Curriculum Design at Task, Module and Programme Level

Questions:

What types of representation at task, module and programme level help to create good curriculum design?

Are current representations and current support effective?

Are there other issues that should be considered?

	Tasks	Modules	Programmes
Stakeholders	Academic staff Students Educational Developers	As left, plus... Course leader(s) Head of Department Quality Officers University Management Registry, IT Services, Estates, Library and other services	As left, plus... Programme Co-ordinators Faculty Administrators University Management
Representations	Design principles (e.g. Principles of Assessment and Feedback) Learning design patterns Case studies and exemplars Published research Descriptions of design processes Learning models embodied in design tools	As left, plus... Module description forms for quality assurance Student handbooks Approval procedures and reviews	Programme specification forms Subject benchmarking statements Prospectus Approval procedures and reviews
Support	Resources for staff and students (websites, leaflets) Workshops Consultancy Rewards for good teaching practice/design activities?	As left, plus... Departmental and faculty review processes Student feedback (questionnaires, staff/student committees, consultations, focus groups) External benchmarking	As left, plus... Faculty reviews National Student Survey Institutional surveys QAA guidelines
Issues	Disciplinary differences Task design is a complex process and hard to represent and share Different pedagogies inform task design (or no pedagogical thinking) Design approaches often tacit Design is dynamic not static Design is different from implementation	Module description forms have limited information about implementation processes Module design might not be linked explicitly to educational strategies Different people can be responsible for design and delivery Designs change over time/with personnel changes Failure to create developmental progression of tasks across the module Quality of information shared across different stakeholder groups Lack of information about crucial processes (e.g. feedback opportunities)	Teachers tend to focus on their own modules in isolation Articulating programme-wide considerations like student progression is complex Programmes might not comprise a coherent set of modules Programme level learning outcomes might not inform module level outcomes Programmes might not be linked explicitly to educational strategies More coherent programme planning might be a constraint on student choice Students get mixed messages about their learning and development

PiP at the University of Strathclyde

The PiP Project is part-funded by the Joint Information Systems Committee (JISC) Institutional Approaches to Curriculum Design Programme. PiP is identifying the key processes associated with the design, documentation, support and implementation of curricula in higher education and developing ways of enhancing these processes using digital technologies.

Project Directors: David Nicol, Diane McDonald
Project Manager: Catherine Owen,
Technical Manager: Jim Everett; Analyst: Donna Cullen; Developer: Dariusz Jabrzyk

University of Strathclyde Glasgow

JISC