



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 | Coeducate | | |
| Project Title | | | |
| Start Date | September 2008 | End Date | June 2012 |
| Lead Institution | University of Bolton | | |
| Project Director | Professor Bill Olivier | | |
| Project Manager & contact details | Stephen Powell s.j.powell@bolton.ac.uk Tel: 01204 903669 | | |
| Partner Institutions | None | | |
| Project Web URL | http://coeducate.bolton.ac.uk/ | | |
| Programme Name (and number) | <i>Institutional approaches to curriculum design, Circular 05/08</i> | | |
| Programme Manager | Sarah Knight | | |

| Document Name | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------|---|
| Document Title | Coeducate Interim Report October 2010 | | |
| Reporting Period | <i>October 2011 - May 2011</i> | | |
| Author(s) & project role | Stephen Powell (Project manager) William Olivier (Project director) | | |
| Date | 1 st June 2011 | Filename | |
| URL | | | |
| Access | <input type="checkbox"/> Project and JISC internal | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General dissemination |

| Document History | | |
|------------------|---------------------------|----------|
| Version | Date | Comments |
| 1 | 1 st June 2011 | |
| | | |
| | | |

Interim Reporting Template

Project Name: Coeducate, University of Bolton

Report compiled by: Stephen Powell

With contributions from: Bill Olivier

Reporting period: October 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.

This section gives a short history of the Codeucate project, from 2008 to the present. We, provide an overview of the initial proposal made to the Institutional Approaches to Curriculum Design programme and our progress in respect of this. A brief explanation of the current context at the University sets the backdrop for the more detailed reporting of activities undertaken and our planned activities for the final year of the project.

In our initial project to JISC (June 2008), we emphasised the radical nature of the change in provision that the University of Bolton was seeking to make. Part of this transformation, included a move to a 'Just in Time' approach to curriculum design and validation using the Professional Development Awards and the Interdisciplinary, Inquiry Based Learning (IDIBL) curriculum design frameworks, both initiatives were aimed at work-based learners and designed to address the needs of the learner and their organisation through negotiated approaches utilising in-work and experiential learning.

Our original project activity, as outlined in the bid, was to:

1. develop and test our IDIBL framework for growing employer and learner led curricula;
2. ensure the availability of appropriate software tools and electronic learning support packages to enable staff to adopt this model when planning and developing employer focused curricula;
3. establish an operational model in each of our Schools of at least one CPD programme per School (6 programmes) incorporating the IDIBL curriculum framework supported by a University-wide technological platform, covering a wide range of employment sectors.

(Coeducate proposal, 2008)

[The IDIBL framework](#) was successfully developed, validated and released under a creative commons license. The framework as a model for teaching, learning and assessment, together with staff's experience of implementing the framework on an institution-wide basis, have now been evaluated, with one paper currently in press and another out for review. A third paper out for review critiques the current working practices in higher education against the working practices successfully used for developing and delivering inquiry-based learning online. These papers set out to identify strategic choices institutions need to make if they want to implement innovative curriculum designs.

We have developed two prototype tools, a widget and a 'block' for Moodle and have joined the project evaluation for the [LDSE \(Learning Design Support Environment\)](#), which builds on the findings of the [London Pedagogical Planner](#) JISC project.

Institutional Approaches to Curriculum Design Programme

The complexity of provisioning software tools to enable staff to develop programmes has emerged as a key finding of the project, in particular, issues of sustainability beyond the lifetime of the project. At a strategic level, this is part of a broader issue faced by the University in supporting and ensuring ongoing maintenance and development of an increasingly diverse software base. We are very conscious of the repeated failure to ensure that software developed in projects is successfully embedded and sustained within institutions. Our work in the Technology Infrastructure Committee aims both to address these issues at Bolton, and to provide insights for the wider sector.

