JISC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES
Project Document Cover Sheet
Final Report
PDP4XL2: Personal Development Planning
for Cross-Institutional Lifelong Learning

Project Acronym	PDP4XL2	Project ID	Not applicable.
Project Title	PDP4XL2: Personal Development Planning for Cross-Institutional Lifelong Learning		
Start Date	01 Oct 06	End Date	30 Sep 08
Lead Institution	Bournemouth University		
Project Director	Janet Hanson Bournemouth University Talbot Campus, Fern Barrow Poole, BH12 5BB Tel: 01202 965044 Fax: 01202 965475 Email: jhanson@bournemouth.ac.uk		
Project Manager	Amina Uddin Project Manager for PDP4XL2 Academic Services Bournemouth University Talbot Campus, Fern Barrow Poole BH12 5BB Tel: 01202 965270 Email: auddin@bournemouth.ac.uk		
Project Partners	Arts Institute at Bournemouth; Open University; University of Gloucestershire; Yeovil College/University Centre Yeovil; South Wiltshire Health and Social Care Academy with Salisbury NHS Foundation Trust; Phosphorix		
Project Web URL	www.bournemouth.ac.uk/asprojects/pdp4xl2		
Programme Name (and number)	Cross-Institutional use of e-Learning to Support Lifelong Learners (03/06)		
Programme Manager	David Kernohan		

Document

Document Title	Final Report		
Reporting Period			
Author(s) & project role	Amina Uddin, Project Manager, Janet Hanson, Project Director		
Date	January 2009	Filename	Final report
URL			
Access	☒ Project and JISC internal		x General dissemination

Document History

Version	Date	Comments
4.0	Jan 2009	Updated by J Hanson

Project Acronym: PDP4XL2
Version: 4.0
Contact: Janet Hanson
Date: 26/01/09

PDP4XL2
Personal Development Planning for Cross Institutional
Lifelong Learning

http://www.bournemouth.ac.uk/asprojects/pdp4xl2

Final Report

Amina Uddin, Project Manager
Dr Janet Hanson, Project Director

Contact: jhanson@bournemouth.ac.uk

Date: 26th January 2009

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

PDP4XL2 was funded by JISC as one of the Capital e-learning projects in the Cross-Institutional use of e-Learning to Support Lifelong Learners (03/06) Programme.

The Project Team included:

Dr Janet Hanson	Project Director, Bournemouth University
Amina Uddin	Project Manager, Bournemouth University (From 01-08-07)
Dr Barbara Newland	Project Pedagogical Advisor, Bournemouth University
Ken Bissell	Project Technical Advisor, Bournemouth University

Grateful thanks are given to all the Project Partners for their contributions to the project, to Dr Neil Ringan, External Evaluator, Manchester Metropolitan University and to our JISC Programme Manager, David Kernohan.

Project Partners

Partner	Key Contacts	Title
Bournemouth University (BU) (Project Lead) www.bournemouth.ac.uk	Dr Janet Hanson jhanson@bournemouth.ac.uk	Head of Academic Services
Bournemouth University: School of Health and Social Care http://www.bournemouth.ac.uk/hsc/	Dr Maggie Hutchings mhutchin@bournemouth.ac.uk	Senior Lecturer in Education
Bournemouth University: Media School and Centre for Excellence in Media Practice (CEMP) http://www.media.bournemouth.ac.uk/	Lizzie Nixon lnixon@bournemouth.ac.uk	Researcher, CEMP (during project, now Lecturer in CMC)
Arts Institute at Bournemouth (AIB) http://www.aib.ac.uk/	Valerie Lodge vlodge@aib.ac.uk	Academic Development Officer
Open University in the South West (OU) (Lead for IAG Strand of SWLLN) www.open.ac.uk www.swlln.ac.uk	Meriel Lee m.lee@open.ac.uk David Hodgeson-Egan DHEgan@bournemouth.ac.uk	Assistant Director, Teaching and Learning. Project Worker, Information Advice Guidance & Learner Support, Southwest Lifelong Learning Network.
Phosphorix Ltd www.phosphorix.co.uk	Selwyn Lloyd Selwyn.lloyd@phosphorix.co.uk	Founder Engineer and Company Director
Salisbury NHS Foundation Trust www.salisbury.nhs.uk	Janine Osmond Janine.Osmond@salisbury.nhs.uk	Director of Learning, Salisbury NHS Foundation Trust
University Centre Yeovil (UCY) www.ucy.ac.uk	Geoff Rowland Geoff.Rowland@yeovil.ac.uk	CIT Programme Manager and Lecturer
University of Gloucestershire (UoG) www.glos.ac.uk	Martin Jenkins mjenkins@glos.ac.uk	Academic Manager Centre for Active Learning

The authors of this report would like to acknowledge that they have drawn heavily on the reports of activities written by partners in its compilation. The separate reports are available on the project website.

Executive Summary

This collaborative project PDP4XL[2] built on the strengths and successful outcomes of PDP4Life and took as its principal focus the use of personal development planning and e-portfolios to develop and sustain favourable learner attitudes towards lifelong learning and to understand the role that technology plays in supporting that process.

The project was led by Bournemouth University (BU), which also led the South West Lifelong Learning Partnership (SWLLN). Two of its academic schools were involved in this project, the School of Health and Social Care (HSC) and the Media School (MS). The partners included the former PDP4Life partners: The Arts Institute at Bournemouth (AIB), Dartington College of Arts (DCA), Open University (OU), University of Gloucestershire (UoG) and the University Centre Yeovil (UCY).

One new partner to join the collaboration was the South Wiltshire Health and Social Care Academy, a link which was arranged through the Avon, Gloucestershire and Wiltshire Strategic Health Authority (AGWSHA). The location for the engagement of the Academy was the Salisbury NHS Foundation Trust (The Trust) in South Wiltshire.

Project staff worked with staff in partner institutions to plan and organise meetings with individual learners and groups to identify their attitudes to and usage of PDP and e-portfolios. Sometimes this was through interviews, at other times it was through observation of their use of e-portfolio tools including ioPortal. Learners included students on undergraduate programmes in HE institutions, students studying an HE programme in an FE environment, those undertaking CPD programmes or workplace learning in practice and non-traditional learners seeking advice and guidance on learning opportunities from the SWLLN.

Project staff also worked with staff in partner institutions to identify employer groups to contact and interview in order to identify their attitudes to the role of PDP and e-portfolios in their selection, recruitment and personnel development processes. The value they placed on PDP in the development of skills for their employment sector and the potential role of an e-portfolio in employment were investigated.

Following the developments with the ioPortal achieved through the PDP4Life extension phase and the further adjustments made by Phosphorix as a result of their involvement with other JISC regional e-learning projects, this e-portfolio process tool was evaluated with learners as above, and adjustments were made based on the findings. The possibility of transferring PDP learner records between ioPortal and PebblePad and between ioPortal and other virtual learning environments including Blackboard, Moodle and ELGG used by the partners were explored.

