

UNIVERSITY OF WALES TRINITY SAINT DAVID CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME

APPLICATION FOR SENIOR FELLOW

Before you start, you will need to refer to the following documents/guidance:

The Advance HE **Fellowship Category Tool** will help you to determine whether Senior Fellowship is the most appropriate category of Fellowship for you at this point;

- + The **Professional Standards Framework for teaching and supporting learning in higher education** (PSF 2023) – the award of Senior Fellowship is based on the criteria of Descriptor 3 (PSF 2023) being evidenced;
- + **Senior Fellowship Applicant Guidance and Guide to the PSF 2023 Dimensions - Senior Fellowship (D3)**

Senior Fellowship is based on meeting **Descriptor 3 (D3) of the PSF 2023** and your **Account of Professional Practice** is the core of your application.

The **Account of Professional Practice** consists of:

- **a Context Statement** (see Applicant Guidance: Section 4.2)
- **a Reflective Narrative** (see Applicant Guidance: Section 6.2)
- **two Case Studies** (see Applicant Guidance: Section 6.3)

There is a **6,000-word limit shared across all three elements** plus citations (overall maximum of 6,500 words). Please note that the Academic Office checks the word count as part of the submission process)

In addition, **Supporting Statements from two referees** (see Applicant Guidance 7) will need to be submitted with your application. **The Supporting Statements** will verify and endorse that what you write about in your Account of Professional Practice represents your practice in a genuine way.

You will need to **continue to refer to the applicant guidance and Descriptor 3 of the PSF 2023** as you draft your application to ensure that you are writing to meet the requirements.

The award of Senior Fellowship is based on **evidence of your effective and inclusive practice**; you might briefly mention future plans as part of identifying what has worked well and any changes you plan to make in future, however, your application will be judged on whether your evidence of recent practice (typically over the last 3-5 years) meets the requirements of Descriptor 3.

Your evidence against Descriptor 3 will be written into your **Reflective Narrative and two Case Studies**.

For Descriptor 3, the examples you select to write about need to demonstrate how your practice supports high quality learning **through leading/ influencing** the teaching and/or learning support practices of others (colleagues, peers, mentees, internal/external, etc).

When you have finalised your application you will need to send the completed form to your referees so that they can write their Supporting Statements. Please direct your referees to the [Senior Fellowship Guidance for Referees writing a Supporting Statement](#). The referees need to return their Supporting Statements for you to upload with your application.

Your application is submitted first to the Academic Office **via the appropriate submission link on Moodle (Advance HE Fellowship module)**.

SECTION ONE:

NAME (as you would like it to appear on your certificate)	Ka Po Chong
INSTITUTE/ DEPARTMENT/PROFESSIONAL UNIT	Institute of Management and Health
POSITION (E.g. Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Principal Lecturer/Director of Discipline/Other (please specify))	Lecturer
ROLE (E.g. Lecturer/Programme Manager/Admissions Tutor/Module Leader/Other (please specify))	Lecturer/ Module Leader
Referees Please could you tick the box if you have sent in your referees' statements? (Please be aware if we do not receive your referees' statements at the time of the submission or a maximum of 2 days after the panel submission date then your application will be passed to the next Panel meeting). If your Supporting Statements are not included with your application, you must ensure your referees send their Supporting Statements to the Academic Office by the deadline. The Academic Office will not chase referees.	Yes ☒ No ☐
Date of Training	22 nd August 2025
Mentor	Dr Angus Slater

SECTION 2: Context Statement

I am a Lecturer in Hospitality Management at the University of Wales Trinity Saint David (UWTSD), a multi-campus university in Wales (15,000+ students), where I have taught since September 2022. I teach Level 4 to Level 6 undergraduate modules covering food and beverage management, gastronomy and contemporary issues in the hospitality industry. My students are a diverse cohort, including international learners studying in their second language and mature students with prior industry experience.

Since joining UWTSD, I have played a foundational role in developing the gastronomy strand of the hospitality programme. Over two consecutive academic years (2023–2025), I designed six gastronomy modules from scratch across Levels 4, 5 and 6, creating all module handbooks, assessment methods and teaching content for a curriculum area that previously had no materials. As I completed each level, different colleagues rotated in to deliver the modules I had built. During 2023/24, I also served as Module Lead for three modules. I currently supervise Level 6 dissertations. I hold a Fellowship of the Higher Education Academy (FHEA).

I influence colleagues' practice through curriculum development and handover, sustained peer observation, mentoring in qualitative research methodology, and championing immersive learning technology across disciplines. I have been the primary advocate for the university's immersive learning rooms within hospitality education, introducing the technology to colleagues in wine education, business and management, and professional training.

