Evaluation plan:

University of Law - Monitoring of Inclusive Learning Panel

Authors: Panagiota Sotiropoulou (Advance HE) and Kierra Bunting (Staffordshire University)

Contributors: Morag Duffin, Rebecca Harland, Anna Hunter, Janet Wright, Rachel Driscoll, and Emma Seagreaves (University of Law)

This is a comprehensive document that outlines the overall strategy and approach for evaluating an intervention. It is designed to align with and be linked to an Access and Participation Plan (APP) where relevant and appropriate and to give accountability to relevant staff and stakeholders within higher education providers (HEPs).

The evaluation plan should be developed collaboratively to ensure relevant perspectives are considered and will therefore likely involve input from practitioners, evaluators, and faculty staff, and should be signed off by a senior lead. It has been designed to inform the development of a research protocol - a detailed and specific document outlining a step-by-step guide to how each aspect of the evaluation will be carried out, including an analytical strategy. An example research protocol (template in [TASO's resources](#)) can be found [here](#) which details an evaluation of a curriculum reform intervention to address the ethnicity degree awarding gap. Depending on capacity at individual HEPs, this evaluation plan may be shared internally or externally to support the development of the research protocol and subsequently to conduct the evaluation.

Date:	March 2024
Evaluation Manager (or appropriate staff member):	Morag Duffin: Head of Access and Student Success
Contact Person:	Name: Rebecca Harland Position title: Widening Participation Evaluation Officer Contact email: rebecca.harland@law.ac.uk Department: Widening Participation

Table of Contents

> **Section 1: Evaluation objectives**
>
> *This section covers the purpose of the evaluation and provides justification for its undertaking. The scope of the evaluation in terms of the causal pathways to be evaluated and the primary, secondary and exploratory research questions. This section states the evaluations specific objectives and hypotheses.*

Evaluation objectives

Purpose

The purpose of the evaluation is to determine whether the Monitoring of Inclusive Learning (MOIL) panel review, its resulting resources, and the design follow-up sessions are effective in improving ethnically minoritised students' engagement and performance in selected modules for piloted review. All modules for the pilot are from the undergraduate degree in Law programme (LLB). As a diversifying the curricula activity, the evaluation also seeks to explore whether the initiative was successful in producing more diversified curricular content for the modules included in the review.

Scope

As this is a pilot intervention, the evaluation will be exploratory, investigating whether all elements of the MOIL process and relevant resources developed were an effective means of:

i.   Improving ethnically minoritised students' engagement and performance in the reviewed modules.
ii. Diversifying the curricular content of the reviewed modules.

As the intervention will be implemented in a pilot form (reviewing a minimum of two modules from the LLB programme), it is within the scope of the evaluation to assess if the intervention in its current format is fit-for-purpose (i.e. feasible), and applicable for a wider roll-out.

Finally, within the scope of this evaluation is also an initial exploration of whether the intervention generated some expected secondary, individual-level outcomes related to delivery staffs' (i.e., those whose modules were reviewed by the MOIL panel) awareness, confidence and competency in diversifying their module curricular and teaching.

Research questions

The main research questions for this evaluation are outlined below, divided into primary, secondary, and exploratory.

Primary:

- Do ethnically minoritised students engage more and perform better in the MOIL-reviewed modules compared to modules with similar profiles not included in the intervention?

Secondary:

- Does the intervention improve the diversification of curricula of the reviewed modules?
- Has delivery staffs' awareness, confidence and competence in diversifying their curricula and teaching practices improved before and after engaging with the intervention?

Exploratory:

- Is the delivery of the intervention feasible within the intended timeline and the resources currently allocated?
- Are there ways to improve the efficiency of the intervention before it is scaled up?
- Are there any key contextual factors that appear to facilitate or impede the successful implementation of the intervention? (e.g., modules with stricter Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRB) regulations harder to diversify, differences in the effectiveness of MOIL panel feedback and recommendations in diversifying curricula across the various University of Law campuses etc.)

Section 2: Intervention

This section describes the intervention being evaluated, to enable replication, and is taken from the associated Enhanced Theory of Change (EToC).

