



## Project Document Cover Sheet

Project Information			
<b>Project Acronym</b>	PC3		
<b>Project Title</b>	Personalised Curriculum Creation through Coaching		
<b>Start Date</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> September 2008	<b>End Date</b>	31 <sup>st</sup> May 2012
<b>Lead Institution</b>	Leeds Metropolitan University		
<b>Project Director</b>	Prof. Janet Finlay		
<b>Project Manager &amp; contact details</b>	John Gray, 45 Snowdon Road, Eccles, Manchester, M30 9AS. email <a href="mailto:johnrichard.gray@Gmail.com">johnrichard.gray@Gmail.com</a> Home: 0161 789 3971 Mob: 07931 674450		
<b>Partner Institutions</b>	None		
<b>Project Web URL</b>	<a href="http://www.pc3.org.uk">http://www.pc3.org.uk</a>		
<b>Programme Name (and number)</b>	<i>Curriculum Design</i>		
<b>Programme Manager</b>	Sarah Knight		

Document Name			
<b>Document Title</b>	Project Plan		
<b>Reporting Period</b>			
<b>Author(s) &amp; project role</b>	John Gray – Project Manager, Janet Finlay – Project Director		
<b>Date</b>	6th February 2009	<b>Filename</b>	PC3_ProjectPlan.pdf
<b>URL</b>	<i>if document is posted on project web site</i>		
<b>Access</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Project and JISC internal		<input type="checkbox"/> General dissemination

Document History		
Version	Date	Comments
1.0	6th February 2009	Draft project plan submitted to JISC
1.1	16 <sup>th</sup> March 2009	Revised following feedback from JISC
1.2	28 <sup>th</sup> April 2009	Revised following feedback from JISC – Risk table extended to include monitoring, stakeholder table extended to include engage/consult/inform column, evaluation plan revised



## **JISC Project Plan**

### ***Overview of Project***

#### **1. Background**

##### **Outline Project Description**

Leeds Met is committed to an agenda of flexible, quality provision that is student-centred and responsive to changing needs. A strategic priority is widening participation through an increase in part-time work-based learners, both those new to education, as highlighted by Leitch, and those enhancing existing qualifications through postgraduate study. Critical to this are links with employers and partners, such as the Carnegie Leaders in Learning Partnership and the Regional University Network, and developing a “study for leisure” market, reflecting Atherton’s conceptions of curriculum quadrants of competence, Continuing Professional Development and learning for the love of it. Traditional curriculum development is not necessarily appropriate for addressing the needs of these different markets. Most current provision still follows a content-driven approach where learners sign up for a specified delivery at a set time and place. Its development rarely involves the learner and only superficially involves employers and professional bodies. In contrast, part-time work-based learners need curricula to be adapted to their individual learning and personal needs, in terms of both content and delivery.

A number of initiatives within the institution have started a move to more flexible curricula. Changes to institutional calendar, regulations and validation procedures have been made through the HEFCE-funded Flexible Learning Developments project. These have enabled exemplar flexible curricula for example, within the Institute of Northern Studies. Our Regional University Network partners have validation procedures for provision that is focused on learning outcomes rather than specific content. Our external partnerships have led to accredited awards that include professional body and/or employer-provided content, for example, from Nortel, Red Hat, Apple and the National College for School Leadership. In addition, marketing and prospectus development has already moved from a Faculty-bounded approach to a subject-oriented grouping of deliveries across the institution.

However, although significant progress has been made, there is still more to be done, to facilitate genuinely flexible and personalized curriculum development. Learners need support to identify their learning needs and ways in which these can be met. This will require self-assessment and mapping of skills and knowledge against appropriate competency frameworks. It will also require guidance in matching provision to need. This will be provided through coaching. Coaching is a non-directive process used to support learners during their own unique learning journey. It aims to enable learners to see what they are doing more clearly and discover their own ways to improve. Skilled coaches do this by helping learners to explore their challenges, problems and goals; providing an objective view of their actions and establishing a joint commitment to action to move learners forward. As a result, a learner will generate her/his own best solutions and develop skills and maturity as an autonomous learner. Coaching is therefore highly appropriate for part-time work-based learners, who need to be able to take ownership of their learning as a life-long process.

The cross-institutional focus of the approach being taken means coaches, learners, employers and professional bodies will need to review the content of courses and modules, access to which is currently restricted within the Virtual Learning Environment (VLE). These barriers need to be lifted through a more open access mechanism, for example based around the University’s repository.

Project Acronym: PC3  
Version: 1.2  
Contact: John Gray  
Date: 28<sup>th</sup> April 2009

The choices made by learners will have implications for the timetabling, resource allocation, assessment and financial processes of the delivering Faculty and will need to be captured and integrated into university administrative and student record systems. Learners will wish to negotiate their way through available provision to suit their own timescales and demands and the requirements of their employers and professional bodies. Curriculum design will therefore need to allow for face-to-face, blended and distance deliveries within the same modules. Processes for new curriculum design must incorporate this and course teams will need support and guidance on how to achieve this. Deployment processes will need to recognise and support activity outside the classroom context. Funding models will need to be adjusted to allow for this approach and to support the role of coach.

Assessment, learning and teaching will need to embrace and, in some cases, accredit informal, as well as formal, learning and provide opportunities for the effective accreditation of work-based learning, through flexible and personalised assessment. Personalised evidence-based assessment, for example via e-portfolio, will need to be integrated into the University's assessment strategy.

Some staff do not recognise the challenges of sustainability, which require new markets and widening participation, particularly if their current targets are being met. Such staff need to be convinced of the benefits of flexible curricula through successful case studies from practice, and to be supported by clear processes, training and appropriate technology. Staff are also largely untrained in coaching and will require staff development to enable this.

This project will build on the outcomes of several JISC funded projects in which core team members are currently engaged. These include Planet (Pattern Language Network for Web 2.0 Learning) and the institutional object repository projects Streamline (Integrating Repository Function with Work Practice: Tools to Facilitate Personal E-Administration) and PERSoNA (Personal Engagement with Repositories through Social Network Applications). The repository is a central component of the PC3 project as this will store the objects that coaches and coachees will review, navigate and select from to devise a personalised curriculum. The tools developed under Streamline and PERSoNA will support and facilitate these activities and enable access to the repository both on and off the Leeds Met campus. The methodology and pattern framework developed in the Planet project will help staff designing new and amended curricula to record, and be aware of, successful practice relevant to the problems facing them in this radical departure from the traditional curriculum design approach.