Externally, I am a Member of the Institute of Hospitality (MIH), served as a panellist at the Institute of Hospitality Round Table on disability in Welsh hospitality (Price, 2024), and serve as an IICCT examiner for FDQ-accredited qualifications. I hold International Sakasho and International Sake Lecturer certifications and serve as a UCU LGBT+ delegate.

SECTION 3: Reflective Narrative

Theme 1: Building a new curriculum from scratch and leading its delivery by others

When I joined UWTSD in September 2022, the hospitality management programme had no dedicated gastronomy modules, no module handbooks, no assessment frameworks and no teaching content in this area. Over two consecutive academic years (2023–2025), I designed and developed six gastronomy modules from scratch across Levels 4, 5 and 6, creating the entire curriculum infrastructure: learning outcomes, module handbooks, assessment briefs, teaching materials and learning resources. This sustained period of curriculum development represents the most significant way in which my practice has extended beyond my own direct teaching and shaped the teaching practices of colleagues (D3.1, D3.3).

I drew on Biggs and Tang's (2011) principle of constructive alignment to ensure coherent links between learning outcomes, teaching activities and assessment methods across the six modules (V3, A1). This was particularly important because the modules combined theoretical gastronomy knowledge with practical hospitality skills, requiring assessment approaches that could capture different forms of learning (K1). I designed assessments that incorporated authentic industry scenarios, reflecting the employability focus of the UWTSD institutional strategy (V4, A3). My specialist professional knowledge, including my International Sakasho and International Sake Lecturer certifications, informed the content directly. For example, I developed teaching materials on Asian gastronomy, including both PowerPoint resources and recorded lectures, which the Programme Manager specifically commissioned for use in her own teaching. This represents a clear example of a senior colleague recognising and drawing upon my specialist expertise to enhance her own practice with students (D3.3).

As I completed the development of modules at each level, I moved on to design the next, and different colleagues rotated in each semester to deliver the modules I had built. In each case, I provided colleagues with the complete module materials and explained the pedagogic rationale behind the assessment design and content structure. Colleagues actively sought me out for these materials and for guidance on how the modules were intended to work, asking specific questions about the learning activities I had designed and how to deliver particular sessions effectively. This process was repeated across multiple colleagues over two years, demonstrating a sustained pattern of curriculum leadership in which my design decisions directly shaped how others taught and how their students experienced the gastronomy curriculum (D3.1, K2).

I subsequently recognised that not all colleagues were delivering the modules as I had designed

them. Some colleagues simplified the content or replaced materials with less detailed alternatives. Rather than viewing this purely as a problem, I reflected critically on why this occurred and recognised that some of my materials required a level of specialist gastronomy knowledge that colleagues without my professional background did not possess (K3). This evaluation informed my subsequent approach: I developed more detailed module handbooks that included explanatory notes, contextual guidance and clearer signposting of the pedagogic intentions behind each element, making the curriculum more accessible to non-specialist colleagues and better supporting their delivery. I also made myself available for informal discussions when colleagues had questions about content or assessment design, establishing an ongoing consultative relationship that continued beyond the initial handover. This critical self-evaluation and adaptive response illustrates how I have used evidence of effectiveness to refine my approach to leading others' practice (K3, A5, V3).

A further example of curriculum innovation that colleagues adopted is the video case study method I developed for the Level 6 module BMGM6000 Analysis and Review of Operations Process. Teaching consultancy at undergraduate level presents a particular challenge: students often struggle to conceptualise what a consultant does in practice and how operational analysis translates into actionable recommendations. Having previously used written case studies from organisations such as Starwood and Lego, I recognised that these, while academically rigorous, did not fully engage students or make the consultancy process sufficiently visible. After considerable reflection, I introduced video case studies using episodes from Kitchen Nightmares as a pedagogic tool, in which a consultant enters a failing hospitality business, conducts an operational analysis, diagnoses problems and proposes interventions. I asked students to analyse these scenarios critically, explaining what the consultant's role entailed. Student feedback was notably positive; students reported that the video format was more engaging and gave them a clearer picture of consultancy work. One episode proved particularly effective for challenging assumptions: in the case of Amy's Baking Company, the consultant was unable to save the business. Students were surprised by this outcome, and it prompted a valuable discussion about consultancy as an advisory role where clients retain the decision to adopt or reject recommendations. The effectiveness of this approach is consistent with Mayer's (2009) cognitive theory of multimedia learning. Colleagues subsequently adopted this method in their own teaching, having observed its impact on student engagement and learning. I shared my materials and pedagogic rationale with the programme team, and the approach has since been used across multiple module deliveries by different colleagues, representing a tangible example

of my practice influencing the teaching approaches of others (D3.1, D3.3, A2).

I evaluated the effectiveness of my curriculum leadership through analysis of module evaluation data, student achievement patterns and informal feedback from colleagues (K3). As Module Lead in 2023/24, I also ensured that all assessment practices met university regulations and led internal moderation processes, supporting colleagues' understanding of the standards expected at each level of study (K5).

