or a review of resources and plans.

Mentoring, for this programme, is visualised as a multi-dimensional process which may involve discussion and analysis, opportunity for reflection, pedagogic discussion, research and action planning. It is this multi-dimensional process that is a key element of professional development on the post graduate programme and takes place during the study of the two modules 'Teaching and Supporting Learning in Higher Education' and 'Curriculum Design and Assessment'.

Mentors will use the Mentor Review of Professional Practice standardised procedures which are outlined in the appendices. This will ensure that the process of review is consistent in approach whilst providing a supporting and developmental approach to the Professional Development Review process for the participant in their School or Unit.

Evidence is required for **a minimum of two** reviews to be undertaken during the period of taught study for each module, evidence of which is a compulsory element to assessment. However it may be desirable for further reviews to take place and this is encouraged where there is time and opportunity.

Participants who are engaging in the Review of Professional Practice through the Post Graduate Certificate in Teaching and Learning in Higher Education would not normally be required to undertake the University wide Peer observation process within their Academic School/Unit.

In addition to participating in the Review of Professional Practice it would be advantageous for participants on this programme to act as a critical friend to other colleagues through undertaking observations of teaching and learning in order to share best practice.

1 The Principles Informing Review of Professional Practice

The Review of Professional Practice (RPP):

- Is designed to enhance the student experience
- May include a range of diverse activities including blended and online approaches and need not necessarily involve a 'face to face' meeting.
- Applies to all participants studying Modules One or Two of the Post Graduate Certificate in Teaching and Learning in Higher Education.
- Is developmental in focus and supports the University's commitment to the enhancement of teaching, supporting the learner and retention.

1.1 Reflection and Scholarship in Learning and Teaching

The mentoring scheme is intended to:

- Engage participants in reflection about their practices
- Develop knowledge of learning and teaching through dialogue
- Encourage all participants to develop a scholarly approach to teaching and learning in Higher Education generally, and The University of Bolton in particular
- Extend the community of learners across the University with a common concern to raise standards in teaching and learning

The key features of the discussion in RPP are designed to promote dialogue and scholarship of learning and teaching, rather than 'giving feedback'.

2 FRAMEWORKS FOR THE RPP PROCESS

2.1 What is Meant by Professional Practice in RPP: Teaching and Supporting Learning?

In the context of this approach 'professional practice' relates to the range of professional activities which are designed to promote, support or assess student learning. This includes, not only the 'performance' of teaching, but the wide variety of processes relating to student learning, e.g.

- Designing new courses, or re-designing an existing course
- Lecturing, facilitating small groups, supervising undergraduate or postgraduate dissertations, professional courses, tutoring in any learning context (studio, field trips laboratory, work-based/work-related learning, etc)

- Designing activities of any kind to support learning of subject or generic knowledge or skills (e.g. study skills, research skills, and professional ethics)
- Assessing student learning and giving feedback in any context or by any means
- Advising, supporting or providing guidance to students about their learning (e.g. through Personal Development Planning (PDP)/personal tutor roles)

2.2 What Does it Mean to 'Review' Professional Practice?

The mentor review is designed to facilitate enquiry into teaching in its widest sense including classroom interaction, curriculum design, assessing students, technology-enabled learning, ways of motivating enquiry, creativity, challenging standard practices, provoking argument and gaining trust.

The focus of the Review is a matter of negotiation between the Mentor Reviewer and the participant and begins with some initial reflection on the part of the participant either brought about by professional experience or through research into learning and teaching.

2.3 Deciding the Focus of the Mentor Review

The participant decides on the focus of the mentor review. To aid this decision, the participant will undertake an analysis of the following information:

- a professional needs analysis – which will be reviewed and revised as the course proceeds;
- on-going reflections in an autobiography - which is a private, personal record of feelings, intuitions and ideas that are related to events around teaching and learning
- a teaching and research log - which is a regular record of what was taught/to whom/with jottings to serve as a reminder about issues around teaching and learning and a log of research papers and readings that have raised interest or require further critique or analysis

The analysis will highlight where there needs to be a focus. And, as the participant progresses through the course they will return to these analyses to review and up-date in light of new information and reflections through the mentor-review process.

