



National  
Teaching  
Fellowship  
Scheme

# NTFS Project Progress Report

The purpose and acceptance criteria for NTFS projects submitting a progress report are described as part of the 'NTFS Project Reporting Procedure' paper.

Please complete the sections below. If you have any queries regarding the completion of the forms please contact the NTFS project strand Project Officer at [ntfsprojects@heacademy.ac.uk](mailto:ntfsprojects@heacademy.ac.uk) or 01904 717500.

## Progress Report Project Information

Project lead	Norwich School of Art and Design
Project title	InCurriculum
Lead contact name	Simon Willmoth
Reporting period	1 January to 30 June 2008

### 1. Project Update Summary

Please provide a short update on the project's achievements and current activities, to be disseminated on the Academy's website, maximum 200 words. **(Only this section will be made publicly available)**

The InCurriculum project has delivered and evaluated six modules in Year 1, using the work of the AchieveAbility project and Art and Design teaching to import good practice for effective teaching and assessment of SpLD students to all students in the HE sector. The website is fully functional with details of the project and project partners, and information on inclusive approaches to teaching and learning, and on the social model of disability. Evaluations of the modules delivered in the first year of the project will be loaded onto the website by September 2008. [www.incurriculum.org.uk](http://www.incurriculum.org.uk)

InCurriculum partners have disseminated information on the project at the NALN conference, at the South East and South West Aim Higher Regional conferences, at the May 2008 Disability Equality Partnership meeting, the June 2008 AchieveAbility Steering Group meeting and the University of Westminster Learning and Teaching Symposium in July 2008.

### 2. Activities and progress

2a. With reference to your project plan summarise your achievements during the last reporting period and whether the anticipated objectives, activities or deliverables have been completed.

If there has been any variance from your planned activities please say what the variance is and what its causes were? If applicable, what is being done to get back on track? Will the project plan need to be revised? *(Please list as headings or bullet points)*

The Project Management Group (PMG) has continued to refine and develop the project, with advice from the Steering Group (SG). A detailed evaluation strategy has been developed and modified in response to feedback from academic coordinators and module leaders. Academic coordinators in two of the partner organisations have met and shared experiences/issues with PMG.

PMG recognised that the role played by the lead organisation was not acknowledged in the project management section of the outline/application to the HEA. Therefore, a Project Leader role has been added to reflect the responsibilities of the contact at the lead organisation. The Project leader will:

- Oversee the progress of project outcomes

- Oversee and manage the project budget
- Act as the main point of contact with the Higher Education Academy, including submitting reports on the project.
- Convene and Chair Steering Group meetings
- Oversee the project identity and website design
- Work closely with the Project Director, Project Development Manager and Project Administrator

The project has delivered and evaluated six modules, five in art and design and one in business studies. Reports have been received from academic coordinators and module leaders. These will inform the planning and delivery of Year 2 of the project. One further module in Managing Creative Enterprise is ongoing as it is a postgraduate module that will finish in August 2008. We have identified the nine modules (three in each institution) that will be the focus of the project in Year 2. PMG and SG have clarified that the project will not be validating nine 'new' modules but will modify existing modules and adjust delivery, assessment and learning outcomes, as appropriate. Thus the operational plan has been adjusted, so that O3/O4 have been amended to read: 'Design of new *and revised* modules to incorporate inclusive approaches, including assessments.' The timing of O5 'Validation of modules' has also been moved to Year 2 of the project.

The website has been developed, with more information about the project and project partners, and some resources. Continued development in Year 2 is planned.

The dissemination strategy has been refined, with identified stakeholder groups and an ambition to disseminate the project internationally through members of the Steering Group. The NSAD academic coordinator was not appointed until late in Year 1 due to an ongoing difficulty appointing a Head of Learning and Teaching Development at NSAD, who was to be the academic coordinator. In the interim the Project Leader has acted as the academic coordinator at the School. This has now been resolved but affected the number of modules delivered and evaluated at the School.

Project partners and the Steering Group have agreed a detailed budget for Year 2 of the project.

2b. Use the template below to report expenditure. Explain the reasons for any significant overspend or underspend. **(Only required for the annual progress report, submitted in July)**

There has been an underspend of £4918 from the HEA funding in Year 1 of the project. This is due to the failure to appoint an academic coordinator at NSAD. The underspend has been incorporated into the balanced project budget for Year 2. We underestimated the cost of travel and subsistence for the project, due to the need for the Project Management Group to meet regularly and for academic coordinators to meet to discuss progress and for staff development activities. The costs of the project identity design and website design will balance over the first two years of the project.

### 3. Reflection

3a. Please articulate, in a short paragraph, the pedagogic issue, 'problem', or research question, at the heart of your NTFS project, bearing in mind that this central component may have evolved, developed and been refined. This should not simply be a reiteration of the project title.

