Project Document Cover Sheet

JISC

Project Document Cover Sheet

Project Information			
Project Acronym	PiP		
Project Title	Principles in Patterns		
Start Date	1/09/08	**End Date**	31/07/12
Lead Institution	University of Strathclyde		
Project Director(s)	Professor Ray Land & Dr Diane McDonald		
Project Manager & contact details	Catherine Owen catherine.owen@strath.ac.uk		
Partner Institutions	n/a		
Project Web URL	www.principlesinpatterns.ac.uk		
Programme Name (and number)	*Institutional Approaches to Curriculum Design*		
Programme Manager	Sarah Knight		

Document Name		
Document Title	*Interim Report*	
Reporting Period	*May 2010 – October 2010*	
Author(s) & project role	Catherine Owen (Project Manager); Jim Everett (Technical Manager); Prof David Nicol (Project Consultant); Dr Diane McDonald (Project Director); Prof Ray Land (Project Director)	
Date	30/04/2010	**Filename**
URL	*if document is posted on project web site*	
Access	☐ Project and JISC internal	✕ General dissemination

Document History		
Version	**Date**	**Comments**
3.0	October 2010	

Interim Reporting Template

Project Name: *PiP (Principles in Patterns) University of Strathclyde*

Report compiled by: *Catherine Owen*

With contributions from: *David Nicol, Ray Land, Diane McDonald, Jim Everett, Donna Cullen, Dariusz Jabrzyk*

Reporting period: *May 2010 – October 2010*

Section One: Summary

1.1   Focussing project aims

The University of Strathclyde is nearing the end of a major re-structuring phase. In response to changing organisational needs the project team have worked with the Steering Group to refine and focus project aims. The revised aims are:

(i)   to develop and test a prototype on-line expert system and linked set of educational resources that, if adopted, would:

- improve the efficiency of course and class approval processes at the University of Strathclyde

- help stimulate reflection about the educational design of classes and courses and about the student experiences they would promote

- support the alignment of course and class provision with institutional policies and strategies

(ii) to use the findings from (i) to share lessons learned and to produce a set of recommendations to the University of Strathclyde and to the HE sector about ways of improving class and course approval processes

These revised aims were communicated to the JISC Programme Manager, Sarah Knight, in June 2010.

1.2   Consolidation of the project team

The re-structuring at the University of Strathclyde has led to changes in project personnel and to project roles during this period. Professor David Nicol retired from his post at CAPLE at the end of September 2010, but retains an active role at the University of Strathclyde and will continue to contribute to project activities and outputs until the project end date in July 2010. Professor Ray Land has replaced David as Co-Director of the PiP project.

Dr Diane McDonald is expected to remain as the project's other Co-Director until December 2010. Any decisions on a replacement for Diane after that date will be communicated to the JISC Programme Manager as soon as possible.

1.3   Educational development

During this reporting period, the project team has:

- Reviewed existing class and course approval documentation and identified the aspects of the documentation that the PiP project should focus its attention on.
- Considered revisions to the educational information collected to support class and course approval, based on the university's emerging educational strategy.
- Presented a plan for revisions to this educational content to the Project Steering Group and to senior management at the University of Strathclyde, proposing new data fields aligned to educational strategy and to its graduates attribute framework.
- Developed an initial set of educational questions to support curriculum approval processes aligned with this strategic work and scoped out the educational resources that might support staff reflection as they answer these questions.
- Piloted these questions with academic staff at the University of Strathclyde.
- Presented, and received further feedback on, the approach to question construction from colleagues at the JISC programme meeting.
- Developed a refined version of these questions based on the feedback received and developed plans for further piloting during November and December 2010.

Once agreement on a new set of educational data fields/questions to support the university's strategy has been reached, these will be incorporated into the prototype online class and course approval system being built by the project team.

1.4   Technical development

The project is creating a prototype web-based approval system to support curriculum design, approval and the management of workflows associated with these processes that includes dynamic guidance for users. Some parts of this work are being undertaken as part of the PiP project and other aspects are part of wider technical developments in the University. One concern of the work during this period has been to ensure that the prototype system interoperates with other university data management systems, that it will be able to re-purposes data fields where appropriate from those existing systems and that, as far as possible, the system reflects the emerging data collection needs of the university.

During this reporting period the PiP project team has:

- Worked with the university's governance team and with sub-groups of the university's review of class and course approval and review group to establish requirements and timelines for delivery of business case information via an online system
- Established data structures in line with the university's corporate data systems.
- Undertaken user testing of interfaces with departmental and administrative representatives.

