

## Personal Development Planning: Is it working in practice?

*Penny Burden, Anne Lee, Matthew Casey, Jane Marriott, Claire Moore*

### Background and Introduction

This paper considers three current approaches to introducing Personal Development Planning (PDP) at the University of Surrey. The first part of the paper attempts to locate the Surrey approaches within appropriate environments, drawing heavily on the work done by Professor Norman Jackson (ex-Higher Education Academy) and Rob Ward (Centre for Recording Achievement). This section also draws attention to the problems of researching and evaluating PDP asking “what” exactly is working in practice and how we might progress this issue within the University. The second part of the paper is given over to case studies of current practice.

In 1997 the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education (the Dearing Report) was published. The Committee had been charged to:

*“make recommendations on how the purposes, shape, structure, size and funding of higher education, including support for students, should develop to meet the needs of the UK over the next 30 years.”<sup>1</sup>*

A total of 93 recommendations were made which caused Barnett to observe:

*“The Dearing Report is all things to all persons. It finds space for everyone, for all discourses, for all hopes and expectations. In it, agendas of economic regeneration, skills and training are run together with sub-plots of life-world learning, of democracy and critical thought”<sup>2</sup>*

One of the recommendations concerned the introduction of the HE Progress File

*“We recommend that institutions of higher education over the medium term, develop a Progress File. The File should consist of two elements:*

- *a transcript recording students achievements which should follow a common format devised by institutions collectively through their representative bodies*
- *a means by which students can monitor, build and reflect upon their personal development”<sup>3</sup>*

This was largely driven by a need to provide more transparent information for employers on the capabilities of graduates, i.e. more detailed paper transcripts of what students had actually studied (Jackson 2001)<sup>4</sup> Universities were encouraged to have the transcript requirements in place by 2002/03 and by the summer of 2003 most institutions were producing transcripts for undergraduate students.<sup>5</sup>

The second part of the recommendation refers to Personal Development Planning (PDP) and universities are requested to have introduced PDP processes at undergraduate level by 2005/06. This is a more complex area than the production of transcripts as there is no universally recognised definition of what PDP really is (Brennan and Shah, 2003). Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) guidelines state that PDP is concerned with learning in a holistic sense (both academic and non-academic) and a “*process that involves self-reflection, the creation of a personal record, planning and monitoring progress towards the achievement of personal objectives*”. The guidelines also give statements as to the intended purpose of PDP, i.e. to enable students to become more effective, independent and confident self-directed learners, to understand how they are learning, to relate their learning to a wider context and to improve their general skills for study and career management.<sup>6</sup> It is worth noting that since Dearing, other government and agency reports have also supported the use of Progress Files including: the 2003 White Paper “The Future of Higher Education”; the UUK “Measuring and Recording Student Achievement” report in 2004; PhD students were included in the initiative by “SET for Success” April 2002 and the QAA Code of Practice for Postgraduate Research Programmes in September 2004.

One of the key themes emerging from the QAA guidelines is that of employability:

1. *improve general skills for study and career management*
2. *making more effective use of off-campus opportunities for learning, such as work placements or study abroad*
3. *creating a mechanism through which career-related skills and capabilities can be recorded*
4. *improving understanding of the development of individual students and tutors' ability to provide more meaningful employment references on their behalf*<sup>7</sup>

These are ambitious targets for students to attain with the help of PDP and evidence that PDP can help to bring about these attributes is somewhat lacking and hard to obtain (Fry et al, 2002)<sup>8</sup>. This paper therefore, will consider current PDP practice at Surrey from a practitioner perspective in three disciplines – Computing, Nursing and Law and begin to consider how we can assess what is working in practice.

Is it working in practice?

