



Project Document Cover Sheet

Before completing this template please note:

- *This template is for completion by JISC funded project managers*
- *Text in italics is explanatory and should be deleted in completed documents.*
- *Please check with your programme manager before completing this form whether they would like to use a specially adapted template specific to your project.*
- *Please see Project Management Guidelines for information about assigning version numbers.*

Project Information			
Project Acronym	PC3		
Project Title	Personalised Curriculum Creation through Coaching		
Start Date	September 2008	End Date	May 2012
Lead Institution	Leeds Metropolitan University		
Project Director	Prof. Janet Finlay		
Project Manager & contact details	John Gray – johnrichard.gray@gmail.com Home Tel: 0161 7893971 Mob: 07931 674450		
Partner Institutions	None		
Project Web URL	http://www.pc3.org.uk/		
Programme Name (and number)	<i>Curriculum Design</i>		
Programme Manager	Sarah Knight		

Document Name			
Document Title	<i>October 10 - Interim Report</i>		
Reporting Period	<i>May 2010 – October 2010.</i>		
Author(s) & project role	Janet Finlay/John Gray		
Date	May 31 st 2011	Filename	
URL	<i>if document is posted on project web site</i>		
Access	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project and JISC internal		<input type="checkbox"/> General dissemination

Document History		
Version	Date	Comments

Interim Reporting Template

Project Name: *Personalised Curriculum Creation through Coaching (PC3) – Leeds Metropolitan University*

Report compiled by: *Janet Finlay/John Gray*

With contributions from: *Dawn Wood, Margaret Christian, Nick Halafihi*

Reporting period: *Oct 2010 – May 2011*

Section One: Summary

Provide an overview of the project to date, highlighting key developments, deliverables/outputs and achievements for the reporting period. This section may be used to inform the Programme and Support team, and may also provide the basis for an update to inform the sector about the project. We suggest you write this section last to highlight what, on reflection, are the key points from the other sections.

The project continues to operate in a context of significant institutional change, adapting to new institutional priorities, as they become clearer. Our central focus – of embedding coaching within the student experience across the university – has not changed. However, the mechanisms by which we are able to do this, have, based both on our prior experience with the module approach, and the new institutional context.

The project has been working very successfully with a team of tutors in Sports Management, and from the academic year 2011-12 coaching will be embedded in their course across all three levels, with peer coaching within and across levels operating both face to face and with technology support. This course is being used as an exemplar to extend the use of coaching within personal and professional development strands and for student support. We have been engaging closely with students on this course as well as staff and we plan to recruit some of these students to be “Student Ambassadors” from September, to propose and implement ways of sharing coaching practice with other students.

The project has successfully embedded coaching for learning in the institutional staff development programme and is currently running coaching training for staff through a series of four hands-on workshops. The plans and resources for these workshops will be made available to the sector as part of the planned Coaching InfoKit.

In the academic year 2011-2012 the university will be undergoing a complete undergraduate refocus, moving from 15 to 20 credit modules, introducing graduate attributes, curriculum principles and core “shell” modules across all courses. One of the graduate attributes will be employability and one of the curriculum principles will be “personalised student support”. PC3 has been tasked with providing support for staff in embedding the latter into their curriculum, which will help in supporting the former. This will be a key mechanism through which the project can influence curriculum design at an institutional level.

We will be developing a coaching InfoKit in order to support individuals and institutions across the sector who are interested in developing coaching within their own contexts. This will be developed within the Design Studio. This will include resources from the PLC module and the staff development activities, as well as the evidence base for the use of coaching and case studies from our experience. It will also include an assessment of the different technologies that can be used to support the process and examples of their use.

Section Two: Activities and Progress

Report on activities in support of project objectives for the reporting period. Please refer to the original project objectives and outcomes in your project plans and discuss progress against these, noting any changes.

Institutional Approaches to Curriculum Design Programme

The reporting period in question has been a challenging one for the project. As reported in the last interim report, the university has undergone significant management changes and the new DVC Student Experience took up post 3 months into this reporting period in January 2011. In the same month the project director (Janet Finlay) was unexpectedly admitted to hospital, resulting in surgery, which meant she was unable to contribute to the project for 3 months. The uncertainty over the position of the project therefore continued for longer than anticipated. We are now reaching some clarity and this will be expanded in the report.

