



FHEA Case Study Exemplar

Written Case Study Title:	The processes of gaining external recognition/accreditation from the CIPR and course reapproval
----------------------------------	--

One of my priorities when I became Course Leader for the XXXX courses in 2009 was to lead on and secure prestigious external recognition/accreditation from the XXXX for our two undergraduate and one postgraduate courses, meaning our courses were nationally and internationally recognised as excellent courses. Among many elements of the overall process I had to develop a 'first submission' which required me to map course content with XXXX criteria, while complementing and not compromising or contradicting the appropriate QAA subject benchmarks. As we were seeking 'full recognition' my submission had to cover the following five areas: XXX; XXX; XXX; XXX; XXX. An extremely broad remit.

Comment [PT1]: Good opening paragraph outlining the drivers behind the required changes.

This was a huge undertaking, especially given institutional constraints (namely the now thankfully more streamlined 'Minor Mods' process) on any modification to Learning Outcomes and assignment tasks. Over the course of several months I was involved in many meetings with academic colleagues, students, representatives from the Quality and LTA teams and the XXXX. I completed the formal submission and in 2010 were delighted to receive full recognition. During this time I became a committee member of the regional XXXX group and the regional *University Liaison Officer* - a post I held from 2011 to summer 2015.

Comment [PT2]: Within this paragraph there are clear opportunities to map to the UKPSF - this hasn't been done at any point.

Two years ago I went through a similar but less onerous process in order to ensure that Sheffield Hallam University became a 'Partner University' with the XXXX, primarily in order to foster links with the XXXX and to give our students all the advantages that go with this status.

Comment [PT3]: Good description of the complexity of the process and the need to engage widely and include for example, the quality teams.

During 2012/13 we had to go through the process of reapproval for the XXXX, XXXX/XXXX and XXXX and once again had to consider a bewildering range of internal and external criteria, constraints and possibilities while staying focused on the central importance of teaching and learning. This gave us the opportunity to thoroughly review our courses, to more closely match our developing areas of expertise to course content and to introduce new modules and attempt innovations, all of which were shaped by External Examiner reports, dialogue with existing students and recent graduates, module and course evaluations and reviews, a variety of student data, dialogue with industry specialists, changes in technology, shifts in teaching 'best practice', shifts in SHU's priorities and policies, and especially the dramatic changes in both the XXXX industry/profession and XXXX as a maturing academic discipline. Especially challenging to incorporate at every level, yet

something we consciously wanted to embrace, was the recent and ongoing 'cultural/critical turn' in the academic discipline of XXXX, which represents nothing short of a paradigm shift and resulted in a more radical overhaul of the course content than we originally envisaged.

This all demonstrates that positive change is possible when there is a genuine sense of academic community and staff are sufficiently motivated and supported to engage in driving that change: the imposition of top down change is contentious and often highly counter-productive.

Word count: 480

Comment [PT4]: An excellent description of the multitude of considerations that need to be, or can be, taken into account with course re-approval. Unfortunately, the opportunity to include academic literature to support this has been missed and there is no indication of the applicants own specific contribution - all activities are described as being undertaken by 'we'.

Comment [PT5]: Good to include some reflection/concluding thoughts, but there is no evidence to support this final assertion either specifically or in the literature. It feels like a parting shot rather than a conclusion and it might have been better to focus the whole case study on the issues regarding change processes in the academic environment and rationalise and evidence the approach chosen. The failings of top-down change could then have been discussed within this critical context.