1.5 Institutional impact

The project is recognised as a source of information and expertise as the University of Strathclyde conducts its institution-wide review of class and course approval and review. Baseline data captured during the first phase of the project has informed the activities of University Committees (Educational Strategy, Graduate Attributes, Curriculum renewal) working groups associated with this review. Reports and other documents created by the project team are influencing university thinking on the relationship between big strategic ideas like graduate attributes development and its monitoring, and their relationship to real student experiences delivered through curriculum designs. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the project has been a catalyst for discussions about revisions to the university's class and course approval process amongst colleagues who may not have met otherwise as part of their day-to-day roles.

Section Two: Activities and Progress

2.1 Activities and progress

During this reporting period the project has:

(i)   Refocused the project aims to secure the best possible fit with institutional strategy;

(ii)   Considered what educational data might be of most value to staff involved in curriculum design; in curriculum approval; and to those staff monitoring the impact of the university's educational strategy.

(iii)   Developed some new course approval questions intended to stimulate reflection about the educational design of classes and courses and about their alignment with institutional policies and strategies

(iv)   Working within the context of wider course and class review, started to develop a prototype class and course approval workflow system and undertaken use-ability testing with academic and administrative stakeholders

2.1.1 Re-focussing the PiP project aims

During academic year 2009/10, the University of Strathclyde has undertaken a re-structuring exercise that has resulted in two faculties merging and in significant re-organisation of the institution's management structures. This process has created new roles in the university's senior management team and re-defined roles and reporting lines for both of the departments involved in the project (CAPLE which is now a part of a larger group, the Student Enhancement and Experience Services and Learning Services, which has now been subsumed into a larger group within the Information Services Directorate). The PiP project enjoys high levels of recognition across the institution and the project is intended to add value to the university by contributing to the reform of institutional processes. The project team have worked with the project steering group and with the new senior managers in post to re-focus the project aims to better reflect the scope of PiP and other developments (ongoing and planned) within the university. The revised aims are:

(i)   to develop and test a prototype on-line expert system and linked set of educational resources that, if adopted, would:

- improve the efficiency of course and class approval processes at the University of Strathclyde
- help stimulate reflection about the educational design of classes and courses and about the student experiences they would promote
- support the alignment of course and class provision with institutional policies and strategies

(ii) to use the findings from (i) to share lessons learned and to produce a set of recommendations to the University of Strathclyde and to the HE sector about ways of improving class and course approval processes

In our previous report (April 2010) we discussed the potential opportunities of creating a new process that linked approval of new classes and/or courses with the review of those classes and/or courses once one or more iterations had been delivered to students. The project's steering group recognised the value of these potential innovations but it was agreed that this work should form part of the set of recommendations for a subsequent phase of work once the current project is complete.

2.1.2   Educational development

During this period the project team have reviewed the current documentation produced as part of class and course procedures and, building on the baseline data collected in the first phase of the project identified that:

- Fields on the current forms do not stimulate productive reflection about the educational design of classes and courses or about the student experiences they would promote.
- Fields in current forms do not stimulate reflection on how class and course provision aligns with institutional strategies and policies (e.g. graduate attributes, internationalisation etc.)
- The current forms give no advice to support design thinking, even, for example, simple advice on how to write learning outcomes.
- It is currently difficult to share examples of good practice across the university because there is no systematic collection of data about how classes and courses are designed and the current documentation does not support this.

The project team reviewed the data fields on a range of the forms currently used to document module proposals for approval. The team identified the specific data fields relevant to the educational aspirations of the university and produced a number of revisions and additions to the existing forms. These changes draw on good educational practice as evidenced by published educational research and on relevant university educational principles and policies (e.g. assessment principles, graduate attributes, employability).

Our initial work has been informed by consultations with academic and administrative colleagues in faculties and departments (including the Strathclyde Business School, Prosthetics and Orthotics, and Chemical Engineering) and builds on the work to revise existing forms undertaken in the Strathclyde Business School and the Faculty of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences.

A paper detailing examples of revised educational questions and supporting contextual advice was submitted to the June meeting of the university's Education Strategy Committee.

2.1.3   Technical development and user testing

During this reporting period the development team have worked with university stakeholders to further develop the technical system that will form one of the outputs of PiP. Stakeholders include the working groups associated with the University's current Review of Class and Course Approval and Review that is being led by the GMAP team as well as staff in academic departments currently responsible for these processes.