Programmes initially identified in the project bid for development using the IDIBL framework are listed below with a brief comment on their progress.

| Programme | Progress |
|---|--|
| M.Sc. in Learning Technology | Validated and running. |
| Foundation Degree for Teaching Awards | Validated, but not run due to staffing constraints. |
| CPD Diploma and Degree Framework in Leadership and Management | Not validated. |
| Foundation Degree/Degree in Urban Regeneration | Validated as Foundation, Bachelors & Masters Degree, and running. |
| M.Sc. Health Professional Framework | Not validated. |
| M.Sc. in IT Service Management | Currently undergoing development bringing together three Masters programmes into together to offer a work-based route. |

Included in our project proposal was the desire to undertake a complete review of the course development process within the university, from identifying curricular need to validation, in order to identify how this process should be streamlined to allow more dynamic and responsive curriculum processes. Following the baseline activity in year 1 of the project, it emerged that, although the documentation required was onerous, the validation process itself, at that time, was 'fit for purpose' for the University (but see point 4. under Current Context below).

The project aims and objectives for the following three years as detailed in the [project plan](#), based on the first year's Baseline Report, were as described below.

Aim

Within the life cycle of the Coeducate project, develop a technologically supported approach to programme development that is efficient, agile and responsive to purchaser and learner needs while protecting the rigour and quality of the existing validation mechanisms.

Objectives:

- 1. understanding the curriculum development problem at UoB;*
- 2. identify tools and processes for course development & curriculum design across the UoB & with stakeholders;*
- 3. implementation of new tools and processes across the UoB;*
- 4. raise awareness & build capacity of staff to critically examine and develop work-based curricula across the UoB;*
- 5. support staff to embed inquiry-based approaches & negotiated learning in work-based programmes offered by the UoB.*

(Coeducate Project Plan, 2009)

The activity areas in the initial proposal were focussed on 5 objectives and in so doing emphasised the uses of technology to support course development. From a validation viewpoint, the aim was to make the current validation process 'slicker' but without radically changing the process or documentary requirements, but to build capability and capacity for the creation of innovative curriculum designs.

Although the University of Bolton and Higher Education context has changes significantly since the outset of the project, the objectives outlined above remain valid. However, the changing context for higher education as whole and the University of Bolton in particular have lead to new opportunities and challenges for the project.

Current context

In preparation and response to the changing fees arrangements coming into force in September 2012, the University is undergoing significant organisational and efficiency reforms that are relevant to the Coeducate project and include:

1. a move from four Schools to three Faculties;
2. selected courses closed to new recruits for September 2011;
3. development of a Core Curriculum Framework which sets out a set of requirements against which all courses must be re-validated by April 2012;
4. and to develop a new more efficient validation process and more effective and focused supporting documentation.

The Coeducate project is deeply involved in points 3 and 4 above in terms of input into, and supporting innovation to meet pedagogical requirements, the generic use of technology to support business processes, in support of the development of a new validation process, now seen to be needed in light of the changing circumstance.

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.

1. Understanding the curriculum development problem at UoB:

- contributing to the work of implementing the new Core Curriculum Framework group including the provision of [analytics](#) to aid the decision making process;
- Archimate modeling of current and to-be curriculum development process
- work on the new validation process;
- and work on the [Technology Infrastructure Committee](#) to realise better IT governance;
- development, delivery and initial evaluation of 21st Century Open Learning Project exploring new models and approaches for higher education initially through a trial initiative with Shaanxi Normal University.

2. Identify tools and processes for course development & curriculum design across the UoB & with stakeholders:

- planning for evaluation of LDSE, when ready;
- [evaluation](#) of document & workflow tools for support of validation processes.

3. Implementation of new tools and processes across the UoB:

- Moodle module block, now on hold pending new developer staffing arrangements;
- development prototype [8LEM Wookie Widget](#), also on hold pending new developer staffing arrangements.

4. Raise awareness & build capacity of staff to critically examine and develop work-based curricula across the UoB:

- initiation of the [Innovation Support Network](#) with staff in the Business and Creative Technology School, using approaches such as the [Business Model Canvas](#).