Theme 2: Supporting inclusive practice and responding to the wider professional context

Working in hospitality management education within a Welsh university serving a diverse student population, I have developed a sustained commitment to inclusive practice that extends into my influence on colleagues. My background as a Hong Kong native fluent in Cantonese and Mandarin with intermediate Japanese gives me particular insight into the experiences of international learners studying in their second language (V1). I have used this understanding to support multiple colleagues at different times in adapting their teaching approaches to better meet the needs of these students.

A particularly illustrative example arose in November 2025 when a colleague invited me to undertake a peer observation of a session with a mixed student group including Chinese top-up students. He, along with others in the team, had expressed frustration that the Chinese students appeared disengaged and reluctant to participate. Some colleagues perceived this as lack of interest. Drawing on my understanding of East Asian educational cultures and the specific circumstances of these learners, I explained that many of these students were experiencing their first time living independently abroad, studying entirely in their second language and adjusting to an unfamiliar pedagogic culture (K1). I made two specific recommendations. First, I advised colleagues to allow students to use transcription and translation software on their devices during sessions, explaining that what appeared to be distraction was students using digital tools to support comprehension. Previously, some colleagues had asked students to put phones away, inadvertently removing a crucial learning support (K4). Second, I recommended that colleagues allow students to communicate in Chinese during group activities, enabling those with stronger English skills to support their peers and fostering peer learning within the cohort (V2).

This was not an isolated intervention. I had been providing similar guidance to colleagues since

joining UWTSD, drawing on my cultural knowledge whenever questions arose about international student engagement. The November 2025 example was the most structured instance, but it built upon a consistent pattern of collegial support over the preceding three years. The impact was significant: within a few weeks, colleagues reported that the Chinese students were noticeably more engaged and beginning to contribute to class discussions. The shift in colleagues' understanding was important: they moved from perceiving these students as disengaged to recognising and accommodating their specific learning needs. These students progressed successfully, and several subsequently obtained references for postgraduate programmes at institutions including the Chinese University of Hong Kong and the University of Glasgow. This illustrates how my influence on colleagues' practice, informed by my cultural knowledge and understanding of how learners learn, ultimately benefited students' academic progression and confidence (A4, D3.1).

My engagement with the wider professional context further extends my practice beyond direct teaching. As a panellist at the Institute of Hospitality Round Table on disability in Welsh hospitality (Price, 2024), I contributed to professional discourse bringing together industry practitioners, educators and policymakers to examine barriers to employment for disabled people in the sector (V4). My contribution focused on how hospitality curricula can better prepare students to create inclusive workplace environments. This work resulted in a published sector white paper, and I have shared the key insights with my programme team, influencing how we frame employability and inclusion within our teaching (D3.3). As an examiner and judge for the IICCT for FDQ-accredited qualifications, I participate in annual quality assurance reviews of examination procedures and professional standards (K5, V4). This external engagement connects me to the professional standards framework that informs the competencies embedded within HE hospitality curricula, ensuring that my curriculum design reflects current industry expectations. As a UCU LGBT+ delegate (2024–2026), I have advocated for inclusive practice at institutional level, contributing to discussions about how the university can better support staff and students from diverse backgrounds (V1, V2).

Theme 3: Enhancing practice through continuing professional development and its transfer to colleagues

My continuing professional development has been purposeful and sustained, and I have consistently sought to use the learning gained to enhance both my own practice and that of colleagues (A5). Completing the Postgraduate Certificate in Teaching Higher Education at

UWTSD provided a foundational understanding of pedagogic theory and reflective practice. During this programme, I undertook peer observations with colleagues, providing constructive feedback that supported their development. I have continued to engage in reciprocal peer observation beyond the formal programme, maintaining this as a sustained collaborative practice with members of the programme team over the past three years. Through these observations, I have provided feedback that has led to specific changes in colleagues' practice; for example, I recommended the use of visual scaffolding techniques for sessions involving international students, which a colleague subsequently adopted and found effective in improving student participation (V5, A2).

My selection for the Oxford and St. Gallen Global Leadership Challenge (2024), as one of 100 emerging leaders worldwide, provided significant learning about leadership in diverse professional contexts. I have applied insights from this experience to my mentoring of colleagues, particularly in how I facilitate change in teaching practice. The programme emphasised participative and coaching-based leadership approaches (Kouzes and Posner, 2023), which informed how I support colleagues to develop their own practice rather than prescribing specific methods. I explore this further in Case Study 1 (A4).