## 2. Aims and Objectives

The aim of the PC3 project is to develop and evaluate an innovative coaching-based framework to support personalized curriculum creation, to be embedded in assessment, learning and teaching practice. This framework will incorporate the processes, documentation, training and technological support needed to implement personalised curriculum creation on an institutional scale.

This will be achieved through the following specific objectives:

1. To analyse existing curriculum design processes and identify requirements for change and enhancement.
2. To design and document a new personalized curriculum design process based on coaching.
3. To develop and document a prototype technology infrastructure to support this process, including integration where required and feasible with other university systems.
4. To develop staff development resources and opportunities to provide coaching skills.
5. To pilot and evaluate the PC framework (2-4 above) with at least 4 cohorts of students from different discipline areas, refining the framework on each iteration.
6. To review the institutional adoption of the PC3 outcomes and their influence on the university Assessment, Learning and Teaching strategy.
7. To make policy recommendations to the institution on future developments to support flexible curriculum development.
8. To disseminate our progress and findings to the wider community and engage in support and synthesis project activities.

### 3. Overall Approach

The PC3 project will follow an iterative, learner-centric development methodology, with an emphasis on stakeholder engagement and piloting through real case studies. The main piloting phases of the project will be preceded by a significant period of review and planning and will be followed by a focus on embedding and dissemination.

The main cohort participating during the first year of the project are students on the Carnegie Leaders in Learning programme. Students on the Leaders in Learning programme were chosen as they will already have experienced a form of coaching in their studies, they are professionals in the field of learning and will be able to reflect on both their experience of the approach as well as its effectiveness, and, their current mode of learning is seated in a distributed and distance oriented context. Once the process has been piloted with this group, additional cohorts from the Regional University, Faculty of Health, Institute of Northern Studies and Faculty of Sport and Education will be included, based on their readiness and needs.

The PC3 project will pilot the necessary processes and software for the particular cohorts selected, and will work throughout with the necessary services within the institution (registry, technical and learning services, procurement) to ensure that the approach developed through the project can be adopted more widely within the institution. The scope of the project is to develop the complete framework within a limited set of cohorts, as pilots and exemplars. The project will not be able to support wholesale adoption of the framework across the institution directly, but will instead provide support and resources to allow other colleagues to roll it out more widely as the project progresses.

The project team will work with commercial suppliers to embed the necessary tools, using existing software where possible. The choice not to develop software in-house is deliberate: while recognizing the importance of appropriate technology to support the framework, the project team needs to be able to focus on user engagement, staff development, process change management and evaluation, and does not want to become sidetracked with technical issues. Any technology must fit with existing products and must be scalable to a large institution. Initial investigations into available products has identified MyKnowledgeMap as offering all the tools required by the project, together with the capability to integrate with our existing repository and VLE.

The critical success factors for the project are the adoption of the PC3 framework and approach beyond our initial cohorts by the end of the project. The framework must be robust and scaleable, with full documentation and staff development resources available.

Early experiences of publicizing the project across the university have lead to a number of requests for engagement in the PC3 approach from staff not included in the original bid. It is clear that the project team and funding cannot directly sustain such extensions to the pilot cohorts and that it is crucial that we manage staff and institutional expectations in a supportive though firm manner. The team must ensure that suitable documentation and training resources for the adoption of the PC3 approach are created in an early phase of the project and that interested staff are directed towards these in the first instance. It is equally important that any such staff are supported in working with the materials and in their introduction of PC3 as part of their teaching activities. One critical aspect of this is the provision of evaluation instruments that both direct staff towards key elements of the approach and also require them to collect evaluation data that allows the team to analyse and assess the effectiveness of the approach and support for wider staff adopting PC3.

### 4. Project Outputs

Tangible project deliverables include:

- Models of existing institutional processes facilitating curriculum design and creation.
- Models of modified institutional processes facilitating personalised curriculum design and creation, incorporating the use of coaching.

Project Acronym: PC3

Version: 1.2

Contact: John Gray

Date: 28<sup>th</sup> April 2009

- Scenarios of current processes and practices
- Baseline report reviewing existing processes and practices
- A prototype technology platform integrated with existing university systems.
- Documentation and tutorials to allow use of the software tools by third parties
- Staff development resources and workshop guides on coaching and the PC3 approach.
- Increased number of reusable learning objects available, including those based on professional body requirements.
- Evaluation instrument for evaluation of impact on teaching practice
- Patterns for good practice in curriculum design
- At least 4 workshops for the community to engage coaching as an aid to support personalised curriculum creation.
- At least 4 case studies, or alternate representation e.g. descriptive scenarios, of how the PC3 approach can support personalised curriculum creation through coaching.
- Evidence supporting a business case for the adoption of the PC3 approach in appropriate circumstances
- Reports for JISC (2 per year + final report).
- Website with project information and deliverables.
- Regular newsletter for Leeds Met staff.
- Contributions to the JISC CIRCLE community and blog and to the Support and Synthesis project.
- Presentations and papers on the project internally and externally.

Less tangible outputs include:

- Better understanding of personalised curriculum creation.
- Experience of an integrated approach to personalised curriculum from both learner and staff perspectives.
- Increased knowledge of coaching in an educational setting.

## 5. Project Outcomes

Design of flexible and personal curricula will be facilitated through the PC3 Framework, and learning resources will be more widely available for reuse across the institution. The PC3 approach will be adopted on a range of programmes.

Learners at Leeds Met across a range of subject areas will benefit from flexible, personalised curriculum design and delivery and be enabled to achieve their personal learning goals. These learners will have a clear understanding of the coaching role in education and, through it, will have been enabled to take control of their own learning.

Teachers will be more able to negotiate provision of learning opportunities and to support learners, through the development and embedding of the coaching model. Those involved in the pilots will have developed skills in coaching and will be champions of the approach to colleagues.

Senior managers will better understand the strategic importance of flexible learning and will be enabled to incorporate this into their area's curriculum design activities, and, in so doing, increase their intake of part-time work-based learners. They will have appropriate models to manage deployment and funding of flexible curriculum and will be willing to adopt the model where appropriate within their provision.

Professional bodies and employers will be able to contribute their requirements and, where appropriate, provide content that addresses these within an accredited award scheme. Assessment of skills and knowledge against professional competencies will be more transparent for learners and teachers.

Coaching as a model for supporting learning will be embedded in assessment, learning and teaching practice at Leeds Met and disseminated throughout the sector. Staff development on coaching will be widely available within the institution with online resources available more widely. Appropriate

Project Acronym: PC3

Version: 1.2

Contact: John Gray

Date: 28<sup>th</sup> April 2009

processes, documentation, training and technologies to support this approach to curriculum design will have been evaluated and shared with the HE community.

