



Senior Fellowship

Supporting Statement Template

Your Name	Dr Mohamed Chahine Ghanem
Applicant Name	Dr Dipo Dunsin
Your Institution/organisation/other	Keele University
Your current role	Associate Professor in Cyber Security
Email address	m.ghanem@keele.ac.uk
Your Fellowship Status (if appropriate)	Senior Fellowship (SFHEA)
Relationship to Applicant	I was Dr Dunsin's PhD supervisor and line manager at London Metropolitan University. I have also worked with him as Co-Principal Investigator on two Innovate UK CyberASAP projects and currently work alongside him as visiting lecturer within UWTSD.
How long have you worked with the applicant (insert dates)	Since February 2019
Declaration	In submitting your Supporting Statement, you are confirming that the applicant's submission relates to their higher education professional practice and that your statement is your own work and has been written specifically for this applicant. If the professional integrity of the Supporting Statement is in question it will not be accepted. I confirm that I have read and agree with the declaration above. Date: 24 July 2026



Supporting Statement

Please provide your statement to verify and endorse the applicant's submission for Senior Fellow in the following section. You are required to comment on the applicant's recent higher education practice (usually within the last 3-5 years) providing examples to support your statement wherever possible.

In completing this Supporting Statement you are confirming that you have read the [Advance HE Senior Fellow Guidance for Referees writing a Supporting Statement](#). In association with the [Descriptor 3 criteria of the PSF 2023](#) as a guide, it is important that you comment on the following in your Supporting Statement:

- + your own personal experience and knowledge of the applicant's effective, inclusive and comprehensive HE practice;
- + your perspective on the practical examples provided within the application to illustrate the requirements of Senior Fellow, focusing on the way(s) in which the applicant has effectively influenced or led on other colleagues' HE practice.

Two sides of A4 will normally be sufficient for this category of Fellowship.

Capacity in which I write, and the basis of my knowledge

I have worked continuously with Dr Dipo Dunsin since February 2019. I supervised his doctoral research at London Metropolitan University, where I was also his line manager. Since then, I have worked alongside him as Co-Investigator on two Innovate UK CyberASAP projects, most recently EXIRAI: Evidence Extraction for Incident Response through Generative and Agentic AI (UKRI reference 10157810), which he managed from March to July 2025.

I am an Associate Professor in Cyber Security at Keele University, a Senior Fellow of Advance HE, and hold an MA in Academic Practice. I am familiar with the PSF 2023 and the evidential expectations of Descriptor 3. This statement reflects a professional relationship, represents my own independent work, and has been written specifically in support of this applicant.

Verification of the account

I have read Dr Dunsin's Account of Professional Practice in full and confirm that it is a fair and accurate representation of his higher education practice, as I have observed it first-hand over the last five years. I would add that it is a conservative account.



He does not claim responsibility for curriculum review or redesign at UWTSD, confines his curriculum design evidence to London Metropolitan University, and does not attribute programme-level survey results to his own teaching. Such restraint is uncommon in applications of this kind. It strengthens, rather than diminishes, my confidence in the claims he makes.

D3.1 - A sustained record of leading or influencing the practice of those who teach and/or support high-quality learning

The central claim of the application that Dr Dunsin's contribution operates principally through colleagues rather than through his own contact hours aligns closely with what I observed as his line manager at London Metropolitan University.

Over several years, he became the colleague to whom module leaders and laboratory staff in cybersecurity and digital forensics turned when practical teaching was not working effectively. What distinguished his approach was his emphasis on building colleagues' capacity to solve problems independently.

In his reflective narrative, he describes a deliberate shift from supplying ready-made materials to using coaching questions. I witnessed that shift and can confirm its effect. Colleagues who approached him for a revised laboratory sheet instead left with a method for identifying where learners were being overloaded within a practical sequence.

The changes he reports included providing orientation and guided practice before independent analysis, offering alternative routes to specialist tooling, and making explicit connections between technical decisions and professional ethics. These changes were implemented by the colleagues he supported, which is precisely the type of influence required by Descriptor 3.

In my judgement, his influence on assessment was his most durable contribution during this period. He argued consistently that assessment in our discipline too often rewarded tool operation rather than investigative judgement. He worked with module teams to move towards incident response reports, forensic case files, vulnerability analyses, and data protection risk assessments.



The effect on staff extended beyond any single assessment brief. Moderation and marking discussions required colleagues to establish collectively what defensible technical reasoning looked like before it could be assessed. This represented a change in shared assessment literacy, and it continued after his departure.

I can speak with particular authority about the supervisory element of his claim, having supervised him myself. He has translated his own experience as a doctoral researcher into structured support for other supervisors. This has included guidance on milestone setting, distinguishing feasible research questions from over-ambitious ones, and providing feedback on method rather than focusing only on output.