Intervention

Why was the intervention developed?

The intervention is run as part of an overarching initiative to diversify the curricula at the University of Law. It focuses on using existing processes and procedures to embed the curricular diversification in business as usual, rather than making it an 'add-on' activity. It seeks to explore and unpack how an existing process, the Monitoring of Inclusive Learning (MOIL) panel, can be used to diversify the curricula and improve ethnically minoritised students' attainment.

In general, the creation of law curricula (whether stipulated by regulators or not) is challenging in terms of inclusiveness as legal content is in nature based on precedent and thereby can replicate historical inequalities. It also reflects an antiquated system with a historic lack of diversity and therefore underrepresentation remains generally and/or in senior roles within the profession. This presents significant challenges when trying to understand and address unexplained degree awarding gaps.

This initiative is evidence-based, utilising institutional survey data (e.g. the National Student Survey (NSS), the Graduate reflections section of the Graduate Outcomes survey, and the internal 'First Impressions' survey). Data from collaborative research projects are also used -e.g. the 'Black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) Student Survey' delivered internally by students on the paid roles of Diversity and Inclusion Advocates and the 2022 Culturally Sensitive Curriculum Scales Project with the Network for Evaluating and Researching University Participation Interventions (NERUPI). The NERUPI findings are particularly important in driving the thinking process for this intervention. Both the quantitative and qualitative results demonstrated that BAME and, particularly Black students, experience their curricula as less culturally sensitive than white students. While NSS data shows that BAME students report lower satisfaction with some aspects of their courses, NERUPI findings suggested that increasing the culturally sensitivity of the curricula may reduce those satisfaction gaps; however, the findings pointed that it may be more important that academics are enthusiastic and approachable than their curricula being culturally sensitive. Developing culturally sensitive curricula, though, was shown to be important, as those support BAME and white students' interest in their course, even when controlling for students' perceptions of the quality of students' relationships with their teachers. Course interest

was defined as engagement with their subject and has been shown in a variety of other studies to be associated with a wide range of positive educational processes and outcomes. The analysis found that five positive aspects of culturally sensitive curricula predict students' interest, namely diversity representation, positive depictions of diversity, module content which challenges power and inclusive classroom interactions.

Finally, a range of external resources covering areas such decolonising the curriculum (specifically in the legal context) and understanding the particular challenges of inequalities within the law profession have also been used (e.g. Campbell et al., 2022; TASO, 2022; 2023).

What is the intervention?

The intervention will be piloted in the undergraduate degree in Law (LLB) programme, and will include the following steps:

- Registry provides attainment data by ethnicity to the LLB Programme director from LLB modules which are counted towards the LLB ethnicity degree awarding gap (EDAG) algorithm.
- LLB Programme Director reviews registry data, past student module feedback from the LLB programme, and findings of relevant institutional projects, like the 2022 Culturally Sensitive Curriculum Scales Project with NERUPI and the annual Stop and Think project, which gather students' reflections and experiences related to the inclusivity and diversity of the modules they attend both in terms of content and delivery from the relevant staff members. Based on those, the programme director identifies a minimum of two modules to be reviewed by the MOIL panel. These comprise:
    - One of the modules with the biggest EDAGs and challenging student feedback
    - One of the modules with the smallest EDAGs and less challenging student feedback
- The programme director then hands the identified modules' materials to the MOIL panel for review electronically, at least two weeks ahead of the panel review meeting.
- The module materials of the chosen modules will be reviewed by the MOIL panel to identify pockets of good practice and areas for improvement under the following topics:
    - Representation
    - Media
    - Flexibility
    - Language Use

