

Pilots Completion Report

Document details

Document owner	Sarah Dyer
Document author	Sarah Dyer
Current version	2
Issue date	31/08/25

Version control

Date	Version	Change details
20/06/25	1	Needs more detail (via email)

Title of the Pilot	<p>Piloting and evaluation of approaches to the professional development for educators to enable successful CLE roll out</p> <p>Project Shift: How can we support academic and PS staff in making the move to Canvas so students benefit?</p>
Pilot ID Number	ID61

Pilot Completion Report Template

Report Category	Report Requirement
Overall Rating <i>(Fully Delivered, Partially Delivered, Not Delivered)</i>	
Summary	<p><i>Please give a summary of what your pilot delivered. With a focus on progress toward the original aims. (Circa 1000 words)</i></p> <p>The project was planned to introduce the Humanities elearning team to service design as an approach for designing the support for staff to move to Canvas in September 2025. The project was planned to take place for the calendar year 2024. The timing of the project was appropriate because it began way before the team had access to Canvas itself. It was a good time to concentrate on understanding the user (in this case academic and PS staff) needs in making this move. The challenge was: How can we support academic and PS staff in making the move to Canvas so students benefit? The intention was to spend a year undertaking problem definition and piloting so that by month 10 (of the project) we would have evidence of what strategies are effective for ensuring the academic professional development needed for successful roll out of the new CLE in Humanities.</p> <p>Phase one (discovery) would employ needs analysis and problem definition tools about 'service' of academic/ps cpd the team deliver. We also aimed to test different approaches to involving students.</p> <p>In phase two we would prototype and evaluate a suite of approaches which we thought may include theme-based training (for example, inclusivity or social justice – led), programme team bootcamps, or online courses.</p> <p>In the final phase three, we wanted to create resources which would have enabled us to scale the approaches we had seen are successful and incorporate the 'know how' developed during the pilot.</p> <p>Through undertaking this project, the intension was the elearning team would be developing their own skills and capacity to undertake the transition to the new VLE, including their own ways of working, building/deepening relationships and visibility across the faculty.</p> <p>Delivery plan: The intention was to create capacity in the elearning team by hiring additional staff to undertake day to day work and to hire an expert service designer who could scaffold a process and coach the team. We had an existing member of the elearning team work as a project manager to coordinate the project.</p>

Deliverables	<p><i>In the application, we set out the following deliverables:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. -University and Faculty stakeholder map; 2. -students recruited to team; 3. -Mapping of current practices and resources; 4. -Needs analysis of educators; 5. -Identified benchmarks to measure progress; 6. -Tested prototypes of student participation; 7. -Tested prototypes of service delivery 8. -Creating and testing different 'interventions' for service delivery to include things like templates; resources and training cut in different ways: programme bootcamp, themed around inclusive learning, creating learning community etc; workflows and models 9. -Creation and evaluation of material (such as student talking heads) to be used to support project. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evaluation frameworks; 10. -diagnostics to support selection of interventions, 11. -work packages and resources for roll out. <p><i>We delivered:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We created evidence-based personas of different 'users', which enabled deeper analysis of the value of different interventions; 2. Students already working in the elearning team were key members of the Project Shift team; 3. We created a tool to enable teams to map current practices; 4. We created personas (as above) and needs based on empathy mapping interviews with users (academic and PS staff); 5. We were supported by Fran Hooley, to create a Theory of Change evaluation framework; 6. We undertook student needs interview. These informed the creation of the Canvas Standards; 7. We prototyped and tested service design rather than delivery; 8. We held a co-creation event with academic and PS staff. From the very long list of possible interventions we were only able to prototype and test two interventions. One was successful. The insights also directly informed the training created in Canvas; 9. See above; 10. Not delivered; 11. Not delivered. <p><i>Unforeseen, deliverables:</i></p>