In the face of the continued uncertainty and being down a director, the team has continued to develop the coaching approach with the Sports Management tutors. Following initial staff development sessions with these tutors (as reported previously), coaching has been introduced to the 200+ sports management students as part of their PDP stream. In particular, coaching has been used to help students clarify their learning goals for their work placements. To address the issue of scalability the tutors decided to introduce peer coaching, getting the students themselves to coach each other. They introduced students to coaching principles and put them in coaching triads, a concept that we use extensively in coaching training but that we had not used with students. This has been extremely successful. In the triad model, one student takes the role of coach, one of coachee and one of observer, and they rotate the roles so that each experiences all three positions. The benefit of having an observer is that it promotes reflection on the process, improving the coaching skills of all participants. Students coached each other face to face but also carried on coaching conversations using technology such as Facebook groups and Blackberry messenger. Students were required to evidence their coaching as part of their assessment and they used these technologies, together with video and paper diaries. The use of technology enabled the students to continue the coaching at a distance during their work placement and a number indicated that they had done this, as well as using coaching to support each other on other modules.

In contrast to the slightly disappointing outcomes from the pilot of the PLC module, this integrated approach to coaching within PDP has exceeded our expectations. The tutors have now rolled it out to all three year-groups and from September are planning cross-level coaching.

The second key strand of work has focused on further development of staff development provision. The team has developed the initial staff development workshop into an intensive series of four workshops, aimed at encouraging staff to “change the conversation” they have with students, from a tutoring/mentoring one to a coaching one. This series is currently running with an initial group of staff, representing all Faculties and is being well received.

We are bringing together all the resources and alternative approaches to coaching in learning into a Coaching “InfoKit” which will eventually be released through the Design Studio. This will be a major deliverable of the project and is being developed for use both by individuals and institutions wishing to introduce coaching into the curriculum.

Following the appointment of the new DVC Student Experience, the university's direction in learning and teaching has become clearer and the main priority is a complete refocus of the undergraduate curriculum: moving from 15 to 20 credit modules, introducing graduate attributes, curriculum principles and core “shell” modules across all courses. The intention of this is to reduce the number of modules, the amount of assessment and the amount of duplication across courses, releasing staff to spend more time with students. The PC3 team have contributed to the discussion on these areas and is expected to be able to contribute to both supporting the graduate attribute of employability, and scaffolding the curriculum principle of “personalised student support”. Although the details are still being finalised, it is likely that PC3 can make a significant contribution to elements that will be significant to these areas, particularly in improving the interaction between staff and students and supporting students in their academic decision-making.

An initial proposal was developed for aligning PC3 directly with the planned curriculum refocus. This included using coaching with staff as part of the change management process for curriculum refocus (a process that is being completed within an 18 month time frame to take effect in September 2012), including coaching as part of staff development for student engagement, and including coaching in the personal development and employability strands of the curriculum. The first of these was rejected as impractical in the time frame and the second two are still being discussed. The team is continuing to

Institutional Approaches to Curriculum Design Programme

operate with the goal of integrating coaching into the curriculum design process as a permanent part of the staff development for teaching staff and an element of student support.

This will be the focus of the final year of the project: to concentrate on embedding coaching as a mechanism for student support within the undergraduate refocus, demonstrating its use in at least one course in each Faculty and developing an InfoKit and recommendations for technology support for introducing coaching at institutional level as a mechanism for supporting students. We propose to do this through the following activities:

1. Working with the Head of Employability, the Head of Curriculum Design and the Head of Academic Staff Development (when appointed) to encourage the use of coaching as the default approach to conversations with students, particularly relating to their personal and professional development, and to embed resources for this into the staff development toolkit that will underpin the relevant institutional undergraduate curriculum principles.
2. Working with specific course teams in each Faculty to help them embed coaching in their revised curriculum design.
3. Supporting staff more widely by providing enhanced staff development opportunities to demonstrate how coaching can be incorporated into personal interaction with students.
4. Recruiting and working with student ambassadors to promote the use of peer coaching as mutual support among students. This will draw ideas from the students themselves as to how to best promote the idea among their peers.
5. Developing an InfoKit on coaching for the wider sector.
6. Organising a Coaching for Learning Conference in May 2012.

