**EXTRACT FROM ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND QUALITY ENHANCEMENT COMMITTEE**

**11 March 2021**

21.19 CONFERMENT OF RECOGNISED TEACHER STATUS: PROCEDURAL CHANGE

Mr Faulkner presented a paper setting out a proposed procedural change to the process for the conferment of Recognised Teacher status (Paper No ASQEC/21/11). At the Committee’s October 2020 meeting the Chair had undertaken to review the conferment process as faculties had raised some concern (min 20.61 refers).

It was proposed to streamline the process so that in future submission of a new nomination form would not be expected each time the Faculty extended the responsibilities of a current Recognised Teacher to other modules on the same course. In future they would be appointed to a particular course and they would be deemed competent to teach and assess on any module in that courseif it was within their expertise and they had capacity to take on additional responsibility. Faculties would be expected to maintain oversight of the staffing of courses and the workloads of Recognised Teachers who teach on their behalf.

Mr Faulkner considered that the previous process had been useful to ensure that faculties maintained oversight of their partners especially at a time when problems had been experienced with particular organisations with a high turnover of staff. Faculties were now better able to meet their obligations on behalf of the University.

A revised Curriculum Vitae template was also proposed in order to ensure that all academic and professional information was provided for a nominee.

The changes would reduce the volume of papers coming from Faculties to Academic Office, CHERP and People and Culture for review.

AGREED: that the proposed changes to procedure and clause 2.8 of the Code of Practice for Recognised Teachers be approved.

**30 November 2018**

18.125 APPROVAL OF NEW OUTCENTRES AND USE OF RECOGNISED TEACHERS

Mrs Alleyne presented Paper No ASQEC/18/37 which noted the range and extent of existing outcentres and reviewed current approval arrangements and proposed some changes. The paper also considered the question of the use of staff in outcentres in teaching and assessment, about which the June 2018 meeting had asked Quality Enhancement to advise (min 18.49 refers).

Recognised Teachers

Mrs Alleyne stated that the paper did not propose a figure for an acceptable proportion of outcentre staff who might be nominated as recognised teachers. Instead, it provided guidance to faculties on the use of outcentre staff in this role, including that:

* the Course Director should be a member of University staff;
* consideration should always be given to the security of overall course organisation, management, delivery and assessment;
* if a large proportion of the course was to be delivered and assessed by recognised teachers, a greater level of oversight would be necessary from the home course team to ensure maintenance and comparability of standards. This should include both a review of student performance and involvement in moderation of assessments;
* external examiner moderation should include sampling of work from students at the outcentre for comparability.

AGREED: that the guidance on the use of outcentre staff in teaching be endorsed and commended to faculties.

**EXTRACT FROM TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE MINUTES**

 **19 October 2011**

11.120 CONFERMENT OF RECOGNISED TEACHER STATUS: ANNUAL REPORT 2010/11

Professor McAlister presented the 2010/11 report on the conferment of Recognised Teacher status. A high proportion continued to be made within the academic year for which conferment was required.

Faculties were reminded of the need to forward nominations in good time, preferably in the preceding academic year for those involved in semester 1. It was also noted that Recognised Teacher status was bestowed for a four year period and consequently those nominations approved for 2007/8 would need to be reviewed and submitted for renewal, if appropriate, in the current year, for 2012/13.

The Chair commented that Recognised Teacher status was originally intended to recognise the contribution and expertise of individuals in the exceptional circumstances where University academic staff were not available to teach and assess University students. In arranging to use external staff in course delivery, Faculties should ensure that their qualifications and experience were commensurate with what was expected for academic staff of the University and that appropriate staff development was provided. Professor McAlister also expressed concern that in some courses a substantial number of recognised teachers was used. Faculty reliance on non-University staff, particularly in the delivery of provision at outcentres, could distort this model of collaboration and call into question quality assurance arrangements, the rationale for offering courses for which the University lacked staff resources/expertise on a significant scale, and the decision not to follow the Recognised Institution and validated course model of delivery.