Key messages from these constituencies reinforce the messages we collected during the initial base-lining phase of the project. Currently there is a lack of institutional information about how processes are conducted across the university and no definitive list of data fields in use across the faculties although there are a number of corporate systems in place which are, or could be, used to collect valuable data about certain aspects of courses (for example, the data associated with the European Diploma Supplement).

The entities diagram below (see Figure 1) represents the project's current best effort at capturing generic data fields associated with curriculum approval. These data fields will inevitably change as the project progresses and new fields are identified as valuable by those university constituencies considering issues like the business case for new classes and courses and the work currently underway in defining educational questions aligned with the university's emerging strategy.

Further discussions with the university's Registry and ITS services have established which data fields from other corporate systems (for example, Human Resources, Registry etc.) might be usefully exposed as part of the PiP system. These fields include:

- Staff member class related responsibility types
- Class activity types (PiP naming) / teaching group types (Oracle Admissions naming)
- Credit Level (PiP naming) / classification (Oracle Admissions naming)
- Credit Scheme types
- Marking scheme types
- Core-optional status (PiP naming) / Elective-non-elective (Oracle Admissions naming)

Current piloting of the educational questions being developed by the team includes a consideration of the best data type or format to support ease of use and re-purposing of data. As this work progresses, technical development will begin to include development of educational question types.

Figure 1: Entities diagram October 2010

.2.3   Progress against work-packages

WORKPACKAGE 4: Agile development of revised process workflow tools and supporting materials

Objective: develop, pilot and refine materials to support curriculum approval

Model enhanced/revised workflow and identify opportunities for materials and process development	First phase of development complete.
Requirements gathering and analysis	First phase of requirements gathering complete. Key work includes defining initial core fields based on the current forms in use and determining which data fields from existing university systems could be usefully exposed in the PiP system.
Identify initial partners – administrative and academic	Complete.
Create first iteration of workflow tools and supporting materials	Demonstrator version of workflow tools complete. (reported in April 2010 report). First iteration of functional system complete.
Iterative piloting and refining of workflow tools	First phase of workshops with key stakeholders complete.

WORKPACKAGE 5: Agile development of curriculum designs and support materials

Objective: develop, pilot and refine materials to support curriculum design

Model enhanced curriculum design practice and identify opportunities for materials development	Complete.
Identify academic partners	Complete.
Requirements gathering and analysis	Complete. Existing documentation has been reviewed and educational fields identified.
Create first iteration of educational questions to support curriculum approval and supporting materials	Complete. A paper detailing the project's approach and including sample questions was submitted to the university's education strategy committee in June.
Iterative piloting with academic partners	An initial set of educational questions to support an enhanced approach to curriculum approval and

supporting resources has been piloted with academic representatives from a number of faculties and departments. Feedback from this piloting is informing a second iteration of these materials.

WORKPACKAGE 6: Year 2 project management and governance

Objective: the effective management of the project

Reporting to JISC	Third interim report delivered in October 2010.
Team meetings	The project team has a scheduled monthly meeting as well as ad hoc meetings as required. Changes to the project team during the reporting period have meant that team meetings have been less frequent.
Meetings of project steering group	The project steering group met in June 2010.
Liaison with university constituencies	The project was featured in the July 2010 edition of PRISM, the University of Strathclyde's internal staff publication.
Maintenance of document archive and shared area	On-going.

WORKPACKAGE 7: Year 2 programme activities

Objective: to share information with and benefit from partner relationships across the programme

Cluster meetings	A cluster meeting took place during the October 2010 JISC programme meeting.
Programme meetings	The project ran a workshop at the October 2010 Programme meeting. Feedback from the workshop is informing future development of educational questions and supporting contextual advice.
Programme evaluation activities	Formative evaluation activities are on-going. A finalised plan for summative evaluation has been delayed due to team changes.
Joint dissemination activities	A joint paper planned with the cluster has not been completed. The cluster is instead considering a joint

online conference and contributions to a book publication.

WORKPACKAGE 8: Year 2 dissemination

Objective: Sharing interim findings and lessons learned within institution and across the sector

Project website development	Development of the project website is on-going, including regular blog updates on project activities (www.principlesinpatterns.ac.uk).
Conferences/presentations	Presentation of project at the University of Brighton, June 2010.