The project aimed to help institutions meet the needs of diverse learners by gaining a more informed understanding of those needs in two specific vocational areas that are important to the SW economy, the creative industries and health care. CI learners are frequently highly skilled in the use of IT, but they have requirements for portfolio building that challenge the concept of the lifelong learner record and specifications for e-portfolios. Learners in the health sector may traditionally be less accustomed to using IT but have a professional requirement to maintain their CPD profile, so the transfer of their records and the associated PDP processes into an online environment presented interesting challenges. In both cases, understanding learner and employer perceptions was important in informing the development of tools to assist e-PDP and e-portfolio building, whether these were individual applications/tools or elements of a larger virtual learning environment. Direct contact with learners through this project involved them in using and evaluating tools that support the processes of reflection, action planning, recording achievement and storage of PDP outputs and processes.

The evaluation of the ioPortal and its potential for providing a non-institutional lifelong learning space was evaluated through this project. The feasibility of transferring PDP data between institutions' virtual learning environments and a non-institution e-portfolio was tested. The test server was located at BU.

A project Dissemination Conference *Exploring attitudes to PDP & e-portfolios,* took place on 23 September 2008 in Bournemouth.

1. Background

Interoperability and ease of data transfer are key issues in the successful development of lifelong learning, but equally important is a positive attitude towards personal development planning (PDP) on the part of learners, academic staff, employers and professional organisations, together with a willingness to use technology in the PDP process to generate the transferable records that support lifelong learning. These two areas provide the key focus for this collaborative project, PDP4XL2, which built on the outputs and achievements of the South West region's distributed e-learning project PDP4Life. (http://www.bournemouth.ac.uk/pdp4life/index.html)

During PDP4Life, we found that many of the project partners had developed localised frameworks for PDP systems but the project prompted them to consider how the need for interoperability must be addressed if progression and lifelong learning across the SW region are to be achieved. The views of their students and academic staff about PDP and its associated records and outputs informed a specification for a lifelong learning record that has the potential to underpin their local development without the need to impose a one-size-fits-all template on individual institutions. Their views also informed the development by Phosphorix of a PDP process within the ioPortal which was evaluated during the extension phase of PDP4Life (October 2006-April 2007).

The Creative Industries (CI) provided a specific focus for the discipline/sector-specific work of PDP4Life, in recognition of the importance of this economic sector to the regional economy in the SW and the inclusion of three specialist arts institutions within the partnership. The views of employers towards PDP and e-portfolios are critical to gaining learners' engagement with them, and those of CI employers on this were illuminating. Of the limited number surveyed, few would have time to consider anything other than a brief, printed CV. A further exploration of employer attitudes to PDP and e-portfolios was undertaken in PDP4XL2.

The inclusion of Salisbury NHS Trust in the project and its links with the School of Health and Social Care at Bournemouth University offered new opportunities to the project to focus on the approach to PDP in the area of health care, both within the practice setting and with learners undertaking CPD units within higher education.

2. Aims and Objectives

The aims of the project were to:

Aim 1:   Continue to embed PDP and e-portfolio use within the creative industries academic setting in the SW, with specific reference to the use of employer feedback to inform PDP tools and processes*.*

Aim 2:   Explore attitudes to and engagement with PDP and e-portfolios for lifelong learning by health care professionals in both academic and practice settings in the SW region.

Aim 3:   Inform, and be informed by, approaches to PDP and e-portfolios used to support the information, advice and guidance (IAG) processes of the South West Lifelong Learning Network (SWLLN).

Aim 4:   Contribute to the knowledge base on interoperability of learner records and data transfer across institutional boundaries in support of lifelong learning.

Aim 5: Successfully manage the project.

3. Methodology

The project was led by Bournemouth University in collaboration with partner institutions. There were two main strands of development, technical and user studies. The technical strand involved three elements: the development of the features supporting PDP within the ioPortal, an investigation into the structures of other e-portfolio tools, including PebblePad and the applications within the VLEs Blackboard and Moodle, and the trial transfer of PDP records between each of these and ioPortal. User studies of attitudes to PDP and use of e-portfolios were undertaken with university students and staff, professionals in the workplace and lifelong learners using the methodology of the focus group and the case study. Feedback from the user studies informed the final specification of amendments to the ioPortal. Each of the partners contributed to a specific aspect within these two strands. An independent evaluation was undertaken towards the end of the project by an external evaluator. The scope of this investigation was to undertake an impact analysis of participation in the project in order to identify how engagement had affected attainment of project aims, individual participants, their organisations and other stakeholders. The full evaluation is available as a separate report and reflections on its findings are incorporated into Sections 7 and 8.

4. Implementation

4.1 Project initiation

Monthly team meetings were scheduled and the full project plan with Workpackages was developed. With such tight timescales it was considered important to have self-contained workpackages wherever possible, to minimise the cumulative effect of any delays. A detailed Gantt chart of project activities and timescales helped to identify where any problems might arise and how they could be minimised. We found that it was possible to align our objectives into parallel developments that enabled us to accommodate some slippage in some of the objectives without a negative impact on all the rest. This feature of project planning, commented on favourably by JISC in the report for PDP4Life, although leading to completion of deliverables, may have not have encouraged as much cross-fertilisation of ideas as the project progressed, as noted in the project evaluation report.

The project manager made visits to each of the partners to clarify roles and expectations and a Memorandum of Agreement was distributed. The building of relationships between the project partners was hastened by the earlier history of working on the previous project. However, as identified in the evaluation report, the importance of sustaining and re-energising these relationships should not be underestimated. Each partner agreed the activities it would undertake to secure the funding allocated for the outcomes associated with their objective. This funding was to cover the time of the senior manager and the institutional PDP specialist needed to engage with the project activities, help with setting up focus groups and taking PDP forward in their own institution, through for example, web development of their own PDP system. They were paid against claims for work completed. Ongoing communication took place through email and meetings scheduled through the Steering Group.

4.2 ioPortal and e-portfolio software reviews

A test version of the ioPortal was ready for piloting in January 2007. Pilots of the tool began late in January when different student groups and staff members were recruited to participate. Guidance sheets were produced to help students navigate their way around the tools. The Media School at Bournemouth University ran a pilot study for 8 weeks with a group of 15 students who used the ioPortal for a PDP exercise. Focus groups were held at the end of the pilot to gather feedback and student perceptions of the tool itself and their attitudes to PDP more generally.

University Centre Yeovil ran a pilot study for 6 weeks with a group of students who were from an IT background using the ioPortal. They compared the ioPortal with the PDP facility in Moodle which was also being piloted at the same time. The students compared the functionality of both tools. The Arts Institute at Bournemouth gave feedback gathered from students and staff members on their perceptions of the ioPortal, including improvements and changes, during a demonstration of its capabilities.

A pilot study using the BlackBoard eportfolio tool was undertaken by Occupational Therapy students in the School of Health and Social Care at Bournemouth University who used the tool in their CPD unit. They piloted the tool for over 5 months and used it to submit their assessed work.

The University of Gloucestershire reported on their use of PebblePad with a range of social sciences students to provide the project with insight into how this tool was being received by students and the challenges they may be facing.

4.3 Data gathering through focus groups and interviews with learners and employers

Reports on each of the pilots were generated through focus group interviews with groups of users. A generic set of questions and themes for discussion was drawn up by the Project Team to ensure consistency in the information gathered across all the focus groups.