5. Support staff to embed inquiry-based approaches & negotiated learning in work-based programmes offered by the UoB

- on-going support of staff wishing to adopt and adept the IDIBL framework.

Steering Group meeting, 9th June 2011

The SG meeting discussed the activities of the project, the significant challenges, and staffing arrangements.

It was agreed that the project should focus on the following areas for the time remaining:

1. developing the innovation support networks;
2. working to develop a new course development and validation process;
3. supporting the re-validation process;
4. implementing technological approaches in support of the above;
5. appoint a full-time technical developer and identify .7 from existing university staff to support point 1 above.

Work Packages 1 & 2 Completed:

1. Review of current processes and practice
Milestone: Report on baseline data, incorporating models of existing processes
2. Understanding the initial issue or challenge and identifying the changes desired by the end of the project.
Milestone: Working document specifying requirements for process change and supporting actions.

Current work packages

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).

| | Earliest start date | Latest completi on date | Outputs (clearly indicate deliverables & reports in bold) | Milestone | Resp. |
|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|--------------|
| WORKPACKAGE 3: Planning and implementing innovations in curriculum design processes in order to realise the desired changes. | | | | | |
| 12. Integrated course development system: this will integrate a number of different technological platforms at the UoB as well as incorporate other tools to help academics plan and validate programmes | April 2010 | April 2012 | New technological and process models. Report on lessons learned from integration of technological platforms. On hold, pending new developer. | April 2012 <i>(originally Dec 2010)</i> | WO |

Institutional Approaches to Curriculum Design Programme

| | | | | | |
|--|--------------|------------|--|--|----|
| collaboratively including with employers. | | | | | |
| 13. A number of discoverable and interoperable learning technology tools (widgets) that would enhance course design. Now likely to be achieved in part through the development of a Moodle Block. | Apr 2010 | Dec 2011 | A selection of W3C widgets that can be played using the Wookie Server, exact number dependent upon 'granularity' of widget functionality. Moodle Block module design tool. On hold, pending new developer. | April 2012 (<i>originally Dec 2010</i>) | WO |
| 14a. Open learning course on "Planning and Developing Distance Learning Courses", level 7, 20 credits | Mar 2010 | June 2010 | Materials for online handbook. | Delivered | SP |
| 15. Curriculum development online handbook / resources as an outcome of course above and other activities. | July 2010 | April 2012 | Site on Moodle for project outputs other resources to support curriculum development. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writers Lab Model • Open Learning Course Model – Designing Learning for the 21st Century. | April 2012 (original Dec 2010) | SP |
| 16. Develop Innovation Support Network. | January 2011 | July 2011 | Evaluative Report on initiative. Initiated. First meetings held. Negotiating for additional university staff. Planning continuation post-project. | October 2011 | WO |
| WORKPACKAGE 4: Piloting and evaluation of the new processes. | | | | | |
| 17. Pilot cohort for Masters in Learning with Technology | Sept 2008 | June 2010 | Research paper on the IDIBL curriculum framework. | Delivered | SP |
| 18. Validate suite of courses around the theme of Regeneration and Sustainable Communities | Sept 2008 | Nov 2008 | Courses validated. | Delivered | SP |
| 19. Pilot cohort for Regeneration and Sustainable Communities | Feb 2009 | July 2011 | Research paper on the IDIBL curriculum framework. | Delivered | SP |
| WORKPACKAGE 5: Embedding the innovations and planning for sustainability | Sept 2011 | July 2012 | Planning final year Innovation Support Network activities to be carried out with the University's Learning Enhancement and Professional Development Unit in preparation to transfer at project end. | | |