A greater understanding of change management issues surrounding the introduction of transformational change within an HE context.

Outcomes from this project will also impact on the JISC CIRCLE / cluster community and the wider HE and FE environments.

## 6. Stakeholder Analysis

Stakeholder	Interest / stake	Engage / Consult / Inform Plans	Importance
University Senior Management	The adoption and spread of good practice across the sector is of crucial importance. It is important that the outcomes of this project are acted upon by this group.	Focus group Regular reports and presentations Direct reports to Pro VC ALT Regular project newsletter Project Blog site	Medium
Teaching Staff – supporting pilots	This group of staff are critical to the success of the project as they will be piloting the approach and feeding into the development. These staff will provide input into the design, contribute to the evaluation, and will require training and support in coaching.	Training in relevant software / technology Regular project newsletter Focus groups for feedback Involve staff in the design and development of the approach and its delivery for the pilot cohorts. Provide training in the coaching approach. Project Blog site. Mentoring of the staff coaches	High
Other Leeds Met teaching staff	This group need to be kept informed about project developments and may be involved in wider adoption across the institution. They may need staff development and training.	Regular project newsletter Project Blog site Presentations Staff development opportunities	Medium
Students – pilot cohorts	This group of students are critical to the success of the project as they will be the learners piloting the approach. They will help evaluate the process and software and will inform the iterative development. They will require induction into the approach.	Training in relevant software and technology Induction into being coached Focus group activity Regular project newsletter Project Blog site Focus group for student coaches	High
Other Leeds Met students	This group need to be kept informed	Regular project newsletter	Medium.

	about project developments and may be involved in wider adoption across the institution. They may need induction into the approach.	Project Blog site Student experience presentations Induction and training opportunities to gain insight into the approach.	
Professional Bodies	Embed requirements for achieving professional status	Consult with these to identify relevant competency criteria. Focus group activity to establish impact and success of the approach. Seek provision of relevant subject content	High
Technical Staff	This group will need to support and administer the collaborative software platform.	Regular project newsletter Project Blog site Focus group activity Gateway to support from key software / technology suppliers Engage in the integration of new software / technology across the university	Medium
Learning Technologists and Technology Enhanced Learning team	These staff will support teaching staff in developing resources to support learners. They may not use the system directly but the increase in flexible learning will lead to an increase in demand for their support.	Regular project newsletter Project Blog site Induction and training in the software / technology Focus group activities	Medium.
Registry, Finance and other support services	Input from these will be critical to the development of appropriate and workable processes.	Regular project newsletter Project Blog site Focus groups Observation of processes in operation Regular review of internal process changes	High
Software suppliers	This group will be responsible for the core technical developments and integration with existing software.	Regular project newsletter Project Blog site Involvement in the design and modification of software /	High

		technology Consultancy opportunities to understand and specify integration of new software / technology across the university	
Other HE Institutions	This group may wish to adopt a similar approach in their own context. Transparent processes and a flexible software platform will be essential.	Regular project newsletter Project Blog site Presentations at conferences, JISC events etc. Publication of project outcomes etc. Offer example business case for following the PC3 approach Offer seminars , workshops etc	Medium
FE Partner Colleges	As HE but with a different context. Important to consider adoption and adaptation of successful practice in terms of level.	Presentations at conferences, JISC events etc. Publication of project outcomes etc. Offer example business case for following the PC3 approach Offer seminars , workshops etc	Medium
FE Regional Support Centres	This group will be a valuable channel for disseminating key messages to the wider FE community	Presentations at conferences, JISC events etc. Publication of project outcomes etc. Offer example business case for following the PC3 approach Offer seminars , workshops etc	Medium
e-Framework	Knowledge of successful flexible curriculum design approaches needs to be shared throughout the e-Framework.	Details of project outputs, products, services etc.	Medium
Support and Synthesis Network participants	This community overlaps with HE and FE but can contribute inwards as well as using the outputs from the project.	CIRCLE posts Sharing of Project Blog site Attendance and networking at programme / JISC events Presentations of project outcomes	Medium
Cluster members of the CIRCLE community	Sharing success within the cluster means each member does not have to	Example business case Regular project newsletter Project Blog site	Medium

Project Acronym: PC3  
 Version: 1.2  
 Contact: John Gray  
 Date: 28<sup>th</sup> April 2009

	reinvent the same practice	Regular CAMEL meetings Sharing process and procedural examples Access to other institutional staff and students Comparison of impact of different projects on staff, students and institutions.	
--	----------------------------	--	--

## 7. Risk Analysis

Risk	Probability (1-5)	Severity (1-5)	Score (P x S)	Monitoring the Risk	Action to Prevent/Manage Risk
<b>Stakeholder-related risks</b>					
PC3 will not be used or reflect the needs of the stakeholders	1	5	5	Follow up the continuation of the PC3 approach within the pilot cohorts. Observe the take up of the PC3 approach beyond the pilot cohorts.	The project is built on existing projects and has already identified key cohorts to pilot, so has links with stakeholders and an assured usage.
Unable to work with intended user groups	2	3	6	Meet with current pilot user groups to get feedback on their satisfaction. Meet with future pilot groups to ascertain their continued willingness to be involved in the project and manage their expectations.	Identifying multiple user groups ensures that we have sufficient cohorts to pilot successfully even if some become unavailable.
Low engagement from employers	2	3	6	For each pilot cohort identify an appropriate employer forum and	The user cohorts from the professions have been chosen to

				engage with them. Seek their agreement over appropriate competency frameworks and manage their expectations.	have existing strong employer relationships with the institution. Not all cohorts are reliant on employer engagement
Low take up from learners	1	5	5	Meet with student focus groups from the pilot cohorts (and the wider student community) to determine their satisfaction with the PC3 approach	Initial groups have already been identified who are interested in studying this way and these will be targeted in the first instance
Partners pull out of arrangement with institution	1	1	1	Regular review of the status of relevant partnerships across the University.	The partnerships that the University has (e.g. Google) have potential benefit to the project but its success is not reliant on them.
<b>Resource-related risks</b>					
Essential personnel may leave project	3	4	12	Regular meetings with key personnel to identify their satisfaction levels with and expectations from the project.	Institutional commitment and active engagement by multiple senior staff means that any personnel leaving will be replaced from within the team or through consultancy.
Insufficient coaches	3	5	15	Regular review of the numbers of trained coaches available within the University. Regular review of the opportunities for training staff in the PC3 coaching approach.	The choice of Carnegie Leaders in Learning as the first user cohort is deliberate as these staff are already familiar and in some cases expert in coaching. Staff development is already in place within the institution to expand the base of staff experienced in coaching. This will help provide a pool of staff for the later user groups. Further training will also be provided.
Insufficient resources available in learning bank	3	4	12	Monitor the numbers of relevant objects in the institutional repository. Monitor issues arising from the deposit and search of objects in the repository.	The resources are available for the user groups identified but they will need to be collected and included in the repository. The inclusion of staff involved in the institutional