**2 February 2011**

11.15 PROPOSAL FOR REVIEW OF RECOGNISED TEACHER REGULATION

Professors Curran and McColgan presented a paper outlining a proposal to revise the Regulation on Recognised Teachers (Paper No TLC/11/4), arising from discussion of this topic in October (min 10.168 refers).

The Committee noted that the title ‘Recognised Teacher’ was an honorary status, which was expected to be conferred on persons who, not being members of Academic Staff of the University, engage in the teaching, supervision, assessment and examination of registered students on University courses (notably those which involve an element of practice placement as part of a professional qualification). It recognised an important contribution to the assessment of candidates for University awards by individuals who were not employees and the close working of University staff and professionals from external agencies in coterminous awards. Senate had delegated its responsibility for this matter to the Committee in 2007.

The Faculties of Life and Health Sciences and Social Sciences reported that they had not applied the regulation in respect of practice placement supervisors/ mentors involved in the assessment of students in clinical practice settings in Nursing, Allied Health Professions, and Social Work courses. The Committee noted that the two Faculties had confirmed that all practice teachers held relevant qualifications and received appropriate training. Standards were quality-assured by the relevant statutory organisations and formal processes were in place for the approval of individuals. Records of those involved were maintained.

The Chair reported that a recent external examiner’s report had identified a number of issues of concern about mentorship arrangements for a particular degree programme. While the application of the Regulation might not have obviated the shortcomings, it might have encouraged a clearer view of the mentors’ relationship with the University and their responsibilities to the University and students.

In view of the hundreds of individuals involved and the high turnover each semester/year, the Faculties considered that it would be impractical to apply the process to allow the timely conferment of the status. Furthermore in certain cases, those involved were not qualified to the same level as academic staff teaching on the course, as the Code of Practice for Recognised Teachers currently expected.

The Committee noted the difficulties which the two Faculties would experience in applying the Regulation and their view that its wider application could devalue the title for other holders. The Committee supported the proposal to confine the title to those who were involved in classroom-type activities.

The Committee noted that the Faculty of Life and Health Sciences considered that Recognised Teacher status should still be conferred on staff of hospital trusts who were involved in the teaching and assessment of work-based professional development programmes such as the PgDip/MSc Developing Practice in Health Care. The Faculties would, therefore, need to be clear about the exact circumstances to be covered in order to ensure consistency.

AGREED that:

1. it be recommended to Senate that the Regulation on Recognised Teachers be amended to exclude practice teachers as follows:

“The term ‘Recognised Teacher’ will apply to persons who, not being members of the Academic staff of the University, engage in the teaching, supervision, assessment and examination of Registered Students of the University. *The status shall not be conferred on persons involved in the supervision and assessment of clinical or social work practice or industrial placement.*

Proposals from Faculties for the designation of Recognised Teacher status together with their duties and responsibilities shall be considered by the Teaching and Learning Committee on behalf of the Senate which may make recommendations to the Council.”

1. subject to Senate’s approval of i), the Faculties of Life and Health Sciences and Social Sciences review the Code of Practice for Recognised Teachers to ensure clarity in the wording of clauses relating to the nomination of recognised teachers in workplace settings;
2. Faculties continue to ensure that robust quality assurance processes oversee the selection, training, support, and monitoring of mentors and practice supervisors.

**2 December 2009**

09.160 Conferment of Recognised Teacher Status (Min 09.147)

The Chair reported that Council, at its meeting on 27 November, had agreed to delegate to the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) its authority to approve nominations for the conferment of Recognised Teacher status.

**14 October 2009**

09.147 CONFERMENT OF RECOGNISED TEACHER STATUS 2008/9

The Committee noted that, while the process had operated successfully, the majority of nominations had been made during the academic year in which duties commenced. It was also noted that the time lapse between Council approval and the issuing of a letter from Human Resources ranged from one week to three months.