The Media School held 3 focus groups with students who participated in the ioPortal pilot. The Arts Institute at Bournemouth held a total of 5 focus groups with staff and students who were able to view demonstrations of the ioPortal and give comments and feedback on their thoughts about the e-portfolio tool and the process of PDP. Three focus groups were held with the Occupational Therapy students at the end of the School of Health and Social Care's pilot use of the Blackboard ePortfolio tool.

The Media School held a number of interviews with Creative Industries employers to obtain their perceptions of PDP and e-portfolio tools and two focus groups were held with health professionals in Salisbury NHS Foundation Trust to gather feedback on their perception of PDP and ePortfolio tools.

4.4 Reports and Case studies

A number of reports have been produced from the pilot studies, along with other deliverables that were established for each partner. Student and staff case studies have been submitted by Salisbury NHS Foundation Trust, the Media School and the School of Health and Social Care. These case studies give in-depth information and details of learners' individual experiences with PDP and e-portfolio tools.

4.5 Risk Analysis

		Risk Occurred	Action taken
		Staffing	
1		Losing Project Manager before the end of the project	The original project manager left the post six months into the project and although a new Project Manager was recruited with the earliest possible start date, there was a 3 month period with no PM in post. The Project Director and Project Advisors kept in contact with the partners during this period.
		Organisational	
2		Partners not engaging with project	Dartington College of Arts experienced a merger with University College Falmouth early in the life of the project and, due to the extent of internal change and the departure of the principal contact to another institution,

	Risk Occurred	Action taken
		decided to withdraw from the project. The designated objectives were incorporated into other partners' activities. The involvement of the South Wiltshire Health and Social Care Academy was limited following the departure of the principal contact to another post early in the life of the project but the objectives for this area of the project were delivered, as anticipated, by Salisbury NHS Foundation Trust.
	Technical	
3	Server reliability and access to IoPortal	Test version of IoPortal hosted on server at BU prior to pilots starting.
	Legal	
4	Status of software licensing	JISC advice sought and accepted.

4.6 Stakeholder Analysis

Stakeholder	Engagement
Bournemouth University (BU) Project Team	Monthly project meeting, monthly project reports and emails on project development
Project Partners	Project meetings when required, monthly project reports and emails regarding project development and progress
South West Lifelong Learning Network Information Advice and Guidance Team	Project meetings when required, monthly project reports and emails regarding project development and progress
BU Senior Management Team (University Executive Group and senior managers)	Steering Committee Meetings and reports to University committees
JISC	Progress and Annual Reports
Students	Focus groups
Wider staff academic community at BU	Internal dissemination through Education conferences
CI and Health employers	Interviews
Other JISC regional e-learning pilots and e-tools developers	JISC Programme meetings and conferences
HE and FE Communities	External dissemination events
HERDA SW	Teaching and Learning Management Group meetings
Professional learning and teaching organisations, eg: CRA, HEA, ALT	External dissemination events

4.7 Project Dissemination

The project has undertaken a number of dissemination activities, including the development of promotional publicity, press releases and a website hosted by Bournemouth University. In addition, partners have disseminated through conference presentations and papers using a range of regional and national networks. Presentations have been made at the following events to further promote the project and its findings:

Hanson, J. and Uddin, A., 2007. *E-portfolios: employability or engagement?* SEEC Professional Development Event, 7 September 2007, University of Westminster, London.

Newland. B., 2008. *Assessing Personal Development Planning (PDP): Ideas and Issues.* Cambridge Assessment Network, 14 February 2008, Cambridge.

Hanson, J., Uddin, U., Lloyd, S. and Hunter, D., 2008. *PDP4XL2: Personal Development Planning for Cross Institutional Lifelong Learning.* JISC Regional Support Centre South West Higher Education conference: Innovation through partnership, 8 April 2008, Bristol.

Lodge, V. Learning and Teaching Conference 2008, 4 July 2008, Arts Institute at Bournemouth.

Uddin, A., 2008. CRA Telling ePortfolio stories: The road to 'stickiness', 5 June 2008, University of Wolverhampton.

The project hosted a visit from academics involved in developing a PDP system for Lund University, Sweden, in 2008.

An article was published in the PDP UK newsletter titled "Exploring attitudes to PDP and ePortfolio held by Health and Creative Industries students and professionals", Page 7-8, edition 13, February 2008.

The final project dissemination conference, *Exploring attitudes to PDP and e-portfolios*, was held at Bournemouth on 23 September 2008 and was attended by 33 participants from the partners, JISC and other universities.

The Centre for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL), LearnHigher, which includes PDP as one of its areas of interest, featured PDP4XL2 with details of the project and its deliverables on its website when it was re-launched in October 2007.

In addition to the above, the following publicity material has also been produced:

- Project Website – includes all reports and minutes of meetings
- Posters
- Conference Exhibition stand
- Leaflets
- Conference Folders

4.8 Project Evaluation

Dr Neil Ringan was appointed as external evaluator to the project and an evaluation plan was agreed that had as its focus a summative evaluation which would evaluate project outcomes by drawing on project partner processes of engagement with the project, how they achieved the project deliverables and the impact this had on them.

Dr Ringan held individual in-depth interviews with all the project partners between July and August 2008 to explore their experiences of working on the project. In addition to drafting the overall report bringing together findings from all the data, he also compiled individual reports for each partner. He presented his summary findings and the lessons learnt from working on the project at the dissemination conference in September and the full report was circulated to project partners. The findings from the evaluation have been incorporated into this report in sections 6-9. The particular value of the report was that it enabled issues to surface that the Project team did not see at the time and highlighted the value of the practice, often found in other HEFCE funded projects, of appointing an external consultant to act as 'critical friend' to the project.

The Project Director also participated in the JISC study undertaken by Elizabeth Hartnell-Young and Gordon Joyes in August 2008 that reviewed the findings of the all the JISC funded e-portfolio projects to look for common lessons and new insights. The employer views on PDP and e-portfolios arising from this project were considered to be of wider interest to the community.

4.9 Project Management

The Project Management Team consisted of a Project Manager supported by two specialist advisers, all Bournemouth University staff. The Project Management Team directed the development and implementation of the Project Plan and its Work Packages under the direction of the Project Director. The team met once a month to plan the work, discuss and report on progress. The membership comprised:

Name	Role	Contact Details	Time on project
Dr Janet Hanson	Project Director Bournemouth University (Head of Academic Services)	jhanson@bournemouth.ac.uk	10%
Amina Uddin	Project Manager	auddin@bournemouth.ac.uk	100%
Ken Bissell	Project Technical Adviser Bournemouth University Service Design Manager	kbissell@bournemouth.ac.uk	20%
Dr Barbara Newland	Project Pedagogical Adviser Bournemouth University (Manager Educational Development Services)	bnewland@bournemouth.ac.uk	10%

The Project Manager originally appointed in December 2007 resigned from the post in April 2007. It took a further 3 months to re-appoint and Amina Uddin took up the position in August 2007. The gap in recruiting the new PM meant that timescales for partners to complete activities slipped and progress on the project objectives and deliverables was delayed. The new PM spent time re-establishing relationships with project partners and re-negotiating their deliverables. New timelines were set for the deliverables and all partners agreed to continue with their original objectives. The project partnership with Dartington College of Arts came to an end in March 2008 and therefore they were not able their deliverables for the project. However, the areas originally outlined for DCA were incorporated into other partners' activities without loss of overall coverage of objectives.