Project Acronym: PC3  
Version: 1.2  
Contact: John Gray  
Date: 28<sup>th</sup> April 2009

					repository projects will help ensure this happens in time for the first cohort.
Costs underestimated	2	5	10	Regular review of the budget allocations. Monitor opportunities both within the institution and also from JISC (e.g. Benefits realisation calls) for supporting the PC3 funding.	The project has strong central institutional backing and is making use of existing institutional resources as far as possible. In particular it is working with the new Carnegie Graduate School to consider how PC3 might underpin M level provision in the institution. This will give it the momentum to ensure early inclusion of the initiative in the institution's sustainable financial planning cycle, which will mitigate any issues with ongoing funding.
<b>Technology-related risks</b>					
Unable to develop and deploy the necessary software	2	5	10	Regular review of the availability and deployment of the necessary software. Regular review of the budget allocation for this facet of the project.	The project will use existing software wherever possible to reduce the risks. Support from specialist consultants will be procured where needed to aid the project team.
Not possible to integrate available technology	2	3	6	Regular review of the progress of technology integration.	The project team have several options available for integration and a base line will be a common access point which is easily achievable. More in depth integration will be investigated but is not essential to the success of the project.
Delay in deployment of new technology	3	3	9	Regular review of the progress of the deployment of relevant new technology for the project.	The institution has already identified the need for an e-portfolio system (the main technology that will need to be deployed) so the

					process of selection has started. The PC3 project will engage in this process. Should the software not be deployed a temporary system is available internally to support early cohorts.
One or more elements of the technology support not available	2	5	10	Regular review of the technology support needed and its availability.	Most of the elements are already available and the remaining elements are under consideration. Should an element not be available a temporary “off the shelf” system will be put in place (e.g. through online services).
<b>Change management-related risks</b>					
Resistance to adoption of PC3 and cultural change among academic staff	3	4	12	Focus groups with staff to determine their level of knowledge, acceptance and satisfaction with the PC3 approach.	Initial staff groups are committed to supporting part-time work-based learners. Known cohorts will be used to develop exemplars to encourage further staff engagement.
Resistance to adoption of PC3 among senior staff	3	5	15	Focus group with senior staff to determine their level of knowledge, acceptance and satisfaction with the PC3 approach.	Senior management supports the project and there is already a flexible learning initiative within the institution. A number of key senior staff have already committed to the project and several meetings have already been held with senior staff at university and faculty level.
Staff slow to adapt to coaching model	3	3	9	Focus groups with staff to determine their level of knowledge, acceptance, satisfaction and hence any issues they may have with the PC3 approach.	The 6 month lead in for each user group before going “live” with learners should ensure that staff have time to become comfortable with the process. Engaging them early in the planning process gives them ownership of their instantiation of the Framework.

Project Acronym: PC3  
Version: 1.2  
Contact: John Gray  
Date: 28<sup>th</sup> April 2009

Change in teaching and learning model not reflected in staff allocation	3	5	15	Monitor staff allocation models used and adopted to support the pilot cohorts. Monitor University strategy regarding reward patterns for teaching staff.	This will be mitigated through engagement with senior staff, who are responsible for staff allocation. A model for this approach to supporting assessment, learning and teaching will be provided to support this process.
PC3 not embedded in institutional processes by project end	2	5	10	Monitor the impact of the PC3 project on the University processes and procedures. Monitor the level of adoption of PC3 across the University.	The project has high level support, and is designed to integrate existing initiatives and build on current projects to give the highest likelihood of sustainability and embedding. The involvement with Carnegie Graduate School places the project firmly in the mainstream of institutional activity.
Learners and staff resistant to using new technologies	2	4	8	Focus groups with staff and students to review their experiences of the training, induction and use of the PC3 approach	User groups have been selected to maximise the likelihood of motivated staff and learners. Training and induction will focus on the benefits of the technologies to the individual's needs.
<b>Process-related risks</b>					
Failure to embed PC3 into existing administrative systems	3	3	9	Monitor the progress and availability of the manual processes and documentation supporting the PC3 approach. Regularly review the level of consistency of PC3 with other university-wide systems.	Manual processes and documentation will be established to ensure that PC3 operates consistently with institutional systems, as is the case for some other university-wide systems.
Failure to embed PC3 into Leeds Met regulatory framework	2	5	10	Regularly review the regulatory framework to ensure changes do not conflict with support for PC3.	Regulatory framework already adapted to support flexible learning and delivery.
Processes under-developed to support staff and learners	1	5	5	Observe the operation of the processes used to support the adoption and delivery of the PC3 approach across administrative,	The development and piloting process is deliberately front loaded and stakeholder-centred to enable processes to be developed in good

				technical, academic staff and students. Focus groups of administrative staff, technical staff, academics and students to review the success of these processes.	time. Staff will engage with the development process over at least a 6 month period before going live with students.
Learner engagement with process low	3	5	15	Monitor the level of engagement of learners in the process. Review the levels of flexibility students seek. Focus groups of students and coaches to review levels of engagement with the process.	The PC3 Framework relies on learners wishing to personalise their own curriculum so learners are assumed to have a vested interest in engaging with the process. However it is also recognised that learners will have many competing demands and realistically may not engage. The coaching process will mitigate this with its personal monitoring and staff-learner engagement, as will the social learning opportunities. Appropriate induction and training will also give clear signposting for learners.
Efficient course information exchange not developed	3	3	9	Regularly check prospectus entries, and documentation provided to students and staff for the identified pilot areas.	External models for information exchange will be adapted to maximise the success of this element. The movement to a more open prospectus and sharing of course information is already in place. The use of clearly identified pilot cohorts makes this less problematic in the short term (course information is easily identifiable).
<b>Training and documentation-related risks</b>					
Documentation not available	2	5	10	Monitor the development and availability of training	Where possible existing documentation (on software tools