My professional certifications as International Sakasho and International Sake Lecturer represent a distinctive form of CPD that directly enriches my discipline and colleagues' practice. I have drawn on this expertise to develop all the gastronomy teaching materials described in Theme 1, which are now used by colleagues who deliver these modules. This represents a sustained transfer of specialist professional knowledge into the broader teaching practice of the programme team (D3.3, A5). I also use creative multimedia approaches in other modules, such as using the film *Ratatouille* to introduce students to professional kitchen structures and hierarchies, further demonstrating how professional knowledge informs innovative curriculum design that colleagues can draw upon (A1, K2).

SECTION 4: CASE STUDIES

Case Study 1

Mentoring a colleague in research methodology to enhance research-informed teaching and student dissertation supervision

This case study examines my sustained mentoring of a fellow Lecturer at UWTSD who teaches in the Business discipline within the same faculty. Although we hold the same level of appointment and I have no formal supervisory responsibility for him, he first approached me in 2024 for informal guidance on qualitative research methodology as he began planning his PhD research. Our discussions initially focused on broad methodological questions about research design and the suitability of qualitative approaches for his area of study. As his doctoral work progressed into 2025, the mentoring relationship deepened and became more structured, expanding to encompass research ethics processes and the critical use of emerging research technologies. His engagement was driven by a dual need: he required a robust understanding of these areas for his doctoral study, and he also needed to develop his capacity to guide undergraduate students through qualitative research methods in their dissertation projects. This case study illustrates how my informal mentoring of a colleague's research practice has enhanced his confidence and competence as both a researcher and a research-informed teacher, with direct benefits for his students' learning.

What I did

My mentoring encompassed three interconnected areas of research practice. First, he sought guidance on thematic analysis as a methodology for his PhD and for supervising student dissertations. I grounded our discussions in Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase approach, while also drawing on their later reflexive refinements (Braun and Clarke, 2019) to emphasise the importance of the researcher's active role in theme development. I chose this framework deliberately because of its wide recognition in qualitative research and its applicability across disciplines, making it relevant to both his doctoral work in Business and his students' projects. I worked through each phase with practical examples from my own doctoral research, demonstrating how to move from raw data to initial codes, and from initial codes to meaningful themes through an iterative process of review and refinement (K2, V3).

Second, my colleague sought support in navigating the university's research ethics application process. I guided him through the preparation of ethics documentation,

explaining the principles underpinning ethical research practice, including informed consent, confidentiality and the management of risk, and how to anticipate and address potential ethical concerns in the application. This area was new to him and he found the process daunting; my practical experience of having recently completed my own ethics applications for my PhD research enabled me to provide specific, contextualised guidance. This support culminated in my colleague inviting me to co-deliver a session with his students on research ethics, in which I shared my experience of the ethical review process and helped students understand how to approach ethical considerations in their own dissertation research. The session was interactive; I used examples from my own fieldwork to illustrate how ethical principles play out in real research situations, making abstract procedural requirements concrete and relatable. This represents a direct example of my mentoring leading to a collaborative teaching intervention that benefited his students' learning (A2, A3, D3.1).

Third, my colleague sought guidance on the critical and ethical use of AI tools in research. This is an area where scholarly opinion is evolving rapidly and where researchers and students require support in making informed decisions about how and when such tools can be used responsibly (V4). I guided him in understanding the current institutional and disciplinary expectations around AI use in research, emphasising the importance of transparency in reporting any AI-assisted processes, critical evaluation of AI-generated outputs and the need to maintain the integrity of the research process throughout. This guidance informed both his own doctoral work and his advice to students undertaking dissertations. His enhanced understanding of thematic analysis has directly improved the quality of his formative feedback to dissertation students, enabling him to guide their analytical development more effectively (A3).

Beyond the technical dimensions of research methodology, I emphasised the importance of reflexivity in qualitative research, drawing on my own experience of conducting qualitative interviews for my PhD research in tourism and hospitality management. I shared how I had navigated decisions about language and cultural context in my own coding process, including conducting analysis in the original language of the interviews to preserve meaning before translating findings. This reflexive dimension was important because my colleague's own research involves participants from diverse cultural backgrounds, and my guidance helped him consider how his positionality might influence his interpretation of data (V1).

Why I took this approach

My decision to ground the mentoring in Braun and Clarke's (2006) framework was informed by its established position as one of the most widely cited approaches to thematic analysis in the social sciences. Its structured, phase-based nature makes it particularly suitable for researchers who are new to qualitative methods, as it provides clear procedural guidance while still allowing for analytical flexibility. I was also influenced by my understanding of how adults learn new research skills. Drawing on Knowles' (1984) principles of andragogy, I recognised that my colleague, as an experienced professional and academic, would benefit most from a mentoring approach that valued his existing knowledge and connected new learning to his immediate professional needs. Rather than delivering instruction in a didactic manner, I adopted a collaborative approach in which I guided his thinking through questioning and discussion, encouraging him to apply each phase of the analysis to his own data and to reflect on his analytical decisions (A4).