The *mentor review process* will also provide us with indications of general needs in terms of professional development and this may instigate opportunities for other workshops provided through LEPDU.

The participant may involve the mentor –reviewer in deciding on the focus for the review. Some key questions might be:

- What aspects of student learning would be most interesting for you to explore?
- What aspect of your teaching or assessment practice would you like to change?
- Are there aspects of your teaching or assessment practice that you would like to investigate, or reflect on further?
- What are your goals in teaching your subject? Are they being achieved?

2.4 What Makes for a Good Focus?

Some characteristics of a good focus are:

- A topic that focuses on developing student learning
- A topic that the participant is interested in or curious about which can be further investigated
- A topic that raises questions about the nature of teaching, supporting, learning or assessment
- Some aspect of the participant's work that has been puzzling or problematic
- An area of teaching or learning which can be clearly defined
- An aspect that is new to the participant, or innovative in a broader sense.

2.5 Focusing the Review

Wherever possible it is preferable to have considered any documentation, or on-line materials, in advance of the Mentor Review meeting so that the meeting itself can be devoted to discussing the issues which arise.

If it has been agreed that the Review will include observation of teaching, the reviewer needs to concentrate on the aspects of the teaching situation which are relevant to the focus of the Review (rather than simply conducting a general observation). For example it might be about:

- Asking questions which encourage student participation
- Organizing students into effective working groups
- Explaining difficult or troublesome concepts
- Take notes on the observed lesson with a view to collecting evidence to inform the discussion about the chosen focus of the review.

Whatever the focus, it is important that this originates from the participant and remains at the heart of the discussions and reflections

2.6 What are the Outcomes of the Process?

The outcome of the RPP is intended to be enhanced professional activity relating to teaching and supporting student learning.

Participants will use the mentor-review session to undertake further research and to reflect in their autobiography. This will, ultimately, contribute to the academic journal that is submitted. Furthermore, the review is likely to prompt questions for further mentor meetings. This will become a permanent record of improvements made, skills learnt and knowledge gained while participating in the Mentor Review scheme.

There is a requirement that evidence of the Mentor Review of Professional practice be attached as appendices and inform the journal which is submitted for Module 1, 'Teaching and supporting learning in Higher Education' and Module 2, 'Curriculum Design and Assessment'.

2.7 Mentor Review Selection, Preparation and Induction

Any member of staff undertaking the role of Mentor Reviewer will normally have a minimum of three years supporting student learning/teaching experience within Higher Education, be an Associate or Fellow of the Higher Education Academy and have a teaching qualification.

Mentor Reviewers will normally be assigned from the School/Unit in which the participant is based.

Mentor Reviewers must attend a minimum of two half-day sessions of Mentor Reviewer preparation before taking on the role of Mentor Reviewer. Mentor Reviewer preparation sessions are to be offered through the University's Learning Enhancement & Professional Development Unit (LEPDU).

Induction will be provided for all Mentor Reviewers for each intake of participants. There will be encouragement for cross-School/Unit experiences and partnerships to be shared and developed, within the mentor reviewing process.

Induction will equip Mentor Reviewers with:

- Information about the Mentor Reviewer/participant roles and staff development opportunities available to Mentor Reviewers through the role
- Understanding and skills to enable them to create an agenda which will comprise a schedule designed to meet the notional learning hours of Mentor Reviewer support designated in the two modules.

2.8 Commitment Implications

A minimum of 10 hours for each participant per module will be provided to each Mentor Reviewer to enable them to carry out the duties and responsibilities of the mentor reviewing role on the Post Graduate Certificate in Teaching and Learning in Higher Education.

This is to support:

- Attendance at the mentor review preparation and induction programme(s)
- Attendance at programme meetings
- A minimum of five mentor review/participant meetings
- A minimum of two recorded Review of Professional Practice meetings

2.9 In summary

The review of professional practice:

- Is instigated by the course participant who decides on the focus of the review
- Is closely connected to the academic journal which is submitted for assessment
- May take a variety of forms which may include observation of teaching.
- Differs markedly from peer – review in terms of approach.