WORKPACKAGE 9: Second iteration phase of agile development of revised process workflow tools and supporting materials

Objective: Develop, pilot and refine revised process workflow tools and supporting materials

Create further iterations of workflow tools and supporting materials	In progress.
Iterative piloting and refining of workflow tools	In progress.
Agree final version of workflow tools	Complete by July 2011.

WORKPACKAGE 10: Second iteration phase of agile development of curriculum designs and support materials

Objective: develop, pilot and refine materials to support curriculum design

Create further iterations of educational questions to support curriculum approval and supporting materials	In progress.
Iterative piloting with academic partners	In progress.
Agree final version of curriculum design materials	The team have discussed a timeline for delivery of iterations of this material based on the technical development window which completes in July 2011. It is likely that user testing of the workflow system including these questions will create useful feedback that could be used to further refine the documentation specifications beyond the technical development phase. A further set of refined questions and supporting contextual advice could then form the basis a final set of recommendations to the university and the JISC community in 2012.

WORKPACKAGE 11: Year 3 project management and governance

Objective: the effective management of the project

Team meetings	
Meetings of project steering group	Colin Grant has replaced Anne Hughes as Chair of the PiP Steering Group. The project team will brief Colin shortly on project aims and activities and a date for the next meeting will be circulated.
Liaison with university constituencies	On-going.
Maintenance of document archive and shared area	On-going.

WORKPACKAGE 12: Year 3 programme activities

Objective: to share information with and benefit from partner relationships across the programme

Cluster meetings	The next cluster CAMEL meeting is scheduled for December 2010.
Programme meetings	Next programme meeting scheduled May 2011
Programme evaluation activities	As required
Joint dissemination activities	As required

WORKPACKAGE 13: Year 3 dissemination

Objective: Sharing interim findings and lessons learned within institution

and across the sector

Project website development   On-going
Conferences/presentations   On-going

2.4   Partnership building

External activities

In September 2010 the team hosted a visit from colleagues from Curtin University of Technology, Western Australia, who have also been developing technical systems to support aspects of curriculum design and approval, including curriculum mapping, at their institution. Our discussion uncovered some particularly interesting ideas about the role of educational development staff in mediating interactions with online tools and about how the data generated from those tools could be used by individual academics and departments to analyse elements of the curriculum. Members of the project team hope to embark on a collaborative project with the team at Curtin shortly.

More information about the Curtin project can be found at:
http://web.me.com/beverleyoliver1/benchmarking/Curriculum_mapping.html

The project team have also been investigating outputs from other projects in the programme, notably those from MMU and from the Open University and considering how these projects are presenting administrative and educational data in their own online tools. We will continue to monitor, and learn from, the approaches taken by other projects as more data becomes available.

Discussions at the recent JISC programme meeting have created some useful opportunities for joint dissemination activities. These are likely to include:

- An online conference considering support for curriculum design in partnership with the Open University and the University of Ulster.
- A joint book publication with other cluster partners across the Institutional Approaches to Curriculum Design cluster.

Section Three: Risks, Issues and Opportunities

3.1   University re-structuring

In our previous interim reports we have reported on the significant re-structuring activities underway at the University of Strathclyde. Changes of particular relevance in this reporting period have included:

- **Re-structuring of professional services**: both departments involved in the project (Learning Services and CAPLE) have been involved in a major re-organisation of the university's central services. This re-structuring is now complete but there have been a number of changes that affect the project team as below. Discussions are currently underway between both departments to ensure that project outcomes are achieved within the context of new roles and responsibilities.

- **Changes to the project team**
  Professor David Nicol retired in September 2010, but will remain an active member of the PiP team until the project is completed in July 2012. Professor Ray Land has replaced David as Co-Director of the project. Any further team changes will be communicated to the JISC Programme Manager as soon as possible.

- **Changes to the project steering group**
  Anne Hughes, Deputy Principal, retired in July 2010. Anne has been replaced with two appointments, Professor Colin Grant and Professor Val Belton. Val is currently a member of the PiP Steering Group and Colin will take over as Chair of this group shortly. The project team will brief both Colin and Val on project objectives and progress shortly.

3.2   Working within university change contexts

In our previous report (April 2010) we commented on the challenges of working within a large organisation undergoing re-structuring activities. The University of Strathclyde is currently undertaking an institution-wide review of curriculum approval and review processes. This review involves the active participation of a large number of university stakeholders drawn from academic faculties and from professional services. The PiP project is recognised as one component of a number of initiatives within this review that will deliver outcomes of use to the university. The review offers the project team the opportunity to influence institutional thinking, and ultimately contribute to a new set of processes, but the team also need to respond to the demands of a large number of diverse stakeholders.