This approach also reflected the participative leadership principles I had encountered through the Oxford and St. Gallen Global Leadership Challenge (2024), which reinforced my belief that effective influence is achieved through empowering others to develop their own capabilities rather than creating dependency on the mentor (Kouzes and Posner, 2023). I was conscious that my colleague needed to develop sufficient confidence and competence to independently guide his own students through similar processes, and that a prescriptive approach would undermine this goal.

How I carried out this approach

The mentoring evolved from occasional informal conversations in 2024 to regular meetings throughout 2025 in which I responded to my colleague's specific questions and worked through methodological challenges as they arose in his research. These were supplemented by discussions about how the same principles applied to his teaching context, particularly his supervision of undergraduate dissertations. For example, when my colleague was uncertain about how to distinguish between codes and themes in his own data, I used this as an opportunity to discuss how he might explain this distinction to his students, encouraging him to develop pedagogic strategies for making abstract methodological concepts accessible to undergraduate learners (K2, K1).

I also shared resources including key readings and exemplar analyses, and I encouraged

him to use these in his own supervision practice as reference materials for students undertaking qualitative projects. Our collaboration extended beyond research methodology into broader collegial support. My colleague and I are co-authoring a research paper, which has provided a further context for collaborative scholarly work and has deepened both our engagement with the methodological literature. I have also supported the continuity of his teaching programme by covering his lessons during periods of absence (January–February 2026), during which I engaged directly with his students and subsequently shared pedagogic observations with him that informed his planning for subsequent sessions. These activities, taken together, represent a sustained and multifaceted pattern of collegial support that goes beyond a single episode of assistance (V5, D3.1).

How I evaluated the effectiveness of this approach

I have evaluated the effectiveness of my mentoring through several indicators. First, my colleague has demonstrated a growing confidence in applying thematic analysis independently, progressing from needing step-by-step guidance to being able to make and justify his own analytical decisions in his doctoral work. He now discusses methodological choices with greater assurance and is able to articulate the rationale for his approach clearly. This progression is observable in the increasing sophistication of the questions he brings to our discussions, which have shifted from procedural queries to more nuanced conceptual considerations (K3).

Second, and more significantly for this application, the mentoring has had a direct impact on his teaching practice. My colleague now supervises undergraduate dissertation students who are using qualitative methods, and he is able to guide them through the process of thematic analysis with a confidence that he did not previously possess. The co-delivered session on research ethics provided his students with practical guidance that they could apply directly to their own projects, and informal feedback from students indicated that they found the session valuable in demystifying the ethics process. This represents the critical chain that Senior Fellowship requires: my influence on a colleague's practice has enhanced his capacity to support student learning effectively (D3.1, D3.3, A2).

Third, my colleague's progression through his own PhD, informed by the methodological understanding developed through our mentoring relationship, contributes to his development as a research-informed teacher. As he develops his research expertise, he brings deeper

scholarly understanding into his teaching, creating a virtuous cycle in which research and teaching mutually reinforce one another (A5).

What I have learned and how this informs my future practice

This mentoring experience has deepened my understanding of how informal peer support can enhance teaching quality within a programme team and across disciplinary boundaries. I have learned that effective mentoring of colleagues in research methodology requires a balance between providing structured guidance and creating space for the mentee to develop independent analytical judgment. The cross-disciplinary nature of this mentoring has also been instructive: supporting a colleague from Business rather than Hospitality has required me to consider how methodological principles translate across different disciplinary contexts, which has enriched my own understanding of the broader applicability of qualitative research approaches (K3, A5).

I have since begun sharing similar methodological guidance informally with other colleagues in the faculty who are developing their qualitative research skills for doctoral study or student supervision. I am also developing a short resource guide on thematic analysis for dissertation supervisors, drawing on the learning from this mentoring relationship, which will formalise the transfer of research methodology knowledge across the programme team and extend the impact of this work beyond a single mentoring relationship (D3.3, A5).

Case Study 2

Immersive Technology Adoption in Hospitality Education: Leading Cross-Disciplinary Pedagogic Innovation

In 2023, UWTSD invested approximately £1.5 million in LED immersive learning rooms, making it one of the first higher education institutions in Wales and the UK to embed this technology within its teaching estate. The facility, shortlisted for an AV Award, offers 360-degree visual and audio environments capable of transforming conventional classroom delivery into experiential, simulated learning. Yet despite this significant institutional investment, uptake among academic staff remained limited, particularly within disciplines beyond art and architecture where the technology had first been demonstrated. Recent systematic reviews confirm that VR contributes to competence development in higher education, though effective integration requires pedagogic frameworks rather than technology adoption alone (Cabrera-Duffaut, Pinto-Llorente and Iglesias-Rodriguez, 2024). Within hospitality and tourism education, no structured pedagogic approach to using immersive technology had been developed, and many colleagues were unaware of the facility's potential for their teaching (K4, V4).