PART TWO

3 THE MENTOR REVIEWER AND PARTICIPANT RELATIONSHIP

3.1 The Function of the Mentor Reviewer

The function of the Mentor Reviewer is to:

- Support the professional development of the participant within their specific area of expertise
- Engage in critical, constructive dialogue relating to the participant's progress in learning and teaching
- Engage in the Review of Professional Practice in order to promote scholarship and excellence in teaching and to strengthen critical understanding of subject pedagogy
- Be a confidential, empathetic listener and 'sounding board'
- Support the participant in establishing and reaching their set aims in an effective and efficient manner
- To help the participant to develop critical and reflective thinking skills in relationship to the different aspects of their role.
- Encourage scholarship in terms of researching and reflecting on learning and teaching.

3.2 Lead Mentor

The Lead Mentor has overall responsibility for the Review of Professional Practice Scheme and will oversee the review of Professional Practice/mentor reviewing process for all of the participants. The Lead Mentor will:

Provide training, development and induction for Mentor Reviewers

Plan and coordinate the Mentor Review of Practice process

Support, guide and develop the Mentor Reviewers

Meet regularly with the Mentor Reviewers as a Peer Mentor support group to share best practice and develop the scheme/approach

Explain the RPP process and the role of the Mentor Reviewer and participant

Represent the Review of professional practice scheme on the Programme Committee

Be the first point of contact, support and assist with any issues that may arise regarding the participant and Mentor Reviewers.

Evaluate the Mentor Review of practice

3.3 Mentor Reviewer Responsibility

Mentor Reviewer responsibilities include:

- Providing guidance and support to their individual participants
- Taking joint responsibility for the Review of Professional Practice (RPP) process with a view to supporting the participant's development
- Agree the focus for the professional practice review
- Assist the participant to explore issues arising from the participant's focus for reflection and review
- Help the participant to reflect critically on those issues
- Find ways in which the participant can move forward constructively to further explore and find answers to questions identified
- Assist the participant to identify further sources of information relevant to the topic
- Ensure the Mentor Review Contract is agreed and signed.
- Complete the Record of Mentor Review Meetings following mentor review meetings
- Complete the Mentor Review of Professional Practice documentation
- Liaising with the Lead Mentor and Programme Leader
- Recognise the professional development opportunities arising from the role of Mentor reviewer.

3.4 The Participant's Responsibility is to:

- To use this opportunity whilst on the programme to be a critical friend and observe other Professionals in Practice and other participants to share best practice.
- Identify one or more topics that may form the focus of the Professional Practice Review and to agree the focus for the Review with the Mentor Reviewer
- Identify relevant information and materials which will enable the Mentor Reviewer to share the participant's perception of the focus chosen and to make these available to the Mentor Reviewer
- Identify and agree how the review processes will be conducted
- Decide on the appropriate professional activity outcomes of the review process
- Engage and fulfil the outcomes of the Mentor Review of practice

- Ensure the necessary documentation is completed and relevant forms given to Mentor Reviewer and Lead Mentor within the specified timeframes.

3.5 Protocol for Matters of Concern/Issues:

Causes of concern may arise for both the Mentor Reviewer and the Participant. It is recognised that the following guidance cannot take into account all circumstances/matters of concern that may arise, such as, unprofessional conduct or threats to health and safety, the appropriate line manager would need to be involved at the outset.

However, when the issues/causes of concern can be characterised as primarily of an educational issues relating to the Review of Professional Practice in relation to the Postgraduate Certificate in Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, the prime responsibility lies with the Lead Mentor. If either party is concerned regarding any aspect of the mentor reviewing process/scheme they should in the first instance raise their concerns with the Lead Mentor. The Lead Mentor will listen to these concerns; provide advice, resolve and action appropriately.

If the Mentor Reviewer has any concerns regarding the participant's progress and achievement of the programme at any time then the Mentor Reviewer will need to raise these concerns with the Lead Mentor and the Programme Leader as soon as possible.

Lastly if the Lead Mentor has any concerns regarding any aspect of the review process/scheme and the progress of the Review of Professional Practice for any of the participants then she/he will liaise directly with the relevant participant and Mentor Reviewer and if applicable discuss these with the Programme Leader. If it is felt that any of these issues may affect the participants' progress and achievement of the programme the Lead Mentor will liaise directly with the Programme Leader.

