



JOURNAL OF Perspectives in Applied Academic Practice

Supporting sessional staff through structured induction: Evaluation, reflections and lessons learned

Beth Dickson, University of Glasgow

Janis McIntyre Davidson, University of Glasgow

ABSTRACT

The case study that is the focus of this article is based on a professional development opportunity provided for sessional staff who were recruited to the School of Education at a research-intensive university in the UK. Research literature on sessional staff demonstrates potential pitfalls both in academic management and continuing professional development for this group of staff. Taking a socio-constructive view of teaching and learning, we outline the construction and delivery of an induction training programme for sessional staff recruited to supervise master's dissertations. The sessions were characterised by active learning, discussion among peers and with staff knowledgeable in the specific areas under discussion. The induction training programme was evaluated by an online survey. Drawing on the survey as well as our own reflections, we found that the induction sessions had enabled sessional staff to become more confident in taking up their roles; that active learning and discussion had been both important and enjoyable; and that knowledgeable staff had contributed to the effectiveness of the teaching and learning which were experienced.

Key words: sessional staff, induction, support, continuing professional development, supervision

Introduction

The case study that is the focus of this article is based on a professional development opportunity provided for sessional staff who were recruited to the School of Education at a research-intensive university in the UK. As a result of successful marketing, in 2018 the school experienced a surge in postgraduate student numbers. Because master's students complete their studies with a stand-alone 60-credit dissertation, there was a need for dissertation supervisors. The decision was taken to recruit sessional staff to undertake supervision, thus placing the school in the neoliberal landscape of university employment practice which is shifting to 'buy in' teaching in order to supplement teaching undertaken by permanent staff (Beaton & Gilbert, 2013; Loveday, 2018). As part of that process, it was deemed important by the school's senior management to establish an induction programme which covered aspects of supervision as well as central learning and teaching resources which sessional staff could use themselves and to which they could point students. This case study describes the induction that was developed and draws on a survey of 18 dissertation tutors undertaken in 2019-2020, to evaluate its impact. Our aim is that our description of the induction and the evaluation, alongside our reflections, will be of interest to others involved in the support of sessional staff.

Literature review

The use of sessional staff has become a common feature of university staffing, and studies have been carried out on such aspects as what percentage of university staff are non-permanent; what their conditions are; what can be done to improve their conditions and why this should be a priority for university managers. In the United States, a country in which the trend has been established over the last 20 years, "gig teaching" can be viewed positively (Kosheleva, Viera, & Kreinovich, 2018) and negatively (Tolley, 2018). This cohort of staff is growing and taking more responsibility for university teaching (Tolley, 2018; Loveday, 2018). Yet the phenomenon exists largely in the shadows of institutions. In 2014, Lopes and Dewan described this group in the UK as "invisible" (p.28) after Gappa and Leslie's (1993) use of the term in their seminal text *Invisible Faculty*. In Australia, which has consistently produced studies in this area, it is estimated that about 50% of the teaching load is undertaken by sessional staff with this rising substantially for undergraduates in their first and second years of study (Ryan, Burgess, Connell, & Groen, 2013; Percy, Scoufis, Parry, Goody, Hicks, Macdonald et al. 2008). As late as 2013, Lopes and Dewan could not access UK data from the Higher Education Statistics agency (HESA) about the numbers of sessional staff, even on request. HESA now does collect data on such staff, and figures released for 2019/20 show that 33% of academic staff were employed on fixed term contracts (Higher Education Statistics Agency, 2021).

Because there is a consistent literature on sessional staff from Australia from the early days of the phenomenon (Smith & Coombe, 2006; Percy & Beaumont, 2008) until the present, this review uses Australian studies as a perspective from which to view UK experience, although there are studies from other nations describing a similar phenomenon. The decision to focus on Australian work is a deliberate choice by the authors to provide an overview of a complex area, within a concise narrative.

Australian studies generally agree that the use of sessional staff is an effect of the neoliberal trend in university governance in parallel with the effects of massification and intensification (Ryan et al., 2013). These authors identify the characteristics of the neoliberal trend as: a reduction in government funding; an increase in the number of students with a lesser increase in the number of staff; changes in the ways in which employment is governed generally; and the need to generate research outputs for the Australian frameworks which categorise some staff as 'research only' while researchers' salaries are cross-subsidised by funds from teaching. An account of similar processes in the UK is provided by Loveday (2018).

