NERUPI in practice: how the framework can strengthen WP practice

Sophie Cloutterbuck

Head of Outreach & London Engagement,

London Metropolitan University

- **Why we chose Nerupi**
- **Benefits**
- **Nerupi and the APP**
- **Project Mapping**
- **Map your WP outreach programmes**
- **Feedback**

Why we chose Nerupi

- **Changing role of WP**
- **No Access Targets**
- **Way of measuring impact**
- **Capabilities approach**
- **Standardisation**

Benefits

- **Compare impact across interventions**
- **Different frameworks for different levels**
- **Universal framework**
- **Seamless Integration**
- **Informing strategy**
- **Identify gaps**
- **Mapping our Access projects**

Nerupi and the APP

- **Assessing ourselves**
- **Best practice**
- **Impact**
- **OfS self evaluation tool**

Dimension 2: Designing your programmes

Dimension 2: Designing your programmes	Does it exist?		How demonstrated?	Notes (use this space to explain your answers scores you have given yourself)
	Response (chose from list			
Are your programmes underpinned by clear objectives for what you want to achieve?	Yes, already in place for the majority of programmes		Defined objectives documented in enough detail to enable someone else to work towards them correctly and effectively, and which are capable of being measured and evaluated. This might be underpinned for example by guidance and support for setting of objectives.	All initiatives are mapped to the NERUPI aims and objectives, particular evaluation methe benchmarks and the relevant key stage. The team work together to map all outreach ini:
Is your programme design informed by evidence?	Yes, already in place for the majority of programmes		This is referring to whether your programme development practice draws on your own or other people's existing evidence of the impact of outreach to inform your programme design features. This evidence would include published research, monitoring, feedback, impact evaluation evidence, national data and own evaluation(s).	All WP and access initiatives and activities are subject to impact evaluation, assessing the activity on its participants, measured against its intended objectives. Using a reflective ev planning cycle while retaining clear steps that support rigorous evaluation, evaluation co quantitative analysis of participation by sub-groups and comparison of outcomes against and national benchmarks, as well as qualitative feedback from participants (including tea parents where relevant). The evaluation provides a coherent theory of change to motivat outreach activities in the context of a coherent outreach strategy. Using best practice fro elsewhere and in the research literature, the evaluation collects data on impact and repo those receiving an intervention have better outcomes and we hope will provide robust ev causal effect of an intervention as we develop our strategy.
Is there a clear and detailed specification of the specific activities your programmes will deliver, and why you are delivering them in this way in order to best meet your objectives?	Yes, already in place for the majority of programmes		References to evidence of impact elsewhere and/or in the research literature on effectiveness in different contexts. Identification of impact evaluation to show that those receiving the intervention treatment you are delivering have better outcomes i.e. you can point to results that show that what you are doing is likely to be effective in terms of generating the desired results.	As above
Have you defined and agreed the deliverables for your programmes?	Yes, already in place for the majority of programmes		Specification of what will be delivered for example you have set targets for the number of different types of activities that the programme will deliver and the volume in terms of those taking part in them.	Yes as part of the bi yearly project mapping exercise all projects/activities as well ashavin aims and objectives have target numbers of students to take part and the amount of hou the intervention should last for.
Are you clear on how you will measure all of the outcomes and impacts of your programmes?	Yes, already in place for the majority of programmes		For example measures of your outcomes would include specification of specific and achievable changes for your participants (pre and post) which can be reliably measured and which are relevant to the aims of your interventions. Measure of impact might include clearly articulated measures of the difference your activities are making to access and participation in higher education. This might be underpinned for example by use of a framework of outcome and impact measures appropriate for different activities/circumstances.	As well as previously described evaluation against NERUPI framework we also use the HE to measure impact. The Higher Education Access Tracker (HEAT) assists HEIs in England t and evaluate their outreach activity. By working collaboratively across the sector, we can on our approach and build evidence of 'what works'. Reports from these data will also be calculate the percentage of the total cohort who engaged with the University before post Other sources of data are also used for anylsis, for example borough and school exam res progress, national data etc.
Are your success measures focused on impact in terms of achieving outcomes for participants?	Yes, already in place for the majority of programmes		Evidence of moving beyond feedback/satisfaction measures and the opinions of the participants to specify outcomes e.g. continuation and progression, attainment, behavioural changes.	As above, we look at the progression and attainment of our participants as well as attitu confidence changes through various means of evaluation from pre and post evaluation q interviews and focus groups depending on activity.
Can you point to evidence underpinning your choice of outcome	Yes, already in place for the		Identification of existing evidence to show that the outcomes and how you measure them are appropriate to the activities in question (i.e. demonstrating that the outcomes	As we are part of a network we share evidence and get to see what works. The main prin theory of change cycle of evaluation is that we draw on the capabilities approach, specific