Faculties were reminded of the need to ensure that nominations were forwarded in good time and preferably in the preceding academic year/semester. It was suggested that the process could be further speeded up if Council delegated its responsibility for conferring the status to the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning), as it had done previously for external examiner appointments. Council could receive a report of approved nominations.

 It was noted that the term of appointment was for four years and that, in due course, it would be important to develop a timely process for review and renewal.

AGREED: that Council be asked to consider delegating its authority for the conferment of recognised teacher status.

 **15 October 2008**

08.186 CONFERMENT OF RECOGNISED TEACHER STATUS

Under its delegated authority framework (2007) Senate had passed the responsibility for the scrutiny of proposed Recognised Teachers to the Teaching and Learning Committee.

The Committee considered TLC/08/69 reviewing the operation of the revised procedure and new Code of Practice during its first year. The following recommendations to enhance the process were made:

* that the relevant Course/Subject Director be notified when Recognised Teacher status had been formally conferred;
* that the Human Resources Department establish a process to remind Faculties when the Recognised Teacher status was coming to an end. If an extension to the period was required, a new nomination form would be submitted by the Faculty to the Academic Office for processing.

The Committee noted that, as nominations were formally submitted to Council, Faculties were encouraged to make nominations in good time so that the status might be conferred before the Recognised Teacher commenced his/her duties. The Vice-Chancellor reported that Council at its recent meeting had agreed to delegate its authority to approve nominations, which would streamline the process.

The Chair reminded Faculties that the new CPD Policy Framework required Recognised Teachers to complete specified academic induction during their first year. Faculties should ensure that they discuss expectations with the proposed Recognised Teacher before the nomination was submitted. It was noted that the Head of Staff Development had confirmed that the Ulster Business School’s own induction for Recognised Teachers teaching on the Advanced Certificate in Credit Union Practice met University expectations. They would not be expected to attend the University’s induction. It was, therefore, possible for Faculties to agree alternatives to University-level induction.

AGREED: that the above recommendations be endorsed.

**17 October 2007**

07.200 RECOGNISED TEACHER STATUS

Under its Delegated Authority Framework (2007), Senate had passed the responsibility for the scrutiny of proposed Recognised Teachers to the Teaching and Learning Committee. The Committee received a proposed Code of Practice and Nomination Form for the conferment of Recognised Teacher status (TLC/07/88).

A review of the current arrangements had involved discussions with key stakeholders in the Quality Management and Audit Unit (which serviced the Senate), Governance Services (which serviced the Council) and Human Resources (in its role of maintaining the database of Recognised Teachers).

The Committee noted the definition of ‘Recognised Teacher’ and a proposal to amend paragraph 2 of the current Regulations for Recognised Teachers to replace the term ‘appointment’ with ‘designation as’. ‘Appointment’ implied a contract of employment whereas in this context, a status is being conferred.

The proposed Code of Practice had been modelled on the process for approval of external examiners and the new roles of the Academic Office and Teaching and Learning Committee had been included. Faculties would have a key role in ensuring that Recognised Teachers were properly qualified and experienced and that they provided the necessary induction and support.

AGREED:

1. that it be recommended to Senate:

a) that paragraph 2 of the Regulations for Recognised Teachers be amended as follows:

‘The term ‘Recognised Teacher’ will apply to persons who, not being members of Academic Staff of the University, may be invited to engage in the teaching, supervision, assessment and examination of students on University courses (notably those which involve an element of practice placement as part of a professional qualification).

 Proposals from Faculties for the [delete appointment] designation of such persons, together with their duties and responsibilities, shall be considered by the Teaching and Learning Committee on behalf of the Senate which may make recommendations to the Council.’

b) that the proposed Code of Practice (Appendix 7) be approved;

 ii) that the Nomination Form be approved;

 iii) that the implementation of the new process be reviewed by the Committee in 2008/9.