3.6 A Note About Confidentiality

Both the participant and the Mentor Reviewer are responsible for maintaining confidentiality where this has been agreed and respecting the professional boundaries between both participants in the process. (See Appendix 1)

4 MENTOR REVIEW OF PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE MEETINGS

It is suggested that time is provided for regular meetings. This should be negotiated and agreed at the first meeting.

Some meetings will require the completion of a form. The related forms are contained in the appendices and can be found on the Moodle site at:

Below is suggested guidance to inform the Review of Professional Practice process throughout the semester of study for modules:
Teaching and Supporting Learning in Higher Education and
Curriculum Design and Assessment.

4.1 Meeting One: Mentor Review Meeting.

Complete form 1

The Mentor Reviewer will outline the RPP scheme to the participant emphasizing its key principles:

- The role of RPP in stimulating continuing professional activity
- The focus on producing practical outcomes designed to be useful to the participant
- The role of the Mentor Reviewer – to be non-judgmental, but nevertheless to ask critical questions
- The confidentiality of the discussion.

From the outset Mentor Reviewers should seek to establish trust with the participant. Emphasis is to be made that it is the Mentor Reviewer's role to achieve a shared understanding of the participant's perspective on the focus of the review and that it is the Mentor Reviewer's job to ask questions, to challenge assumptions and to help the participant think through their own professional practice.

Agreements will include:

- The completion of the Mentor Review contract. (One copy to each of the mentor review pair and one to the Lead Mentor). (Appendix 2)
- Discussion and agreement on:
 - The aims and purposes of the Mentor Review
 - The length of the relationship
 - The frequency and times of meetings
 - Clarification of the Mentor Reviewer role
 - Clarification of the participant role
 - The nature and boundaries of the relationship

4.2 Meeting Two: Agreeing the Focus for the Review

Complete Form 2

The review need not necessarily be focused on teaching 'performance'. The open nature of RPP is designed to recognise the diversity of roles that colleagues undertake to support student learning. Not all participants are involved in 'teaching' in the traditional sense of the word. Participants and mentor-reviewers are encouraged to take a broad approach to what is reviewed. The focus of the review may be, for instance:

- A critique of current research that relates closely to the participant's and their learners' experiences
- A particular aspect of learning and teaching that the participant wishes to address
- Plans, ideas and assessment that are of concern
- The use of technology-enabled learning that is new to the participant

4.3 Meeting Three: Conducting the Review

Complete form 3a or 3b

Form 2 will have noted the focus for observation. The participant will have begun the process of reflection by identifying an area of concern. Remember that the mentor's role is to support further reflection in order to reach a goal. For example, the focus may be 'How do I engage my students in meaningful discussion?'

Remember, this is **NOT** peer review. Therefore while you may identify some other areas for discussion, it is important to provide your mentee with information, observation and ideas that will deepen their reflection about the issue(s) that concern them.

In consultation with the mentee, you may select to use either form 3a or 3b.

Form 3a may be used where the review does not include an observation of teaching in the traditional sense. Form 3b may be used to focus thoughts and ideas while observing the mentee in any learning and teaching situation. Adapt the forms to suit the needs of both yourself and your mentee.

The review is intended to be a *critical* and *constructive* conversation between two colleagues focusing on the aspect of teaching and learning agreed at meeting two. The precise format of the review is a matter of negotiation.

The conversation about the chosen topic will be informed by:

- The teaching and learning context of the participant in the initial reflective statement

- Relevant documentation provided by the participant to the Mentor Reviewer (for example course outlines, learning materials, student feedback)
- The experience of both participants in the Review
- The University's Strategic Plan and the School's Learning and Teaching Strategy
- Evidence from existing research

Whilst it is one of the functions of the Review to identify aspects of the participant's teaching, course design, assessment methods (depending on the focus of the Review) which are successful, it should not be merely a process of confirmation. The role of the process is to ask key questions that will help the conversation to be searching and productive.