Jackson and Ward (2004) propose five different curriculum and assessment environments which are being used to support learning and PDP structures<sup>9</sup>:

1. The “additional” curriculum
2. An “explicit” curriculum
3. A curriculum based on a model of learning
4. An institutional trans-disciplinary curriculum
5. A personal curriculum for a transdisciplinary world

*“By looking at PDP from the perspective of different curriculum models, we can see that it can be implemented in many different ways and has different relationships to the overall learning enterprise. In some situations it might appear fairly marginal to the “academic” learning enterprise, whereas in others it might be a core learning process. Different scenarios will result in different impacts and this poses a real challenge to researchers of PDP.”* (Jackson and Ward, (2004) p435)<sup>10</sup>

For the purposes of this paper, we have taken the additional curriculum to mean “not assessed” and explicit curriculum to mean “assessed and embedded”. The practitioner perspectives presented within this paper would appear to fall into the first two environments.

### **The “additional” curriculum**

Students experience different types of learning but they are hidden within the academic curriculum. Teaching and assessment focus primarily on the acquisition and use of disciplinary knowledge and there is little formal recognition of other sorts of learning. Student recording of their own learning is likely to be limited or non-existent. (Jackson and Ward, 2004)<sup>11</sup>

Within this category, Jackson and Ward outline five extracurricular strategies which they have identified in UK universities which attempt to engage students in reflecting on and recording their own learning and their experiences of learning. One of these strategies is to see **PDP as a support mechanism within a personal tutor system for all students**. Students monitor and reflect on their academic and personal development and produce simple records that form the basis of conversations with their tutors.

*“In the case of learning that is not assessed, the motivation for engaging with PDP might simply be to provide a basis for rich and purposeful conversations between tutors and students. The focus then, is one of strengthening the support and guidance that tutors provide and building tutor knowledge about individual students.”* (Jackson and Ward (2004) p. 438)<sup>12</sup>

## An “explicit” curriculum

Teacher perceptions of students’ learning stretch beyond the interests and concerns of the discipline, and teachers and students are aware of the range of skills and other learning that is being developed across the curriculum. If these are expressed as learning outcomes then they will also be assessed. An explicit curriculum will actively broaden students’ skill base and knowledge of learning processes, often achieved by introducing learning approaches that are skills-based, problem or enquiry based or work based. Learning other than academic related learning will be assessed and credit will be gained for the learning demonstrated.

Of the case studies represented here, the pilot in the Computing Department fits into the additional curriculum environment and the Law experience would be located within the explicit curriculum, albeit at a fairly tentative stage. The EIHMS experience straddles the two as they utilise the personal tutoring system within the School but also embed throughout the curriculum. Within the case studies, some reflective commentary and observation has been made as to how practice would change for the next intake of students but Jackson and Ward suggest that a key research question might be “*does PDP actually improve learning and the capacity to learn?*”<sup>13</sup> Is this the question for us to consider at Surrey?

They go on to outline three routes currently being used to examine this question:

1. Synthesis of relevant scientific knowledge which relates PDP to how people learn. (See Gough et al, 2003)<sup>14</sup>
2. Synthesis of institutional evaluations and practitioner action research on PDP implementation. (See CRA website: <http://www.recordingachievement.org/>)
3. Examining PDP against theoretical models of learning – examining PDP from the perspective of the models of learning that is it intended to promote. Specific models mentioned are Kolb’s experiential learning cycle and Zimmerman’s self-regulatory learning.<sup>15</sup>

PDP was first introduced at Surrey in 2002 with an ambitious pilot encompassing all Schools then on campus. The pilot was evaluated (Burden, 2003)<sup>16</sup> and Surrey became one of the first UK Universities to publish this on the national practitioner database (See CRA Website)<sup>17</sup>. This kind of practitioner action research is seen by Jackson and Ward as helpful as it provides evidence of practitioner perceptions and institutional community views on the impacts of particular approaches to implementation. A representative from the University of Surrey is now part of a joint HEA/CRA Research and Evaluation Working Group which is looking to develop an evaluation toolkit to encourage a more robust approach to evaluation across the sector.

The initial pilot reinforced the view that the PDP approach at UniS needed to be discipline focused – a “one size fits all” approach was inappropriate and unpopular, particularly with students. This finding is similar to those in other institutions, e.g.