	Given the difficulty experienced in undertaking a service design (human-centred design) approach, this pilot focused on service design (item 7). We have undertaken an evaluation of this (attached).
<u>Relevance</u>	<p><i>Has the pilot topic and its activities met the information/experience needs of the intended stakeholder groups? To what extent are the completed pilot outcomes still in line with the needs and priorities of the Flexible Learning Programme?</i></p> <p>1) Taking stakeholders in turn:</p> <p>Humanities elearning team: We evaluated the experience of working on this project and have gained a deeper understanding of the challenges involved in creating a team to undertake service design in this way. A couple of the take home insights concern expectations. The team didn't appreciate that this project was experimenting with working in a new way and saw the project primarily about creating new resources; team perceptions of productivity made upfront problem (re-)definition appear inefficient; the team didn't feel they could (or didn't want to) take ownership of the project streams.</p> <p>Humanities leadership: Humanities leadership groups (Professional Services and TLSE) have received reports and presentations about the process and outcomes of the project. The evaluation is reasonably recent and a copy has gone to key stakeholders, including the elearning team managers. Humanities are currently setting up a Teaching Academy and, informed by this project, have chosen to understand similar discovery research as the 'service' is designed.</p> <p>University leadership: The project has been shared with the Strategic Change Office (as a presentation to their all staff away day and in meetings); as a presentation to the PS leadership away day; a presentation to the IT all staff away day is planned. The learning from this project will inform the writing of the Manchester 2035 playbook.</p> <p>Humanities PS and academic colleagues who will use the training and support in making the move to Canvas (and indirectly their students): the pilot has informed the support package that is being offered, albeit not as directly as hoped for. The discovery research was useful to the FLP Hums learning designer who designed much of the Humanities support.</p> <p>2) The pilot remained highly relevant to FLP as it experimented with service design (new way of working in line with widely used digital transformation approaches). The project highlighted many possible problems with employing this approach at UoM. Our evaluation contains recommendations for a next iteration.</p>
<u>Efficiency</u>	<i>To what extent did the methods/approaches used in this pilot lead to improvements in efficiency (financial/staffing/resourcing etc)?</i>

	<p><i>What other approaches could be considered in light of the pilot - would these be more or less efficient?</i></p> <p>1) Personally, I think the answer to this question depends on where we take the scope of efficiency to end. Creating services which don't fulfil user needs is inefficient. It creates more work for everyone – the team in sorting out problems and academics/PS staff in working out how to meet their needs. As such, I would argue a service design approach is in the long run a much more efficient way of working.</p> <p>The team undertaking this project (or at least those who took part in the evaluation) came to see this as an inefficient way of working though. I think there are two elements to this. First, it takes time and 'bandwidth' to learn a new approach. Second, service design requires more time be spent on understanding any complexity and the lived experience/needs of the people who will be use the service.</p> <p>The first of these would be something any new way of working encountered. In terms of service design specifically, our evaluation identified: The team identifies as helpful by being productive, building resources and being efficient at all times. They enjoy helping their internal clients and solving their problems. They build the solutions they are ask to, with limited time. Many feel motivated by technology and enjoy the recognition that comes with showcasing their specific technical skills or L&T expertise.</p> <p>For us this possess the following questions: How might we encourage a broader understanding of productivity? How might we help teams see value beyond immediate outputs when assessing productivity? How might we highlight and reward technical and T&L expertise in human-centered design processes that start without a defined solution?</p> <p>2) We address possible approaches in our proposal for a next iteration of a Human-centred design project. They broadly concern engaging with the following things in the set up of a project: people in a team's sense of identity and understanding of what their work is; more explicit upfront skills development and expectation setting; team social 'contract' and ways of working.</p>
<u>Effectiveness</u>	<p><i>To what extent did the methods/approaches used in this pilot lead to improvements in effectiveness (learning/outcomes/experience/flexibility etc)? What other approaches could be considered in light of the pilot - would these be more or less effective?</i></p> <p>1)The project was designing a new 'service' to support a change in VLE which isn't complete yet and so it is hard to answer this question. The outcomes have informed the provision of support for making the move to Canvas. There hasn't been an evaluation of the effectiveness of the outputs of the project.</p>

