

# PSF Review: Group Survey

---

Response ID	Completion date
908421-908403-97566949	15 Jul 2022, 20:57 (BST)

1	<b>I consent to participate in this survey.</b>	Yes
---	-------------------------------------------------	-----

2	<b>Are you completing this survey on behalf of a:</b>	Professional Organisation
---	-------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------

3	<b>Please provide the full name of the professional organisation or institution for which you are responding:</b>	Staff and Educational Development Association
---	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------

4	<b>Please tell us the country in which your professional organisation or institution is based. Please select your country or nation from the list below:</b>	England
---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------

5	<b>Please indicate how your professional organisation or institution uses the PSF:</b>	Our recognition/accreditation services for institutions embed use of the PSF
---	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------

6	<b>Thinking about how the draft presents the Purpose of the PSF, are you:</b>	dissatisfied
---	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------

6.a	<b>Please provide reasons for your response</b>	We object to the first bullet point which, in its current form, implies an imposition of (UK-centric) values on local and global contexts. This is not appropriate for its use by other values-led organisations or by non-UK cultures. Our preference would be to omit this bullet point. If it were to be retained we would like to see the word 'benchmark' replaced by 'framework'.
-----	-------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

7	<b>Is the section entitled Structure of the PSF:</b>	unhelpful
---	------------------------------------------------------	-----------

7.a	<b>Please provide reasons for your response:</b>	The role of the critical strands within the structure and their relationship with the Dimensions and Descriptors are not clear. However, we do welcome that the Professional Values are listed first within the Dimensions.
-----	--------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

8	<b>Is the representation of the PSF as an image (please see page 5 of the Draft Revised PSF):</b>	unclear
---	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------

8.a	<b>Please provide reasons for your response:</b>	Whilst the Values are central, this representation is in a different order to the description above. If Areas of Activity are underpinned by Values and Knowledge then depicting this as per current UKPSF would be better. Any critical strands would be better represented as a single golden thread connecting other aspects rather than repeated in each dimension. Creating a balanced image of 5 items in each dimension leads to a contrived list in each at the expense of a more intuitive distribution.
-----	--------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

9	<b>From the consultation data, three Critical Strands have emerged: inclusion, context and effectiveness. When using the PSF, are these likely to be:</b>	not at all useful
9.a	<b>Please provide reasons for your response:</b>	The overlap between 'inclusion' & 'effectiveness' and V1 & V2 respectively adds unnecessary duplication and complexity that had otherwise been nicely tidied up in this version. The point about context is very useful but could be included in an introductory paragraph about how to use the framework. From an accreditation perspective, the strands might feel like another 'box to tick'. We would prefer they were omitted entirely. If they are to be included they would be better titled as 'principles'.

10	Is the explanation of the Dimensions:	clear
----	---------------------------------------	-------

11	For each set of Dimensions: Professional Values, Core Knowledge and Areas of Activity, a short phrase has been introduced to emphasise the intention of each Dimension (...enact, apply, demonstrate...). Are these phrases likely to be:	helpful
----	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------

12	Please tell us your views on the proposed Professional Values:	
12.1	V1	
12.1.a	Clear	clear
12.1.b	Useful in your practice	useful
12.2	V2	
12.2.a	Clear	unclear
12.2.b	Useful in your practice	useful
12.3	V3	
12.3.a	Clear	unclear
12.3.b	Useful in your practice	useful
12.4	V4	
12.4.a	Clear	clear

12.4.b	Useful in your practice	useful
12.5	<b>V5</b>	
12.5.a	Clear	clear
12.5.b	Useful in your practice	slightly useful
12.5.c	<b>Please provide reasons for your responses. Each answer should be no more than 500 characters</b>	We welcome V5 but wonder whether it could inadvertently exclude e.g. those who work predominantly 1-to-1 or outside of an institution.
12.a	<b>Is there anything else that you would like to add, remove or change in the Professional Values?</b>	Yes
12.a.i	<b>If 'Yes' please provide a brief description:</b>	V2 and V3 potentially recreates the problem with old V1 and V2, namely these overlap (critical evaluation is part of evidence informed practice) – an example of where it feels contrived in an attempt to get a neat 3x5 framework. The framework includes no reference to student or staff wellbeing, which seems a striking omission given growing evidence of its critical importance in enabling successful learning; we encourage consideration of an additional or expanded value which encompasses this.