*“A discipline/profession-based approach has advantages e.g. of helping employers understand what they are seeing, of demonstrating how those qualifying for one profession emerge from higher education with common understanding, skills, knowledge and competences as well as some different ones. It enables files to be better tailored to need; a common file would be a very broad brush affair. An approach that is not too prescriptive and allows professions to develop files has much to recommend it, including the potential benefit of continuing the file into professional life.”* (Fry et al (2002) p.107)<sup>18</sup>

The study carried out by Fry et al, St Bartholomew’s, Royal London School of Medicine and Dentistry and the University of London went to state:

*“One clear finding emerging ..... is the need for all parties to understand their purposes, for guidance to be given about their use and for curriculum time to be made.”* (Fry et al (2002) p.109)<sup>19</sup>

Which brings us back to the question posed in the first paragraph of this paper, “what” is working? PDP is being introduced across the University in a number of disciplines in a variety of ways. How do we know if it’s working? What is “it”? Is it process, product and/or policy? Clegg (2004:296) argues that we are in danger of losing the contextual understanding which practitioners derive from pedagogical practice within the larger ideological debate of “what works”. She considers it important to acknowledge the “chaotic nature” of the concept of PDP and the problem of complexity and diversity of ideas which underpin PDP and to make sure that practitioner questions are not sidelined.<sup>20</sup>

We are beginning to consider how we are going to evaluate current PDP practice at Surrey which brings with it some difficult questions. We would welcome views and expertise from our colleagues and we would encourage interested parties to contact us with a view to working together on a robust attempt to look at PDP at Surrey and answer the question – “is it working in practice?”

---

## **COMPUTING DEPARTMENT PDP PILOTS**

In the Department of Computing, three different approaches to introducing PDP have been trialled over the last two years. Two of these trials have focused upon MSc students, one on 1st year undergraduates. Programmes for each of these cohorts include modules aimed at teaching relevant professional skills, such as communication skills, how to conduct a literature survey and team working. Other professional aspects are also included, such as ethics. To some extent, skill-based PDP activities are therefore already included in the programmes, as recognised within the University PDP strategy, but additional support was trialled to help improve student reflective practice as well as to learn further about embedding PDP within programmes.

### **1) PDP delivered through seminars**

During the 2004/2005 academic year, a 28 page booklet was drawn up for the MSc cohort by the Centre for Learning Development (CLD), based upon previous pilot PDP skills audit booklets. The list of skills was tailored for Computing students, but included the typical study skills, such as time management and writing, as well as a reflective summary planned to be completed at three points during the year. In addition, the booklet listed further skills resources and useful links, included a form to be used for coursework feedback, which was to be completed by both the student and the marker, and a framework for students to complete relevant details to help the Department provide a reference.

The booklet was supported by three academic-led sessions during the two semesters, and was used during one tutorial led by the Language Centre, which delivered the professional skills module. Students were encouraged to attend the academic-led sessions with their completed skills audit so that further advice and information regarding resources could be obtained. Evaluation was via student feedback and a focus group session run by the CLD.

In general, the first two academic sessions went well, with mostly good attendance and interest. However, attendance dropped significantly towards the end of the first semester, and obtaining participants for subsequent sessions and the focus group was difficult, with only about 10% of the 65 student cohort attending. Informal feedback during the academic-led sessions indicated that most students thought that the idea of PDP was sound, but that only two or three students actually felt they benefited from the approach. Very few of the students completed their skills audit, and it was felt that this either needed to be structured (possibly assessed) or removed. Furthermore, the coursework feedback and reference details sheets remained unused. This feedback was used in the next approach to providing PDP to the MSc students in the following academic year.

During the 2005/2006 academic year, the scheme was revised to be focussed on student-led discussions on key skills required for their studies and beyond. No booklet was produced, instead six sessions over the two semesters were planned to cover a range of issues, as decided by the students. These were introduced during the induction programme. So far four of the six sessions have been run. A focus group is planned at the end to gain feedback.

This approach has appeared to be more successful at engaging the students. They asked for the sessions to be focussed on three areas: managing coursework, the dissertation process and requirements (two sessions), and employability and careers. The CLD and Careers Service were asked to provide relevant material for each of these sessions, with good material and exercises used. One very useful aspect was the use of two past MSc students to present their thoughts on coursework and the dissertation. Both gave excellent insight that has received very good feedback from the cohort.