In 2008, the Australian Learning and Teaching Council published a report which aimed to "establish the full extent of the contribution that sessional teachers make to teaching and learning in higher education" (p.2). The document summed up its findings as: the need for [R]ecognition of sessional staff; the [E]nhancement of their academic management and the need for their professional [D]evelopment. The initial letters of these findings give rise to the report's familiar name — the RED report — which concluded that professional development should be "contextualised, accessible, mandatory and paid" (Percy et al., 2008, p. 32). In 2013, to address the felt need for the work of sessional staff to be evaluated and improved, the Benchmarking Leadership and Assessment of Sessional Teaching (BLASST) project was established leading to the Sessional Staff Standards Framework which enabled Australian universities to evaluate their practices in this area (Luzia & Harvey, 2013).

Research literature after 2008 continues both to chronicle difficulties as well as to report on ameliorating processes with regard to academic management and professional development. Crimmins, Nash, Opreescu, Alla, Brock, Hickson-Jamieson, and Noakes (2016) argued that Australian universities found themselves working in a paradox where the effort to increase research outputs militated against the quality of student experience. In order to gain more time for research, staff were able to bid for money to buy themselves out of teaching. However, ensuing problems were not foreseen. Smith and Smith (2012, p. 455) report that:

It was uniformly recognised by all parties that buying-out did not result in complete relief from the teaching activity that was bought out; a great deal of time and energy needed to be invested by the academic in making appropriate arrangements and monitoring the quality of work undertaken by the casual staff.

Some researchers argued that casual staff had lower academic expectations of students which contributed to low retention figures (Umbach, 2007). Other academic management issues to be resolved included: heads of school being concerned about rising numbers of appeals from students taught by casual staff and students themselves feeling "shortchanged" when taught by sessional staff (Smith & Smith, 2012, p.466).

Conditions experienced by sessional staff differed markedly from those of permanent staff. The work of Ryan et al. (2013) provides a view of a segmented workforce where the conditions of sessional staff were found to be "inferior, sub-standard" (p. 173). These included: low or limited payment, poor academic management, lack of development in terms of teaching and assessment, lack of access to library, email accounts, office space or computing services and lack of career development opportunities. Others have reported that casual staff were unable to attend meetings as they were not paid for attendance (Fredericks & Bosanquet, 2017). In the UK, Beaton (2017) reported the low morale felt by sessional staff who did not always have a clear line of management contact with faculty. Furthermore, Beaton found there was no clear line of contact with those on their teaching team, nor a physical base where sessional staff could leave their belongings.

An important study by Crawford and Germov (2015) showed how an intentional workforce strategy could integrate sessional staff more effectively. This useful study on workforce management is outnumbered by the studies on professional development which it is argued, also integrates staff and reduces isolation. Grainger, Adie and Weir (2016) found that continuity of staffing, relationships between team members, structure of moderation meetings and the importance of criteria sheets emerged as ways in which teaching communities could be built in which assessment practices were focused on and developed. Crimmins et al. (2016) found that inviting casual staff to a thoughtful and comprehensive moderation process supported quality assurance as well as giving sessional staff confidence they were marking accurately against criteria. Fredericks and Bosanquet (2017) established a Tutor Induction Programme which brought together sessions offered by various university departments and then ensured they existed on a scholarly basis. These latter projects ensured that tutors were paid to attend the sessions and both projects reported the reduction of feelings of isolation among sessional staff.

Recent UK work utilises contemporary ideologies, such as neoliberalism, or theories such as poststructuralism and gender studies to provide explanations for the existence and positioning of sessional staff within universities (Loveday, 2018; Read & Leathwood, 2020; Leathwood & Read, 2020), thus enabling sight of the emergence of a gap between universities' stated values of the importance of teaching and its reality. A perception which pervades this research literature is expressed by one Australian writer who concludes "teaching is perceived, overwhelmingly, as being awarded lower status than research" (Probert, 2013, p. 37).