Project Mapping

- [**Our framework**](#)
- **How we used it**
- **Identifying and filling gaps**
- **Your turn**

	Activity	Education stage	NERUPI framework objectives (non-NERUPI in italics)	Overview	Rationale	Evaluation methods (to be developed)	Lead team	APP regulatory activity	Recruitment activity	Number of DELIVERY days	Number of students reached	
2	Upward Bound	Age 13-15 (Level 2, Years 9-10)	* Improve GGSE attainment for borderline C/D predicted grade students * Increase confidence in their potential to progress onto HE * Develop study skills through projects which encourage active learning * Develop understanding and competence of GCSE curriculum * Engage in challenging educational projects which extend understanding and contextualise learning * Access and experience appropriate attainment-raising interventions LBI Objectives: * Children and young people (CYP) can communicate better * CYP are more self-reliant, confident and resilient * CYP can plan and solve problems creatively * CYP can work together better	2 year alternative Saturday School project for 100 Islington students to raise attainment in GCSE English Maths, Sciences and study skills SHS	OfS APP Regulatory Notice 1: at least one outcomes focused target to raise attainment in schools / colleges	* Pre/post-activity participant evaluation forms * Teacher/parent evaluation * Case studies * Interviews * Focus Groups * GCSE results comparison to wider Islington Borough cohort	Maxine (WP)	Yes		30 Saturdays	200	
3	National Saturday Clubs: Art and Design / Writing and Talking	Age 13-16 (Level 2, Years 8-11)	* Broaden understanding of subject knowledge and its wider applications * Increase knowledge of study/career pathways in HE and at London Met * Develop confidence in potential to progress onto and succeed at HE * Improve art, design and analytic skills and capacity for creative and innovative thinking * Enhance student portfolios for those not able to study GCSE arts but considering in the future * Improve speaking skills, build personal confidence	1 year Saturday School programme (40-50 students up to 30 weeks/yr) Cass	* EMI report 2018 - Entry to arts at KS4 lowest in a decade * HEPI (2017) Importance of social capital and Widening Participation	* Pre/post-activity participant evaluation forms * Teacher/parent evaluation * HEAT data tracking of future HE participation * Qualitative evaluation by Saturday Club Trust - participant and tutor focus groups	WP	Yes		25-30 Saturdays	50	
4	Year 12 Summer Schools	Age 16-19 (Level 3, Year 12)	* Investigate course & placement options, social & leisure opportunities in HE and at London Met * Engage with the UCAS process and submit a strong application * Anticipate challenges in HE and make a successful transition * Enhance academic skills that develop capacity for critical thinking, independent research and self-directed learning * Situate existing knowledge within wider fields of knowledge and apply to other contexts	1 week subject-specific summer school. Approx 250 students Follow up activities in Year 13 GBL, SCDM, SHS, SSc, Cass, Student Journey SMAA, MetSU	* OfS Regulatory Advice 6: Listed as both Outreach and Access activity that helps to raise awareness, aspirations and attainment, * Previous OFFA priority for Access Agreement	* Student presentations * Pre/post-activity participant evaluation forms * HEAT data tracking of future HE participation	WP	Yes	Potentially	5 days, 3 weeks	300	
5	Primary school partner programme	Age 9-11 (Years 5-6)	* Experience a positive intro to HE * Identify links between HE and careers * imagine themselves as a future university student * Discover some of the skills that students require for HE * Participate in engaging educational activites that stimulate interest and encourage a positive attitude to learning	2 year programme with activities including: school visits, mini HE project and visit to campus (some collaboration with ReachOut)	* OfS Regulatory Advice 6: A whole lifecycle approach to access and participation starts with primary school outreach. * Previous OFFA priority for Access Agreement	* Participant qualitative evaluation forms * Pre/post-activity teacher evaluations	WP	Yes		15	300	
6	Primary literacy mentoring	Age 10-11 (Year 6)	* Develop understanding and competence of KS2 curriculum * Participate in engaging educational activites that stimulate interest and encourage a positive attitude to learning	1-to-1 mentoring/tutoring programme (20 weeks), delivered in school	As above	* Pre/post-activity assessment grades * Participant qualitative evaluation forms * Pre-and post-activity teacher evaluations * HEAT tracking	WP	Yes		20	10 per school (pilot)	
			* Understand how GCSE study relates to HE/careers * Choose GCSEs that correspond with personal/career goals									

Feedback

- **How do you find NERUPI?**
- **Your gaps?**
- **Are we covering wellbeing enough?**