In re-focussing the aims of the project we have sought to clarify what areas of institutional activity the project might seek to *influence* and what areas of activity it should *respond* to. This is an important distinction that recognises the complexity associated with large-scale data systems at the university. The system being built as part of the PiP project outcomes will inter-operate as far as possible with existing systems and will include those data fields that have been agreed by the university as part of the wider review process. These fields include, for example, those which are concerned with the business case for new classes (or modules). The project team do not seek to

define or influence the design of these fields, but can incorporate then into the workflow system if they are defined during the development timescale for the project.

The project team do however aim to contribute to institutional thinking about data collection related to the aspirations in the university's educational strategies and about the kinds of support offered to academic staff involved in curriculum design. This includes contributing to the discussions at the university's education strategy committee and its working groups and helping to resolve some of the complexity associated with translating high-level strategic aspirations into real curriculum designs. The outputs and recommendations of the PiP project are likely to constitute one part of a larger framework that includes a strategic vision for the work of the Centre for Academic Practice and Learning Enhancement (CAPLE), the Careers Service and others concerned with implementing the university's vision for the student experience.

There are, inevitably, many stakeholders with particular interests in the student experience who are also seeking to influence the way that curricula are designed, documented and approved at the institution. The challenge for the project team is to ensure that project activities and recommendations are usefully aligned with institution-wide activities and that decisions about how curriculum approval processes may be defined and managed in the future reflect the best possible educational thinking.

Section Four: Outputs and Deliverables

4.1   Packaging of project outputs

The project team is currently considering planned project outputs in more detail and discussing how project outputs might best be packaged and disseminated to different audiences. At the University of Strathclyde, key outputs are likely to include:

- A baseline map of the sequence of institutional processes and procedures that support decision-making and approval of curricula.
- A prototype online class and course approval workflow system that, as far as possible, reflects the needs of different constituencies involved in course approval processes.
- A prototype set of educational questions that, if incorporated into curriculum approval documentation offers better fit with university educational strategy and potential to create a valuable re-purposable resource to support enhancement.
- A sample of online support resources for academic staff involved in curriculum design and curriculum approval decisions.
- Recommendations for the future of the online system, including a development roadmap and business plan to inform investment decisions.
- Recommendations and a roadmap for future provision of support for curriculum development at the university, drawing on the lessons learned in PiP.
- Dissemination events to institutional audiences including senior managers, academic staff etc.

Although many of the materials listed above can be made available to external audiences, the project's outputs of most interest to those outside the University of Strathclyde are likely to include:

- Recommendations about the development of online systems to support curriculum approval.
- Recommendations about the development and use of enhancement-led questions in curriculum approval.
- Research and conference papers.
- A joint online event with our cluster partners.
- A joint book publication across two clusters in the programme.
- A website detailing progress during the lifespan of the project and as a dissemination point after the project close.
- An evaluation report detailing successes and lessons learned.
- Interim and final reports to JISC detailing lessons learned

We are currently experimenting with the Design Studio and discussing how current project deliverables including papers, presentations and prototype tools might be presented to this audience.

Section Five: Evaluation

5.1   Current evaluation activities

The project's evaluation activities are currently primarily formative and embedded within the development work currently on-going. Data is being captured on an internal team blog that allows project team members to record comments, observations and reflections on meetings with stakeholders and other activities. The focus of these activities is to ensure that the outputs of PiP, including the workflow system, educational questions and support materials best reflect institutional need. Additional data collection activities are helping the project team to develop recommendations about the future of technical and other outputs from the project based on an informed view of changing university requirements. A growing database of documents and other resources created in SharePoint and by the project team helps to draw together information.

Earlier outputs from the project, including the data collected during the base-lining phase have been shared with the GMAP team at the university and the data collected about current approval processes has informed the activities of the current institutional review of approval and review processes.

5.2   Focussing future evaluation questions

In our last report (April 2010) we described the BIILS methodology and reported that the project had been invited to be a BIILS case study. Our experience of participating in the BIILS workshops has suggested a methodology for collecting data from university stakeholders about perceived potential benefits of the PiP prototype class and course approval workflow system and about the educational resources supported by the system.

We anticipate that focus groups with stakeholders will suggest a number of potential benefits from the system and that some of these benefits may not have been anticipated by the project team. Discussions with stakeholders as part of the formative development of the project are already suggesting benefits including the value of creating a databank of new class and course data that could hep the university to demonstrate the alignment of educational strategies with curriculum provision and facilitate sharing of good practice across the institution.