Case study

At the institution in which this case study took place, the sessional role of Associate Tutor (AT) was advertised in order to ensure all master's students had support and supervision for their dissertation work. (This study does not focus on Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs) although there are some similarities between the GTA role, and the role discussed in this article (Leigh, 2014)). Recruitment interviews were held in a formal academic process facilitated by Human Resources (HR) colleagues. Sessional staff recruited in an *ad hoc* process can find it harder to access central services (Crimmins, 2017). Successful applicants were provided with a contract, a guaranteed minimum workload, a university email account and a senior tutor who could signpost to other university services and to colleagues with whom tutors would be teaching. The new ATs were also given access to a room in the school building where they could meet other tutors, photocopy resources and keep personal belongings (Beaton, 2017). Furthermore, they were invited to participate in a Performance and Development Review (P&DR) process. This process was a less onerous version of that undertaken by permanent staff but enabled new staff to comment on their teaching and supervision and make suggestions to senior tutors about how teaching and/or HR processes might be improved. Attendance at structured induction sessions was paid, as highlighted by Percy and Beaumont (2008). These aspects of academic management formed the employment context in which the induction sessions took place (Crawford & Germov, 2015).

We regarded it as essential to facilitate an induction process to enable ATs to assume their roles with confidence. Our teaching is based on social-constructivist theories (Laroche, Bednarz, Garrison, & Garrison, 1998) which finds a key source in the work of Vygotsky (1962). We took an active learning approach along the lines outlined by Watkins, Carnell, and Lodge (2007), which focuses on three modes (ch.6):

- Behavioural: actively using and creating materials
- Cognitive: actively thinking, constructing new meaning
- Social: actively engaging with others as collaborators and resources

The tutors were self-regulated and proactive learners suited to active approaches (Zion & Slezak, 2005). The intention was to provide enhanced opportunities for the social aspect of active learning so the programme was created to afford an opportunity for the ATs to meet other tutors, share ideas and ask questions. We ensured time was available for small-group discussion both as a context and as a medium of active learning (White, Larson, Styles, Yuriev, Evans, Rangachari, Short, Exintaris, Malone, Davie, Eise, & MacNamara, 2016).

Many of the new ATs had teaching experience, in nursery, primary, secondary as well as tertiary education and all had a master's qualification in education. They were taking on the supervision roles with a substantial degree of prior knowledge and experience of teaching, and because of the ethos of the School of Education there was a belief that core teaching skills (including the belief that teaching is based on socially just, reciprocal relationships and competence in calibrating teaching to learners needs) are neither necessarily stage-specific nor only to be found only in classrooms (Boshier, 2009). Therefore, the aim was not to explain 'how to teach' but rather, to demonstrate how teaching and dissertation supervision manifested in a specific higher education context. The authors, (one based in Academic and Digital Development, the university's central learning and teaching resource, and one from the School of Education) collaborated to design an induction programme and plan sessions. We developed a short programme that comprised six main topics that we believed were important for new supervisors. These are outlined briefly in Table 1.

Table 1: Details of the Associate Tutors Induction Programme

Associate Tutors Induction Programme	
Session	Details
A: Introduction to teaching at the University	<p>Induction: Contract-related issues such as rates of pay; how to report absence; HR contact; the payment process, etc.</p> <p>An overview of the AT supervision role.</p> <p>Setting expectations: Establishing the supervisory relationship and the importance of setting expectations between supervisors and students – taught cognitively through individual reading of relevant text; and socially through peer discussion and learners-tutor discussion.</p>
B: Ethics and ethical approval	Supporting students applying for ethical approval for their research – some aspects taught socially through discussion with tutor.

C: Supporting international students	An introduction to teaching students for whom English is an Additional Language – some aspects taught socially through discussion with tutor.
D: Students' perspectives	Supervision based on the areas with which students report difficulty and how they can be addressed – taught cognitively through engagement with student views of supervision and socially through some discussion with tutors.
E: Assessment and feedback	Ensuring consistent assessment and effective feedback - taught behaviourally by interaction with relevant ILOs, success criteria, marking schedule and excerpts of students' work; cognitively by asking learners to use these resources to assess the student work; and socially by asking the learners to work in groups and finally in a plenary with groups and tutors.
F: Methodology	Helping students to develop their methodology. Looked in detail at positivist and constructivist methodologies and how they manifest in various sections of dissertations. This enabled tutors to know what students had already been taught in this area as well as acting as a refresher session for those who had not had a recent interaction with methodology.

