

<b>Factor to Evaluate</b> <i>What do you want to know?</i>	<b>Indicators</b> <i>How will you know?</i>	<b>Source of information</b> <i>Where can this data be obtained?</i>	<b>Collection method</b> <i>How will the data be gathered?</i>	<b>Schedule</b> <i>When, where and who will gather the data?</i>
<b>Does the PC3 approach support Assessment, learning and teaching within Leeds Met?</b>				
Is coaching effective in supporting personalized curriculum creation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Positive feedback and increased demand from students for PLC module.</li> <li>•Increasing demand from staff for adopting PLC module in programmes.</li> <li>•Increasing enrolment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Academic and admin. staff, students, internal requests for engaging with PLC modules</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•PLC reflections, student and staff focus groups</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•PC3 Team as requests are made, research officer for surveys at end of academic year, PLC module teams and PC3 team to review student reflections on completion of PLC module</li> </ul>
Has coaching influenced academic programme design within Leeds Met?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Invitations to raise awareness of PC3 at key programme events,</li> <li>•Inclusion of the PLC module in awards not identified as part of the pilot cohorts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Programme leaders, programme event calendars, programme specifications</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Workshops at key programme events, review of new and amended programme specifications</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Research officer will review annually</li> </ul>
Does coaching complement existing ALT approaches within Leeds Met?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Increasing numbers of students enrolling on the PLC module,</li> <li>•Students more autonomous,</li> <li>•Staff adopt coaching as a further teaching approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Student record system</li> <li>•Staff and student feedback on life and learning experiences at Leeds Met</li> <li>•Staff feedback and reflections</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Annual review</li> <li>•PLC reflections and subsequent contacts with students</li> <li>•Institutional reflections and staff PLC reflections</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Research officer will work with Student record system data</li> <li>•PC3 Team assessment and PLC module team reviews</li> <li>•PC3 Team at end of PLC modules</li> </ul>
Has coaching influenced the choice of assessment, learning and teaching tools within Leeds Met?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Criteria for new institutional (and Faculty) ALT support tools include support for coaching approach.</li> <li>•Coaching activities involved in student assessments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Draft tool criteria,</li> <li>•Changes in assessment approaches,</li> <li>•PC3 team members,</li> <li>•Coaching oriented presentations to key programme events</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•PC3 have input to criteria creation,</li> <li>•Teacher Fellow discussions,</li> <li>•Survey of programme / module leaders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Annual review by research officer working with ALT staff.</li> </ul>
<b>What is the impact of coaching within Leeds Met?</b>				
<b>Does coaching work for students?</b>				
Are learners at Leeds Met able to benefit from flexible, personalised curriculum design and delivery across a range of subject areas?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Students successfully using competency mapping and coaching to choose personalized pathways.</li> <li>•Formal and informal learning accredited through flexible and personalised assessment, students from a range of disciplines experienced PC3 approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Students, Lecturers, admin staff, student reflections on</li> <li>•PLC module</li> <li>•Student record systems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Cohort questionnaires.</li> <li>•Use of platform.</li> <li>•PLC module assessment</li> <li>•Assessment records</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•DW at the end of each session.</li> <li>•Course tutors.</li> </ul>