However, despite the sessions proving more useful and better attended, during the second semester, attendance has again dropped off, with the fifth and sixth sessions cancelled due to lack of attendance. Several conclusions can be drawn from this, which match current known problems with introducing PDP, especially with MSc cohorts. Firstly, PDP is about encouraging reflective practice. Encouragement can be through voluntary or assessed activities, with much debate about which is preferred. For Computing, assessment did not appear appropriate. The problem then is that, without assessment, there is little explicit incentive for the students to engage. Whilst students are interested, they participate, but once, for example, they get greater demands from coursework, then attendance reduces. Secondly, perhaps the sessions themselves are not sufficiently focused, delivered or relevant enough for the students to engage. Further feedback regarding this will come from the focus group at the end of the semester. However, since the students themselves chose the subjects, this may mean that the way the material was delivered was not sufficiently engaging, despite informal feedback to the contrary for the sessions that have been run.

This feedback suggests that, if we were to run this scheme in the same way next year, then perhaps it should be focused on the first semester only. This corresponds with the recorded good attendance and engagement from this year, together with the reduced expectation of coursework during this period.

## **2) PDP delivered through tutorials**

Given the results of these two trials for the MSc cohort, during the 2005/2006 academic year, a light-touch scheme was devised by the CLD for 1st year undergraduate students. Instead of concentrating on seminar based skills sessions, a tutorial approach is being used for the undergraduates. The CLD were asked to produce a short skills audit booklet that covered key skills only. As a trial, two academics within the Department volunteered to run tutorials for their first-year students based around the booklet. Of the potential six tutees on the trial, three agreed to participate.

Following on from a short induction session run by the CLD at the beginning of the second semester, the plan was to hold three tutorials for each student during the semester. At the time of writing, two of these tutorials have been completed, with the tutorials held in groups. Prior to each tutorial, the students were asked to complete a skills audit. The audit was then discussed during the tutorial, summarised and action points set for the next tutorial.

Although this trial involves only a small number of students, so far the feedback has been encouraging. Firstly, the students have recorded how their ability to perform certain skills has changed over the sessions. Particular changes include their time management skills with relation to coursework deadlines; advice on planning ahead was used by the students to reduce deadline pressure. Secondly, and most importantly, these structured sessions appear to have improved communication between the students and tutors. Typically, such tutorial sessions within the Department are ad-hoc, with an emphasis on providing support during the first critical months of student life. By introducing the PDP tutorials, students have gained improved access to academics and vice versa, something that is desired of a good personal tutor system, but which is recognised as being inconsistent across the University and subject to workload and strategic pressures.

In conclusion, both the seminar and tutorial based approaches seem to work to some extent, but rely upon students volunteering their time which may conflict with existing commitments, such as coursework. Here, the seminar based approach highlights the need to engage the students for the sessions to offer any benefit, but allows one session to reach more students (potentially the whole cohort) with initiatives such as insight from past students. In contrast, the tutorial system offers benefit through improved staff-student communication on an individual or small group basis. The volunteering aspect can be alleviated by making tutorials and seminars mandatory. More importantly, in this context,

PDP can be used to structure and supplement the personal tutoring system, if appropriate. Indeed, this approach has recently been advocated during a Departmental strategy meeting to improve personal tutoring. The alternative is to embed such PDP activities into the curriculum, with the need to assess participation which is an altogether more complex area.

## **PDP IN THE EUROPEAN INSTITUTE OF HEALTH AND MEDICAL SCIENCES**

The European Institute of Health and Medical Sciences (EIHMS) has decided to introduce personal development planning in two ways. Firstly through guided self assessment with 'light touch' monitoring through the tutorial system and secondly by embedding it in the curriculum.

### **1) PDP delivered through 'light touch' tutorials**

The objective is to enable students to reflect and to develop their skills through guided criteria, but also to ensure that there is sufficient monitoring for tutors to pick up any problems.

