|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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.
 |