The Project Manager had responsibility for:

- overall co-ordination of the project in accordance with the Project Plan;
- coordination and management of project work in liaison with project partners;
- undertake activities in support of achieving the deliverables as agreed with the partners;
- monitoring project progress and performance, including identifying and managing risks;
- budget management;
- management of communications and publicity about the project;
- liaison with the evaluator;
- production of progress, final and other reports and liaison with JISC;
- arranging meetings (e.g. management team and steering committee) and write the minutes

The supporting members of the team had responsibility for:

- production of work within their respective areas of expertise
- providing technical and pedagogic advice to the Project Manager.

The Project Director had overall responsibility for the project and for ensuring compliance with JISC requirements for grant allocation and reporting.

The evaluation report (Ringan 2008) found that the project management function was exercised very effectively following the appointment of the second project manager. It also identified that an additional research function might have been added to the Project Team to synthesis, analyse and reflect on emerging findings from the reports in order to capitalise on all the potential outputs from the project.

5. Outputs and Results

This section provides a visual summary of the status of the intended outputs and indicates the extent to which they have been completed.   Discussion of the outputs and their contribution to achieving project outcomes can be found in Section 6. (The numbering of the outputs refers to the numbering in Appendix B (Workpackages-revised November 2007) of the Project Plan submitted to JISC).

Aim 1:   Continue to embed PDP and e-portfolio use within the creative industries academic setting in the SW, with specific reference to the use of employer feedback to inform PDP tools and processes.

Activities	Intended Project Outputs	Results
1.1 Evaluate potential of ioPortal for PDP by CI learners (DCA).	**1.1.2** Report of evaluation of ioPortal by DCA.	Partnership with DCA ceased early in 2008. Activity transferred to Bournemouth
1.2 Identify CI employer views on value of PDP.	**1.2.2** Report considering CI employers' views with recommendations informing development of tools and approaches to PDP.	Published report.
1.3 Evaluate potential of ioPortal for PDP with CI learners (AIB).	**1.3.2** Report of evaluation of ioPortal by AIB.	Focus groups x3; 1x staff and 2x students Published report.
1.4 Limited pilot of Blackboard e-portfolio with CI learners.	**1.4.2** Reports and case studies following limited pilot of the ioPortal informing development of tools and approaches to PDP.	ioPortal pilot substituted for Blackboard e-portfolio. Published report

Aim 2:   Explore attitudes to and engagement with PDP and e-portfolios for lifelong learning by health care professionals in both academic and practice settings in the SW region.

2.1 Evaluation of nursing and midwifery practitioners' attitudes to PDP for lifelong learning on CPD units of study.	**2.1.2** Report and case studies following evaluation of nursing and midwifery practitioners' attitudes to PDP for lifelong learning on CPD units of study.	Focus group x2 April_07 Published report and case studies.
2.2 Evaluation of clinical practitioners' attitudes to PDP for lifelong learning in Salisbury Trust.	**2.2.2** Report and case studies following evaluation of clinical practitioners' attitudes to PDP for lifelong learning in Salisbury Trust.	Published report and case studies.
2.3 Evaluation of current NHS tools and approaches to PDP and attitudes for lifelong learning of health professionals.	**2.3.2** Report and case studies evaluating the current NHS tools and approaches to PDP and attitudes for lifelong learning of health professionals.	Published report and case studies available? (Transcript of AU/KB visit to JO_24-10_07 also available)
2.4 Evaluation of undergraduate Allied Health Professionals (AHP) students' attitudes to PDP	**2.4.2** Report and case studies following evaluation of undergraduate Occupational Therapy students' attitudes	Published report and case studies

for lifelong learning.	to PDP for lifelong learning.	
2.5 Limited pilot of Blackboard e-portfolio with AHP students.	**2.5.2** Report and case studies informing development of tools and approaches to PDP.	Published report and case studies
2.6 Limited pilot of the ioPortal and ELGG with (faculty to be notified) students to compare both tools	**2.6.2** Report and case studies following the limited pilot of the ioPortal and ELGG with (faculty to be notified) students to compare both tools	Published report and case studies
2.7 Evaluate potential of PebblePad for PDP by Social Science students in UoG	**2.7.1** Report on development and current usage of PebblePad in UoG	Published report
	2.7.2 Report following evaluation of the potential of PebblePad for PDP by Social Science students in UoG	Published report

Aim 3: Inform, and be informed by, approaches to PDP and e-portfolios used to support the information, advice and guidance (IAG) processes of the South West Lifelong Learning Network (SWLLN).

3.1 Explore models for PDP and e-portfolios appropriate to lifelong learners.	**3.1.2** Report and case studies resulting from an exploration of models for PDP and e-portfolios appropriate to lifelong learners.	Published report and case studies.
3.2 Evaluate potential of ioPortal for PDP within SWLLN and compare with existing diagnostic tools developed for the Western Vocational LLN (WVLLN).	**3.2.2** Report of evaluation of ioPortal for PDP within SWLLN.	30 adults used questionnaire to evaluate ioPortal. Published report and case studies. WVLLN tools not available for comparison.

Aim 4: Contribute to the knowledge base on interoperability of learner records and data transfer across institutional boundaries in support of lifelong learning.

4.1 Investigate the data structure of learner records for PDP in the Blackboard e-portfolio application and compare with specification in ioPortal.	**4.1.5** Identify the transforms required after an investigation of the data structure of learner records for PDP in the Blackboard e-portfolio application and a comparison with the specification in ioPortal.	Published report
4.2 Investigate the data structure of learner records for PDP in the Moodle e-portfolio application and compare with specification in ioPortal.	**4.2.5** Identify the transforms required after an investigation of the data structure of learner records for PDP in the Moodle e-portfolio application and a comparison with the specification in ioPortal.	Published report
4.3 Investigate the data structure of learner records for PDP in the AGW MLE (e2train) and compare with specification in ioPortal.	**4.3.5** Identify the transforms required after an investigation of the data structure of learner records for PDP in the AGW MLE (e2train) and a comparison with the specification in ioPortal.	Due to the findings of objective 2.3.1, this work did not need to be carried out.

4.4 Limited amendment of ioPortal following CI and employer feedback.	**4.4.2** Amend ioPortal	Code available from Phosphorix
4.5 Trial transfer of learner data between ioPortal and PebblePAD.	**4.5.3** Reports on results of the trial transfer of learner data between ioPortal and PebblePAD and on the use of PebblePad by the UoG.	Published reports x 2.
4.6 Amend ioPortal following CI and employer feedback and data gained from VLEs/e-portfolios.	**4.6.2** Amended ioPortal following CI and employer feedback and data gained from VLEs/e-portfolios.	Code available from Phosphorix
4.7 Further evaluate ioPortal and develop use cases.	**4.7.4** Report after further evaluation of the ioPortal and development of use cases.	Published report.