13	<b>Please tell us your views on the proposed Core Knowledge:</b>	
13.1	<b>K1</b>	

13.1.a	Clear	unclear
13.1.b	Useful in your practice	useful
13.1.c	<b>Please provide reasons for your responses. Each answer should be no more than 500 characters</b>	There isn't a clear understanding within psychology or cognitive/neuroscience of 'How learning occurs', therefore it is ambitious to expect individuals to be able to understand or articulate this. The previous 'How students learn' feels more comfortable and achievable. If the intention is to deliberately avoid the word 'students' then perhaps 'people' could be used or the phrase 'Concepts of learning'.
13.2	<b>K2</b>	
13.2.a	Clear	clear
13.2.b	Useful in your practice	useful
13.2.c	<b>Please provide reasons for your responses. Each answer should be no more than 500 characters</b>	There is a duplication of V1 and the inclusion strand. The previous version of K2 worked well and could be retained.
13.3	<b>K3</b>	
13.3.a	Clear	unclear
13.3.b	Useful in your practice	slightly useful

<b>13.3.c</b>	<b>Please provide reasons for your responses. Each answer should be no more than 500 characters</b>	This is uncharacteristically specific in that it starts to dictate curricula rather than generic approaches to teaching and supporting learning, and also risks excluding colleagues who may struggle to see how it can be applied in their context (e.g. some 'pure' disciplines in Becher & Biglan's typology such as maths or music). It should be omitted. If it needs to be specified anywhere, then it would be relevant to refer to it the separate guidance against V4.
<b>13.4</b>		<b>K4</b>
<b>13.4.a</b>	<b>Clear</b>	clear
<b>13.4.b</b>	<b>Useful in your practice</b>	useful
<b>13.5</b>		<b>K5</b>
<b>13.5.a</b>	<b>Clear</b>	clear
<b>13.5.b</b>	<b>Useful in your practice</b>	useful
<b>13.5.c</b>	<b>Please provide reasons for your responses. Each answer should be no more than 500 characters</b>	There is no one 'learning experience'. '...quality and enhance learning experiences' would be more inclusive.
<b>13.a</b>	<b>Is there anything else that you would like to add, remove or change in the Core Knowledge?</b>	Yes
<b>13.a.i</b>	<b>If 'Yes' please provide a brief description:</b>	See comments in table above.

<b>14</b>	<b>Please tell us your views on the proposed Areas of Activity:</b>
-----------	---------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>14.1</b>	<b>A1</b>	
<b>14.1.a</b>	<b>Clear</b>	clear
<b>14.1.b</b>	<b>Useful in your practice</b>	useful
<b>14.2</b>	<b>A2</b>	
<b>14.2.a</b>	<b>Clear</b>	clear
<b>14.2.b</b>	<b>Useful in your practice</b>	useful
<b>14.3</b>	<b>A3</b>	
<b>14.3.a</b>	<b>Clear</b>	clear
<b>14.3.b</b>	<b>Useful in your practice</b>	useful
<b>14.4</b>	<b>A4</b>	
<b>14.4.a</b>	<b>Clear</b>	clear
<b>14.4.b</b>	<b>Useful in your practice</b>	useful
<b>14.5</b>	<b>A5</b>	
<b>14.5.a</b>	<b>Clear</b>	clear
<b>14.5.b</b>	<b>Useful in your practice</b>	useful
<b>14.a</b>	<b>Is there anything else that you would like to add, remove or change in the Areas of Activity?</b>	No

<b>15</b>	<b>Is the explanation of the Descriptors:</b>	clear
-----------	-----------------------------------------------	-------



<b>15.a</b>	<b>Please provide reasons for your response:</b>	The description is clear and we welcome the new compact nature of the Descriptors which helpfully removes previous overlaps and duplications with the Dimensions.
-------------	--------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>16</b>	<b>Please tell us your views on the proposed Descriptor 1:</b>	
<b>16.1</b>	<b>Introductory text</b>	
<b>16.1.a</b>	<b>Clear</b>	clear
<b>16.1.b</b>	<b>Useful</b>	useful
<b>16.2</b>	<b>D1.1</b>	
<b>16.2.a</b>	<b>Clear</b>	clear
<b>16.2.b</b>	<b>Useful</b>	useful
<b>16.3</b>	<b>D1.2</b>	
<b>16.3.a</b>	<b>Clear</b>	clear
<b>16.3.b</b>	<b>Useful</b>	useful
<b>16.4</b>	<b>D1.3</b>	
<b>16.4.a</b>	<b>Clear</b>	clear
<b>16.4.b</b>	<b>Useful</b>	useful
<b>16.a</b>	<b>Is there anything else that you would like to add, remove or change in Descriptor 1?</b>	Yes

<b>16.a.i</b>	<b>If 'Yes' please provide a brief description:</b>	All of the Values are relevant at D1 and, when using the document to support career progression, we would want to emphasise all the values from day 1 of a colleague's career in teaching and/or supporting learning. Ideally, all should be included at D1 but at least V1 – V3 (though V2 and V3 could be merged as noted earlier).
---------------	-----------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>17</b>	<b>Please tell us your views on the proposed Descriptor 2:</b>	
<b>17.1</b>	<b>Introductory text</b>	
<b>17.1.a</b>	<b>Clear</b>	clear
<b>17.1.b</b>	<b>Useful</b>	useful
<b>17.2</b>	<b>D2.1</b>	
<b>17.2.a</b>	<b>Clear</b>	clear
<b>17.2.b</b>	<b>Useful</b>	useful
<b>17.3</b>	<b>D2.2</b>	
<b>17.3.a</b>	<b>Clear</b>	clear
<b>17.3.b</b>	<b>Useful</b>	useful
<b>17.4</b>	<b>D2.3</b>	
<b>17.4.a</b>	<b>Clear</b>	clear
<b>17.4.b</b>	<b>Useful</b>	useful
<b>17.a</b>	<b>Is there anything else that you would like to add, remove or change in Descriptor 2?</b>	No