In order to support this programme of work, the project director will be working full time on the project until the end of the project, along with the project officer. In addition, one of the tutors on the Sports Management course (Nick Halafihi) will be joining the course team, to work with the student ambassadors particularly.

Provide a full review of progress in terms of your workpackages including technical approaches and developments, pilot activities and project meetings. Briefly explain any changes to the overall approach outlined in the project plan, and note any amendments, for example to the project team, deliverables or milestones. If appropriate, attach an amended copy of the relevant sections of your project plan (see checklist at end of document).

Workpackage 1 Complete

Workpackage 2 (implementation and deployment of the initial PC3 framework)

The initial framework was deployed for the PLC module, but as previously reported, some students experienced difficulties with the range of technologies. This confusion was confirmed by feedback received from some students who withdrew from the module. Our experience with the Sports Management students suggests that students will choose and adapt their own tools to support the coaching process. However, we intend to integrate the coaching tools we have developed into an ePortfolio system, as an illustration and exemplar of how technology can support the process. The university has confirmed its intention to procure an ePortfolio system and this is now in a tendering process. Depending on the outcome of this we will investigate implementing the framework within this ePortfolio system. We are also evaluating the effectiveness of different technologies in supporting the coaching process as part of the InfoKit.

Workpackage 3 (to ensure that the PC3 approach works well with a range of staff and students) is underway;

The Carnegie Leaders in Learning programme (CLLP) cohort following the PLC module implementation have now completed. Two students out of the original ten gained M level credits for their submissions. Five students withdrew and three failed to submit. This is obviously disappointing but not unexpected given our experience on the module (previously reported). Given the difficulties and the institutional changes, the decision has been made not to repeat the module in this form. Instead we are using the OER developed for the module for both student and staff coaching training and focusing on working with staff to incorporate coaching into existing curricula as a way of supporting student decision making. Personalised Student Support has been identified as one of nine curriculum design principles that will form the basis of the undergraduate refocus. The PC3 project has been charged with producing a "how to" guide for staff, drawing on these resources,

Institutional Approaches to Curriculum Design Programme

demonstrating how to introduce coaching into their curriculum to support this principle. This will be completed in August 2011. We are also currently working with Sports Management staff and are training staff from each Faculty to support them to embed coaching in their practice. In addition in September we will recruit student ambassadors from the Sports Management cohort and task them with designing and developing the means to “sell” the concept of coaching for learning to their fellow students.

Workpackage 4 (to ensure that the changes to the curriculum design processes become part of the culture and activities of the university)

Coaching for learning is now incorporated into the institutional academic staff development programme. The priority of the university is refocusing the undergraduate curriculum to ensure that all students demonstrate specific graduate attributes, including employability, and that all courses reflect nine curriculum principles. These curriculum principles include “Personalised Student Support” and PC3 will lead on providing the academic staff support for embedding this principle.

The initial project plan to introduce a completely personalised curriculum structure is no longer in line with institutional priorities so we are focusing instead on contributing to the undergraduate refocus, to ensure that coaching is considered in the redesign of each course.

Workpackage 5 (ensure the project meets its aims and objectives on budget and on time) - all activities ongoing. The team is continually monitoring plans to adapt to a changing environment and has kept the programme manager updated throughout. The project blog site continues to be active and the team has also contributed to the Design Studio, JISC events, and a variety of other workshops, seminars and conferences (see Section 7 for details). The intention is to develop and release the Coaching InfoKit within the Design Studio. Work on this will begin in August 2011.

Section Three: Risks, Issues and Opportunities

Review your original risk analysis and comment on any changes to the risk profile and how you are managing this. If any risks have become live issues affecting the project explain how you are dealing with them. Report on any other issues that did not stem from identified risks and explain how you are tackling them. For all identified issues or challenges detail what impact any issues may have on the achievement of project targets.

The change in institutional direction has had an impact on how directly we can influence curriculum design processes but we have adapted our focus to ensure that our primary goal (that of embedding coaching within the curriculum of the institution) can still be met.

The unexpected long-term illness of the project director has meant that she was able to make limited contribution for several months. Other team members provided cover, and the project director is moving to working full-time on the project to ensure that the remaining work can be completed on time.