Project Acronym: PC3  
 Version: 1.2  
 Contact: John Gray  
 Date: 28<sup>th</sup> April 2009

				documentation, its suitability and its effectiveness.	etc) will be adapted. Process documentation will be developed in consultation with the flexible learning team who have existing examples of non-standard models of curriculum.
Insufficient training is provided	1	5	10	Monitor the opportunities for training staff in the PC3 coaching approach.	Training for both staff and students is built into the pilot timetable.
Staff development packages not developed	3	3	9	Monitor the University staff development opportunities for training in the PC3 coaching approach.	Staff development packages for coaching are already under development in the institution and will be adapted for this project. The UK Centre for Coaching Excellence will be used as appropriate to provide specialised staff development for staff. As far as possible, accredited courses will be used.
Patterns cannot be elicited	3	1	3	Monitor the opportunities for collecting appropriate case studies and their subsequent refinement into patterns (or other suitable dissemination forms). Regularly review the number of patterns (or alternatives) generated and their effectiveness.	The JISC funded Planet project has developed a method to achieve this together with software support. However the information can be disseminated in other forms (e.g. case studies, guidelines) if this proves problematic.

## 8. Standards

LEAP2.0e-portfolio interoperability standard		
SRU	2.0	Web interface for repository object search
SWORD		Simple Web service offering repository deposit

## 9. Technical Development

The project will follow a user engagement model of development, using tools from the UIDM toolkit. Although the main technical development will be done by commercial providers, this will be in close consultation with the project team and our user groups to ensure the end result is appropriate for our users' needs. The software developers will manage the technical development with agreed work packages and will follow a PRINCE 2 methodology. The current proposed workpackages include (subject to further negotiation with supplier):

- a) Overall project including project reviews, management and top level concept designs and user/project team website
- b) Systems tailoring and extension work
- c) Elluminate integration
- d) BANNER integration
- e) WebCT integration
- f) Single sign on and authentication
- g) Intralibrary integration
- h) Other Leeds Met systems integration
- i) Training and user support programmes and guides

These workpackages will be developed in phases, addressing initial priorities for a working prototype (without full integration) for the first cohort in Summer 2009 with ongoing enhancement during the rest of 2009 and adjustments thereafter contingent on evaluation and user consultation.

## 10. Intellectual Property Rights

IPR for software and algorithms brought to the project by any software supplier will remain with that supplier. IPR for outputs produced during the project will be owned by Leeds Met and made available to the wider community. All the project deliverables, reports and other relevany outputs will be published via the project website and made freely available to the academic community. Where appropriate, materials will be offered to relevant repositories (including JORUM and CloudWorks) to support wider dissemination and sustainable access. We will make all other outputs available to the community and contribute project outcomes to JISC initiatives (such as the e-Framework) where appropriate.

Where standards are not available, community conventions will be used wherever possible and stakeholder groups will be consulted to agree appropriate models.

## *Project Resources*

### 11. Project Partners

There are no project partners. The proposed project sub-contractor for software development is MyKnowledgeMap. A proposal is currently under negotiation and it is expected that an agreement will

Project Acronym: PC3  
Version: 1.2  
Contact: John Gray  
Date: 28<sup>th</sup> April 2009

be signed before the end of March. Project management for the project is to be supported part-time by consultant John Gray of JRG Consultancy, who is an experienced PRINCE 2 project manager. An agreement has been signed with John Gray and is attached.

## 12. Project Management

The project will establish a high level steering group to meet no more than twice per year. This group will be comprised of senior managers from the IT services, library services and representatives from the academic community through the Teacher Fellow Network, and the core project team. External representatives will include professional body representatives, from the relevant subject areas. The cluster's critical friend will also be invited. The steering group will be chaired by the Pro VC for ALT or nominated representative. It will have responsibility for reviewing progress and impact of the project within the institution.

The project will use the JISC InfoNet framework for project management. The project manager is Mr. John Gray who will allocate some 0.7 days per week of his time to project management, with a particular focus on producing required documentation of meetings and for JISC. The project director, Janet Finlay, will allocate 2.5 days a week from April 2009 (1 day a week prior to this) and will concentrate on managing the operation and strategic development of the project and the staff involvement. The project will be monitored by a management team, consisting of all project team members and a user group representative, which will meet every three months. The Programme Manager will be invited to this meeting where appropriate. The remit of this meeting is to review progress against the management plan and agree actions to ensure progress.

Day to day communication will be facilitated using a management blog ([www.pc3.org.uk](http://www.pc3.org.uk) – note this blog is publicly viewable to promote transparency of the developing framework). In addition the Project Manager will liaise with individual team members on at least a fortnightly basis to review their individual contributions. All work package leaders report directly to the Project Director/Project Manager. All team members will be consulted on substantive decisions and consensus will be sought through discussion. The Project Manager (in collaboration with the Project Director) is empowered to take budgetary and managerial decisions where these are in line with the agreed management plan. Any changes to the management plan will be discussed with all parties.

Day to day operational discussions will be pursued using Google groups.

The current project team consists of:

Prof. Janet Finlay, Technology Enhanced Learning Team, Leeds Metropolitan University,  
[j.finlay@leedsmet.ac.uk](mailto:j.finlay@leedsmet.ac.uk)

Role: Project Director, leading WPs 1, 2, and 4 but involved in all other WPs. Expertise in user centred design methodologies and technology enhanced learning.

John Gray, Project Manager, [johnrichard.gray@Gmail.com](mailto:johnrichard.gray@Gmail.com)

Role: Project Manager, involved in all WPs and leading WP 5. Expertise in Project Management, management and software development.

Dawn Wood, [d.a.wood@leedsmet.ac.uk](mailto:d.a.wood@leedsmet.ac.uk)

Project Officer full time from April 09 to August

11 and will lead Workpackage 3 and coordinate the pilot studies and evaluation.

Margaret Christian, [m.christian@leedsmet.ac.uk](mailto:m.christian@leedsmet.ac.uk)

Director of Carnegie Leaders in Learning. Contributing to WPs 1-3 and coordinating the coaching model and support.

Tam Mason, [t.mason@leedsmet.ac.uk](mailto:t.mason@leedsmet.ac.uk)

Project Acronym: PC3  
 Version: 1.2  
 Contact: John Gray  
 Date: 28<sup>th</sup> April 2009

Carnegie Leaders in Learning. Contributing to WPs 1-3 and to the development of resources on coaching.

In addition, the project has active support from a number of senior staff from core services and representing different cohorts. These include registry, technical support, the repository team, library services and the Assessment, Learning and Teaching area. These staff have an allocation of up to 10 days each and will be consulted as required in the course of the project.