As a Lecturer in Hospitality Management with extensive international industry experience across luxury establishments including Amangiri Resort and The Ritz-Carlton Tokyo, I recognised that immersive technology offered a distinctive opportunity to address a persistent pedagogic challenge: the difficulty of providing students with authentic exposure to global hospitality environments when international field trips were no longer funded. My students, many of whom have limited travel experience, were studying global gastronomy and operations management through textbooks and lecture slides alone. Having worked in settings where sensory awareness, cultural context and spatial understanding are fundamental to professional competence, I understood that this gap between classroom learning and professional reality was a significant limitation (K2, V4).

Drawing on Kolb's (2015) experiential learning cycle and Mayer's (2009) cognitive theory of multimedia learning, I saw the potential for the immersive room to bridge this gap. Kolb's model emphasises that effective learning requires concrete experience followed by reflective observation, abstract conceptualisation and active experimentation. The immersive room could provide the concrete experience that my modules lacked, while my facilitation could scaffold the subsequent stages of the cycle. Dewey (1938) argued that not all experiences

are equally educative; I therefore approached the technology not simply as a novel venue but as a pedagogic tool requiring careful design to ensure meaningful learning outcomes (A1, K2, V3).

Developing my own practice

Beginning in October 2023, I integrated immersive room sessions into two modules across Levels 4 and 6. In one session, I used 360-degree footage of the Toyosu Fish Market in Tokyo to contextualise sustainable sourcing practices, allowing students to virtually experience the auction environment while I explained procurement decisions and supply chain considerations. The immersive room displayed market visuals and ambient sound, creating a multisensory learning environment that traditional lecture slides could not replicate (A2, K4). In another Level 6 session, I showed students a virtual reality restaurant concept in Tokyo, TREE by NAKED Yoyogi Park, to explore innovation strategy in hospitality operations, prompting discussion about how technology is reshaping the guest experience globally (A1, A4). I also designed a banquet operation and reception simulation using the immersive environment to create a sense of place and occasion that supported students' understanding of event management logistics.

Following these sessions, I facilitated reflective discussions in which students considered how they might apply immersive approaches to their own projects. I specifically asked Level 4 students how they would use the immersive room if they reached their final year, encouraging them to think critically about the relationship between technology and learning design rather than passively consuming the content (A4, K3). The responses revealed both potential and limitations. Several students were enthusiastic; one commented that the session showed them "the difference between gastronomy management and hospitality management," indicating that the immersive context had communicated something about professional identity and disciplinary scope that previous teaching had not conveyed as effectively. This was significant: my use of flair bartending demonstrations and high-end restaurant concepts within the immersive environment had communicated aspects of the profession that textbook-based teaching alone had failed to achieve (A2). A kitchen-based student asked whether they could film their own cooking for projection in the immersive room, demonstrating creative engagement with the technology's possibilities and suggesting potential for student-generated immersive content.

However, I recognised that engagement was mixed. Compared with the visually striking content produced by art and architecture students with purpose-built immersive materials, the hospitality-specific resources available online were limited. I acknowledged that my own technical skills in content creation constrained what I could produce, and that pedagogic value depended on content quality, not merely venue novelty. This honest self-evaluation shifted my thinking from "how do I use this room?" to "what pedagogic framework should underpin immersive learning in hospitality education?" (K3, A5).

Influencing colleagues across disciplines

Alongside developing my own practice, I actively championed the immersive room to colleagues beyond hospitality education. My approach was not prescriptive; rather, I shared my experiences, offered practical support and encouraged colleagues to explore the technology's potential within their own disciplinary contexts (D3.1, V5).

I first introduced the concept to Christopher, a colleague in wine and viticulture education, suggesting that the immersive room could enhance his teaching of terroir by virtually transporting students to vineyard environments. I discussed with him how the same pedagogic principles that I had applied in hospitality using immersive simulation to overcome geographical barriers to experiential learning could work within his discipline. Christopher was receptive and subsequently adopted the technology, using it to show vineyard landscapes, wine production settings and regional terroir characteristics that students studying in Wales would otherwise never experience first-hand. He reported that his students responded positively, engaging with viticultural contexts visually and spatially in ways that conventional lecture-based teaching could not achieve. His adoption demonstrated that the pedagogic principles I had identified were transferable beyond my own subject area, and the benefit to his students' learning represents a direct impact of my influence on a colleague's practice (A2, K2, V4, D3.3).