Institutional changes mean that there is a risk that coaching is associated with the previous management team and therefore no longer promoted. We are mitigating against this by working with those responsible for academic student support and focusing on “changing the conversation” rather than the term coaching.

Report on any unexpected opportunities, positive outcomes and successes arising from changes to the plan and new opportunities.

The new learning and teaching priority of the university is a complete refocus of the undergraduate curriculum for delivery in September 2012. This gives us the opportunity to directly influence all courses across the university by ensuring that coaching is a key strand in the personalised student support that each course must demonstrate it offers.

The change in staffing within the Centre for Learning and Teaching means that the project director can commit more time to the project in the final year, allowing us to ensure that a significant InfoKit can be delivered.

Section Four: Outputs and Deliverables

Institutional Approaches to Curriculum Design Programme

What outputs are you expecting to arise from the project? Please provide an up-to-date list. This should include a short paragraph summarizing expected technical outputs/system integrations, or any unanticipated outputs.

See attached outputs document.

Please also provide a brief summary on how the project has engaged with the Design Studio to date.

There has been a delay (due to illness) in uploading the OER resources to the Design Studio as these are still being extracted from the module and made standalone. The intention is to do this by September 2011, and include the "how to" resource being produced for the undergraduate refocus. After that creating the InfoKit within the Design Studio will be a major focus of the project.

Please indicate clearly what outputs, if any, have been produced in this reporting period. Include any outputs, including interim and work in progress that might be of interest to other projects or external audiences. Please describe and provide details of where these can be found, e.g. URLs or attached documents etc. Please note which of these if any have been uploaded to the design studio.

See attached document.

Section Five: Evaluation

Provide details of progress during this reporting period in terms of the development and implementation of the project evaluation plan. Include what activities you have undertaken (including details of the methods used), what you feel has worked, what has not, and any aspects you have changed. Please provide links to any relevant materials (e.g. evaluation reports, tools, blog posts, team reflections, etc)

Detailed interviews have been conducted with the staff running the Sports Management cohort. These have been transcribed and thematic analysis is currently in progress but a number of initial observations can be made. Firstly, students are creative about their use of technology to support the coaching process, and a number of different platforms were used successfully. The choice was largely determined by the group's own current practices. Secondly, students indicated that they extended their use of coaching beyond the assessed requirements of the module, both into supporting work placement and supporting other modules. Thirdly, there is some evidence that engaging in the coaching process helps students improve their confidence.

These observations are supported by feedback from students themselves and by the submitted assessments which are being analysed by Nick Halafihi. These include video evidence of the benefits of coaching. One of the students did a joint presentation of this experience at the ELESIG/JISC symposium on Engaging Students as Agents of Change in Exeter in April 2011. A video was made of this presentation for SpringBoard TV.

Exit surveys of students withdrawing from the PLC module were sent out but only two responses were received. This is disappointing but not unexpected. Evidence from these responses supports our observations on the assessments and informal feedback, that the coaching element of the module was very much appreciated but there was a concern about the technology used. Students felt confused by having to learn to use several technologies that were new to them. We are therefore examining how we can make use of platforms that students are already familiar with, or integrate all support on a single platform (e.g. an ePortfolio).

Please give details of the key evaluation activities you will undertake in the next 6 month period. Please tell us the rationale/purpose for activity, planned method, participants, and timing.

We have a number of evaluation activities planned in the next 6 months. Firstly we will be running a qualitative study to explore how different technologies impact upon the quality and effectiveness of a coaching session. Coaching will be arranged with the same pairings but using a series of different technologies (face to face, Elluminate, phone, Skype). Coaches and coachees will be interviewed after each session.

Further work is needed to evaluate the activity of peer coaching within the Sports Management cohort. This will take two forms. Firstly a more detailed analysis of the submitted assessments on the

Institutional Approaches to Curriculum Design Programme

coaching process will be undertaken. Secondly focus groups will be undertaken with representatives of the student cohort. These will take place in October.

We will be evaluating the impact of staff development workshops, particularly with regard to the influence they have had on staff practice. The final workshops (in the two series of four) will be recorded (with permission of the participants) and will focus on discussions of how staff will use coaching in their own Faculties. These recordings will then be used to develop a plan for supporting staff to take this forward. In addition feedback sheets will be issued to participants to identify the most and least effective parts of the workshop series to feed into future deliveries and the InfoKit.