Institutional Approaches to Curriculum Design Programme

| | | | | | |
|--|----------|--------------|---|------------------|----|
| | | | Working with university's Quality Assurance and Enhancement to develop and embed new validation processes and requirements. Working with university's Head of IT & Libraries to develop a sustainable approach to process support, piloted through the validation process. | | |
| WORKPACKAGE 6: Dissemination and collaboration | | July 2012 | Ongoing. Blog, conferences, and collaboration with LDSE. | | SP |
| WORKPACKAGE 7: Project management | | | | | |
| 20. Project website | Nov 2008 | July 2012 | Project website comprising evaluative, reflective posts and project outputs http://coeducate.bolton.ac.uk . | Ongoing delivery | SP |
| 21. Project planning documentation | Oct 2008 | Jan 2009 | Draft project plan. | Delivered | SP |
| 22. Project planning documentation | Jan 2008 | April 2009 | Project plan. | Delivered | SP |
| 23. End of year 1 project progress report | | July 2009 | Progress report. | Delivered | SP |
| 24. Mid year 2 project progress report | | Jan 2010 | Progress report. | Delivered | SP |
| 25. End of year 2 project progress report | | July 2010 | Progress report. | Delivered | SP |
| 26. Mid year 3 project report | | October 2010 | Progress report. | Delivered | SP |
| 27. End of year 3 project progress report | | June 2011 | Progress report. | Delivered | SP |

Staffing

The project's developer was head-hunted and has left the University employment.

For academic year 2011/12, we have identified .7 staff to be employed by the project and are advertising for a 1.0 FT developer.

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.

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

Risks

Live issue: Inability to appoint sufficiently capable technical developer and timely for project completion

Institutional Approaches to Curriculum Design Programme

Mitigation: Currently advertising and hoping to appoint new developer by October 2012. Need to meet with VC to overcome salary constraints imposed by HERA.

Live issue: Retirement of Dean of Academic Quality Assurance and Enhancement Unit

Mitigation: The newly appointed Academic Registrar has taken over the responsibilities of the Dean of Academic Quality Assurance and Enhancement and we are working with the Pro-VC Academic as well as the new post-holder to develop the revised validation process.

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

At senior management level, the University has decided to initiate a new curriculum development process and, at our prompting, a revised validation process, to be in place for academic year 2012. This offers considerable opportunities for the project as we are in a position to propose changes identified over the previous three years to improve the quality of course development and reduce the perceived bureaucracy. This work was ruled out-of-scope following the baseline review, but now offers a way to offer further concrete outcomes as a result of the project.

Section Four: Outputs and Deliverables

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.

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

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

| Anticipated outputs | Outputs |
|---|--|
| 1. Description of technology and process underpinning an integrated course development system including lessons learned from integration of technological platforms. | |
| 2. working on production of 8LEM widget to support course design | |
| | Millwood, M., Powell, S., in press. A cybernetic analysis of a university-wide curriculum innovation, Conclusions . Draft of full paper . |
| | Models and examples of curriculum approaches with particular emphasis on employer engagement. Outputs funded by Coeducate: 1. WRITERS' LAB @BOLTON 2010 ; 2. Developing a sustainable business model for open learning . |
| 3. Moodle, module design block to offer contextualised support for module authoring activities. This will have an interface tool to enable easy update & customisation with | |

Institutional Approaches to Curriculum Design Programme

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| minimal technical support. | |
| 4. Report on implementation of Work/document flow tool to support validation process. | |
| 5. Evaluations of capability & capacity building initiatives. | Ongoing blog reports. |

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.)

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.

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.

Using the realistic evaluation approach described in previous documentation, the project team have established a summary of the evaluation strategy based on the key programme elements in the following table:

Design matrix for Coeducate project realistic evaluation

| Programme elements | Term of anticipated impact | Unit of analysis | Research strategy | Theory-development | Opportunity for experimental control | Techniques | Result |
|--|----------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1.IDIBL framework for work-focussed learning | Long term | Community | Action research | High | None | Quantitative / qualitative | Theory formation & development |
| 2. Programme design tools involving process change | Medium | Community | Action research | Medium | None | Quantitative / qualitative | Theory formation & development |
| 3. Innovation Support Network | Medium | Community | Participatory action research | Medium | None | Quantitative / qualitative | Theory formation & development |

Data collection activities in the next six months

| Programme elements | Proposed activity | Timing | Progress & activity |
|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| Programme validation support and & module design tools involving process change. | User group testing of LDSE | 1 day session, 21 st July | The LDSE tool will be evaluated as part of their formal project evaluation, simultaneously being used as an activity to collect data on the Widget and Moodle design block. |

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.