Delivery was in-person, in the early evening (17.00-19.00) to accommodate the ATs' work and other commitments during the day, and sessions began with light refreshments, providing an opportunity to meet and chat with fellow ATs. The induction training programme was provided by the authors alongside colleagues in the wider school and college. The presentations and resources used in the sessions were then uploaded to a virtual learning platform where tutors could review them as needed.

Evaluating the Associate Tutors Training Programme

It was important to evaluate the provision of this significant development programme and investment in the induction of ATs. Bentley-Williams (2017) has found that by listening to sessional staff, their views can be usefully woven into course improvement. We were keen to learn from the participants' experiences so that we could enhance future iterations of the programme as well as plan future CPD for subsequent cohorts of tutors. We identified the following questions for our evaluation:

1. How effective was the programme in supporting new tutors to prepare for their new role as supervisors of master's projects?
2. What changes (if any) are needed to enhance the programme and what should future iterations include?
3. What further development opportunities are needed to continue to support good supervision practice?

In order to address these questions, we developed a plan to seek participant ATs' views that was both "judgement-oriented [and] improvement-oriented" (Cousin, 2009, p. 227) in the sense that we wanted to explore the effectiveness of the programme as well as inform its future development. Ethical approval for our study was provided by the institution in which the study was carried out, confirmed on June 3, 2020.

We designed a questionnaire that was administered online for ease of completion and to encourage as many responses as possible from our potential participants (Botham, 2018). This proved to be important as our study was undertaken during the global pandemic, which would have made alternative data collection methods such as interviews or focus groups challenging to undertake.

Participants

The questionnaire was launched on June 22, 2020, with the link sent to everyone that had participated in the second year of the induction programme. It closed on July 31, 2020, and there were 18 completed questionnaires, representing a response rate of 45%. The questionnaire design included questions that sought information about participants' experience of teaching and supervising in higher education. Sixteen of the respondents had previous experience of teaching as outlined in Tables 2 and 3.

Table 2 Experience of teaching in years

Teaching experience (in years)	Number of participants
None	2
1-10	6

11-20	4
21-30	3
Over 30	3
Total	18

Table 3 Teaching experience by sector

Teaching experience (by sector)	Number of participants
Primary education	5
Secondary education	4
Technology & Special Educational Needs	1
Further education	3
Higher education	4
Total	17

NB. One participant had experience in both FE and HE.

Although some were very experienced teachers, seventeen participants had not supervised a master's dissertation before, highlighting the potential importance of effective development opportunities.

Evaluation, reflections and discussion

The remainder of the questionnaire comprised a mix of closed questions on the effectiveness of the programme, and open questions that aimed to elicit participants' views and varied perspectives (Creswell & Poth, 2018). The closed questions utilised a rating scale of 1-5 to evaluate the sessions on the training programme, with participants choosing a rating of 1 to indicate they found a session 'not at all helpful' and choosing 5 where they found a session to be 'extremely helpful.' Open text boxes provided an opportunity for participants to give reasons for their answers. We undertook analysis of the qualitative data from the open questions, informed by the approach advocated by Lichtman (2013), which involves six steps of analysis, moving from initial coding, through the creation of categories to identifying concepts.

The findings from the quantitative elements as they relate to the individual sessions can be found in Table 4.

Table 4 Ratings for individual sessions

Session	1 (Not at all helpful)	2	3	4	5 (Extremely helpful)	Total of Responses
A	0	0	1	6	11	18
B	0	0	1	8	9	18
C	0	0	2	10	6	18
D	0	0	3	8	6	17*
E	0	0	1	6	11	18
F	0	0	3	10	5	18

*One respondent did not attend this session

The quantitative data shows that the participants found all the induction sessions to be helpful or extremely helpful overall, suggesting that the structured induction had gone some way to addressing participants' development needs. However, responses were more mixed to the question "How ready do you feel to start supervising master's dissertations?" with a substantial number indicating they felt neutral about this, as can be seen in Table 5.