The project outputs that may have potential to live on after the project ends and the ways in which they might be taken forward are listed below, along with the issues involved in making them sustainable in the longer term.

Project Outputs	Why Sustainable	Scenarios for Taking Forward	Issues to Address
1.2.2; 1.3.2; 1.4.2 Reports and case studies following evaluation of CI employers and learners views of PDP and e-portfolios	Information relevant to BU and AIB	Information used to improve existing procedures and for developing new ones	Funds for further development; Strategic curriculum development plans
2.1.2; 2.2.2; 2.3.2 and 2.4.2. Reports and case studies following evaluation of the attitudes of various health service personnel to PDP for lifelong learning on CPD units of study.	Information relevant to the NHS and other health service employers.	Information used to improve existing procedures and for developing new ones.	Funds for further development
2.5.2 Report and case studies following limited pilot of Blackboard e-portfolio with AHP students.	Information relevant to BU and potentially to health service employers.	Information used to improve existing software and for developing new tools.	Strategic curriculum development plans; Willingness of commercial company to engage in further development; Dissemination of outputs to Blackboard user community
3.2.2 Report of evaluation of ioPortal for PDP within SWLLN	Information potentially relevant to LLNs	Information used to improve existing software and for developing new tools.	Funds for further development; Dissemination to strategic decision-makers in LLNs
4.1.5; 4.2.5 and 4.3.5 Identification of the transforms required after an investigation of the data structure of various learner records and comparisons with the specification in ioPortal.	Potentially useful information to software companies for the development of PDP and e-portfolio systems.	Development by an institution. Development by a commercial company.	Ownership and funding
4.6.2 Amended ioPortal following CI and employer feedback and data gained from VLEs/e-portfolios.	Increasing utility of the ioPortal and Blackboard will result in tools that have received informed development	Tools are developed by an institution to fit their specific requirements. Tools are developed speculatively by a commercial company.	Ownership and funding

6. Outcomes

The principal aspirations for the longer term outcomes arising from the project included a) enhancing opportunities for lifelong learners to engage with PDP and retain their associated records and b) enhancing understanding across the SW region of the developments in PDP processes and e-portfolio use among its higher education providers. In support of the first element, factors affecting the engagement of learners with PDP processes and use of e-portfolios have been the focus for investigation in this project. These have included employer perspectives on the value of PDP and the role of e-portfolios in recruitment and selection, in addition to learner views on this topic. The views of those guiding adults in their personal and career development were also sought in this project.

In support of the second element, the project sought feedback from learners on the usability of the ioPortal and other tools in use among partners, including PebblePad, ELGG and Blackboard. The usability factors also included technical analysis of the potential for transporting PDP records from one system to another in support of lifelong learning and movement between learning institutions and the workplace. The following sections provide some detail on how these aspirations have been met, drawing on the reports from partner activities and the project evaluation report.   In several cases the executive summaries of the partners' reports have been taken directly from their reports and reproduced here. A full list of the reports is in Appendix 1.

6.1 Employer perspectives and engagement with PDP and e-portfolios

One of the benefits of engaging HE students in personal development planning is to enable them to be better prepared for seeking employment, for meeting the demands of continuing career development and for staying employed (HEA 2002; PDP Guidelines Advisory Group 2008), therefore employers' perspectives on PDP and the value of e-portfolios as presentational tools in the recruitment and selection of candidates for employment is relevant in motivating learners to engage with PDP.

Building on work undertaken by AIB for the earlier PDP4Life project, the BU Media School undertook a further investigation into Creative Industries' employer perceptions of the value of PDP processes and e-portfolios. The report highlighted employers' concerns about the PDP process as well as their recommendations on how e-portfolio tools can be improved further and what functions within the tool can be developed in order for more useful information to be captured, which will be of use the CI employers.

19 professionals, ranging from SMEs to large corporations, including Disney and the BBC, were interviewed. The main finding was that CI employers desperately seek individuality and personality in job applications, particularly for the large companies, and most are positive that PDP can help the applicant to clarify their goals and express them in this respect. Personal development seems to be supported by the appraisal system in most CI sectors (some associated the term 'PDP' directly to 'CPD' i.e. Continuous Professional Development) and is considered necessary for career progression, although smaller companies do not tend to operationalise this in a formal system. Positive attitudes to personal development are accentuated by the dynamic, fast paced nature of an industry which is project-driven and, in terms of job security, less stable.

A number of more practical issues concerning job applications were identified and detailed advice concerning the design and implementation of e-portfolios for the creative industries was offered, although it was clear that very few employers believed they had the time to view an applicant's e-portfolio. Overall, there was a very high value attached to the *process* of PDP, as well as to the concept of e-portfolios as a tool within this learning process.

These findings were supported by the views of academic staff at AIB who referred to the issue of employability during their focus group meeting. This staff group were concerned about employers being restricted in the amount of time they were granted to view applicants' e-portfolios. They felt that employers would not necessarily look within a two day window but would want the option of being able to look at work as they needed to, maybe even months after it had been submitted.

The AIB staff group discussed whether employers would still prefer a traditional portfolio to an electronic one. They determined that this would depend very much on the course which the student is studying on and nature of the work being shown. Much development work is done manually through the sketch book.

They were very concerned that any system, including the ioPortal, would be too prescriptive and would not enable, or provide opportunities for students to demonstrate their creativity through what was described as the "spirit of the person".

SWLLN evaluated the potential of the ioPortal with a small sample of Information Advice and Guidance and Learner Support professionals who work with potential learners, both from the SWLLN and staff of the Western Vocational Lifelong Learning Network (WVLLN). Having reviewed the tool they provided constructive criticism, identified useful features and ways it could be improved, and considered that continued trials with a more diverse group could prove beneficial. It was not possible to compare ioPortal with the diagnostic tools used by the Western Vocational LLN (WVLLN) as these were still under development at that time.

The overview gained from Salisbury NHS Foundation Trust about e-portfolios concluded that the concept is great and it would be good for people who are computer literate but it is complex for those who do not use a PC. It was felt to be "for teenage children at the start of their careers really, for the MySpace generation as they are used to do doing this already". Details relating to the design of the ioPortal demonstrated to this group were referred to Phosphorix as outlined below.

In addition to the specific aspects of e-portfolio design gained from these employers, greater understanding of their perceptions of PDP and e-portfolios gained through this project could be used to inform the development of PDP within the HE curriculum, its role in employability and the use of e-portfolios for presentation.

6.2 Learner perspectives and engagement with PDP and e-portfolios

A trial of the ioPortal was undertaken with a sample of undergraduates studying subjects within the creative industries (CI) in the Media School of Bournemouth University. A total of 13 students used the ioPortal over a seven week period and were asked to complete evaluation forms and attend one of three focus groups at the end of the pilot. The research had two main objectives, to gather feedback on the ioPortal in order to inform the development of tools for PDP and to gather students' understanding of and attitudes to PDP in general, in order to inform approaches to PDP. In addition to the data from the evaluation sheets and the focus groups, two students wrote narratives of their use in an attempt to capture their 'learning journey' as experienced through their use of the ioPortal, identifying features that both helped and hindered their learning. The themes derived from the qualitative research should be viewed in the context of the software usage data over the trial period.