- o Accessibility
  - o Opportunities for including diverse and inclusive content.
- Existing relevant data might be used to complement the MOIL review process, such as the regression analysis findings from the NERUPI project, according to which diversity representation, positive depictions of diversity, module content which challenges power and inclusive classroom interactions are the five aspects of culturally sensitive curricula which predict students' interest.
- The existing MOIL feedback report template will be used for the write-up and the presentation of the MOIL panel findings. This includes qualitative feedback under each one of the six topics mentioned above, and the outlining of concrete action points.
- Before the written report is shared, the chair of the MOIL panel will hold a dialogic feedback meeting with the programme director. This will include setting mutually agreed action points with target dates for completion.
- The written report is circulated to the LLB programme director, as well as the module leads, whose modules were reviewed by the MOIL panel.
- Oral debrief sessions take place between the programme director and the aforementioned staff.
- After the oral debrief sessions, all resulting resources are forwarded to the Design team, who are in charge of working with the Programme Director and module leads to incorporate the actions and feedback from the MOIL report into the updated module curricula for the next academic year, during the Design Phase. This involves collaborative work in the form of online workshops/meetings.
- At the end of the Design Phase, updated curricula will be in place for launch in the next academic year.
- At the end of this pilot, the overall process will be reviewed and updated as necessary for scaled-up and optimised implementation (i.e., being applied to new modules from across different programmes, following a rolling cycle).

Who is the intervention for?

The main beneficiaries are intended to be students from ethnically marginalised backgrounds, particularly Black and Asian students, who have been identified from institutional data as priority groups and who show the largest Ethnicity Degree Awarding Gaps (EDAGs).

Delivery staff will be indirect beneficiaries, as they will receive assistance from the design team through follow-up meetings that will:

- Use dialogue to share and review the MOIL feedback report and help colleagues identify both pockets of good practice and areas of improvement in modules; and
- Provide practical recommendations on how to diversify curricula, using specific lesson plans as concrete examples.

Who is delivering the intervention?

- **Registry team** - Expertise in data analysis to provide breakdown of EDAG and other student performance indicators by module and demographic group.
- **LLB MOIL panel members** - There are currently 30 members of the MOIL team. Panels are organised at the beginning of the academic year and team members indicate which panels they are available to participate in. Attendance is generally high. Team members represent different areas and specialisms from across the university. The key members include the Academic Practice Advisor (MOIL Chair), Pro-Vice Chancellor (PVC) Diversity, Inclusion and Students, and the Director of Academic Enhancement.

Areas and specialisms represented are:

- Student voice (including the Diversity and Inclusion Advocates)
- Design and Assessments
- Library and Study Skills
- Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) and Widening Participation
- Student's Union

Membership is voluntary, although some areas are approached specifically to ensure appropriate representation. The membership is rolling, and people can volunteer to join at any point, without a fixed formal call point. Training for MOIL panels is provided by the Academic Enhancement Team and new members may shadow their first panel.

The MOIL panel review process starts with the MOIL chair assigning materials (from the identified modules) to be reviewed by the panel members. In doing so, the Chair is mindful of utilising members' expertise accordingly (e.g. a Widening Participation specialist and Head of Design and Assessment were looking at the same materials in advance, then an EDI colleague and a student etc). One unit from each module is reviewed by all panel members so that everyone has reviewed one unit in common.

- **Central design team** (e.g. Director of Design & Assessment and Academic Manager – Design and Production) - Expertise in supporting centralised design of teaching resources and assessments. The design team provides training for module leads.

- **LLB National Programme Director and Head of LLB Programmes** - Expertise in the delivery of centrally-designed law programmes.

- **LLB module leads** - Experience in the design or updating of centrally-designed LLB modules. Module leads are lecturers/senior lecturers with the additional responsibility for updating/designing a particular module. Module leads receive training on design from the central design team and guidance from National Programme Director and Head of LLB Programmes.

How is the intervention delivered?

The intervention starts with the Registry team providing attainment data by ethnicity from all LLB modules in an online format to the LLB Programme Director. For the current pilot, this will be data from the 2022-23 academic year, which will be handed out to the Programme Director in March 2024.

Following this, the LLB Programme Director will identify the modules to be reviewed by the MOIL panel, based on a combination of:

- The registry data
- Past student module feedback
- Relevant institutional project findings from the 2022-23 academic year.

The Programme Director will make their decision by the end of April 2024.

Based on the Director's decision, identified module materials will be handed to the MOIL panel for review electronically at least two weeks ahead of panel meeting, so by the end of May 2024.