Table 5 Readiness to begin supervision

1 (Not at all ready)	2	3	4	5 (Fully ready)	Total
0	0	7	6	5	18

The finding that seven individuals were neutral about how confident they were to begin as tutors is troublesome and could point in at least two directions. It could be that it indicates a natural conscientiousness found among this group of workers who take their responsibilities very seriously and do not want to appear to overclaim about future capacity (Lopes & Dewan, 2014). However, it also indicates that the end of an induction programme is a milestone and that more needs to be done to ensure ATs feel able to undertake their role – a finding which is consistent with previous studies (Percy & Beaumont, 2008; Hitch, Mahoney & Macfarlane, 2018). Although the ATs had found the induction programme helpful, it appeared that ongoing support would be welcomed. Further opportunities for development are discussed in our conclusions and recommendations.

In the next section we discuss some key themes that were identified in the analysis of the qualitative data, making use of quotes from the open text responses to illustrate the main points.

Overall, the response from the participants to the open questions was very positive, supporting the quantitative data. The words “useful”, “helpful” and “informative” were applied to all the sessions suggesting that the programme content was appropriate for the ATs’ needs and was successful in its aim of preparing new supervisors for their role.

The introductory session, which gave specific guidance about pay and conditions, was an important element that was valued by almost all the participants, reinforcing the need for clear and accessible management processes (Crawford & Germov, 2015). From the data analysis, gaining information about what the role would entail was identified as important, with many participants commenting on this aspect. One AT described the introduction as “a very comprehensive overview of what was involved – including practicalities”.

Other features of the introduction that were appreciated were the opportunity to meet fellow ATs and the confidence that was built through raising awareness of the support that was available for both ATs and students. As the quotes below suggest, the session provided initial information that served to introduce roles and responsibilities as well as allaying any fears or doubts:

Set the scene for us, allowed us to meet staff and other associate tutors.

It was succinct, relevant and confidence building.

Informative and reassuring.

A good overview of the role was provided. I also enjoyed the opportunity to meet colleagues.

As mentioned above, we aimed to create a supportive atmosphere in the training programme, and these responses suggest that we were able to achieve this. That the building of relationships between sessional and permanent staff enables sessional staff to feel that they are part of a team is a pervasive finding in the literature (Beaton & Gilbert, 2013; Grainger et al., 2016; Fredericks & Bonsanquet, 2017) and conversely those studies which discuss demoralisation and marginalisation often point to the lack of contact with managerial or teaching staff as a possible reason for this (Crimmins, 2017; Read & Leathwood, 2020).

The feedback we received suggests that some topics were more challenging than others. One of these was the session on ethics and ethical approval. Participants reported finding this topic “too complicated” and “a little too much” for the time allocated. We had tried to ensure the ATs had all the information they would need to support their students to achieve ethical approval for their studies but in doing so it seemed we had provided too much material on what one participant described as a “difficult area to navigate.” Our analysis of the comments on this session suggests that the participants were very positive about how this session was delivered, but the topic itself was challenging. Many of the ATs were returning to higher education for the first time since their own qualification, and this might explain the issue to an extent. It will be important to take account of this in future iterations of the training programme, ensuring we acknowledge challenging content and allowing more time for the participants to consolidate their learning. While this point seems obvious, it does demonstrate the crucial role of reflection in teaching in order to ensure future sessions are reconstructed to meet the needs of learners (Scales, 2017).

Nonetheless, there were many positive comments about the session on ethics. This from one participant was typical of others:

This was a very useful session [w]hich dealt with the ethics process and issues that may/could arise with students. I felt it prepared me for dealing with supporting my students with the ethics application process, even though this was halted [due to the pandemic].

Indeed, another participant reported they had found the session so interesting they had become a reviewer of ethics applications.

According to the open text responses, the session on assessment and feedback needed more time also. Although the session was appreciated, and the analysis suggests this was not perceived as a particularly challenging topic, many participants requested “more” or “longer” sessions. One explanation for this could be that this was a very active session in which participants were given an assessment task in advance of the session that they discussed in class with their peers. These quotes illustrate this well:

Great session and very interactive. Loved the activities as they really got me thinking and applying the principles.

It was good to see some student work [and] to go through the criteria with peers; good opportunity for moderation of marking also. I would have liked to have more of these sessions, particularly after I started to look at my students' work as I would have had many questions to ask.

Our analysis suggests that this session should remain interactive in future, with additional sessions to allow sufficient time for discussion, especially as assessment and feedback are important activities in dissertation supervision. The ATs' response demonstrates both a pervasive concern among them about assessment (Grainger et al., 2016) and the concomitant need to address it through continuing professional development (CPD) (Crimmins et al., 2016).