A final year 3,000 word essay asking students to reflect on their journey using the information from their PDP booklets provides additional motivation to complete the self assessment booklet and to consolidate their learning.

In Autumn 2005 four hundred student nurses attended an introductory 45-60 minute lecture to the concept of PDP in two groups. It was given in the second week of their programme and was well received. The lecture was mainly a series of rhetorical questions, the thrust of the message was 'Personal development planning is up to you, it will help you to complete your course successfully, it is not a lot of hard work and is essential if you want to get the best job at the end of the course'.

The materials used for the lecture include a purple booklet 'Personal Development Planning' for each student (originally developed by CLD, now produced by EIHMS), a green leaflet 'Skills and Personal Development for Students in EIHMS (produced by CLD) and overhead projector transparencies of each page of the purple booklet (also available on computerised projection screen for the first lecture).

Students then see their tutors four times during the next two years for fifteen minutes at each session, they are expected to have completed the relevant pages of the purple booklet before each meeting and the tutor uses these pages to identify problems (and draws on them when the student's reference is drafted). Longer appointments can then be made if these meetings reveal particular issues which need more time.

### **2) PDP embedded in the curriculum**

Whilst PDP is most obviously introduced through the workbook and associated tutorials, there are other ways that it is embedded in the programme, for example, mentoring in placements and reflective assignments.

A major feature of the degree and diploma courses for student nurses is the mentoring and assessment that they receive when they go on practice placements. A student will undertake 15 or 16 placements the course of nine different modules over a three year period. In this feature, whilst the essence of professional development through practice is common to most courses at the University of Surrey, EIHMS are different because the placements happen throughout the course and are not focussed in just one year.

The principles guiding the appointment and training of mentors for student nurses in practice are laid down by the Nursing and Midwifery Council. Mentors must have studied mentorship and assessment and EIHMS are responsible for providing mentoring updates for all Trusts. It is an audited requirement that each placement provides a trained and certificated mentor.

To assess whether or not PDP is embedded in the programme, EIHMS have reviewed the programme content and mapped it across to the learning objectives proposed in the Resource Guide, currently being developed by CLD. They have found that the programme content meets considerably more than the suggested minimum of one learning objective from each of the three categories of: 'Learning, Research and Scholarship'; 'Employability and Engagement with Society' and 'Personal Effectiveness and Communication Skills'.

In the opening weeks of the first year students are taken to the Library and have specific library sessions when they are taught how to locate and retrieve resources and given their Athens password. They are asked to write a reflection on their first placement and individual tutorials seek to understand where the students are with their learning and what they are going to do about it.

They complete the workbook (described above) and complete a reflective assignment for each module (examination marks and marks for the portfolio are apportioned roughly equally – about 50% each.) The development of communication skills comes through the mentoring on placement.

Thus in the first year students are meeting objectives about communicating their knowledge base, using IT and developing a commitment to assessing their own learning (learning, research and scholarship). They are also recording their achievements in their purple workbooks and carrying out a skills assessment (employability and engagement with society) as well as demonstrating that they can work independently, locating University resources, working in a team, demonstrating cultural awareness and communicating cogently orally and in writing (personal and communication skills).

In Year 2 students continue to meet a variety of PDP objectives through tutorials, placements, mentoring and reflective assignments, but there is no expectation that students will need to have sessions with an explicit careers focus because the NHS Trusts advise on employment availability.

Thus for EIHMS students in Year 2 the PDP objectives covered relate to identifying transferable skills, developing professional working relationships, reflecting upon their own learning, critiquing the provenance of knowledge resources, demonstrating curiosity about knowledge, looking for a wider awareness and taking responsibility for academic work with a minimum of direction (learning, research and scholarship), they also will have had opportunities to identify the main attributes of the different employment worlds, maintain their CV and update their skills assessment (employability and engagement with society). During the year, through a variety of placements they will have had to adapt to new situations and evaluate their performance in those situations and gather evidence of communicating appropriately (personal and communication skills).