The participants who trialled the software in this study held fairly cynical attitudes towards personal development, particularly when implemented as PDP in their higher education experience. Though the underpinning concepts of personal development are viewed quite positively, the operationalisation of PDP through the ioPortal was considered problematic by these media students. The one dimensional software did not encourage usage on a regular basis and tended to distract users from their PDP development rather than engage, prompt or further their thinking. This partner activity concluded that much more development of the software would be needed before the tool could be implemented more widely, as reported in Section 6.3.

The AIB students who participated in focus groups in which the ioPortal was demonstrated to them found the ioPortal to be a useful tool in enabling them to understand the *process* of personal development planning, for example, reflection, planning, the ability to draw up a CV etc, but it was too prescriptive for displaying the *product* of pdp. These students suggested it was important for the ioPortal to support the key software packages that they are using to create their work, particularly film and animation students. Above all, the issue of creativity was paramount. For such a tool to be useful to the Creative Industries, it must enable learners to showcase their work as creative, artistic

individuals, both in how they present themselves and in what they are presenting. It seems unlikely that any prescriptive tool, such as the ioPortal, would facilitate this.

Students are encouraged to reflect throughout their time at the Arts Institute, however, they suggested that they would probably not continue to do pdp after graduation, either through laziness or not having access to a computer when they learnt something. They were also unsure about what they might need after they graduated. They liked the idea of being able customize a portfolio on the ioPortal, to pick and choose work to suit a particular employer instead of having to send them a generic showcase and being able to have one file displayed in multiple portfolios. However, they preferred to have more open access, allowing for the possibility of being 'discovered' by employers, rather than actively having to grant someone access to their work.

The SWLLN evaluated the potential of ioPortal for supporting PDP within SWLLN. A range of adults aged 25+ who were not currently in institution-based learning were surveyed about their learning and career histories and their views on the potential of an electronic portfolio for personal development planning. They were interviewed early in the project to ascertain their own learning and work histories, their understanding of the concept "lifelong learning", their views on personal development planning and experiences of using any personal development planning processes or recording mechanisms. They were also asked to suggest what features they would like to see in an e-portfolio. The feedback from these interviews was used to inform the design for the re-skinning of ioPortal and also formed the basis of case studies that were presented separately.

A larger group of adult learners with similar profiles who were comfortable using IT was invited to pilot the ioPortal. Using a pre-formatted questionnaire to collect their responses, they explored some the functions of the ioPortal. Most people found that some of these would be of use to them. Users made many suggestions for improvements to its functionality and overall image. There was a wide range of reactions to the ioPortal, and a sufficiently large amount of positive feedback was obtained to indicate there could be value in further improvement and continued trials with this group of potential learners. The re-skinned ioPortal was also presented to the IAG professionals above.

Details arising that related to the design and features of the ioPortal when it was demonstrated to these various audiences were referred to Phosphorix as outlined in the next section.

The School of Health and Social Care (HSC) at Bournemouth University piloted the Blackboard e-portfolio tool over a period of 4 months with 31 Level C (Year 1) undergraduate Occupational Therapy students with the intention of getting them to engage with Personal Development Planning and Reflection within their Foundations of Continuing Professional Development unit. They were required to produce an e-portfolio demonstrating their PDP activity as a summative assignment for the unit. Blackboard is BU's VLE and this pilot of the e-portfolio was the first use of this tool within the University.

At the start of the pilot the students were asked to write a brief reflection on their personal views of PDP and their thoughts about using the e-portfolio tool. 25 of the 31 students completed these, a mix of positive and negative views were displayed. Some students obviously understood the relevance of PDP to practice at this early stage while others were sceptical of its value. Environmentally conscious and computer literate students were excited by the prospect of using an e-portfolio and the potential advantages of electronic over paper-based portfolios were acknowledged. A number of students were not confident with their own IT skills or felt that lack of access to IT resources might disadvantage them.

At the end of the pilot, focus groups were used to evaluate the students' views on Personal Development Planning and their use of the Blackboard tool.   As in the initial reflections, the concerns around IT skills, access to resources and problems with using the software were reported. The unit tutor's view was that the Blackboard e-portfolio tool did not appear to adequately encourage or enhance PDP and reflection but acted merely as a storage device.   Nevertheless further trials with other groups of students were suggested and it was reported that the professional body, the Chartered Society of Physiotherapy (CSP) www.csp.org.uk, are piloting the PebblePad e-portfolio tool with their members for recording and reflecting on CPD activities.

The University of Gloucestershire has been undertaking a three year trial of PebblePad that commenced in 2005. While the University has a PDP policy there is no strategic requirement to use PebblePad for PDP but projects have been supported across a range of disciplines including Business Management, Environment, Criminology, Sociology, Social Work, Leisure & Tourism and Education (Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Education). In each case, the use of PebblePad has been integrated into the delivery or assessment of a module. Several issues that parallel the findings from the BU pilot in HSC have emerged as critical to the institutional implementation of an e-portfolio tool . Student training in the use of the tool is as important as emphasising that PDP is a process rather than a product. Staff development in both the approach to PDP and the use of PebblePad as a tool is essential. Where possible, staff themselves should be encouraged to be using e-portfolios themselves. It was reported in the Social Work trial that at a national level a consortium has been established with the social work courses at the Universities of Kent and Wolverhampton to develop the use of PebblePad for the assessment of the National Occupational Standards (NOS) for social work. A pilot programme will run in September 2008 involving a small group of second year students and their practice assessors. Students will also use the blog tool on PebblePad to record their learning experiences whilst on placement.

An in-depth interview with the lead for the project from Salisbury NHS Foundation Trust was undertaken and two focus groups were completed. The report on the findings included details of staff attitudes towards PDP and E-portfolios and information about the current NHS PDP systems and staff attitudes towards the usage of them within the NHS.

6.3 Implications for the design of e-portfolio tools

The projects' research activities through interviews and demonstrations generated much useful data about learners' and employers' perspectives on e-portfolios, their design and useability, both generic and relating to ioPortal, as outlined below.

CI employers' perspective - generic perceptions about e-portfolios

Many of the interviewees had professional experience of designing and implementing online resources and offered advice on producing an e-resource for PDP. The key issues are summarised below.

E-portfolios -
- should be leaky, interoperable and exportable;
- should be aesthetically pleasing and avoid restrictive templates;
- should use boxes that release opportunity, by being in a format that is fun and inspiring (H 219), rather than promote box-filling (H 169-170). The software might prompt other ways of communicating such as photo stories, poetry, short piece of fiction, footage from a mobile phone, testimonials;
- institutional e-portfolios may limit creativity and the chance of discovery.

CI learners' perspective – specific issues relating to the ioPortal

Students particularly liked -
- the reminders and would be interested in paying to use this, especially if it is cheaper to maintain than a website;
- the initial layout;
- the feedback option.