The circumstances of the current pandemic highlighted areas of supervision that had not been addressed in the training programme. For this cohort of participants, there was a sudden shift to online, remote supervision that had not been foreseen. If remote supervision is to continue, further guidance on this will be needed, as these participants noted:

Practical things like how to use Zoom more imaginatively for greater interactive learning would be most helpful.

Perhaps an additional session this year on the best way to support students remotely and more advice on moving to secondary research/extended lit review approach.

The second of the quotes echoes others that asked for guidance on moving from supporting students to undertake collection of primary data for their dissertations, to supervising literature reviews and desk-top research.

This case study suggests that structured induction for new ATs is key. It can provide information and build confidence as well as help new supervisors feel part of a group of peers.

Conclusions and recommendations

We acknowledge the potential impact of our role as tutors on the Associate Tutors' Induction Programme in this case study. To address this, the information that accompanied the questionnaire emphasised that we wished to learn from participants' experiences of the programme and highlighted that participation in the study was voluntary and would have no impact on participants' employment as a tutor. The evaluation of our induction programme was small in scale and as such we do not seek to generalise from our findings. Nonetheless, we do make this modest contribution to the field in terms of evaluating the views of ATs on the induction itself and in beginning to evaluate the use of permanent staff in the development of sessional staff (Hitch et al., 2017). We hope that others involved in the support and development of sessional staff might be interested in our findings as they develop their own provision and support.

From this case study we would observe that our results are largely confirmatory. Research literature has already pointed out that professional development in a group is key for supporting part-time staff (Beaton & Gilbert, 2013). The characteristics of quality CPD noted in Australian policy – that CPD for sessional staff should be “contextualised, accessible, mandatory and paid” (Percy et al., 2008, p. 32) – had been implemented by management decisions. The induction programme contextualised master's supervision within the university and school context in which staff would be working. From the perspective of ATs, the induction sessions were effective in supporting them to prepare for their new role as supervisors of master's projects and enabling them to begin their supervision duties with some confidence. Our evaluation of the induction pointed to changes needed to enhance future iterations of the programme, most notably in relation to the session on assessment and feedback which confirms Australian findings (Grainger et al., 2016). In terms of assessment and feedback, it was important to weigh up the request for 'more' CPD with the issue of timing. On reflection we decided not to include more sessions on assessment *during* the induction programme. Rather, we gave the responsibility for *ongoing* professional development to the leaders of the programmes on which ATs worked as that was where 'live' issues of assessment and feedback existed. Programme Leaders address assessment practice in different ways, but moderation meetings and the development of success criteria are commonly used (Grainger et al., 2016). Where we made some new findings was in relation to ethics where ATs had also asked us to enhance that session. We made changes to these sessions for a subsequent cohort of ATs. The ethics session was improved in collaboration with the school ethics officer who enhanced the cognitive and social aspects of active learning by providing case study examples to stimulate new thinking in discussion with others (Watkins et al., 2007). This material was provided in addition to the comprehensive presentation already constructed by the ethics officer for the virtual learning platform which can be viewed asynchronously by ATs as often as necessary. Findings around lingering anxiety among ATs about readiness for practice and requests for training on how to ensure pastoral care for students when teaching online during the pandemic, though generated from a small sample, are worth noting as indications of the awareness among this group of staff of the complexity of university teaching and their concerns to do it well.

We are aware that there is still more to do in order to ensure this group of staff are working as effectively as possible. Most requests for ongoing professional development to support good supervision practice were for opportunities to work with permanent staff on assessing written work. This could be achieved by practising on real student essays alongside academic colleagues, so that ATs can observe the process and how assessment criteria are used in assessment. There were also requests for occasional meetings of all ATs so that the issues of teaching and employment which they face as a distinct staff group can be discussed, which we intend to implement. Further development needs were identified through the P&DR process such as attendance at whole school meetings and support to attend conferences that we will address where possible going forward.