As already described, EIHMS students undertake placements throughout their programme, and not just in the third and final year. The third year students are asked to 'buddy' first year students, and this means that they also meet one more of the objectives under 'Employment and Engagement with Society'. They will also have plenty of opportunity to reflect on the interaction, synergies and possible conflicts between academic studies and work experience (learning, research and scholarship) and will be asked to write an evocative placement report which will include reflecting on how they faced unexpected difficulties and coped with a range of interactions with individuals and groups (employment and engagement with society as well as personal effectiveness and communication skills).

In the final year of the programme students take a clinical effectiveness module which requires them to do an extended piece of work of 10-12,000 words. They also undertake a Leadership and Management module which covers interviewing skills, presentation skills and cv writing.

Throughout the programme there has been a continuous tutorial and mentoring scheme in process. References are compiled from tutors' perceptions of personal management and communication skills, academic feedback, practice reports, sickness and absence records. This means that in terms of PDP objectives, students will have demonstrated the ability to report on how they learn best, be able to communicate comprehensive subject knowledge, be aware of ethical values and personal responsibility and understand the purpose and scope of their course in Higher Education (learning, research and scholarship).

By this final stage in their programme their personal effectiveness and communication skills should include the ability to adapt to new situations and evaluate their performance in those situations, communicate persuasively in an appropriate manner and to anticipate problems and propose realistic solutions to them, lead and/or be a positive and sensitive group member, interacting effectively within a team/learning group and responding in a way that demonstrates cultural awareness and to give and receive information and ideas clearly, and modify responses where appropriate.

All of these objectives will be assessed through placement assessments, assignments and tutorials. Continuing professional development is a requirement of all Registered Nurses, and unless they have undertaken a specified amount every three years they are not allowed to re-register, and therefore to practice. EIHMS hope that by introducing students to PDP they will become more aware of their ability to learn, and continue this in the spirit of life-long learning.

### **PDP FOR LAW STUDENTS**

The Bar Council make plain the skills that they expect Law students to gain during their undergraduate programme and many of these are closely related to UniS's own PDP objectives. The Bar Council identifies as essential the ability to apply knowledge to complex situations, to use the English language and legal terminology with care and accuracy, and to conduct efficient searches of the web. During 2005/06, Law students completed a PDP group exercise at level 1 and a skills audit at level 2 and 3.

Year One undergraduates attended a lecture on PDP at the beginning of the second semester. It stressed that they must be aware of how their skills were developing. They were then put into small groups to identify the five academic skills that they have found most difficult since they began the programme, the five aspects of University life that they have found most difficult to adjust to and the five things they have found most satisfying so far.

The common issues that were identified were:

- Time management
- Too much reading
- Getting up in time for 9am lectures
- U-learn
- Lecturers talking too fast

The lecturer synthesised all the students' lists and derived answers to their problems from various approaches to PDP. The appropriate web pages on skills development were identified and explanations were given about the approaches to studying needed (e.g.: that students do not need to write down every word the lecturer says, but do need to be able to identify the essence of an argument).

Students in Years 2 and 3 were introduced to the more detailed skills audit through a one hour introductory overview to the year. Students were invited to one of four lecture groups according to their level of attainment so far ('Firsts and 2:1'; '2:2'; 'Thirds' and 'Others' – others were the underachievers). The lecture groups were selected by attainment because the message to each needed to be different.

All students were told that they would be sent a skills audit and that completing it was optional. The skills audit asked students to assess themselves on a ranking of 1-5 on time management, preparation, lectures, tutorials, assignments, coursework and exams. There were detailed sub-categories for each of these (for example, under "Lectures", students are asked to rate themselves on: attendance; identifying the key points/cases and reviewing/augmenting lecture notes).

About 275-300 skills audits were sent out by email and 60 (c22%) were returned. The PDP co-ordinator reviewed all those returned to identify any common problems, and then the completed

assessments were given to the student's tutor. Every student was invited to go and see their personal tutor about their completed skills audit, and about 30 students took up this opportunity.