	<p>In terms of the pilot and a 'lead to improvement', I was surprised by the ways in which the pilot fed into the way the elearning team did go about supporting the move to Canvas. Our evaluation showed that the eLearning team who were involved in the project felt most interested in/comfortable with the discovery phase of the project. The insights we gained did seem to resonate and then inform how approached people did things although they rejected the idea of using the insights in any more 'formal' or shared way to structure development or evaluate possible approaches. The final output – a set of scenario cards – has been used with subsequent training being aligned with the scenario cards.</p> <p>2) The approaches would broadly those outlined in the section above, as these address how we think service design might be supported as an approach in this context. I think the reflection above highlights the ways in which current ways of working perhaps make certain collaborations difficult. Again, attitude to collaboration was highlighted in the evaluation with team members.</p>
<u>Outcome</u>	<p><i>To what extent was the pilot able to meet/exceed its objectives? To what extent has the pilot led to improved outcomes or behaviours in the stakeholder groups? Were there any other unintended positive or negative outcomes from the pilot?</i></p> <p>1) The outcomes were not as expected as I hadn't appreciated how difficult service design would be in this context.</p> <p>2)As above, I do think the outcomes (the support available in making the move to Canvas) has slightly been improved by the insights of the discovery research we did in this project.</p> <p>3) I think the most valuable outcome from this project is a better understanding of the barriers to undertaking service design in this context. The project serves as a case study of both the promise and the difficulties. This has been shared with the Strategic Change Office and PS leadership.</p>
<u>Sustainability</u>	<p><i>To what extent has the pilot identified the potential for its activity to lead to the long-term behaviour/operational change? What would need to happen to make these changes happen?</i></p> <p>Yes. The evaluation has provided really useful insights to this approach in UoM. As an example, we have identified what skills development could be expected to take place in teams and what aspects of service design might mor usefully be set up as specialist functions (for example, in the strategic change office) that teams could access to support their processes of service design.</p>
<u>Financial</u>	<p>It took a long time to recruit backfill for elearning team (May, five months) and then the project manager had an extended leave. This</p>

	<p>impacted the team's perception of the support that they were being given to take part in the project. There was a sense that they had been offered time to undertake this project but that didn't play out as expected.</p> <p>.</p>
Lessons Identified / Learned	<p><i>Please Consider enabler and inhibitors in the following areas:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Systems and process</i> <p>A lesson about the need to articulate how the people delivering a service understand the system/process and their role in it, if you are going to look for different ways of working.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Incentives and capacity</i> <p>A lesson that supporting skills development isn't sufficient to support new ways of working. Our evaluation also identified identity (see above); sense of autonomy, permission, and accountability; ways of working esp re collaboration as areas in need of articulation and development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Policy and strategy</i> <p>Not directly. My sense is that service design will be important in delivering Manchester 2035. This experiment with is highlights the challenges.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Student experience</i> <p>Not directly, but as above.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Physical Estate</i> <p>None</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Culture</i> <p>Covered by 'systems and process' and 'incentives and capacity'.</p>
Materials or publications	<p>None.</p> <p>The work has been presented to: Humanities TLSE twice (process and outcomes), Humanities PS Leadership away day, Directorate of planning away day, and University PS leadership away day.</p>
Report approval and comments	

I have summarised the financial position in notes below the table. I am requesting remaining budget be transferred into next financial year (as per meeting and email agreement).

I have a £5,000 invoice yet to be processed (which will be processed in June) and we still have to print project outputs.

Cost Type	Description	Costs and Total
Staff	@ 3,942.16	£79,623.16

	<p>Agency Staff @ 41,040.00 @ 11,868.00 UoM backfill @22,773.00*</p> <p>*I think that this appears as unmatched in the FLP spreadsheet shared with me.</p>	
Non-Staff	<p>Computer @ £850** Catering@ 94.25+632.85 (total £727.10) Software @£100 DT course @£2264 Service design consultancy @ £22313 claimed and £6000 as yet invoiced (total £28,313)</p> <p>**The hardware code on the FLP spreadsheet has £5335.20 against the hardware code. We have only bought one computer and the spend against this code need investigating.</p>	£32,254.1
Adjustments		
Final reconciliation	<p><i>Total Staff and non-Staff cost 111,877.29 (including outstanding invoice) + 3,885.71 (requested transfer to next financial year)</i></p>	
Request for payment	<p><i>There is an outstanding invoice of £6000, which we are expecting to receive next week. This is included in the Service Design line above.</i></p> <p><i>We are requesting 3,885.71 be transferred in to the next financial year for output printing costs.</i></p>	<p><i>£6000 (outstanding invoice)</i></p> <p><i>£3885.71 (transfer to next financial year)</i></p>