We hope our conclusions will help other colleagues who have responsibilities for supporting sessional staff. First, we note that the social experience of group engagement in common learning activities was a key factor in building confidence. Second, support from academic management is crucial in the inception and continuation of induction, most notably in ensuring sessional staff are paid for their participation (Percy & Beaumont, 2008). Third, our reflections are that inviting relevant colleagues to contribute to the induction programme because of their expertise generated a high standard of helpful content. This was borne out in the quantitative element of the evaluation that highlighted the effectiveness of the sessions. Finally, the provision of ongoing support and development is crucial to ensuring that ATs feel confident and enabled to undertake their role.

Biographies

Beth Dickson is a senior lecturer in teacher education. In addition to teaching and creating new initiatives in teacher education, she is responsible for the professional induction of sessional staff. Her 'scholarship' focus is professional development of teaching for staff in universities.

Janis McIntyre Davidson is a senior lecturer within Academic and Digital Development. Her role involves contributing to a range of initiatives to enhance learning and teaching in the university. Her research interests include professional development for academic staff and widening access to higher education.

References

- Beaton, F. (2017). Just in time and future-proofing? Policy, challenges and opportunities in the professional development of part-time teachers. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 22(1), 19–30. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2016.1261354>
- Beaton, F., & Gilbert, A. (Eds.). (2013). *Developing effective part-time teachers in higher education: New approaches to professional development*. Routledge: Taylor and Francis.
- Bentley-Williams, R. (2017). Engaging university casual tutors in collaborative reflection for improving student learning outcomes. *Reflective Practice*, 18(4), 540–553. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2017.1323732>
- Boshier, R. (2009). Why is the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning such a hard sell? *Higher Education Research & Development*, 28(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360802444321>
- Botham, K.A. (2018). The perceived impact on academics' teaching practice of engaging with a higher education institutions' CPD scheme. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 55(2), 164–175. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2017.1371056>
- Cousin, G. (2009). *Researching learning in higher education: An introduction to contemporary methods and approaches*. New York: Routledge.
- Crawford, T., & Germov, J. (2015). Using workforce strategy to address academic casualisation: A University of Newcastle case study. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 37(5), 534–544. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2015.1079394>
- Creswell, J. W. & Poth, C.N. (2018). *Qualitative enquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. (4th ed). London: Sage.
- Crimmins, G. (2017). Feedback from the coal-face: How the lived experience of women casual academics can inform human resources and academic development policy and practice. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 22(1), 7–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2016.1261353>
- Crimmins, G., Nash, G., Oprescu, F., Alla, K., Brock, G., Hickson-Jamieson, B., & Noakes, C. (2016). Can a systematic assessment moderation process assure the quality and integrity of assessment practice while supporting the professional development of casual academics? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 41(3), 427–441. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2015.1017754>
- Fredericks, V., & Bosanquet, A. (2017). 'An essential right': Reflections on evaluating a professional development program for tutors. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 22(1), 84–89. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2016.1261355>
- Gappa, J., & Leslie, D. (1993). *Invisible Faculty: Improving the Status of Part-Timers in Higher Education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Grainger, P., Adie, L., & Weir, K. (2016). Quality assurance of assessment and moderation discourses involving sessional staff. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 41(4), 548–559. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2015.1030333>
- Harvey, M., & Luzia, K. (2013). Editorial: How do you measure up? Standards for sessional staff teaching: moving from periphery to core. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, 10(3). <https://researchers.mq.edu.au/en/publications/editorial-how-do-you-measure-up-standards-for-sessional-staff-tea>
- Higgins, K., & Harreveld, R. E. (Bobby). (2013). Professional development and the university casual academic: Integration and support strategies for distance education. *Distance Education*, 34(2), 189–200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2013.801759>
- Higher Education Staff Statistics (2021). *Higher Education Staff Statistics: UK, 2019/20*. Retrieved from <https://www.hesa.ac.uk/news/19-01-2021/sb259-higher-education-staff-statistics>
- Hitch, D., Mahoney, P., & Macfarlane, S. (2018). Professional development for sessional staff in higher education: A review of current evidence. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 37(2), 285–300. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2017.1360844>
- Kosheleva, O., Viera, J., & Kreinovich, V. (2018). From Gig Economy to Gig Education. Departmental Technical Reports (CS). Retrieved from https://scholarworks.utep.edu/cs_techrep/1253

Supporting sessional staff through structured induction: Evaluation, reflections and lessons learned