The MOIL panel review meeting will be conducted on 17 June 2024 through an online session taking place as part of an annual rolling schedule. Within this meeting, the MOIL panel members will agree upon qualitative feedback and concrete action points relevant to each one of the six areas used for the module reviews. Before the final write-up of the MOIL panel feedback and recommendation, an oral debrief session will be held between the Chair of the MOIL panel and the programme director via Microsoft Teams to discuss based on the identified feedback from the review and agree on points to be actioned. This should take place by the end of June 2024.

After this meeting, the Chair of the MOIL panel will compile the feedback report for each one of the modules reviewed in an electronic document within a month of the panel review meeting (by middle of July 2024), using the designated Word template developed. This document will identify areas of good practice and in need of

improvement, providing clear recommendations/action points in relation to how curricula for these modules could be further diversified. This document will eventually be disseminated as an electronic document to the LLB programme director and relevant module leads.

Debrief sessions between the programme director and the module leads will be conducted via Microsoft Teams within a month of the MOIL feedback review dissemination, so that all debrief sessions are concluded by end of August 2024.

After the debrief sessions, all resulting resources (i.e., MOIL panel review feedback and meeting minutes from the debrief sessions between the programme director and module leads who modules were reviewed) will be forwarded to the Design team, who will oversee working with the Programme director and module leads to incorporate the actions and feedback from the MOIL report into the updated module curricula for next year, during the Design Phase. The Design Phase comprises design follow-up sessions with programme directors and module leads conducted online within a month of the debrief sessions (so that all follow-up sessions are concluded by end of September 2024). A minimum of two different sessions will be delivered by the Design team, taking a workshop format, focusing on the following areas:

- What diversifying module content and assessment is (e.g. goes beyond adding diverse authors in reading lists or adding diverse characters in scenarios)
- Step-by-step tailored approach on how to implement diversifying module content and assessment in practice by using an example of a session plan.

Guidelines/materials used in the staff design follow-up workshops as well as course materials before and after the re-design process will be hosted in the Digital Design Lab (currently under development). This will be an online resource area for module leads/assessment designers to have access to top-tips to help staff successfully diversify their curricula.

Staff whose modules were reviewed will have to update their curricula based on both the MOIL panel feedback review recommendations and the Design follow-up sessions. This will be the second semester of the 2024-25 academic year for Spring semester modules or the first semester of 2025-26 academic year for Fall semester modules.

Where is the intervention delivered?

The intervention is delivered in all University of Law campuses. The multi-campus nature of the University of Law, which includes many hybrid and remote workers,

requires adequate IT infrastructure for business to be conducted online. The MOIL panel uses the Microsoft Teams platform for meetings.

How long is/how many times will the intervention be delivered?

MOIL panels will meet monthly across the academic year for all programmes at the University. The key date for the next LLB review panel is 17 June 2024.

After the end of the intervention pilot in its current format for the LLB programme, evaluation findings will be used to determine whether the intervention is feasible and how it can be further tailored for a wider roll-out, highlighting elements that work well as well as areas in need for improvement. Depending on the results of the pilot, the intervention will be rolled out to additional programmes in 2025-26 until all programmes across all University of Law campuses have participated in the MOIL review.

Will the intervention be tailored?

The MOIL panel review is tailored for each programme and modules within it. The National Programme Director chooses the modules for review using the data provided by Registry, student module feedback and relevant institutional project findings. The MOIL panel provides general recommendations for the programme, as well as specific and tailored recommendations for each module. The module leads then implement the recommendations tailored for their particular modules with the support and guidance from the central design team through follow-up design workshops.

The follow-up design sessions/workshops for these particular modules will be used to inform design work for other modules within the LLB programme with similar context/topics. The learning will also be shared across other programmes with similar modules, for example the Postgraduate Diploma in Law (the Law conversion course for students with a degree in another discipline).

After the end of the intervention' pilot in its current format for the LLB programme, evaluation findings will be used to determine whether this is fit-for-purpose for wider roll-out, highlighting elements that work well as well as areas in need for improvement.

How will the intervention be optimised?

