



Senior Fellowship

Supporting Statement Template

Your Name	Dr Ramzi Djemai
Applicant Name	Dr Dipo Dunsin
Your Institution/organisation/other	London Metropolitan University (and University of Wales Trinity Saint David, MSc supervision)
Your current role	Principal Lecturer in Employability & Senior Lecturer in Computer Science and Applied Computing
Email address	r.djemai@uwtspd.ac.uk
Your Fellowship Status (if appropriate)	Fellow of the Higher Education Academy (FHEA), Advance HE
Relationship to Applicant	Former colleague at the London Metropolitan University, and now working together again at 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: 24/07/2026



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.

I have known Dipo Dunsin since February 2019. We were colleagues in Computer Science and Applied Computing at London Metropolitan University, and we now work together again at the University of Wales Trinity Saint David, where he is Programme Manager for the MSc Cybersecurity and Digital Forensics and I supervise MSc dissertation students on that programme. That second relationship matters for this statement, because it means I am one of the colleagues whose practice he leads. I am writing about work I am on the receiving end of, not work I have been told about.

I have read his Account of Professional Practice and I can confirm that it represents his practice accurately. I recognise the person in it. I also want to say at the outset that the most striking thing about the application is what it does not claim. He states plainly that he has not undertaken curriculum review, redesign or new curriculum development at UWTSD, and he keeps his curriculum design evidence anchored to London Metropolitan University. In my experience that restraint is unusual and it is characteristic of him. He does not overstate.

Leading the practice of other supervisors

The clearest evidence I can give from direct experience is how he leads the MSc supervisory team. I am one of around nine supervisors he coordinates.

On 15 June 2026 he wrote to all of us after running a student workshop on 12 June. He did not simply pass on an instruction. He set out a shared standard for what supervisors should be doing and in what order: proposals reviewed and approved by the supervisor before a student progresses, then literature reviews that demonstrate domain understanding and identify genuine research gaps, and only then research design and methodology, with his own next checkpoint fixed for 10 July. The effect on me was concrete. It gave me a defensible sequence to hold my own students to, and a shared expectation I knew my colleagues were



applying too. Before that, supervisors were making those judgements individually and inconsistently.

On 5 July 2026 he addressed a process failure that was affecting both students and staff. Students had been coming onto campus for supervision on the strength of a CELCAT entry that is only an attendance placeholder, rather than a confirmed appointment. He explained the distinction clearly to students and required that meetings be agreed directly with the supervisor first. That is a small intervention in isolation. In practice it protected supervision time across the whole team and removed a source of confusion that none of us had managed to fix individually.

On 15 July 2026, when the Senior Student Engagement Officer raised that some supervisees had not yet met their supervisors, his response was to say he would speak to the supervisors concerned, including me, to understand what was actually happening. He investigated before escalating. I have been on the wrong end of the opposite approach elsewhere, and the difference in how it lands on a team is substantial.

Those three examples fall within two months and all of them are the same pattern: he identifies where colleagues' practice is inconsistent or obstructed, sets a shared expectation, and holds a checkpoint against it. This is what Descriptor 3 asks for, and I can attest to it from inside the group being led rather than from observation.

The case studies

His first case study, on inclusive curriculum and assessment, describes influencing colleagues to scaffold practical work, design authentic assessment and treat moderation as shared assessment literacy rather than a compliance exercise. I saw the earlier version of this at London Metropolitan University, in cybersecurity and digital forensics teaching, and I recognise the specific claim about laboratories. He is right that laboratory sessions in this discipline routinely introduce unfamiliar tools, unfamiliar concepts and unfamiliar assessment expectations at the same time, and that this quietly advantages students who already have technical confidence. His approach of asking colleagues what students should investigate, justify and evidence, rather than what topics need covering, is one I have heard him use and it does change the conversation.

I would add one thing his own account understates. He describes moving from solving colleagues' problems for them to helping them solve their own. Having been mentored in both directions by different people, the second is considerably harder and slower, and most people who claim it are still doing the first. He genuinely does the second. He asks questions rather than supplying answers, which is occasionally frustrating and consistently more useful.

His second case study, on the Cybersecurity Academic Startup Accelerator Programme and the Innovate UK funded EXIRAI project, sits slightly outside my direct knowledge. I can confirm the programme and his role in it from our overlap at London Metropolitan University, and that his mentoring of early career researchers there was well regarded, but I did not work inside that project and I will not claim more than I saw.

Inclusive practice

The inclusion claim is the part I would most readily endorse. He treats accessibility as something designed in at the start rather than a response to a student who has already struggled, and he applies the same standard to how he communicates with staff. His instructions to supervisors are unambiguous, they explain the reasoning rather than just the requirement, and they are written so that a colleague new to the programme could follow



them. That is inclusive practice directed at the team, and it is easy to overlook because it looks like ordinary competence.

Overall

I support this application without reservation. Dipo's evidence of influencing and leading the practice of other colleagues is real, recent, and in the case of the supervisory team, something I have experienced personally over the last few months. His account is honest about its limits, which makes the claims it does make more credible rather than less. On the evidence I have seen, he meets Descriptor 3.