|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Dimension | Expected aspects | NERUPI Contribution | Commended aspects | NERUPI Contribution |
| 1. Strategic Context | * Opportunities for your WP team(s) to have   conversations about evaluation on a regular basis;   * Delivery staff and partners aware of the importance of evaluation and committed to facilitating robust data collection processes; * A skills base/expertise identified amongst professional service staff for undertaking or commissioning evaluation of APP programmes. | * The NERUPI team can support internal dialogue through ad hoc consultancy and ongoing support to institutional WP teams; * Evaluation an integral part of the NERUPI framework in terms of planning and review of interventions, and the framework provides a common language to underpin discussions (e.g. at outreach team meetings, APP advisory groups); * NERUPI framework ensures staff are aware of expectations for data collection. | * Mechanism for strategic overview of evaluation of access and participation programmes * Resources deployed with evaluation aspects in mind * Evaluation activity coherently maintained across the whole programme of activities * A whole institutional approach to widening participation * Opportunities for honest reflection and encouragement for reflective practice * Opportunities to enhance evaluation skills and understanding | * Strategic overview based on praxis teams; * Mapping activities to the NERUPI framework levels and outcomes supports coherence and a whole institutional approach; * NERUPI resource bank and toolkits are designed to build capacity and support skills development – both theoretical and practical aspects; * Membership of NERUPI allows APP team and partners to participate in CPD opportunities on an ongoing basis. |
| 2. Programme Design | * Programmes underpinned by clear objectives; * Programme design informed by evidence; * Clarity on how to measure all of the outcomes and impacts of your programmes; * Success measures focused on impact in terms of achieving outcomes for participants; * Evidence underpinning choice of outcome measures for A&P programmes | * The NERUPI framework is based on a clear set of aims and objectives; * NERUPI has been built on evidence of what works in APP. The theoretically grounded context specific aims and objectives are a foundation for programme design; * Learning outcomes focus in the NERUPI framework provide a coherent basis for assessing impact of individual activities and programme; * The framework underpins the design of activities and the identification of appropriate outcomes and data collection measures. * Indicator bank associated with the framework is being developed to share measures of the immediate outcomes. | * Detailed specification of the specific activities your programmes will deliver, and why; * Benchmarks against which to measure the outcomes; * Evaluation specified during the planning stage of interventions. | * Focus on learning outcomes in the NERUPI framework supports process of activity design and specification through theory of change; * Mapping activities to the framework allows benchmarks to be identified; * Evaluation is an embedded aspect of the framework and therefore at the forefront during programme design stage. |
| 3. Evaluation Design | * Evaluation plans for programmes in line with   the standard of evaluation expected by the OfS;   * Clarity about the intended audience for the evaluation and requirements for the evaluation given how the findings will be used. | * The Toolkit is designed to help with evaluation planning. Working through the resources enables decisions on the type of evaluation; * Toolkit resources help teams to gain clarity on the evaluation arrangements. | * Formal evaluation plans specifying roles, responsibilities, resources required. |  |
|  | * Programmes underpinned by an explicit and shared understanding of what works in what context(s), through a theory of change, logical framework, or other underpinning rationale that demonstrates understanding of the processes involved * Evidence used on an ongoing basis to support the development of the processes involved in delivering your activities on the ground | * NERUPI framework incorporates a theory of change approach by specifying the capabilities required for successful progression into and through HE; * Praxis teams support an action research based approach to continuous improvement. | * Changes are measured against a counterfactual; * Research design establishes causality and ensures the rigour of results. | * Indicator bank supports pre and post activity measurement. |
| 4. Evaluation Implementation | * Identified how to access the data required to measure outcomes and impacts; * Approach to data complies with the requirements on data collection and data sharing; * Procedures in place for addressing ethical considerations; * Assessed the level of resources required and allocated these for evaluation. | * Data collection can be mapped against the framework of aims, objectives and learning outcomes; * NERUPI framework helps with strategy for the deployment of evaluation resources. | * Partnership working to maximise evaluation data and results; * Measurement of individualised change (as well as cohort or subgroup analyses); * A methodology to track the outcomes of your participants over time; * Use of validated or sector-standard tools and techniques; * Evaluation budget proportionate to the activity budget and type of activity; * Risk analysis for evaluations. | * NERUPI supports partnership working through a shared framework and language; * Indicator bank puts the focus on benefits to individuals; * We are developing the indicator bank as a sector standard tool; * Toolkit resources help teams to identify evaluation appropriate to the activity in question. |
| Learning: | * Evaluation reporting acknowledges the limitations of the research design approach used in each case; * A mechanism in place to share the findings from evaluation internally; * Clarity about how findings will be used. | * Praxis based approach as a mechanism for making decisions on use of evaluation findings and sharing internally. | * Attribution of impact is possible; * Evaluation data is triangulated from different sources; * Reporting contributes to the scholarly literature on effectiveness; * Mechanisms exist to allow evaluation results to influence delivery; * Mechanisms exist to allow evaluation results to influence sector; * Contributing to body of knowledge. | * Mixed methods research is a feature of the NERUPI approach; * Feedback loop from evaluation to delivery supported by our praxis teams; * NERUPI network is a conduit to other practitioners and the sector; * NERUPI has an online repository for evaluation results; * NERUPI events enable dissemination and sharing of knowledge. |