Please note that we expect these evaluation activities to produce lessons and outcomes for reporting under section 5 of future interim reports and for your final report or final evaluation report.

Section Six: Outcomes and Lessons Learned

Outline any emerging outcomes or lessons that have been learned during this reporting period through your research, evaluation and pilot activities which could be of interest to others outside of your institution, and identify any emerging themes. Please be aware that these reports will be made available publicly, so please indicate clearly any lessons that you wish NOT to share more widely. Also outline any new ideas or opportunities that have emerged.

We have further evidence that our assumptions about the digital literacy and confidence of students were unfounded. When planning online delivery we would suggest minimising the number of different technologies used and providing students with as integrated experience as possible.

When given the choice, students are resourceful in the way they adapt the technologies they are familiar with, and that they use regularly, to support new activities. In our experience, allowing this choice was much more effective than providing new technologies, even when the new technologies were, on the surface, better suited to the task.

Engaging with students as partners (as opposed to recipients) in a process is motivating for all concerned and can lead to new initiatives that would not otherwise happen. Our planned student ambassador programme is being developed as a direct result of engaging with students as peer-coaches and co-presenters. The intention is that the students drive the promotion of coaching to other students.

Changes in institutional priority have the potential to have serious impact on projects. We need to be flexible enough to change direction and adapt to new contexts, even to the point of adapting primary goals. Such changes are unsettling but can lead to significant new opportunities.

Unexpected events such as staff illness or leaving are risks that should be taken seriously and the involvement of a network of staff helps to mitigate the impact of this when it happens.

When thinking about outcomes and lessons you might: (a) revisit your original challenge and identify anything you have learned that is helping your institution to address this challenge; (b) revisit any mindmaps or other representations you have of the problem space in which you are working and identify any changes; (c) revisit your original research or evaluation questions and identify any areas in which your understanding has changed, or been enriched, qualified, or confirmed.

The change in institutional direction has meant that we have had to adapt our initial plans to work within the new priorities, namely the undergraduate curriculum refocus. This has been challenging but as the structure of the curriculum refocus has become clearer, there are obvious areas where PC3 can make a significant contribution. The project is on target to meet its overall goal of embedding

Institutional Approaches to Curriculum Design Programme

coaching practice in supporting personalised curriculum, but our vision of what this will look like has changed considerably. Our original vision of a student enrolling on an entirely customisable course and being supported by coaching to populate it according to their needs, has been replaced by one of students on every undergraduate course having the opportunity to reflect throughout on their personal development and to receive support for this process and its implications through coaching.

Section Seven: Communication and Dissemination Activities

Provide details of any activities or events which have involved liaison or collaboration outside the project consortium, including key project stakeholders. Attach or provide URLs for any appropriate dissemination or presentation materials.

Internal events

- 8th Month Learning and Teaching series (8th December 2010 - presentation)
- Leeds Met PGCHE conference (16th February 2011 - presentation)
- Leeds Met FLAP conference (25th May attended)
- Leeds Met Centre for Academic Practice and Research in Internationalisation (CAPRI) seminars (18th March, 18th May, 13th June 2011 – attended)
- Leeds Met Employability conference (10th June - attended)
- Staff development sessions on coaching (7th June, 10th June, 14th June, 17th June 2011 - presentation)

External events

- JISC 2011 Conference (Liverpool 14th-15th March 2011 - presentation)
- ELESIG Students as Agents of Change Symposium (Exeter 27-28th April 2011 - presentation)
- JISC programme meeting (11th May 2011 - attended)
- ELESIG Elluminate seminar (7th June 2011 - presentation)
- Blended Learning Conference (Hertfordshire 15th-16th June – attended)
- Stafford (Enable) hosted a Cluster meeting on 26th May 2011 with Bolton (CoEducate), Manchester Met (SRC) and Leeds Met (PC3). A previous meeting planned at Leeds Met on 4th February 2011-06-20 was cancelled due to the project director's illness. This has been rescheduled for September 2011.

Please also provide an update on your communication methods, including project blogs, twitter, YouTube etc. and discuss their effectiveness.

The project has continued to use a combination of email, blogs and face-to-face meetings to promote communication within the group. For external communication we use these approaches but have also used Facebook, Twitter and YouTube to share project activities. For the final year of the project we intend to use Elluminate more to allow more flexibility in team meetings.