Staff whose materials will be subject to MOIL review (e.g. programme director, module leads) need to be 'warmed up' to why diversifying the curricula is important and how their engagement with the entire MOIL process will help them to improve their practices and achieve the institutional commitments of diversifying the curricula and improve the continuation, completion and ethnicity degree awarding gaps of Black and Asian student. For this reason, employing timely communications is key (e.g. potential for roadshows for different programmes to raise awareness among staff about institutional priorities related to EDAG and the role of MOIL as a means to achieving those).

Messaging should be tailored to academic staff audiences for their buy-in (e.g. how diversifying the curriculum will enhance and empower their practice as well as increased student's academic success).

MOIL panel staff workload allocation needs to allow them time to:

- Conduct thorough reviews of the identified module materials, providing clear feedback and action points.
- Facilitate follow-up debrief sessions with programme director and module leads.

MOIL panel and Design staff need to have protected time to create synergies to make useful guidelines and follow-up design sessions to help delivery staff understand what diversified curricula are and how they can implement these in practice. Similarly, delivery staff workload allocation needs to allow them to devote time to the debrief and the follow-up design sessions.

The MOIL review and follow-up debrief and design sessions will be optimised by focusing on how to diversity both teaching and learning materials, as well as assessment and teaching practices. The assessment design project (currently formalised), which focuses on making assessment design more inclusive, will be another project closely linked to the follow-up design sessions.

For future iterations of the initiative, teaching observations could take place to ensure that the diversified curricula are implemented in practice (i.e., monitoring if module leads' teaching and learning practices align with the institutional guidelines around their academic/pedagogic duties). Learning walks (a process whereby another staff member – e.g. line manager, designer- goes in a session to observe and then provides the instructor with feedback) has been identified as a good existing process that could be used for this purpose because it has been unanimously agreed that even with the best design, if staff do not implement it, there will be no change.

Section 3: Evaluation design

This section provides details on the recommended evaluation of the intervention, including the design of both impact evaluation and implementation and process evaluation, sample, outcome measures, and data collection.

Evaluation design

Methodological approach

This is a multi-method evaluation that triangulates insights from multiple sources of information to address the research questions forming an impact evaluation and implementation and process evaluation (IPE) (See Table 1 and Table 2 respectively).

Impact evaluation

The impact evaluation will be based on a difference-in-difference[12] design to identify whether ethnically minoritised students' engagement and attainment is positively impacted by the MOIL review process and its resulting resources.

Implementation and process evaluation (IPE)

As part of the implementation and process evaluation, firstly, a comparative document analysis will be used to assess the degree and nature of curricular diversification resulting from the intervention to the MOIL-reviewed modules.

Secondly, reflective journals will be used to gather initial evidence relating to:

- Whether or not delivery staffs' awareness, confidence and competence in diversifying their module curricular and teaching practices has improved before and after their engagement with the MOIL process (e.g., did delivery staff feel that the MOIL review process was useful in helping them to diversify their curricular content and practices? Did oral debrief sessions between the MOIL panel chair and LLB programme director help in shaping reasonable and achievable recommendations and action points for the design phase? etc.)
- The intervention's feasibility in its current format, focusing on lessons learnt and how these could facilitate the intervention's scalability for a wider roll-out (e.g. were there any specific parts of the MOIL process or specific resources that were particularly helpful for delivery staff?, How could the MOIL process be improved? etc.)

---

[1] https://taso.org.uk/evidence/evaluation-guidance-resources/introduction-to-quasi-experimental-designs/
[2] https://theeffectbook.net/ch-DifferenceinDifference.html

Data collection

1. Learner analytics' monitoring – comparing student engagement and performance through a difference-in-difference design

Student engagement and performance metrics (e.g. data on attendance, assessment first-time submission rates, first time pass rates, module grade, and overall grade) from the 2022-23 academic year will be provided by the Registry team broken down by ethnicity for the modules that will be identified to partake in the LLB MOIL panel review in July 2024 (these modules will form the experimental group).