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 mind maps 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.

| Indicative project outcomes: | Lessons learned |
|--|--|
| 1. Rich picture of the curriculum development process at UoB & outlining possible strategic interventions. | |
| 2. Amended and improved technical systems to support curriculum development. | The SOA approach being pursued at the UoB by this and other projects is yielding results as exemplified by the linking of three separate technology systems explained elsewhere. In a relatively small institution with limited resources, this approach offers best chance of being able to respond to new opportunities and challenges required of our technology. |
| 3. Simplified and streamlined curriculum development processes. | Separating the academic, business case and administrative aspects into different layers that in principle have their own validation consideration and potentially processes. |
| 4. Increased capacity for development of curriculum relevant to purchaser needs including delivery, teaching and assessment approaches | The University has many staff who are creative in their thinking about and designing new courses and approaches for learning particularly those who are new to higher education teaching. The challenge is how to put in place structures, systems and processes that make it possible for these approaches to flourish and not be marginalised by the operational pressures that tend to dominate and exclude innovation. |
| 5. Increased employer understanding of and engagement with Higher Education in the development of work-based programmes of learning. | Learning: where employer is paying for courses, engagement is already carried out; where the work-based student is paying, the student has to carry out the employer negotiations. |
| 6. New courses that enable new groups of students to access Higher Education. | In trying to promote radical innovative curriculum designs that also require different capabilities and working practices of staff, it is questionable whether the existing structures and processes within an HEI can be made sufficiently accommodating for them to operate effectively. |
| 7. Use of inquiry-based and negotiated learning approaches across the UoB work-based learning portfolio. | For radical innovations, either wholly owned subsidiaries/ business units, or new, completely independent institutions are needed, without the constraints of existing HEI processes and culture. |

Section Seven: Communication and Dissemination Activities

Project blog <http://coeducate.bolton.ac.uk/> remains the primary route for dissemination activities.

The uncertainty created by the changes in response to 2012 has created in some cases a more open climate where colleagues are prepared to consider different approaches and ways of doing things. This clearly isn't something that we engineered, but it enables us to have conversations around the activities of the project.

[Presentation](#) at OER 11, Manchester, May 2011

Section Eight: Collaboration and Support

Cluster meetings have worked well as a means of sharing ideas and keeping up-to-date with sector wide changes and the pattern of three sessions per year remains about right. Joint paper at the ALT-C conference will hopefully serve as good vehicle to pull some of experiences and ideas together. When contacted, the support team have been responsive in dealing with any issues or requests made.

We have also had a series of meetings and exchanges with the LDSE project to plan evaluation.

Section Nine: Financial Statement

In this section you should detail the expenditure of the project so far. Against the budget headings you should set out the expenditure for the reporting period, noting any significant over/under spend giving reasons for this. You should also state the total expenditure to date against each budget heading. The table below is designed to help this reporting process. Additional budget headings may be added to fit an individual project's budget. Projects may find it more appropriate to use a spreadsheet to report financial information.

| | | | |
|-------------------------|--|----------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Total Grant | £400,000 | Duration of project | 45 months (3 years, 9 mths) |
| Reporting Period | 1 November 2010 - 30 April 2011 | | |

| Budget Headings | Total budget allocated | Expenditure this reporting period | Total expenditure to date | Further information |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Staff | | | | |
| Travel & Subsistence | | | | |
| Equipment | | | | |
| Dissemination activities | | | | |
| Evaluation activities | | | | |
| Other (please specify) | | | | |

Checklist:

Before you return this report:

Institutional Approaches to Curriculum Design Programme

- ❖ 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.