A good review will be one which stimulates the participant to think about aspects of their teaching, or of student learning. It should help the participant to think about ways in which further enquiry into their teaching would be beneficial to both themselves and the students: research will be prompted.

The Mentor Reviewer is not presumed to be an expert who will necessarily know the answers to questions raised in the review and the process presumes that, whilst colleagues will share their experience and knowledge, new questions may be identified that will require further investigation.

4.4 Meeting Four: Evaluation and Action Plan Agreed

Complete Form 4

In this meeting the mentor and participant will discuss their respective reflections on the review. Ideas, evaluations can be considered and any actions decided upon.

4.5 Further meetings

These may lead on in the same way as previously outlined – particularly where the participant has made changes and developments and would like these to be observed by the mentor. However, the focus of the review may change, and this will depend on discussions between mentor and participant in the manner described in **Meeting Two**

4.6 Final Meeting

It will be important to have a final meeting so that documents can be signed and some conclusions can be reached.

POST GRADUATE CERTIFICATE IN TEACHING AND LEARNING IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Name of Participant

Name of Mentor reviewer

Date:

The above mentor reviewing partners agree to enter into a mentor reviewing relationship under the following conditions:

Code of Conduct

We agree to protect each other's privacy and abide by the code of conduct as specified by the University of Bolton

Telephone (please delete if not applicable)

The Mentor Reviewer agrees to be contacted by telephone between meetings on the following number(s)

The participant agrees to be contacted by telephone between meetings on the following number(s)

Email

The Mentor Reviewer agrees to be contacted by e-mail between meetings at the following address

The participant agrees to be contacted by e-mail between meetings at the following address

Purpose

The aims of this mentor reviewing relationship are:

Drawn up in triplicate (copies to Mentor Reviewer, participant and Lead Mentor)

Signature (Mentor Reviewer) Date.....

Signature (participant) Date.....

Form 2 Agreeing the focus for the review

**POST GRADUATE CERTIFICATE IN TEACHING AND LEARNING IN
HIGHER EDUCATION**

Participant:

Mentor Reviewer:

Date.....

1 *Key areas for reflection*

--

2 *Links to UK Professional Standards Framework*

Areas of Activity	Core Knowledge	Professional Values

3 *The nature of the review (eg. observation, discussion, overview of resources)*

--

Signed _____ **Mentor Reviewer**

_____ **Participant**

POST GRADUATE CERTIFICATE IN TEACHING AND LEARNING IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Participant:

Mentor Reviewer:

Date:

1 Key areas for reflection

2 Observations, notes and ideas relating to the key areas

**2 Observations, notes and ideas relating to the key areas
(continued)**

3 Other general observations

Signed (Mentor-reviewer)

Mentor Review of Professional Practice

Form 3b

Mentor Review of Professional Practice – Observation Comments

Course Member:

.....

Mentor Reviewer:

.....

Date:

.....

These questions are not complete or relevant to every session. Use them to guide your observation and note taking.

Introduction

Planning and Organisation

Methods/Approach

Voice and pace:

Content

Student Participation

Use of Learning Resources

Use of Accommodation

Diversity and Inclusivity

Overall style and ambience

Summary, points for further reflection and engagement with UKPSF

Signed _____ **Mentor Reviewer**

_____ **Course Member**

Date _____

Form 4 Evaluations and Action Plan

**POST GRADUATE CERTIFICATE IN TEACHING AND LEARNING IN
HIGHER EDUCATION**

Participant:

Mentor Reviewer:

Date:

Key ideas, conclusions, ideas originating from the review
Actions to be taken (Such as research, including action research, consultations changes or modifications)

Signed _____ Mentor Reviewer

_____ Participant

POST GRADUATE CERTIFICATE IN TEACHING AND LEARNING IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Code of Conduct

Both Mentor Reviewers and participants will abide by the following code of conduct which identifies seven features of the relationship:

Beneficiality: The fundamental purpose of the relationship is to benefit the participant. In order that this is achieved, the following must exist:

- The Mentor Reviewer must be diligent in providing knowledge, wisdom and development support
- The Mentor Reviewer must demonstrate appropriate skills in mentor reviewing (such as listening, organisational knowledge and patience)
- The Mentor Reviewer will have undertaken formal Mentor Reviewer training.
- The Mentor Reviewer has a duty to take the utmost care in the quality of advice being provided
- The participant must show commitment to the process and prepare themselves appropriately for meetings.