<b>Factor to Evaluate</b> <i>What do you want to know?</i>	<b>Indicators</b> <i>How will you know?</i>	<b>Source of information</b> <i>Where can this data be obtained?</i>	<b>Collection method</b> <i>How will the data be gathered?</i>	<b>Schedule</b> <i>When, where and who will gather the data?</i>
Have learners as stakeholders had a say in project activities and how they are carried out?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Student feedback collected, analysed and used to refine the process and the PC3 module</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Focus group feedback, PC3 module student feedback, informal anonymous feedback from coaching sessions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Promotional meetings with selected pilot groups where individuals can opt for the coached route and input into the project</li> <li>•This will occur for each cohort so will inform future activities e.g. evidence gathering, development of support technology and materials.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The whole team for the first cohort. Subsequently the research officer will co-ordinate data collection through the staff teams supporting the delivery of the PC3 approach for the individual pilot groups.</li> </ul>
Does coaching encourage self-direction and independence in learners?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Students demonstrating increased self-direction as a result of the coaching process.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Self-direction measures</li> <li>Student reflections</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Self direction instrument applied pre and post coaching</li> <li>•Reflection guidance include reflection on self direction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Data collected for each cohort of PC3.</li> </ul>
<b>Does coaching work for staff?</b>				
Are the PC3 team members and staff able to support students using the PC3 approach?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Team members have successfully completed a recognized coaching course.</li> <li>•Team members have successfully trained other staff in coaching as an educational approach.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Staff CVs, accredited coaching courses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Staff put through accredited training courses in coaching</li> </ul>	All – Apr 09 – Dec 09
Are there training materials available to support the use of coaching as an educational tool?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Appropriate training materials available</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Accredited training courses in coaching, staff experienced in training, staff experienced in coaching</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Available training materials tailored for the PC3 approach</li> </ul>	All Sep 09 – Feb 10
Is there a schedule of courses for training staff and students in the coaching approach?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Training opportunities for staff adopting the PC3 approach are scheduled</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Materials available, dates of training lodged with Faculties, availability of staff involved with first cohorts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Create a schedule based around staff availability, start date of using PC3 approach and the time at which the training materials become available</li> </ul>	All – before Jun 10
Is coaching effective in supporting personalized curriculum creation from the staff viewpoint?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Lecturers are comfortable with coaching and are able to use it to negotiate the provision of learning opportunities and support students.</li> <li>•Students are able to create their own study paths and report satisfaction and success in the processes followed and the outcomes achieved.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Lecturers, students, admin staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Staff and student questionnaires. Focus groups.</li> <li>•Case studies illustrating the coaching process, student negotiations, student outcomes from adopting the PC3 approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•DW at the end of each session.</li> </ul>
<b>Does coaching work for the institution?</b>				

<b>Factor to Evaluate</b> <i>What do you want to know?</i>	<b>Indicators</b> <i>How will you know?</i>	<b>Source of information</b> <i>Where can this data be obtained?</i>	<b>Collection method</b> <i>How will the data be gathered?</i>	<b>Schedule</b> <i>When, where and who will gather the data?</i>
Has PC3 been adopted by staff not involved in the pilot cohorts?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Approvals of course teams for adopting PC3.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•New Staff coming forward to be involved in the PC3 project. Invitations to address staff outside the initial chosen cohorts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Feedback from staff in the SRO</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•JF / JG throughout the project.</li> </ul>
Has PC3 influenced University strategies and directions?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•PC3 a key element of the university Assessment, Learning and Teaching Strategy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Institutional strategies and other key university documents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Pro Vcs and other senior staff requesting input from the PC3 team in revising key institutional strategies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•JF / JG throughout the project.</li> </ul>
Do senior managers understand the strategic importance of flexible learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Senior Management engage in the project, and are involved in relevant change management processes.</li> <li>•Faculties target new markets</li> <li>•Changes to processes, regulations and institutional procedures</li> <li>•Changes to university administrative and records systems</li> <li>•There is an increase in the enrolment of part-time work-based learners</li> <li>•Enrolment onto individual curriculum pathways</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Marketing staff, enrolment staff,</li> <li>•RSO manual of processes, Student records</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Attendance at events.</li> <li>•Revised processes and systems.</li> <li>•Annual audit of enrolment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•DW after each event.</li> <li>•University records.</li> <li>•Cohort staff on each complete intake.</li> </ul>
Is coaching as a model for supporting learning embedded in ALT at Leeds Met	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Coaching used increasingly across the university.</li> <li>•National recognition of Leeds Met as an educational coaching centre</li> <li>•Staff promote coaching as critical to their success</li> <li>•Increased number of staff qualified coaches.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Existence of Educational coaching centre</li> <li>•Lecturers undertaken recognised qualifications and/or staff development.</li> <li>•Increase in courses making use of coaching.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Interviews/questionnaires with lecturers</li> <li>•Records of training</li> <li>•Prospectus and course descriptors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Audit of university records and completion of courses.</li> <li>•Audit of university courses using coaching</li> </ul>
<b>What is the impact of technology on the PC3 coaching?</b>				
Do we know what we want the prototype technology to be able to do?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•A list of functional and user requirements for the technology has been created.</li> <li>•A specification for the PC3 framework has been created.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Academic staff, technical staff, administrative staff, students, reports from earlier projects, inputs from CETL ALPS and</li> <li>•ALiC staff, input from employers and staff engaged in employability activities, professional bodies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Formation of user groups, evaluation of previous reports, collation of past experiences</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•All – Mar 09</li> </ul>