Colleagues adopted the proposal-feedback and literature-mapping approaches he shared. As a result, students received more consistent guidance on feasibility, originality, and research responsibility.

D3.2 - Practice that is effective, inclusive and integrates all Dimensions

Dr Dunsin's inclusive practice is anticipatory rather than remedial. It is also genuine, rather than something assembled specifically for this application.

Our cybersecurity cohorts at London Metropolitan University were highly diverse in their prior technical experience, language backgrounds, and employment commitments. He was among the first colleagues with whom I worked to treat this diversity as a matter of educational design, aligned with A1, V1, and V2, rather than solely as a matter of individual learner support.

His use of Universal Design for Learning was substantive rather than decorative. He encouraged teaching teams to consider whether a learner without industry experience could understand the task, practice safely, locate appropriate support, and recognise what good performance looked like. I have since adopted this line of questioning in my own practice.

The scholarly grounding of his work is clear, particularly in relation to V3 and K3. His use of CSEC2017 and CyBOK helped broaden colleagues' understanding of the discipline beyond tools and procedures to include risk, law, human factors, and ethics, consistent with V4. This was an effective intervention within a team working under considerable delivery pressure.



His scrutiny of specialist and educational technology, aligned with K4, is similarly disciplined. In programme and project meetings, he routinely asked what a proposed tool would improve for learners. This questioning prevented more than one overly enthusiastic adoption, including proposals I had supported.

His handling of evidence also deserves specific comment. He reports a 69.1% positive response relating to feedback on general progress, alongside markedly stronger results elsewhere. Rather than presenting only the stronger figures as evidence of achievement, he treats the weaker result as the more important finding. This demonstrates the critical evaluation required by the descriptor and is consistent with the rigour he applies to research evidence.

D3.3 - Practice that extends significantly beyond direct teaching and/or direct support for learning

I can verify Case Study 2 directly through my role as Co-Investigator on the CyberASAP work. In my assessment, Dr Dunsin's contribution was educational rather than merely administrative.

The researchers and early career academics involved were technically strong but often less confident in communicating their work. They were able to demonstrate a model but not always able to explain its limitations to a non-specialist audience.

He addressed this by requiring them to identify what a listener should be able to understand or decide, anticipate likely misconceptions, and incorporate privacy, bias, and accountability into the initial design of their presentations rather than adding them as closing remarks.

The structure he introduced focused on the problem, users, evidence, response, risks, and intended impact. Academic colleagues subsequently reused this structure in supervision and project briefings, and I have seen it continue to be used since the funded period ended in July 2025. This demonstrates influence that persisted beyond the original intervention.

This work involved leadership across research, enterprise, external partner, and teaching boundaries. It was sustained under funding pressure and resulted in identifiable changes in how colleagues supervise researchers and brief students.



The connection between knowledge exchange activity and benefits for learners is one that Senior Fellowship applicants often struggle to demonstrate. Dr Dunsin makes that connection clearly and, in my view, convincingly.

I also currently work with Dr Dunsin at UWTSD and therefore have direct knowledge of his programme management and wider academic practice in that context. In his role as Programme Manager for the MSc Cybersecurity and Digital Forensics, I have observed him coordinate programme delivery, oversee assessment processes and guide colleagues in interpreting institutional requirements consistently. In programme and assessment discussions, he redirects attention from procedural compliance towards practical questions about learner impact, the evidence required, consistency across modules and professional responsibility. As a result, colleagues have developed a more shared and deliberate approach to assessment oversight and quality assurance, with greater attention to how individual module decisions contribute to the coherence of the programme and the student experience.

Endorsement

Dr Dunsin demonstrates a sustained record of leading and influencing the practice of those who teach and support learning, as required by D3.1. His practice is effective, inclusive, and integrates the Professional Values, Core Knowledge, and Areas of Activity of the PSF 2023, as required by D3.2. His influence also extends significantly beyond his own teaching and direct learner support, as required by D3.3.

I endorse this application without reservation and recommend Dr Dunsin for the award of Senior Fellow

Mohamed Ghanem

Dr Mohamed Chahine Ghanem, SFHEA CISSP
Associate Professor in Cyber Security
Cyber Security Research Lead
Member - [EPSRC Peer Review College](#)
Editor-in-Chief - [Journal of Cyber Security and Risk Auditing](#) (Q1)
Editor - [ACM Digital Threats: Research and Practice](#) (Q1)
School of Computer Science and Mathematics
Room CR103, Colin Reeves Building
Keele University, Newcastle-Under-Lyme, United Kingdom, ST55AA
Visiting Professor - [Cybersecurity Institute, the University of Liverpool](#)
email: m.ghanem@keele.ac.uk | mohamed.chahine.ghanem@liverpool.ac.uk