Avoidance of Harm: The relationship should do no harm to the participant. In order to achieve this:

- The Mentor Reviewer and participant have a duty to avoid manipulation, deceit
- The Mentor Reviewer must avoid oppressive behaviour
- Mentor reviewer and participant must ensure that expectations are appropriate and agreed then fulfilled.
- There must be avoidance of negative effects due to gender differences.

Autonomy: One of the purposes of mentor reviewing is to encourage independence. In order to achieve this:

- Mentor Reviewers should engage in open disclosure of information
- The Mentor Reviewer will avoid paternalistic relations with the participant.

Confidentiality: The importance of confidentiality is obvious. It is the key to trust, and trust is the core of the mentor reviewing relationship. Therefore:

- The participant has a right to privacy in terms of meeting venues and agendas
- There will be a requirement for the Mentor Reviewer to provide clarity about circumstances where confidentiality may be inappropriate.

Fairness: Participants need to be reassured that the relationship will be one that is fair and in their interests. Therefore:

- The organisation of Mentor Reviewer/participant pairs needs to be undertaken in an impartial manner
- Participants need fair access to alternative Mentor Reviewers in the event that the Mentor Reviewer/participant relationship is unproductive.
- Those responsible for organising mentor reviews to participants need to be aware of sensitive issues such as social class, ethnicity, gender etc in their allocation procedures
- Mentor reviewers need to show restraint in any promotion of their participant

Loyalty: The role of Mentor Reviewer holds certain tensions in terms of loyalties. Therefore:

- Mentor reviewers should avoid any conflict of interest
- Mentor reviewers need to be aware of the tensions between their loyalty to the participant and to their employer
- Mentor reviewers must have the opportunity to attend regular Mentor Reviewer support groups
- Both Mentor Reviewer and participant should demonstrate loyalty to the relationship and the process through attending meetings punctually and arriving with heart and mind prepared.

Concern: It is accepted that mentor reviewing implies a more emotional level of duty. Therefore:

- Mentor reviewers must ensure that their 'obligation of concern for the participant does not relieve [them] of obligations to third parties and to the organisation' (p.111)

The following general behaviours are advocated:

- There is respect for each other's time
- The focus is on participant's goals not the Mentor Reviewers
- There is a duty, for both Mentor Reviewer and participant, to follow through on commitments
- There is a duty, for both Mentor Reviewer and participant to be sensitive to cultural and other differences.

APPENDIX 2

POST GRADUATE CERTIFICATE IN TEACHING AND LEARNING IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Video/DVD-Recordings for Review of Professional Practice - Guidance

Introduction

The Review of Professional **practice** for the online/blended learning approach can be undertaken by procedures which involve a video/DVD of the participant and other documentary evidence. Indeed this would be essential where time and distance prevent a 'face-to-face' assessment. A request to be assessed in this way must be approved negotiated and agreed by the Mentor Reviewer. For such a session permissions are necessary for ethical reasons.

Obtaining Equipment and Filming Support

It is the participant's responsibility to check that access to the necessary equipment and support is available. It is the responsibility of the participant to source necessary equipment.

Obtaining Permissions

Once the participant is confident that the necessary equipment and filming support is available, permission must be obtained from various people for the filming to take place for the purpose of the review. A form for this purpose needs to be completed (see below Form 2a). **Filming must not take place without all permissions specified on the form being granted in advance. Participants must also note that they may not film a group of learners aged under 16 without written parental permission for each learner. For this reason film recording should not be used in a class where there are young learners.**

Ensuring Adequate Film Quality

Participants are responsible for ensuring that the filmed record is of adequate quality for the purposes of summative assessment. If the Mentor Reviewer who will be reviewing the video deems the recording not to be of sufficient quality for the purpose of the review process (including obtaining permissions) it will have to be repeated. For this reason it is **most important** that plenty of time is available for such an eventuality. **Film-recorded reviews of professional practice must take place well before the allocated deadlines** to avoid potential problems with such deadlines.