<b>Factor to Evaluate</b> <i>What do you want to know?</i>	<b>Indicators</b> <i>How will you know?</i>	<b>Source of information</b> <i>Where can this data be obtained?</i>	<b>Collection method</b> <i>How will the data be gathered?</i>	<b>Schedule</b> <i>When, where and who will gather the data?</i>
Is there existing technology that we can use to support the PC3 process?	•Potential suppliers have been identified and a best fit candidate proposed.	•Team knowledge, input from user groups, recommendation and word of mouth, advertising in professional publications etc, features claimed for potential supplier products	•Comparison of potential product features against the list of functional and user requirements	•JF/JG/DW – Apr09
What university systems will this technology need to integrate with?	•List of systems have been identified	•Technical support staff at the university, VLE support staff, repository support staff, RSO staff, user groups for existing university systems, academic staff, students	•Steering group containing key representatives created to identify the interaction of the technology with existing and imminent university systems	•JF / JG / DW – May 09
Can this technology integrate with those systems?	•Statements of the degree of integration required between proposed technology and key existing university systems.	•Technical support staff at the university, VLE support staff, repository support staff, RSO staff, user groups for existing university systems, academic staff, students	•Steering group containing key representatives created to identify the interaction of the technology with existing and imminent university systems	•JF / JG / DW – May 09
Is this technology appropriate for use with other university systems?	•Statements of the degree of integration required between proposed technology and other existing university systems.	•Technical support staff at the university, VLE support staff, repository support staff, RSO staff, user groups for existing university systems, academic staff, students	•Steering group containing key representatives created to identify the interaction of the technology with existing and imminent university systems	•JF / JG / DW – May 09
Are staff and students supported in their use of the technology?	•Documentation for technical staff, academic staff and students on using the proposed technology has been created. Induction resources are available.	•Suppliers of the proposed technology, team members, academic staff	•Proposed technology will come with user documentation and this will be tailored by team members to support academic staff, and academics together with project team members will create student user documentation	•All – Feb 10 for the Leaders in Learning cohort.
<b>Facilitating Personalisation?</b>				
Does the university support personalisation? What are the existing curriculum design processes?	•A model of the processes and procedures has been built. •Report outlining these processes has been created.	•University Academic Principles and procedures, the Registrar and Secretary's office (RSO), academic staff engaged in designing curricula	•Analysis of the existing principles and procedures, discussions with RSO and academic staff	•JG and JF will have models ready for Apr 09

<b>Factor to Evaluate</b> <i>What do you want to know?</i>	<b>Indicators</b> <i>How will you know?</i>	<b>Source of information</b> <i>Where can this data be obtained?</i>	<b>Collection method</b> <i>How will the data be gathered?</i>	<b>Schedule</b> <i>When, where and who will gather the data?</i>
Does the university support personalisation? What changes are required to these existing processes to accommodate the PC3 approach?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•A list of stakeholder requirements has been created.</li> <li>•A list of change requirements has been created.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Models of existing processes, cases of sample typical part time work based students.</li> <li>Stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Analysis of the models created against sample cases of typical part time work based students to identify constraints stopping or hindering the PC3 approach. Discussions with stakeholders.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•MC / TM will do this for Leaders in Learning students in Feb 10; JF and</li> <li>•JG will do it for staff in the RUN for Jun 10</li> </ul>
What changes are needed to enhance personalisation? What are the processes necessary to support the PC3 approach?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•A model of these processes has been built</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•University Academic Principles and procedures modified by the change requirements identified above, the Registrar and Secretary's office, academic staff engaged in designing curricula</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Outcome from the analysis of existing curriculum design processes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•JG / JF together with staff in the RSO, academic staff and staff in the Quality standards Review and</li> <li>•Enhancement team by Jun 10</li> </ul>
Will the amended processes support the PC3 approach?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Typical cases of sample part time work based students are able to follow a PC3 approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Amended curriculum design processes and sample part time work based student cases.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Application of the cases against the amended processes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•JG / JF, MC/TM together with staff in the RSO, academic staff and staff in the Quality standards Review and Enhancement team by Jun 10</li> </ul>
Is coaching effective in creating personalized curricula?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Students successfully using competency mapping and coaching to choose personalized pathways.</li> <li>•Formal and informal learning accredited through flexible and personalised assessment, increase number of students following personalised curricula, increasing number of staff adopting coaching as a teaching approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Students, Lecturers, admin staff</li> <li>•Student record systems</li> <li>•Numbers of staff completing coaching training</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Cohort questionnaires. Use of platform.</li> <li>•Assessment records</li> <li>•Student feedback, staff feedback, student records, case studies from staff using coaching</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•DW at the end of each session.</li> <li>•Course tutors.</li> <li>•Admin staff, central records staff</li> </ul>