Student engagement and performance metrics from the same academic year from two additional LLB modules with similar EDAGs, student feedback and profile to those that were chosen for the MOIL review will be used as a comparator group. Student engagement and performance data of ethnically minoritised students in the MOIL-reviewed and non-MOIL reviewed modules will be compared before (academic years 2022-23 and 2023-24) and after the end of the intervention (2024-25 and 2025-26), to understand whether ethnically minoritised students perform better in the reviewed modules. Note that there will need to be parallel trends in the pre-intervention data for the MOIL-reviewed and comparator modules to establish a causal link between the intervention and student performance.

2. Comparative document analysis of module materials before and after the MOIL review

A comparative audit/review of the module handbook and assessment materials before and after the MOIL review will be used to explore if and how the MOIL review contributed to the production of more diversified curricular content.

This comparative analysis will be conducted by MOIL member panels as part of an annual review of the process, likely to happen for the first time before the start of 2025 academic year. It will use the MOIL feedback report recommendations and actions identified, alongside the main areas highlighted by the design team in the design follow-up sessions, as guidelines for the development of a content analysis guide. This review will:

  i.   Track the number of curricular changes implemented and not implemented and their scope.
  ii. Assess the nature and effectiveness of curricular diversification after the MOIL review.

This comparative document analysis will also seek to shed light on whether there were any differences in the 'degrees of diversification' across different modules? (e.g. were modules with stricter PSRB regulations harder to diversify) or across the various University of Law campuses.

3. Reflective journals

MOIL panel members assigned to the LLB review, the LLB programme director, members of the design team in charge of the follow-up design sessions, and staff whose modules were reviewed by the MOIL panel will be prompted to keep reflective diary entries to gain additional insights into how they experienced and perceived their engagement with the MOIL review process.

Specific prompts will be used corresponding to the relevant touchpoints and roles of each one of the aforementioned staff groups. These will shape the reflective journal entries, as well as leave space for participants to record additional insights that are not currently accounted for in the stated outcomes in the Theory of Change.

To maximise engagement, there will be flexibility in terms of how participants record their journal entries (e.g. voice recordings, written logs etc.). Each participant will be requested to record:

- One journal entry before their engagement with the MOIL review process commences (e.g. in this entry, delivery staff will be prompted to reflect upon their awareness, confidence and competencies related to creating diverse curricular content to effectively engage ethnically minoritised students).
- One journal entry shortly after their engagement with each one of the activities of the MOIL review is finished, as appropriate for each role. For example, staff from the Design team will only have to write a journal entry after the Design Phase is completed, as they are not involved in any of the previous activities. By contrast, MOIL panel members will have to write one after the completion of the MOIL panel review and one after the dissemination of the review is finished. In this entry, the MOIL panel members will be prompted to reflect upon the way the MOIL panel review meeting was conducted, the effectiveness of the current MOIL review feedback template in highlighting areas of good practice and areas in need of improvement etc.).
- A final entry after the intervention is finished to holistically assess the effectiveness of their intervention).

Future evaluations

Should the intervention be successful in its main aims of increasing ethnically minoritised students' engagement and attainment and diversifying the MOIL-reviewed module curricula, some additional methodologies could be included in future iterations of the intervention.

For example, learning walks could be used to collect additional evidence on whether the way the MOIL-reviewed modules are taught has actually been diversified in practice by the staff whose modules were reviewed by the MOIL panel. An observation guide will be

used to record at least two sessions of all the MOIL-reviewed modules (one observation to be conducted before the MOIL review and one after the module content has been diversified based on the MOIL panel feedback and the design follow-up sessions). Observations would take place towards the middle of each module's schedule in the academic year. The observation guide would include things like inclusion of diverse material during the session, ways of interacting with students in the classroom etc.

In addition, a comparison of existing student feedback data could be done to assess any changes to ethnically minoritised students' perceptions regarding the inclusivity and relevance of the curricular content before and after the MOIL review. Module feedback survey results, as well as relevant comments related to the target courses raised by ethnically minoritised students who take part in the annual 'Stop and Think' project could be reviewed for this purpose. These are conducted by the student Diversity and Inclusion Advocates to identify and address problematic or uncomfortable situations that students from racially and ethnically under-represented backgrounds may have encountered related to their course/module content or their interactions with staff.

Sample selection

The selection for the two modules to be reviewed by the MOIL panel will be conducted by April 2024.