Students wanted e-portfolios to provide -
- ability to show videos, cad files, avi and similar media, and to be able to drop files other than web pages and images on to it;
- opportunities for businesses to list their job opportunities;
- group pages so that potential employers could be invited to a group exhibition;
- facility for a business to show all the work a business is capable of, not just the individuals in it.

NHS employees' perspective – a combination of generic issues and responses to a demonstration of ioPortal.

NHS employees would like e-portfolios to have -
- simple buttons and data input options, simple actions from clicking on a button; Easy insert options e.g. Job start date/finish date, Job Title, Name of employer, Location, References;
- a simple name and non-technical language; a tool that generates questions to ask you about aspects of your life; phrases such as "What do you want to do" would be better understood;
- an archived section where information such as previous job, line manager and dates can be stored;
- links to current job description and specifications and appraisal; A section to records training given, training completed, other activities, committees you may be in;
- precautions in place against ID fraud; staff need to be assured that the information is secure;
- assurance that the information in the e-portfolio is accurate and guarantees that the information will not be altered by those unauthorised to do so.

The **SWLLN lifelong learners** were provided with a template to evaluate the different features of ioPortal and provided some detailed comments about the tools within ioPortal, including the CV Builder, the website builder and the portfolio builder. They also provided comments on the colours, the layout of the screen and its overall ease of use.

All the suggestions arising from the pilots were collated into one document and passed onto Phosphorix to include in their ongoing specification development.

A demonstration version is available at: http://swlln.ionetwork.ac.uk/swlln/

The lessons derived from the HSC pilot with Blackboard have informed further implementation of this e-portfolio tool across the whole of one undergraduate first year framework within another School at Bournemouth University.

Phosphorix welcomed the focus group findings as incisive and confirmed that they will inform priorities and decision making for the development of future ioPortal features. It became clear once the project was underway and was further evidenced in the various reports that with any e-pdp or portfolio system, staff buy in and training is essential to gain a fuller learner experience. In future projects staff training would be very high on the agenda. Many of the suggestions by learners could have been quickly implemented by staff without the need of Phosphorix or expert developers. Staff use cases of the ioPortal ioSequence activity builder have been fully researched and tested in the JISC / HEFCE funded SOLVS creative industries and health industries portals. Indeed Bournemouth University PDP activities have been taken on by Bolton University developers to develop a version of ioPortal called "Project Me" which will now be used in production by three institutions in the North West. This was done using the ioPortal activity builder and so Bournemouth's PDP activities could be made easily available to the PDP4XL2 ioPortal via a simple import of the ioSequence.xml. The GMSA and the Bolton BLIS team undertook to seek the permission of BU to reuse their PDP activities in this way. SWLLN expressed a clear interest in training for the PDP activity builder capability but due to staff problems this did not happen during the project.

6.4 Interoperability

One of the aims of the project was to contribute to the knowledge base on interoperability of learner records and data transfer across institutional boundaries in support of lifelong learning. Phosphorix have generated the following three reports in support of this aim:

1. Identified the transforms required after an investigation of the data structure of learner records for PDP in the ELGG e-portfolio application and a comparison with the specification in ioPortal. Comparisons between the two systems show that there are many similarities. Although the process by which an ePortfolio is created differs there is enough common ground to suggest that those used

to one system would be able to create e-portfolios fairly quickly in the other. XML feeds in both systems meant interoperability was possible "out of the box".

2. Reported on results of the trial transfer of learner data between ioPortal and PebblePad. The transfer of data from PebblePad into ioPortal was successful but in a limited capacity. Whilst it was possible to import an ePortfolio created on PebblePad into the ioPortal system, the imported ePortfolio is imported as a static HTML artefact. The imported ePortfolio cannot be edited using the ePortfolio wizard. PebblePad does however support the exporting (and importing) of ePortfolios using the IMS Eportfolio XML standard (http://www.imsglobal.org/ep/index.html). ioPortal could be extended to import and export its ePortfolios using the IMS Eportfolio standard. This would allow maximum interoperability between ioPortal and PebblePad for ePortfolios. This could be achieved using the ioMorph technology which facilitates transforms between XML standards.

Subsequent work by CETIS, (Grant, Simon et al) so-called LEAP2a, could be implemented as an exchange standard though the LEAP2a specification was not made available during the project and only became public at the end of the project. LEAP2a provides the basis of and XML feed like RSS and Atom and thus the lessons learned from the ELGG investigation could be applied here.

3. Identified the transforms required after an investigation of the data structure of learner records for PDP in the Blackboard e-portfolio application and a comparison with the specification in ioPortal.

These project activities did not take place until the second year of the project, which might account for the suggestion in the evaluation report that responsibility for this activity was unclear to the majority of partners.

7. Conclusions

The Project was successfully completed on time with the majority of outputs delivered and was deemed by the evaluation report to have been successful in attaining the stated aims and objectives, although in a number of cases it did not prove practical to use authentic student activity to evaluate the tools. Therefore the potential of the project to have an impact on individual and institutional practice was not fully achieved.

The project has had a positive impact on many of those who participated in it as project partners. The evaluation report found that "All the participants in the project found their involvement with the project to be a positive experience and had benefitted from the engagement" (Ringan 2008:14). For many of them engagement had allowed them time to review the underpinning issues associated with PDP or e-portfolios.

Some of the wider implications for PDP processes and products, drawn from the evaluation report, are noted in the next section.

In addition to the positive outcomes, the evaluation also noted that there were some "missed opportunities" arising from the design and implementation of the project that could have resulted in further benefits. These included:

1. Individual project partners working in isolation on specific work packages reported that they were unclear of the overall objectives of the project and their specific role in achieving this. Mechanisms for ensuring how activities and outcomes from each of the individual work streams could inform the work of other work streams and partners were, at best, not well understood or, at worst, seen to be missing entirely.

2. There appeared to be very limited attempts at a central level to synthesise or evaluate emerging research or evaluation data from the individual work streams as they progressed. Equally there appears to have been little consideration of how the emerging data could be used to inform the ongoing development or implementation of the overall project or individual work packages. This might have been overcome by having a dedicated function within the project management team with a remit to analyse, evaluate and reflect on emerging results.

3. There was a disjoint between the staff in partner organisations who had been consulted during development of the bid and the actual staff engaged in delivering the project once it was approved. The strategic or institutional commitment and agreement of a partner's contribution by a senior member of staff was often poorly cascaded within that institution to the member(s) of staff actually responsible for delivering the project. There was a perception by many participants in this evaluation that they had been expected to "hit the ground running" and deliver the project without really knowing what the project was about or what their specific role within it was.

8. Implications

Implications for PDP processes and products

Despite nearly ten years' experience of implementing PDP in higher education, institutions are still facing challenges over embedding it within HE. With new policy guidelines on PDP for HE about to be published, it is worth noting the following points arising from the project evaluation report:

1. In principle, the use of technology to support PDP and portfolio development within the curriculum and the wider lifelong learning sphere is perceived as having significant potential benefits. However the key issue is in ensuring that the tool or tools that are available or provided by the institution are appropriate for purpose within the specific context of each programme; group of learners; subject domain and wider stakeholder requirements.