Given the emphasis on coaching it is important that the core team is adequately trained and experiences coaching first hand. Training is therefore being arranged for the team, which will include coaching and being coached. This training will form the basis of the staff development offered to staff.

Project team members will attend relevant JISC seminars and workshops to ensure they are able to learn from JISC initiatives and share experiences with other CIRCLE colleagues.

### 13. Programme Support

The Support and Synthesis project programme is facilitating sharing experience within its core activities.

### 14. Budget

See Appendix A.

## Detailed Project Planning

### 15. Workpackages

See Appendix B.

### 16. Evaluation Plan

See Appendix C.

### 17. Quality Plan

Note: these only cover the first year's outcomes; others will be qualified the as project progresses.

Output					
Timing	Quality criteria	QA method(s)	Evidence of compliance	Quality responsibilities	Quality tools (if applicable)
Jun 09	Model of existing curriculum design processes	Review and comparison	Agreed with institutional registry staff	JG / JF	MicroSoft Visio modelling tool
Jun 09	Model of flexible curriculum design processes	Review and feedback from RSO and stakeholders	Agreed with institutional registry staff, support flexible enrolment and life cycle of students	JG / JF	MicroSoft Visio modelling tool
Dec 09	Coaching workshops and other documentation for staff development	User feedback	Staff engagement, adoption within staff work approaches	TM, MC	
Dec 09	Benchmarks for	Software	Operational	Supplier/JG/JF	

	software development	testing	software meeting requirements		
--	----------------------	---------	-------------------------------	--	--

## 18. Dissemination Plan

Note: these only cover the first year's events as others will be scheduled as project progresses. The intention is that dissemination will occur through collaborative activities with stakeholders, with the blog providing a regular opportunity for stakeholders to feedback to the team. Once students are involved, they will be encouraged to use this, as well as the social network area and the ePortfolio, to reflect on the value of the process. Later in the project, patterns or a similar representation, will be used to capture the good practice of the project for others. These will be captured using a collaborative methodology, based on that developed by the Planet project, which will involve stakeholders in the process. Once we have piloted the approach we will also seek to present our findings at relevant conferences, such as ALT-C and the HEA conference, as well as JISC events.

Timing	Dissemination Activity	Audience	Purpose	Key Message
Regular	Website /blog	JISC community HF/FE community Project stakeholders	Awareness, inform, engage, promote	Project aims, Project findings
Monthly	JISC CIRCLE / project meetings	JISC community	Awareness, inform, engage, promote	Project aims, Project Findings, Evaluate outputs
Throughout	Attend conferences	Wider teaching community	Inform, promote, engage	Project aims, Project findings
Sept 08	Workshop 1	User community and Senior Management	Awareness and launch	Engage users,
Nov 08	Presentation	Carnegie Graduate School	Awareness and involvement in School.	Engage user groups
Dec 08	Presentation	ALT Enhancement Forum – Regional University Network	Awareness and involvement	Engage potential user groups
Sep 08-Jul 09	Faculty presentations	Faculty staff	Awareness	Engage user groups
May 09	Workshop 2	Project community	Evaluate coaching training and materials	Coaching is an effective pedagogic approach
Sep 09	Workshop 3	Wider community	Present interim findings	Demonstrate framework
6 monthly	Project reports	Wider teaching community	Inform	Project progress
As appropriate	Presentations and contributions	JISC Learning and Teaching Experts Groups	Awareness, engage, promote, involvement	Project outcomes, coaching as an educational approach
Annually	Presentations, posters	JISC online conference	Awareness, promote, engage	Coaching as an educational approach

## 19. Exit and Sustainability Plans

Project Outputs	Action for Take-up & Embedding	Action for Exit
Reports	Will be made available via the project website	Access: the server will be hosted by Leeds Metropolitan University Preservation: reports will be archived Maintenance: institutional maintenance will apply Intellectual Property: Creative Commons
Software Platform	Will be documented via the project website and available to other institutions.	Access: the server will be hosted by supplier Preservation: documentation will be archived. Maintenance: software will be maintained by commercial provider. Intellectual Property: Project partners with licensed use
PC3 framework	Will be documented via the project website. Will be freely available to all HE/FE institutions	Access: the server will be hosted by Leeds Metropolitan University Preservation: documents will be archived Maintenance: institutional maintenance will apply Intellectual Property: Creative Commons
Coaching resources	Will be available within the institutional repository and available for use elsewhere.	Access: the server will be hosted by Leeds Metropolitan University Preservation: will be available in the repository Maintenance: institutional maintenance will apply Intellectual Property: Copyright with Leeds Met; available to community.
Institutional adoption and embedding of the project outputs	Incorporated within institutional strategies, integrated within institutional systems	???

### Project outputs that may live on after the project ends.

Project Outputs	Why Sustainable	Scenarios for Taking Forward	Issues to Address
Coaching resources	Subject matter persistent and of continuing interest to the institution and the sector	Used as stand alone resources or within guided workshops.	Ensuring stand alone use is appropriate.
Software platform	Software will be flexible and	Other institutions contract for software with supplier –	Appropriate licensing to reflect input from PC3.

Project Acronym: PC3

Version: 1.2

Contact: John Gray

Date: 28<sup>th</sup> April 2009

	adaptable to other contexts.	developments through PC3 made available as enhancements.	
PC3 processes	Will be tried and tested approach to flexible personalised curriculum design.	Taken up by other institutions.	Processes elsewhere different – capturing the invariance.