The pedagogic issue is concerned with the accessibility of the HE curriculum to the diversity of students, specifically as regards learning style and learning difference. There is a developing literature about learning and teaching approaches which support dyslexic students, particularly in pre-university education (e.g. the AchieveAbility project). Our research question is: 'Can HE teaching and assessment be made more inclusive and accessible to all students, by drawing upon practices developed for those with specific learning differences?' Sub-questions include: 'Are the recommendations of the AchieveAbility project transferable to HE?' 'Are the visual approaches often used in Art & Design transferable to other disciplines?' 'Does modifying courses to make them more accessible improve students' response?' 'What is the response of course tutors to such initiatives?'

3a. Are you experiencing any problems which are impeding progress? If applicable, what are these? Are there any unresolved problems from the last report?	
We have anticipated a potential problem with the retirement of the Project Director in February 2009. We have informed the Higher Education Academy of this and of the plan to retain David Pollak as Project Director, paying him on a freelance basis. This will require the renegotiation of the Collaborative Agreement with De Montfort University and identifying continued support for the DMU academic coordinator within the University. This is ongoing.	
3b. How has the implementation of activities informed your approach? How do you see the project developing? Has progress changed the project or your expectations in any way? What lessons have been learned?	
<p>The project has developed in several ways. The three partner institutions are both similar and contrasting; the key point is that the modules involved in the project are complementary. We have enthusiastic and able co-ordinators in each institution; through working with them it has been decided that the project will not follow the plan of developing and validating brand new modules in each institution; rather, the focus is upon modifying existing modules in terms of delivery and assessment. In each institution, the modules involved are from both Art &amp; Design and another discipline. Through an Action Research approach, we will obtain detailed feedback from staff and students about each initiative, and reflect on this before moving to the next stage. We have learned that there is a great deal of good practice already in use; our expectation is that data analysis will show that staff and students both benefit from what might be summed up as 'dyslexia-friendly' practice, and that the 'mainstreaming' of this is beneficial to all. We have recognised the need to reinforce the focus of the project – to embed good practice for SpLD students into HE, to identify the benefits of this practice for non-SpLD students, rather than focus on SpLD students.</p> <p>We are aware that the outcomes of the project will need to be applicable to a range of subjects and will have to be realistic in terms of teaching budgets and staff/student ratios. It has become apparent that academic coordinators need to share experiences and practices with each other much more than occurred in the first half of Year 1. We have invited them to PMG and Steering Group meetings to further integrate them into the project, and they will meet regularly in Year 2.</p>	
<b>4. Future Activities</b>	
What activities, objectives or deliverables you expect to achieve during the next reporting period? <i>(Please list as headings or bullet points)</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expand information on the project website, including the evaluations of the first six modules.</li> <li>• Deliver staff development for academic coordinators and module leaders for Year 2 of the project. <i>24 September 2008 at NSAD.</i></li> <li>• Deliver and evaluate at least three modules informed by the outcomes from Year 1 of the project.</li> <li>• Renegotiate Collaborative Agreement between NSAD and DMU.</li> <li>• Negotiate a contract with David Pollak to operate from quarter 3 of Year 2.</li> <li>• Plan the Interim conference for quarter 4 of Year 2.</li> </ul>	
<b>5. Any other comments</b>	

I understand that the text provided in section 1a will be made publicly available on the Academy's website and other publications.

<b>Name</b>	Simon Willmoth
<b>Date</b>	10 July 2008

## Project Expenditure Template

	Expenditure over reporting period	Institution contribution over reporting period	Total
<b>Staff</b> (list all staff with FTEs and salary scale range)			
<i>Project Director NTF PL scale 0.3</i>	£16218		£16218
<i>Project Development Manager PL scale 0.3</i>	£14897		£14897
<i>Project Administrator, Administrator scale, 0.4</i>	£ 8770		£ 8770
<i>Academic staff coordinator SL scale, 0.14 x 3</i>	£12164		£12164
<i>Chair of Steering Group/Project Leader Director scale</i>		£2268	£1134
<i>Finance staff, Administrator scale, 40 hrs p.a.</i>	£532		£532
<b>Travel &amp; Subsistence</b> (include attendance at relevant programme meetings)	£1500		£1500
<b>Equipment</b> (specify individual items over £1,000)			
<b>Dissemination activities</b> <i>Project branding design</i>	£587.50		
<i>Website Design and development</i>	£2643.75		£3231.25
<b>Evaluation</b> activities			
<b>Office running costs &amp; overheads, (fEC)</b> <i>Indirect Costs</i>		£55247	
<i>Estates costs</i>		£9082	£64329
<b>Other</b> (please specify)			
<i>e.g. Consumables</i>			
<i>e.g. Small equipment (under £1,000)</i> <i>Computer for project administrator</i>		£700	£700
<b>Total</b>	<b>£57312</b>	<b>£67297</b>	<b>£124609</b>

(All costs stated should include VAT where applicable)