The most important measure of success will be the extent to which the university adopts the recommendations made by the project team on the future development of the outputs of the project.

Section Six: Outcomes and Lessons Learned

6.1 Complexities in creating and piloting meaningful educational questions

Task, class (module) or course (programme) level?

During the base-lining phase of the project we considered the relationship between tasks, classes (or modules) and courses (programmes) and how these levels inter-related to create the student experience. One question that we have been considering during this reporting period is which level might be the best starting-point for the development of new educational questions to support enhanced curriculum approval processes.

Initially, we focussed on the design of courses (or programmes) and had a number of discussions with academic staff and with key administrators including Faculty Officers, about how best to revise the university's existing programme specification forms. As a result of the feedback from these discussions we decided to focus instead on class or module-level documentation, which is widely viewed as more tractable. We reviewed a varied set of module documentation forms in use across the institution and identified educational fields that could be improved.

Our initial question designs have re-focussed attention away from what the *teacher* intends to deliver during the module (e.g. how many lectures, how many assignments) towards an attempt to capture what the *students* will experience and where their learning will occur during the module. This draws on work by George Kuh on high-impact learning activities that is currently informing the university's educational strategy development.

Feedback from piloting of these initial questions has raised issues about the level of detail that module approval documentation should collect about what students are asked to do in each module and how these activities relate to the high-level aspirations in university strategies. The next phase of work is considering approaches to these issues.

Some further lessons from this work

- Changing a single field or question on the existing forms is likely to have little or no real effect. The impact in terms of stimulating appropriate reflection will be far greater if a combination of reinforcing fields/questions is produced.
- Many academics view filling out these forms as a chore: if the information collected could be re-used it would enhance academic staff's motivation to crate good quality data (e.g. if it could be re-purposed to create information for students or to support sharing of good practice).
- The data fields should ask the kinds of questions that are already being asked by staff members in departments when they are designing modules. The hope is that revised data fields can make a real contribution to existing design practice in departments.

Section Seven: Communication and Dissemination Activities

7.1   Internal Communications

- Presentations to senior managers on the aims and progress of the project.

- Paper on PiP's educational development and alignment with the University's educational strategy presented at the June meeting of the university's Education Strategy Committee.

- Paper including description of PiP's role in embedding assessment and feedback principles in the curriculum tabled at the October meeting of the university's Education Strategy Committee.

- The project was featured in the June 2010 edition of PRISM, the University of Strathclyde's internal staff newsletter: http://www.strath.ac.uk/media/publications/prism/2010/Prism_252.pdf

- Further piloting of the demonstrator version of the process tools which the team have used with a variety of stakeholder groups to explain project goals and outcomes and to stimulate discussion about system and process requirements.

- Piloting of educational questions with representatives of the university's academic community.

7.2   External Communications

- The PiP project manager hosted a half-day seminar at the University of Brighton in June 2010 which presented PiP in the context of a number of related institutional change activities at the University of Strathclyde, including the REAP project (www.reap.ac.uk).

- The PiP Project Manager hosted a workshop session at the October JISC Programme Meeting. This session presented early versions of the educational questions being developed by the project team and asked for comments about their utility and relevance. The feedback from the session is informing the development of a further iteration of these questions.

- The project website (www.principlesinpatterns.ac.uk), includes blog entries and key documents and other resources.

Section Eight: Collaboration and Support

8.1   Cluster meetings

The next cluster CAMEL meeting is scheduled for $2^{nd}/3^{rd}$ December. The cluster took the opportunity to meet during the October JISC Programme Meeting and discussed opportunities for joint dissemination activities. This topic will form the basis for the December meeting.

8.2   Critical friend

Peter Bullen, the project's critical friend provided support and advice in the development of the project's workshop at the October JISC Programme Meeting and helped to facilitate the session. We greatly appreciate Peter's input on educational ideas within the project and his help in translating project concerns into messages that are relevant to the wider programme.

8.3   Programme support

Project team members have participated in Elluminate sessions hosted by the programme team and found these an effective way of getting useful information and sharing ideas across the programme. We hope to be able to offer a similar session from the PiP project in 2011.

As planned, we are now drawing on support from the programme team in developing and mounting resources on the JISC Design Studio.

Section Nine: Financial Statement

** pending publication of October figures.

Total Grant		Duration of project	
Reporting Period			

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:

- ☐ 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)