I then began sustained discussions with Dr Helen Lee, a Lecturer in Business and Management who also works with the Doctoral College. Over several months from early 2025, I shared my experience of using the immersive room, discussed potential applications for her discipline and encouraged her to visit the facility. In September 2025, I accompanied her to the immersive room and arranged a meeting with the university's immersive technology team, who demonstrated projects from disciplines including agriculture. I showed

her examples of what was possible and we discussed together what content could work within her teaching context, for instance exploring how innovation strategy or organisational behaviour could be brought to life through immersive scenarios (D3.1, K4). Dr Helen had not previously been aware of or considered using the immersive room. Following our discussions and the visit, she developed her own sessions, ultimately designing an integrated pedagogic approach that she used with her Level 7 students in November 2025 and documented in her PGCert in Teaching in Higher Education assignment. While the pedagogic approach she developed was her own, she has acknowledged that it was my sustained recommendation and practical support that introduced her to the facility and prompted her to explore its possibilities. Her subsequent use of the technology with postgraduate students represents an extension of my influence into a different disciplinary context and a different level of study (V5, D3.3).

I also shared the concept with Antoinette, a colleague involved in WSET (Wine and Spirit Education Trust) training, to explore whether immersive environments could support sensory education in wine and spirit qualifications. As Antoinette is less confident with technology, we remain at an exploratory stage, discussing how immersive sessions might complement existing tasting-based pedagogy. This ongoing dialogue illustrates that influencing colleagues' practice is not always immediate; sustained support and patience are required, particularly when colleagues face barriers to technology adoption (V5, K4). My colleague Jaliya, with whom I collaborate on research, experienced the immersive room with genuine enthusiasm but acknowledged that the significant preparation required did not suit his current teaching approach. Nevertheless, Jaliya and I are co-developing a conceptual paper on immersive pedagogy in hospitality education. This scholarly collaboration represents a different dimension of influence: even where a colleague does not adopt the technology directly, engaging them in the intellectual framework that underpins it contributes to the broader development of pedagogic thinking within the discipline (V3, V5).

Critical evaluation and reflection

Evaluating the impact of this work requires honesty. The student outcomes from both my sessions and Dr Helen's were not as consistently positive as I had initially expected. Dr Helen reported that her students' experience did not fully meet her expectations, and my own sessions produced mixed engagement. I initially found this discouraging, but upon reflection I recognised that this feedback was itself pedagogically valuable. It challenged my

assumption that immersive technology would inherently generate engagement and forced me to consider more carefully what conditions are necessary for immersive learning to be effective. I reflected on these outcomes through the lens of Salmon and Wright's (2014) work on learning design, which emphasises that technology-enhanced learning requires structured pedagogic design rather than simply placing students in novel environments. Research confirms that immersive technologies can enhance engagement only when underpinned by sound pedagogic design (Pratisto, Thompson and Potdar, 2022). Makransky and Petersen's (2021) Cognitive Affective Model of Immersive Learning reinforced my understanding that presence and agency are the key psychological affordances of immersive learning and must be deliberately facilitated through instructional design rather than assumed from the technology itself (K3, A5, V3).

Significantly, several of my students were surprised to learn that the facility existed after three years of study, highlighting an institutional communication gap around the visibility and accessibility of learning technologies that extends beyond individual lecturers' practice (K5, V4). I have raised this observation within the programme team, and it has implications for how the institution communicates specialist learning environments to staff and students.

This critical evaluation has directly informed my current scholarly work. The conceptual paper I am developing with Jaliya proposes a pedagogic framework for immersive learning in hospitality education, drawing on experiential learning theory, multimedia learning principles and the practical insights from this case study. The framework is intended to provide colleagues across the discipline with an evidence-informed structure for designing immersive sessions that go beyond technological novelty to achieve meaningful learning outcomes (D3.3, V3, V4).

This case study illustrates that leading pedagogic innovation does not always produce uniformly positive results, and that the most valuable professional learning often emerges from critically examining why outcomes fell short of expectations. My role in championing immersive technology at UWTSD has evolved from initial enthusiasm in October 2023 to a more scholarly, framework-driven approach over two years. The experience has deepened my understanding of how to influence colleagues effectively: sustained encouragement, practical support and intellectual engagement are more effective than prescriptive advocacy,

and different colleagues respond to innovation at different paces and in different ways (D3.1, D3.3, A5).

SECTION 5: References and Citations

Reference list

Biggs, J.B. and Tang, C. (2011). *Teaching for Quality Learning at University : What the Student Does*. 4th ed. Maidenhead, England ; New York: Mcgraw-Hill, Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.

Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006). Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), pp.77–101. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>.

- Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2019). Reflecting on Reflexive Thematic Analysis. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 11(4), pp.589–597. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806>.
- Cabrera-Duffaut, A., Pinto-Llorente, A.M. and Iglesias-Rodríguez, A. (2024). Immersive learning platforms: analyzing virtual reality contribution to competence development in higher education—a systematic literature review. *Frontiers in Education*, 9(1391560). doi:<https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1391560>.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and Education*. New York: Touchstone.
- Knowles, M.S. (1984). *Andragogy in Action: Applying Modern Principles of Adult Learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kolb, D. (2015). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. 2nd ed. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Kouzes, J.M. and Posner, B.Z. (2023). *The Leadership Challenge*. 7th ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Makransky, G. and Petersen, G.B. (2021). The cognitive affective model of immersive learning (CAMIL): a theoretical research-based model of learning in immersive virtual reality. *Educational Psychology Review*, 33(3), pp.937–958. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-020-09586-2>.
- Mayer, R.E. (2009). *Multimedia learning*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pratisto, E.H., Thompson, N. and Potdar, V. (2022). Immersive Technologies for Tourism: a Systematic Review. *Information Technology & Tourism*, 24(2), pp.181–219. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1007/s40558-022-00228-7>.
- Price, K. (2024). *White Paper Breaking Barriers in the Hospitality Profession A Round Table White Paper on Disability in Wales*. [online] Celtic Manor Resort, Newport: [instituteofhospitality.org](https://www.instituteofhospitality.org). Available at: <https://www.instituteofhospitality.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/loH-White-Paper-Breaking-Barriers-2024.pdf> [Accessed 23 Feb. 2026].
- Salmon, G. and Wright, P. (2014). Transforming Future Teaching through ‘Carpe Diem’ Learning Design. *Education Sciences*, 4(1), pp.52–63. doi:<https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci4010052>.

Your application (including the two Supporting Statements from your referees) is submitted first to the Academic Office **via the appropriate submission link on Moodle (Advance HE Fellowship module)**.

SECTION 6: Referees

Your application must be accompanied by **two references** from persons who are in a position to comment on your teaching and learning practices and achievements.

The function of your Referees is to provide an informed peer review of your eligibility for Senior Fellow, using their knowledge of your work and the context in which you teach and/or support learning. Referees are expected to **verify and endorse your application** by commenting directly on the content of your application and to make additional, relevant comments, as they wish.

Referees should be experienced staff and be able to comment knowledgeably, and from first-hand experience, on your current role and any other relevant activities recently undertaken. **At least one of your Referees should either be a Fellow, Senior Fellow or Principal Fellow of the Higher Education Academy (HEA)**, or an appropriate experienced member of staff working for a UK Higher Education Institution (HEI). All Referees need to be familiar with PSF 2023.

Referees should be provided with a copy of the Guidance Notes for Referees – please speak to your mentor regarding this document.

First Referee:	
Name	Jaliya de Silva
Job Title	Lecturer
Fellowship Status	Fellow
Institute/Centre/Discipline/Unit	Institute of Management and Health
Email address	j.de-silva@uwtsd.ac.uk
Jaliya de Silva is a fellow Lecturer within the same faculty at UWTSD. He has direct knowledge of my teaching practice, my championing of immersive learning technology across the programme, and my influence on colleagues' pedagogic approaches. He is co-author of a conceptual paper on immersive pedagogy in hospitality education that we are developing together. He has also observed my engagement with colleagues across disciplines and can comment on my sustained commitment to collaborative practice and pedagogic innovation.	

Second Referee:	
Name	Dr Helen Lee
Job Title	Lecturer
Fellowship Status	Associate Fellow
Institute/Centre/Discipline/Unit	Institute of Management and Health
Email address	h.lee@uwtsd.ac.uk
Dr Helen Lee is a Lecturer in Business and Management at UWTSD who also works with the Doctoral College. She has direct experience of my influence on her teaching practice, specifically my sustained recommendation and practical support that introduced her to the university's immersive learning facility and prompted her to explore its pedagogic potential within her own discipline. She can comment on my role in arranging her visit to the immersive room, facilitating her	

meeting with the university's immersive technology team, and sharing my experience of using the technology in hospitality education. As a colleague within the same faculty, she has also observed my sustained commitment to pedagogic innovation and collaborative practice.

SECTION 7: Declaration

Please sign and date in the box below to confirm that the application you are submitting is your own work.

Signature	<i>B.C.</i>
Date	12 th Feb, 2026

GDPR on data sharing with ADVANCE HE

Following the implementation of GDPR you should be aware that following successful recognition at UWTSD, personal data including your name and email address will be supplied to Advance HE. This is in order to trigger your fellowship registration and certificate being recorded on their MyAdvanceHE database.

<https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/my-academy-manage-your-higher-education-academy-experience>

Advance HE will make use of this data in the course of providing their Accreditation Services to UWTSD, and potentially in any reviews they might carry out of our accredited provision.

By submitting your coursework and appendices you are confirming you agree to this data sharing.