<b>18</b>	<b>Please tell us your views on the proposed Descriptor 3:</b>	
<b>18.1</b>	<b>Introductory text</b>	
<b>18.1.a</b>	<b>Clear</b>	clear
<b>18.1.b</b>	<b>Useful</b>	useful
<b>18.2</b>	<b>D3.1</b>	
<b>18.2.a</b>	<b>Clear</b>	clear
<b>18.2.b</b>	<b>Useful</b>	useful
<b>18.3</b>	<b>D3.2</b>	
<b>18.3.a</b>	<b>Clear</b>	clear
<b>18.3.b</b>	<b>Useful</b>	useful
<b>18.4</b>	<b>D3.3</b>	
<b>18.4.a</b>	<b>Clear</b>	clear
<b>18.4.b</b>	<b>Useful</b>	not at all useful
<b>18.4.c</b>	<b>Please provide reasons for your responses. Each answer should be no more than 500 characters.</b>	This unnecessarily duplicates V3. It does emphasise that this Value applies to their leadership as well as to their teaching practice, but this could be highlighted in the introductory text (i.e. the reminder that all Dimensions should be considered in the context of leadership).
<b>18.a</b>	<b>Is there anything else that you would like to add, remove or change in Descriptor 3?</b>	Yes
<b>18.a.i</b>	<b>If 'Yes' please provide a brief description:</b>	Remove D3.3 (see comment in table above).

<b>19</b>	<b>Please tell us your views on the proposed Descriptor 4:</b>	
<b>19.1</b>	<b>Introductory text</b>	
<b>19.1.a</b>	<b>Clear</b>	clear
<b>19.1.b</b>	<b>Useful</b>	useful
<b>19.2</b>	<b>D4.1</b>	
<b>19.2.a</b>	<b>Clear</b>	clear
<b>19.2.b</b>	<b>Useful</b>	useful
<b>19.3</b>	<b>D4.2</b>	
<b>19.3.a</b>	<b>Clear</b>	clear
<b>19.3.b</b>	<b>Useful</b>	useful
<b>19.4</b>	<b>D4.3</b>	
<b>19.4.a</b>	<b>Clear</b>	clear
<b>19.4.b</b>	<b>Useful</b>	not at all useful
<b>19.4.c</b>	<b>Please provide reasons for your responses. Each answer should be no more than 500 characters</b>	This unnecessarily duplicates V3. It does emphasise that this Value applies to their leadership as well as to their teaching practice, but this could be highlighted in the introductory text (i.e. the reminder that all Dimensions should be considered in the context of leadership).
<b>19.5</b>	<b>D4.4</b>	
<b>19.5.a</b>	<b>Clear</b>	clear
<b>19.5.b</b>	<b>Useful</b>	not at all useful

<b>19.5.c</b>	<b>Please provide reasons for your responses. Each answer should be no more than 500 characters</b>	This unnecessarily duplicates A5. As for D4.3, the context specificity could be emphasised in the introductory text.
<b>19.a</b>	<b>Is there anything else that you would like to add, remove or change in Descriptor 4?</b>	Yes
<b>19.a.i</b>	<b>If 'Yes' please provide a brief description:</b>	Remove D4.3 & D4.4 (see comments in table above).

<b>20</b>	<b>If a Student Descriptor were introduced, for students who support the learning of others, would this be:</b>	unhelpful
<b>20.a</b>	<b>Please provide reasons for your response:</b>	Many institutions already use D1 (and, in some cases of experienced Graduate Teaching Assistants, D2) with students. The changes to the Descriptors' introductory nicely takes away reference to particular roles, thereby allowing the focus to be on what the individual does in practice. A separate Student Descriptor would be counter to this ethos.

<b>21</b>	<b>If a glossary providing practical explanations of key words and phrases within the Framework were introduced, would this be:</b>	helpful
-----------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------

22	<b>Please tell us anything else that you would like us to know about the draft revised PSF.</b>	<p>We strongly endorse the revised PSF remaining sector-owned via UUK &amp; GuildHE. Relatedly we query the removal of 'UK' from the Framework – as the revised PSF makes clear, context is important and inescapable – 'UK' differentiates it from other frameworks globally and recognises the ethnocentricity of its origins. We object to all references to Advance HE Fellowship: other organisations accredit against the framework and it is inappropriate that one should be favoured; Advance HE should produce separate guidance on the relationship between HEA Fellowship and the framework. This draft contains grammatical inconsistencies which risk alienating colleagues: it will be important to rectify these.</p>
----	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------