## Appendixes

### Appendix A. Project Budget

<b>Table 1: Budget summary</b>					
<b>Directly Incurred</b>	<b>Aug08– Jul09</b>	<b>Aug09– Jul10</b>	<b>Aug10 – Jul11</b>	<b>Aug11 – Jul12</b>	<b>TOTAL £</b>
<b>Staff</b>					
Janet Finlay, Project Coordinator, Prof1, 0.2 FTE first 6 months, 0.5 FTE thereafter					
Dawn Wood, Research Officer, Point 27, 1 FTE for 2.5 years from Apr 09					
<b>Total Directly Incurred Staff (A)</b>					
<b>Non-Staff</b>	<b>Aug08– Jul09</b>	<b>Aug09– Jul10</b>	<b>Aug10 – Jul11</b>	<b>Aug11 – Jul12</b>	<b>TOTAL £</b>
Travel and expenses					
Hardware/software					
Evaluation/Dissemination activities					0
Consultancy – John Gray (at £350 per day)					
Consultancy – software, partners, employers (at £400 a day)					
<b>Total Directly Incurred Non-Staff (B)</b>					
<b>Directly Incurred Total (C)</b>					
<b>(A+B=C)</b>					
<b>Directly Allocated</b>	<b>Aug08– Jul09</b>	<b>Aug09– Jul10</b>	<b>Aug10 – Jul11</b>	<b>Aug11 – Jul12</b>	<b>TOTAL £</b>
Staff (named in paragraph 34 excluding Margaret Christian and Tam Mason) at 5 days each (4 days in Year 1, 2 a year thereafter)					
Margaret Christian and Tam Mason at 30 days each (4 days in Year 1, 2 a year thereafter)					
Staff time associated with each cohort – 5 days x 4 cohorts costed at point 43					
Estates					
<b>Directly Allocated Total (D)</b>					
<b>Indirect Costs (E)</b>					
<b>Total Project Cost (C+D+E)</b>					
<b>Amount Requested from JISC</b>					
<b>Institutional Contributions</b>					
<b>Percentage Contributions over the life of the project</b>	<b>JISC</b>	<b>Partners</b>			<b>Total</b>
	58 %	42 %			100%
<b>No. FTEs used to calculate indirect and</b>	<b>No FTEs</b>	<b>Which Staff</b>			

Project Acronym: PC3  
Version: 1.2  
Contact: John Gray  
Date: 28<sup>th</sup> April 2009

<b>estates charges, and staff included</b>	<b>0.56</b>	<b>Finlay, Wood, named senior staff (paragraph 34)</b>	
--	-------------	--	--

Project Acronym: PC3  
Version: 1.0  
Contact: John Gray  
Date: 6<sup>th</sup> February 2009

Project Acronym: PC3  
 Version: 1.0  
 Contact: John Gray  
 Date: 6<sup>th</sup> February 2009

## Appendix B. Workpackages



### JISC WORK PACKAGES for the PC3 Project: Personalising Curriculum Creation through Coaching

WORKPACKAGES	Month	2	4	6	8	10	12	14	16	18	20	22	24	26	28	30	32	34	36	38	40	42	44	
1: Review and Planning		█	█	█	█																			
2: Implementation and Deployment of Initial PC3 Framework						█	█																	
3: Piloting and Evaluation					█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█										
4: Embedding and Sustainability												█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█
5: Project management, dissemination and communication		█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█

Project start date: 1<sup>st</sup> September 2008

Project completion date: 31<sup>st</sup> May 2012.

Duration: 44 months

Project Acronym: PC3  
Version: 1.0  
Contact: John Gray  
Date: 6<sup>th</sup> February 2009

	Start date	End date	Outputs	Milestone	Responsibility
<b>YEAR 1</b>					
<b>WORKPACKAGE 1: Review and Planning</b>  <b><i>Objective: To identify what is needed to create and support the PC3 framework.</i></b>					JF, MC, TM
1. Review existing projects, regulations and software	01/09/08	31/03/09	Report on technology, regulatory and process requirements	<b>1.1</b>	JG, JF
2. Consult Stakeholders	01/09/08	31/02/09	Report on stakeholder requirements	<b>1.2</b>	JF, MC, TM
3. Develop coaching model	01/01/09	31/03/09	Proposal for coaching model	<b>1.3</b>	MC, TM
4. Specify PC3 framework	01/02/09	31/03/09	PC3 framework specification	<b>1.4</b>	MC, TM
<b>WORKPACKAGE 2: Implementation and Deployment of Initial PC3 Framework</b>  <b><i>Objective: To provide appropriate processes and infrastructure to support the PC3 approach.</i></b>					JF, MC
5. Establish processes for learner support and induction	01/04/09	30/06/09	Process model	<b>2.1</b>	JF, JG, MC, TM
6. Develop software support	01/04/09	31/08/09	Prototype system	<b>2.2</b>	JF, DW, JG, MKM
7. Ensure available resources for learners	01/06/09	31/08/09	Phase 1 <b>prototype</b> of PC3 resources	<b>2.3</b>	JF, DW, MC, TM
<b>WORKPACKAGE 3: Piloting and Evaluation</b>					DW

Project Acronym: PC3  
Version: 1.0  
Contact: John Gray  
Date: 6<sup>th</sup> February 2009

<b>Objective:</b> To ensure that the PC3 approach works well with a range of staff and student groups.					
8. Pilot User Group 1: Carnegie Leaders in Learning	01/03/09	30/09/10			MC, TM
9. Identify learners and staff teams	01/03/09	31/03/09			MC, TM, DW
10. Staff team engagement and induction in PC3 and coaching	01/03/09	31/05/09			MC, TM, DW
11. Revise PC3 framework	01/06/09	31/08/09	Approval of PC3 instantiation by course team	<b>3.1.1</b>	JF, MC, DW
12. Induction in PC3 for learners	01/09/09	30/09/09			TM, DW
13. Pilot PC3 with learners	01/10/09	31/07/10			TM, DW, JF
14. Evaluate PC3 and identify case studies	01/10/09	01/09/10			TM, DW, JF
15. Adapt PC3	01/08/10	30/09/10	Evaluation report and case studies	<b>3.1.2</b>	DW, JF
16. Pilot User Group 2: Regional University Network	01/08/09	28/02/11			DW, JF
17. Identify learners and staff teams	01/08/09	31/08/09			DW, JF
18. Staff team engagement and induction in PC3 and coaching	01/08/09	31/10/09			DW, JF
19. Revise PC3 framework	01/11/09	31/01/10	Approval of PC3 instantiation by course team	<b>3.2.1</b>	DW, JF
20. Induction in PC3 for learners	01/02/10	28/02/10			DW, JF
21. Pilot PC3 with learners	01/03/10	31/12/10			DW, JF
22. Evaluate PC3 and identify case studies	01/03/10	30/09/11			DW, JF
23. Adapt PC3	01/01/11	28/02/11	Evaluation report and case studies	<b>3.2.2</b>	DW, JF
24. Pilot User Group 3: Institute of Northern Studies	01/03/10	30/09/11			DW, JF
25. Identify learners and staff teams	01/03/10	31/03/10			DW, JF
26. Staff team engagement and induction in PC3 and coaching	01/03/10	31/05/10			DW, JF
27. Revise PC3 framework	01/06/10	31/08/10	Approval of PC3 instantiation by course team	<b>3.3.1</b>	DW, JF

Project Acronym: PC3  
Version: 1.0  
Contact: John Gray  
Date: 6<sup>th</sup> February 2009