2. The fundamental value of both PDP and portfolio development is in the process rather than the product, and in ensuring that the process is appropriate within a particular context

3. This may involve recognition at an institutional level and across the sector more widely, that there is no "one size fits all" solution to ensuring the effective embedding of PDP or portfolio within the curriculum. This in turn may require recognition that a range of different software tools, or differing versions or implementations of a single tool, may be required within a single institution to support the range of contexts and approaches to PDP and portfolio within that institution.

4. Adequate support for staff and students has to be provided by the most appropriate staff within the institution, to ensure that maximum benefit is obtained from these approaches. This support for students becomes critical when the PDP or e-portfolio is the basis for summative assessment.

5. From a lifelong learning perspective, more detailed consideration needs to be given to how learners across a diverse range of institutions, and outside of institutions, with limited or no tutor support, with varying IT literacy skills, varying access to IT infrastructure, different experiences and different levels of confidence, can engage effectively with e-PDP and e-portfolio tools.

6. Technical and organisational systems and processes need to become much more flexible and mobile for learners. The project outcomes substantiated the suggestion that "Social software may yet be their (students) preferred way of establishing networks to gain support, record significant moments of their lives, and collaborate with others" (JISC 2008:24).

9. Recommendations

9.1 Recommendations for future work

The evaluation report made a range of useful recommendations to the teaching and learning communities for future work. These are summarised below and expanded in the evaluation report.

1. A comparison of learner experiences of Personal Development Planning and Portfolio Development from both a traditional and technology-based perspective would be useful in gaining further understanding the learner perspective.

2. Assessing the impact of IT skills and tutor support on student ability to effectively engage with technology-enabled approaches to PDP and portfolio development.

3. Evaluation of potential links between e-PDP and e-portfolio tools and non-academic tools which may be beneficial. In particular, the use of technologies commonly referred to as "Web 2.0" tools such as blogs, social networking sites, wikis, etc. may contain information and evidence created by learners which they may wish to incorporate within their academic work.

4. Developing effective processes whereby employer and other stakeholder perspectives on the use of PDP and portfolio can be embedded within the curriculum.

9.2 Recommendations for funders

Evidence from the evaluation interviews undertaken with project participants indicates that additional benefits may have accrued from the project if certain project structures and approaches had been in place. Their absence from the project was in part attributed to pressure arising from factors that give rise to the following recommendations:

1. It is recommended that funding bodies ensure that calls for funding and their deadlines are realistic and allow sufficient opportunities for discussion and agreement to occur. This is of vital importance in multi-partner, regional or sub-regional projects such as PDP4XL2 where geographic issues compound time pressures thus decreasing even further the opportunities for effective discussion and agreement of ideas and plans for the project prior to final submission.

2. Funding bodies must also ensure that calls for funding bids and the subsequent submission dates are as harmonious as possible with the academic lifecycle.

3. More robust guidance should be provided to potential project teams on ways in which commercial partners should be involved in projects of this type.

References

HIGHER EDUCATION ACADEMY (HEA), 2002. Guide for Busy Academics No.3. Using Personal Development Planning to help students gain employment.

JISC, 2008. *Effective practice with e-portfolios.* Bristol: JISC.

MALINS, J. AND MCKILLOP, C., 2005. Evaluating GraysNet: an online PDP tool for use in an art and design context. *Art, Design & Communication in Higher Education* 4(1) 31-47.

PDP Guidelines Advisory Group, 2008. *Personal development planning: guidance for institutional policy and practice.* (Draft). Centre for Recording Achievement.

Websites

Project website PDP4XL2
http://www.bournemouth.ac.uk/asprojects/pdp4xl2/index.html

Project website PDP4Life
http://www.bournemouth.ac.uk/asprojects/pdp4life/index.html

PebblePad
http://www.pebblelearning.co.uk/

Blackboard
https://mybu.bournemouth.ac.uk/webapps/portal/frameset.jsp

ELGG
http://moodle.yeovil.ac.uk/elgg/

LearnHigher website
http://www.learnhigher.org.uk/

CEMP
http://www.cemp.ac.uk/

Project Partner Website

Bournemouth University (BU) (Project Lead)
www.bournemouth.ac.uk

Bournemouth University: School of Health and Social Care
http://www.bournemouth.ac.uk/hsc/

Bournemouth University: Media School and Centre for Excellence in Media Practice (CEMP)
http://www.media.bournemouth.ac.uk/

Arts Institute at Bournemouth (AIB)
http://www.aib.ac.uk/

Open University in the South West (OU) (Lead for IAG Strand of SWLLN)
www.open.ac.uk
www.swlln.ac.uk

Phosphorix Ltd
www.phosphorix.co.uk

Salisbury NHS Foundation Trust
www.salisbury.nhs.uk

University Centre Yeovil (UCY)
www.ucy.ac.uk

University of Gloucestershire (UoG)
www.glos.ac.uk

Appendix 1

Reports and deliverables submitted for the project which are all available on the project website
http://www.bournemouth.ac.uk/asprojects/pdp4xl2/index.html

Author	Report title	Institution	Date	Project objective
Amina Uddin	Report on informing development of tools and approaches to PDP and e-portfolio structures for the health profession	Salisbury NHS Foundation Trust	August 2008	2.1.2 & 2.2.2
Daniel Cox	Supporting Documentation Investigating the data structure of learner records for PDP in the Moodle/ELGG e-portfolio application and compare with specification in ioPortal	Phosphorix Ltd	May 2008	4.2
Daniel Cox, David Hunter, Selwyn Lloyd	Investigating the data structure of learner records for PDP in the Moodle/ELGG e-portfolio application and compare with specification in ioPortal	Phosphorix Ltd	May 2008	4.2
Daniel Cox, David Hunter, Selwyn Lloyd	Investigating the data structure of learner records for PDP in Blackboard and comparing it with the specification in ioPortal	Phosphorix Ltd	August 2008	4.1
Daniel Cox, David Hunter, Selwyn Lloyd	Trial transfer of learner data between ioPortal and PebblePad	Phosphorix Ltd	August 2008	4.5
Dr Neil Ringan	External Evaluation Report	Centre for Learning and Teaching Manchester Metropolitan University	September 2008	
Kirsty Stanley	Evaluation of undergraduate AHP students' attitudes to PDP for lifelong learning and pilot of Blackboard e-portfolio with AHP students.	School of Health and Social Care	August 2008	2.4 & 2.5
Lois Thorn	Evaluate potential of ioPortal for PDP within SWLLN and compare with existing diagnostic tools developed for the Western Vocational LLN (WVLLN).	South West Lifelong Learning Network Information, Advice, Guidance and Learner	June 2008	3.2

		Support Strand		
Martin Jenkins	Development and current usage of PebblePad	University of Gloucestershire	January 2008	2.7.1
Martin Jenkins	Issues identified from the usage of PebblePad and the impact this will have in the future	University of Gloucestershire	June 2008	2.7.2
Janine Osmond	Case studies – Appraisal experience with PDP	Salisbury NHS Foundation Trust	August 2008	2.3
Valerie Lodge	Evaluate potential of ioPortal for Personal Development Planning with Creative Industries' Learners	The Arts Institute at Bournemouth	March 2008	1.3