Based on this selection, ethnically minoritised students from the two modules selected to be reviewed by the MOIL panel will form the main sample for this intervention. The engagement and outcome metrics of these students will be compared to those of their peers in two modules with similar EDAGs and student profiles that will not be reviewed by the MOIL panel (these comparator modules will also be selected by April 2024).

For the comparative document analysis, the module handbook and assessment materials of the two modules that were reviewed in the June 2024 meeting will form the sample to be reviewed by two selected members of the MOIL panel team.

Finally, the MOIL panel members who took part in the LLB module review, the LLB programme director, the members of the design team who will lead the design follow-up sessions, and the two module leads (whose modules will be reviewed by the MOIL panel) will form the sample for the reflective journals.

Outcome measures and data collection

Tables 1 and 2 summarise the outcome measures, data sources and points of collection for each of the research questions addressed in the impact evaluation and IPE, respectively.

- **Primary** – those related to whether the MOIL review process is effective in improving ethnically diverse students' engagement and performance.

- **Secondary** – whether the intervention:
  - o Improves the diversification of curricula (both perceived and observed) of the reviewed modules, and
  - o Generates improvements in staff awareness, confidence, and competence around diversifying their curricula and teaching practices.

- **Exploratory** – whether the intervention in its current format is feasible in terms of time and resources allocated, as well as how it can be further tailored based on lessons learnt in preparation for a wider roll-out.

Table 1. Research questions encompassed by the impact evaluation, methodological approach and target sample.

Type of Research question	Research question	Outcome measure / data source	Sample	Point of collection
Primary	Do ethnically minoritised students engage more and perform better in the MOIL-reviewed modules compared to modules with similar profiles not included in the intervention?	Administrative data (learner analytics monitoring)	Ethnically minoritised students in target modules	Pre- and post-intervention

Table 2. Research questions encompassed by the IPE, methodological approach and target sample.

	Research question	Outcome measure / data source	Sample	Point of collection
Secondary	Does the intervention improve the diversification of curricula of the reviewed modules?	Comparative document analysis	Module handbooks and assessment materials of the target modules	Post-intervention
Secondary	Has delivery staffs' (i.e. - those staff members whose modules were reviewed by the MOIL panel) awareness, confidence and competence in diversifying their module content, delivery and assessment improved after engaging with the intervention?	Reflective journals	LLB programme director LLB module leads	Across journal entries before, during and after the intervention

Exploratory	Is the delivery of the intervention feasible within the intended timeline and the resources currently allocated?	Reflective journals	MOIL panel members, LLB director, Design team, delivery staff	Across journal entries during and after the intervention
Exploratory	Are there ways to improve the efficiency of the intervention before it is scaled up (e.g., increasing the number of modules reviewed, changing the MOIL feedback report template, changing the content/mode/time of the design follow-up sessions etc)?	Reflective journals	MOIL panel members, LLB director, Design team, delivery staff	Post-intervention
Exploratory	Are there any key contextual factors that appear to facilitate or impede successful implementation of the intervention? (e.g. were modules with stricter PSRB regulations harder to diversify, differences in the effectiveness of MOIL panel feedback and recommendations in diversifying curricula across the various University of Law campuses etc.)	Comparative document analysis, and reflective journals	Module handbooks and assessment materials of the target modules, and MOIL panel members, LLB director, Design team, delivery staff	Post-intervention

References

Campbell, P. et al. (2022) *Evaluating the racially inclusive curricula toolkit in HE.* Available at:

https://player.flipsnack.com/?hash=OTc1OUFBRkY4RDYrMTlhZDB3NDhhNg%3D%3D&p=14

TASO (2022) *The impact of curriculum reform on the ethnicity degree awarding gap*. Available at: https://s33320.pcdn.co/wp-content/uploads/Full-report-the-impact-of-curriculum-reform-on-the-ethnicity-degree-awarding-gap.pdf

TASO (2023) *Approaches to addressing the ethnicity degree awarding gap. Contextualising the landscape and developing a typology.* Available at: https://taso.org.uk/news-item/new-report-tackling-the-ethnicity-degree-awarding-gap/