Filming Advice

Ensure that the person who will operate the camera is aware that the filming needs to record tutor activity **and** student activity – they should balance their filming between the two, rather than concentrating excessively on one or the other. This is because the Mentor Reviewer will want to observe the behaviour of the teacher and the students, just as they would in a 'face-to-face' observation.

Test that the camera is working *before* you start filming the actual session. Filming must be continuous and of approximately one hour duration. The footage must not be edited or cut in any way.

The participant and the person who will record the session should practice recording in the same room and with the same equipment that will be used for the real session. Check what camera positions will be possible without unduly disrupting the students or the participant. Check how much (if any) moving the camera around will be possible. Some positions might need to be ruled out because of lighting issues (e.g. direct window light adversely affecting the picture).

The person who will film the session should practice camera movement (e.g. 'panning' – moving left or right) and zooming. For panning and zooming, very slow and deliberate movements should be used, rather than fast, sudden or jerky movements.

Recordings made during this practice should be observed and listened to; to make sure everything is satisfactory.

Note that the actual filming session will be a long period – approximately an hour. It is thus vital to ensure **and** check that there is enough tape in the camera, it is wound to the start, and the camera is being mains-powered correctly. You will need to use mains power for the camera as the duration of the filming will be beyond the life of most battery packs, even if they are fully-charged.

After the filming, copy and send the tape and supporting documents

Check that the recording is satisfactory (vision and sound) by watching it through from beginning to end.

A copy of the video/DVD must be made for the participants' records and in case of loss of the original. If the copy can't be arranged by the participant assistance should be sought, but making the copy is the responsibility of the participant. Check the copy has been made satisfactorily.

Find out from the mentor Reviewer what address the video/DVD and other documents should be sent to, taking care to record this accurately,

particularly the post code. Send the following as a padded package by registered delivery to the address specified by the Mentor Reviewer:

- The tape original, labelled with the trainee's name, the course tutor/assessor's name, and the date, time and location of the recording
- A copy of the relevant lesson plan with lesson objectives
- A copy of any handouts or other resources used during the session.
- A paragraph or two explaining the context of the session (e.g. about the group and the course they are on)

Reminder: A copy of the completed permissions form (see below form 2a) must be sent to the Mentor reviewer and Lead Mentor

The next steps

Upon receiving the package above, the assessor will observe the session very much in the manner of a normal session, making the same notes and completing the same forms as they would for a face-to-face observation.

Debriefing may take place by telephone, or by a meeting, depending upon what is convenient to both parties. Apart from the fact that the assessor was not physically present during the session, in all other respects the treatment of teaching practice assessed by this means is identical to that for face-to-face visits.

Form 5 Video/DVD recordings for Review of Professional Practice - Proforma

This form, when completed, should be photocopied and the copy delivered to named Mentor Reviewer:

Please retain the original

Form for approval of the use of VHS video recording for the purposes of Review of Professional Practice		
1 Name of participant		
2 Name of Mentor Reviewer		
3 Place of teaching activity		
4 Date/time/location/class type of class to be recorded on VHS video for review of professional practice purposes	Date: Time: From: To:	Location: Class type:
5 Declaration by usual class teacher (pre-service participants)/line manager (in-service participants)	I confirm that the participant above approached the group to request permission for the session to be recorded and no objections were received. I also do not object.	Signed: Date:
6 Declaration by the Mentor Reviewer scheduled to review the participant above.	I agree to the review of professional practice to take place utilising a video recording of the above teaching session.	Signed: Date:

Filming must not take place without all permissions specified on the form being granted in advance. Participants must also note that they may not film a group of learners aged under 16 without written parental permission for each learner. For this reason film recording should not be used in a class where there are young learners