There were some common problems which came up in many of the self assessed skills audit:

- Essay writing
- Knowing how to tackle a problem question (applying the law to a scenario)
- Time management
- Referencing

The academic staff had expressed reservations about this approach at the beginning of the semester. In the Department of Law the staff:student ratio means that each member of academic staff has between 40 and 50 tutees. They were very concerned that all the students might want to come to them with their skills audits (in fact only 11% did, but it is questionable whether or not this was a good thing?). Staff were also worried that they might not be able to answer the queries that students raised, so a resource map was provided for each tutor.

Feedback from the academic staff has been requested, and the lack of any complaints is being taken as an acknowledgement that the workload caused has not been as great as was feared.

The Department of Law is now going to look at ways of integrating PDP more into the modules, and thereby making it compulsory. In 2005 the aspiration was to encourage students to become more self-motivated and to take the initiative, the experience was that the high achievers undertook the work and were proactive about it. Because it was not compulsory many of the low achievers chose not to do the work at all. From that low achieving group, where students did undertake the work, there was only a marginal shift towards the student becoming proactive.

The School of Arts, Communication and Humanities is planning on creating some entry-level e-PDP for all students. The Department of Law also believes that students would be more involved if some of the material they used in 2005 was re-written so that it is discipline specific. The PDP co-ordinator in the Department is keen to find ways of getting all the academic staff involved in how PDP is delivered, so that it can become truly embedded. There is also a need to design some group work which encourages all students to get involved, and does not allow some students to 'opt out'.

### **Some possible questions for Schools/Departments to ask:**

1. Where, within the existing curriculum, are students already experiencing PDP-type activities?
1. Should PDP be delivered through tutorials, lectures or via a blended approach?
2. What should the content be? How does the discipline knowledge base drive what the content should be?
3. Should it be compulsory?
4. Should it be assessed?

---

### **References**

- 1 NCIHE 1997a p.3
- 2 Barnett, R. (1998) *"In" or "For" the Learning Society* Higher Education Quarterly, Vol.25 (1) pp7-21
- 3 NCIHE 1997
- 4 Jackson, N. J. (2001) Building capacity to support PDP: An Optimistic Vision of Large Scale and Complex Change. LTSN Generic Centre and the University of Surrey. <http://www.ltsn.ac.uk/genericcentre/projects/PDP>

- 5 Brennan, J. and Shah, T. (2003) Report on the Implementation of Progress Files; Centre for  
Higher Education Research and Information
- 6 QAA Guidelines on HE Progress Files: [www.qaa.ac.uk/crntwork/progfilhe/contents.htm](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/crntwork/progfilhe/contents.htm)  
(**accessed June 2005**)
- 7 QAA, *ibid.*
- 8 Fry, H., Davenport, E.S., Woodman, T. & Pee, B. (2002) *Developing Progress Files: a  
case study* Teaching in Higher Education, Vol. 7 (1) pp97-111
- 9 Jackson, N., & Ward, R. (2004) *A Fresh perspective on progress files – a way of  
representing complex learning and achievement in higher education* Assessment and  
Evaluation in Higher Education Vol. 29 (4) pp423-449
- 10 Jackson and Ward, *ibid*
- 11 Jackson and Ward, *ibid*
- 12 Jackson and Ward, *ibid*
- 13 Jackson and Ward, *ibid*
- 14 Gough, D. A., Kiwan, D., Sutcliffe, S., Simpson, D. & Houghton, N. (2003) A systematic  
map and synthesis review of the effectiveness of personal development planning for  
improving student learning. Available online at:  
[http://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/EPPIWeb/home.aspx?page=/reel/review\\_groups/EPPE/LTSN\\_intro.h  
tm](http://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/EPPIWeb/home.aspx?page=/reel/review_groups/EPPE/LTSN_intro.htm) (accessed March 2004)
- 15 Jackson and Ward, *ibid*
- 16 Burden, P (2003) *Evaluation of PDP Pilot at UniS 2002/03*
- 17 CRA Website: <http://www.recordingachievement.org/>
- 18 Fry et al, *ibid*
- 19 Fry et al, *ibid*
- 20 Clegg, S. (2004) *Critical Readings: progress files and the production of the autonomous  
learner* Teaching in Higher Education, Vol. 9 (3) pp287-298