- Larochelle, M., Bednarz, N., Garrison, J., & Garrison, J. W. (1998). *Constructivism and Education*. Cambridge University Press.
- Leathwood, C., & Read, B. (2020). Short-term, short-changed? A temporal perspective on the implications of academic casualisation for teaching in higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2020.1742681>
- Leigh, J. (2014). “I Still Feel Isolated and Disposable”: Perceptions of Professional Development for Part-time Teachers in HE. *Journal of Perspectives in Applied Academic Practice*, 2(2), 10-16. Retrieved from <https://jpaap.napier.ac.uk/index.php/JPAAP/article/view/105>
- Lichtman, M. (2013). *Qualitative research in education. A user's guide*. (3rd Ed). London: Sage
- Lopes, A., & Dewan, I. A. (2014). Precarious Pedagogies? The Impact of Casual and Zero-Hour Contracts in Higher Education. *Journal of Feminist Scholarship*, 7(8), 28–42.
- Loveday, V. (2018). The neurotic academic: Anxiety, casualisation, and governance in the neoliberalising university. *Journal of Cultural Economy*, 11(2), 154–166. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17530350.2018.1426032>
- Luzia, K., & Harvey M. (2013). *The BLASST Guide: Benchmarking with the Sessional Staff Standards Framework*. Retrieved from http://blasst.edu.au/docs/A413_008_BLASST_Benchmark_Guide.pdf
- Percy, A., & Beaumont, R. (2008). The casualisation of teaching and the subject at risk. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 30(2), 145–157. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01580370802097736>
- Percy, A. K., Scoufis, S., Parry, A., Goody, M., Hicks, I., Macdonald, K., ... Sheridan, L. (2008). *The RED Resource, Recognition – Enhancement – Development: The Contribution of Sessional Teachers to Higher Education*. Australian Learning and Teaching Council.
- Probert, B. (2013). *Teaching-focused academic appointments in Australian universities: Recognition, specialisation, or stratification?* Retrieved from https://ltr.edu.au/resources/Teaching-focused_academic_appointments.pdf.
- Read, B., & Leathwood, C. (2020). Casualised academic staff and the lecturer-student relationship: Shame, (Im)permanence and (Il)legitimacy. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 41(4), 539–554. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2020.1748570>
- Robertson, M. J., & Fyffe, J. (2019). What happens to doctoral supervision when university departments have high levels of precarious academic employment?: An Australian case study. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 56(5), 652–662. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2018.1522268>
- Ryan, S., Burgess, J., Connell, J. & Groen, E. (2013). Casual Academic Staff in an Australian University: Marginalised and Excluded. *Tertiary Education and Management* 19(2), 161–75. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13583883.2013.783617>.
- Scales, P. (2017) *An Introduction to Learning and Teaching in Higher Education: supporting fellowship*. London: McGraw Hill.
- Smith, E., & Coombe, K. (2006). Quality and Qualms in the Marking of University Assignments by Sessional Staff: An Exploratory Study. *Higher Education*, 51(1), 45–69. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-004-6376-7>
- Smith, E., & Smith, A. (2012). Buying-out teaching for research: The views of academics and their managers. *Higher Education*, 63(4), 455-472. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-011-9452-9>
- Tolley, K. (2018). *Professors in the Gig Economy: Unionizing Adjunct Faculty in America*. Baltimore, MD: JHU Press.
- Umbach, P. D. (2007). How Effective Are They? Exploring the Impact of Contingent Faculty on Undergraduate Education. *The Review of Higher Education*, 30(2), 91–123. <https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2006.0080>
- Vygotsky, L. (1962) *Thought and Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Watkins, C., Carnell, E., & Lodge, C. (2007). Effective Learning in Classrooms (pp. 69-86). London: SAGE Publications Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446211472>
- White, P.J., Larson, I., Styles, K., Yuriev, E., Evans, D.R., Rangachari, P.K., Short, J.L., Exintaris, B., Malone, D.T., Davie, B., Eise, N., McNamara, K. & Naidu, S. (2016). Adopting an active learning approach to teaching in a research-intensive higher education context transformed staff teaching attitudes and behaviours, *Higher Education Research & Development*, 35(3), 619-633. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2015.1107887>
- Zion, M., & Slezak, M. (2005). It takes two to tango: In dynamic inquiry, the self-directed student acts in association with the facilitating teacher. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21(7), 875–894. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2005.05.016>