References and Further Reading

- Barnett, R. (1990) *The Idea of the University*. Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press.
- Bass, R. (1999) *The Scholarship of Teaching: what's the problem?* *Inventio* (1(1): 1-9).
- Becher, T. and Trowler, P. R. (2001) *Academic Tribes and Territories*. Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press.
- Biggs, J. (2003) *Teaching for quality learning at University*. 2nd Ed, Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press.
- Boyer, E. (1990) *Scholarship Reconsidered: priorities of the professoriate*. New Jersey: Princeton.
- Clutterbuck, D. (2004) *Everyone needs a Mentor Reviewer*, 4th ed. London: CIPD.
- Cowan, J. (2006) *On Becoming an Innovative University Teacher: reflection in Action*, 2nd ed. Maidenhead: SRHE and Open University Press.
- D'Andrea, V. and Gosling, D. (2005) *Improving teaching and learning in higher education: a whole institution approach*. Buckingham: Open University Press, McGraw-Hill.
- Daresh, J.C. (2003) *Teachers mentor reviewing teachers*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press, Inc.
- De Bono, E. (1987) *Six Thinking Hats*. London: Penguin Group.
- Egan, G. (1998) *The skilled helper - a problem management approach to helping*, 6th ed. London: Brooks Cole.
- Fry, H., Ketteridge, S., et al. (2008) *A Handbook for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: enhancing academic practice*. London: Kogan Page.
- Goodson, I. and Hargreaves, A. (2005) *Professional knowledge, professional lives*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Gosling, D. (2005) *Mentor Observation of Teaching*. SEDA (paper 118). London.
- Hutchings, P., (ed.) (2000) *Opening Lines: Approaches to the Scholarship for Teaching*. Paolo Alto: Carnegie Foundation.
- Hannan, A. and Silver, H. (2000) *Innovating in Higher Education: teaching, learning and institutional cultures*. Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press.
- Hay, J. (1999) *Transformational mentor reviewing: creating developmental alliances for changing organizational cultures*. Watford: Sherwood
- Heron, J. (1990) *Helping the client*, 4th ed. London: Sage
- Jenkins, A., Breen, R., et al. (2003) *Reshaping teaching in higher education*. London: SEDA/Kogan Page.
- Ketteridge, S., et al (2002) *The effective academic: a handbook for enhanced academic practice*. London: Kogan Page.
- Knight, P. T. (2002) *Being a Teacher in Higher Education*. Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press.
- Laurillard, D. (2001) *Rethinking University Teaching: A Framework for the Effective Use of Learning Technologies*, 2nd ed. London: Routledge.
- Lave, J. and Wenger, E. (1991) *Situated learning: legitimate, peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Lipman, M. (2005) *Thinking in Education* 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Marton, F., Hounsell, D. J., et al., (eds.) (1997) *The experience of learning*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.
- Meggison, D. and Clutterbuck, D. (2005) *Techniques for coaching and mentor reviewing*. Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Rogers, J. (2004) *Coaching skills – a handbook*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Moon, J. (2004) *A handbook of reflective and experiential learning: theory and practice*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Progoff, I. (1975) *At a journal workshop*. New York: Dialogue House Library.
- Prosser, M. and Trigwell, K. (1999) *Understanding learning and teaching: the experience in higher education*. Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press.
- Ramsden, P. (2003) *Learning to teach in higher education*, 2nd ed. London: Routledge.
- Rowland, S. (2000) *The enquiring university teacher*. Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press.
- Shulman, L. (1993) Teaching as community property. *Change*, 25(6) pp, 6-7
- Shulman, L. S. (1999) Taking learning seriously. *Change*, 11-17.
- Weick, K.E. (1995) *Sensemaking in organizations*. London: Sage Publications Limited.

Web Sites

HEA available on-line at:

<http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/ourwork/professional/recognition>

On mentor observation of teaching: <http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/988.htm>
This includes several useful discussions and an extensive bibliography.

The ESCALATE site also has some resources relating to Mentor Observation of Teaching: <http://www.escalate.ac.uk/resources/mentorobservation/>

University of Reading:

<http://rdg.ac.uk/Handbooks/TeachingandLearning/MentorReviewGuidelines.html>

University of Wisconsin, Madison, 2004, Mentor Review of Teaching:

<http://wisc.edu/MOO/>

University of North Carolina, Wilmington has some useful guidelines on mentor observation/mentor review: <http://www.uncw.edu/cte/et/prappe-h.htm>

University of Nebraska, Lincoln has an excellent web site describing their well-developed mentor review programme: <http://www.unl.edu/mentorrev/>