Discuss any strategies you have found useful for engaging stakeholders at this stage of the project.

We continue to contribute to internal staff development and external conferences. The hands on workshops have been most useful for engaging colleagues. In the 8th Month session, for example, we provided scenarios of student conversations that staff might encounter and facilitated a discussion around coaching questions that might be appropriate to these. The records of these discussions are now being used to inform development of the staff development resources for the InfoKit.

It has been useful also to attend a number of related events, such as the Leeds Met Employability conference, which gives opportunity to discuss the project informally with different audiences.

Outline any publicity the project received during the reporting period.

As well as the conferences, symposia and internal meetings already listed, the project has been regularly featured in the Leeds Met internal bulletin. Our co-presentation to the ELESIG symposium with one of our students was also reported in the Vice Chancellor's newsletter.

Section Eight: Collaboration and Support

Institutional Approaches to Curriculum Design Programme

Briefly summarise contact with the programme manager, critical friends and support team, formal or informal links with other projects, programme-related activities, and ways in which you have been able to influence the development of the programme.

The project team have been actively involved in all programme meetings, additional meetings with the support project and all cluster meetings. We have also attended meetings beyond the programme, at the invitation of the support team and/or critical friend. The programme manager has been particularly helpful in providing support for the project through the challenges of the past 6 months.

Do you have any specific needs, requests or suggestions for support?

It may be useful to have a meeting with the Director of Centre for Learning and Teaching, the Heads of Curriculum Design, Employability, Academic Staff Development, and eLearning (when they are appointed) and, if available, the DVC Student Experience, to emphasise the support of JISC for the project's contribution to the curriculum refocus at Leeds Met.

How have you found the process of working with your critical friend and Cluster? Please highlight what has worked well and what hasn't worked as well, and any recommendations for how to improve the process.

The Cluster meetings continue to prove helpful and informative particularly regarding areas of similarity over e-portfolio usage, problems in gathering and presenting university wide course and module information, and issues surrounding internal university management and organisational change. We have proposed Professor Mark Stubbs as keynote for a planning day on curriculum refocus, to talk about his experience of curriculum restructure at Manchester Met. This proposal is still under consideration by the organising team but it is hoped that it will lead to some high level sharing of practice between our institutions.

Section Nine: Financial Statement

Total Grant	£400,000	Duration of project	Sept 2008 – May 2012
Reporting Period	November 2010 – April 2011		

Budget Headings	Total budget allocated	Expenditure this reporting period	Total expenditure to date	Further information
Staff				
Travel & Subsistence				
Hardware /				

Institutional Approaches to Curriculum Design Programme

software				
Evaluation and dissemination activities				
Other (please specify) Consultancy – John Gray 138 days at £350 Consultancy – learning resources, coaching and specialist support Consultancy – software, partners, employers				

Proposed budget revision

We have adjusted the budget allocations across the project to reflect the changes in activity and priority. The main change is a shift in funds from consultancy, travel and hardware/software to staffing. If acceptable these will be the budget allocation figures used in the final year of the project.

Budget Headings	Revised budget allocation	Further information
Staff		
Travel & Subsistence		
Hardware / software		
Evaluation and dissemination activities		
Other (please specify) ██████████ ██████████)		
Consultancy – learning resources, coaching and specialist support		

Consultancy – software, partners, employers	
------------------------------------------------	--

Checklist:

Before you return this report:

- Ensure that your project webpage on the JISC site is up to date and contains the correct information. Attach details of any required amendments to this report. Project webpages can be found from: www.jisc.ac.uk/curriculumdesign
- If there have been any changes to the original project plan and/or work packages, ensure that amended copies of the relevant sections of your project plan are attached to this report.
- Identify and name any areas within this report that you'd like removed before the report is made public (*see below)

***Please note** the interim reports will be made available on the JISC website and on the Circle site with the budgetary information removed. We recognise that projects may occasionally address very sensitive issues. We would like you to present as full a picture in this report as you can as the lessons you learn are valuable to us. We assure you that any issues you identify as confidential are removed before the report is made public. Where such issues do represent valuable lessons for the community we will involve you in further discussion as to how they could be passed on without identifying institutions or individuals.