28. Induction in PC3 for learners	01/09/10	30/09/10			DW, JF
29. Pilot PC3 with learners	01/10/10	31/07/11			DW, JF
30. Evaluate PC3 and identify case studies	01/10/10	01/09/11			DW, JF
31. Adapt PC3	01/08/11	30/09/11	Evaluation report and case studies	<b>3.3.2</b>	DW, JF
32. Pilot User Group 4: Faculty of Health	01/03/10	30/09/11			DW, JF
33. Identify learners and staff teams	01/03/10	31/03/10			DW, JF
34. Staff team engagement and induction in PC3 and coaching	01/03/10	31/05/10			DW, JF
35. Revise PC3 framework	01/06/10	31/08/10	Approval of PC3 instantiation by course team	<b>3.3.1</b>	DW, JF
36. Induction in PC3 for learners	01/09/10	30/09/10			DW, JF
37. Pilot PC3 with learners	01/10/10	31/07/11			DW, JF
38. Evaluate PC3 and identify case studies	01/10/10	01/09/11			DW, JF
39. Adapt PC3	01/08/11	30/09/11	Evaluation report and case studies	<b>3.3.2</b>	DW, JF
<b>WORKPACKAGE 4: Embedding and Sustainability</b>					
<b>Objective:</b> To ensure that the changes to the curriculum design processes become part of the culture and activities of the university.					
40. Establish long term costs and funding	01/06/10	30/11/10	Inclusion of PC3 in sustainable planning cycle	<b>4.1</b>	JF, DW, JG
41. Staff development support and transfer of practice	01/06/10	31/01/12	Staff development resources	<b>4.2</b>	JF, DW, JG
42. Monitor impact and use of PC3 framework	01/09/10	31/05/12	Report on impact of PC3	<b>4.3</b>	JF, DW, JG
<b>WORKPACKAGE 5: Project management, dissemination and communication</b>					
JG					

Project Acronym: PC3  
 Version: 1.0  
 Contact: John Gray  
 Date: 6<sup>th</sup> February 2009

<b>Objective:</b> Ensure the project meets its aims and objectives on budget and on time					
43. Project management and planning	01/09/08	31/05/12	Revised <b>project plan and evaluation plan</b> submitted to JISC - Feb 09	<b>5.1</b>	JG, JF
44. Project reporting	01/09/08	31/05/12	<b>Interim reports</b> to JISC at 6 monthly intervals, <b>final report and closure report</b> at the end of the project	<b>5.2.x</b>	JG
45. Project communications	01/09/08	31/05/12	Project <b>blog, website and systems</b> setup	<b>5.3</b>	JG. JF
46. Engaging with synthesis project and other stakeholders			Dissemination <b>workshop</b> for senior UK academics	<b>5.4</b>	All

Members of Project Team:

JF - Janet Finlay  
 MC - Margaret Christian  
 TM - Tam Mason  
 DW - Dawn Wood  
 JG - John Gray

<b>Factor to Evaluate</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Source of information</b>	<b>Collection method</b>	<b>Schedule</b>
<i>What do you want to know?</i>	<i>How will you know?</i>	<i>Where can this data be obtained?</i>	<i>How will the data be gathered?</i>	<i>When, where and who will gather the data?</i>
Are learning resources more widely used through the PC3 framework?	Increased usage of the repository especially by participants in PC3 courses.	The institutional repository staff, lecturers, students	Monitoring of the number, range and use of learning objects in the repository.	Data gathered annually by staff overseeing the repository
Are learners at Leeds Met able to benefit from flexible, personalised curriculum design and delivery across a range of subject areas?	Students successfully using competency mapping and coaching to choose personalized pathways. Formal and informal learning accredited through flexible and personalised assessment	Students, Lecturers, admin staff  Student record systems	Cohort questionnaires. Use of platform.  Assessment records	DW at the end of each session.  Course tutors.
Is coaching effective in supporting personalized curriculum creation?	Lecturers are comfortable with coaching and are able to use it to negotiate the provision of learning opportunities and support students	Lecturers, students	Staff and student questionnaires	DW at the end of each session.
Do senior managers understand the strategic importance of flexible learning	Senior Management engage in the project, and are involved in relevant change management processes. Faculties target new markets Changes to processes,	Marketing staff, enrolment staff, RSO manual of processes, Student records	Attendance at events.  Revised processes and systems.  Annual audit of enrolment	DW after each event.  University records.  Cohort staff on each

	<p>regulations and institutional procedures</p> <p>Changes to university administrative and records systems  There is an increase in the enrolment of part-time work-based learners</p> <p>Enrolment onto individual curriculum pathways</p>			complete intake.
Are professional bodies and employers engaged in the project	<p>They will have contributed content that addresses their requirements in the relevant award schemes. Input to curriculum design activities  Competency maps created for professional body requirements. Present on employer liaison committees</p>	<p>Student learning materials,  MKM competency maps  Employer liaison minutes</p>	<p>Availability of resources, maps and minutes.</p>	Audited by DW
Is coaching as a model for supporting learning embedded in ALT at Leeds Met	<p>Coaching used increasingly across the university.  National recognition of Leeds Met as an educational coaching centre  Staff promote coaching as critical to their success  Increased number of staff qualified coaches.</p>	<p>Existence of Educational coaching centre  Lecturers undertaken recognised qualifications and/or staff development.  Increase in courses making use of coaching.</p>	<p>Interviews/questionnaires with lecturers  Records of training  Prospectus and course descriptors</p>	<p>Audit of university records and completion of courses.    Audit of university courses using coaching</p>

Project Acronym: PC3  
 Version: 1.0  
 Contact: John Gray  
 Date: 6<sup>th</sup> February 2009

Are processes, documentation and training effective in supporting this approach?	Positive feedback from users Process compliant with university regulations and efficient	Lecturers and students  Comparison to regulations and standards	Questionnaires  Document analysis	DW for each cohort  JF/JG with registry.
Are the prototypes and tools developed effective and acceptable to users? Do they provide the intended functionality and meet quality standards?	Positive feedback from users on usability and user experience. Tools meet functionality and quality specifications.	User groups in workshops and one to one sessions. Developers.	Observations of use and user diaries. Focus groups Questionnaires Expert inspection.	Formative evaluation following each release Summative evaluation after final release DW, JF
What will indicate the project's long term impact?	Contribution of framework for personalised curriculum creation for the wider community Successful adoption of the PC3 framework within the institution, beyond the initial cohorts.	Other projects in programme  Deans and Associate Deans	Survey interested parties  Interview Deans	JF after project end.