Final Project Report
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Notes [delete once report complete]:

* The purpose of this report is to provide a comprehensive final project report which combines the impact evaluation (IE) and implementation and process evaluation (IPE).
* It is designed for reporting evaluation of a specific intervention. Other templates should be used for non-intervention studies.
* The final report should follow the following structure:
* Executive summary
* Introduction
* Methodology
* Analysis
* Results
* Discussion
* Conclusions
* Citations and references. All citations and references in TASO’s research should follow the Harvard style of referencing.
	+ For a full guide, please refer to: [Imperial College London’s Harvard Referencing Guide](https://www.imperial.ac.uk/media/imperial-college/administration-and-support-services/library/public/harvard.pdf).
* Please provide the Theory of Change and as an appendix.
1. **Executive summary (2 pages max.)** Note: for TASO funded projects these subheadings are to be adhered to and should not be replaced by a narrative executive summary.
	1. Project team
	2. Project description
		1. Intervention being evaluated
* Aim and description of intervention
* Target group
* Number of students involved
* Implementation – how often, when, who, where
	+ 1. Brief description of evaluation design (pilot, efficacy, or effectiveness trial)
		2. Brief description of IPE
		3. Key findings
		4. Key conclusions
		5. Additional findings (more discussion based)
		6. Impact table (see [Annex A](#bookmark=id.g20ioo3f5e8v) for template)
1. **Introduction**
	1. Background and rationale for intervention, including existing evidence and the challenge. (NB: include the scale of the challenge, i.e., differences in access to HE for different groups, not just the challenge at the local level).
	2. Intervention aims and objectives
	3. Detailed description of the intervention (to enable replication)
	4. Brief description of the evaluation and what this report covers.
2. **Methodology**
	1. Statement of research questions and hypotheses.
	2. Overview of planned IE design and methods.
		1. Specific research questions related to IE
		2. Research methods (rationale on decisions made, and a description of what you hope to learn from each method).
		3. Primary outcome (description and how measured)
		4. Secondary outcome
		5. Exploratory outcome
		6. Estimated sample (size, demographics, recruitment)
		7. Analytical approach (based on research protocol)
	3. Overview of IPE design and methods.
		1. Specific research questions related to IPE
		2. Research methods (rationale on decisions made, and a description of what you hope to learn from each method.
		3. Sample, data sources (size, demographics, recruitment, data collection)
		4. Details of dosage, compliance, fidelity, and usual practice.
		5. Analytical approach (testing causal assumptions underpinning theory of change. If using thematic analysis, inductive/deductive/combination?)
	4. Ethics (very brief outline of the components that required ethical approval, who granted this, e.g., the specific Research Ethics Committee, and ethical approval reference).
3. **Findings**
	1. Summary of findings from the impact evaluation, referencing the key research questions.
		1. The content in this section should draw from the technical report and include all sections as appropriate. Please refer to the appropriate template for the headings or rough sections to include.
	2. Summary of findings from the implementation and process evaluation, referencing the key research questions.
4. **Discussion**
	1. Discussion of findings, linking the IE and IPE results.
		1. Frame by compliance, fidelity, dosage, reach, and moderations made to the intervention (e.g., in the context of COVID-19).
		2. Evidence to support theory of change - comment on the extent to which the results of the whole evaluation support the original TOC. Explain if/ how/ why the TOC was revised based on study data. Comment on any areas of the TOC with particularly strong/ weak evidence, and any areas that require further research including those that were not explored as part of the study.
	2. Limitations of the research.
		1. Internal validity
		2. External validity
5. **Conclusions**

6.1. Final reflections on findings and recommendations for future research.

**Annex A: Impact table**

This impact table is intended to summarise the results for the primary and secondary outcomes and communicate how confident we should be when making claims about the findings. The Evidence in Governance and Politics (egap) [methods guides](https://egap.org/methods-guides/) may be useful resources to consider when reporting.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome**  | **Sample size**  | **P Value**  | **Effect** | **Estimated ‘real world’ effect**  | **Evaluation security**(1 = not at all secure5 = very secure) | **Type of evidence**  |
| *What is the outcome measure? (include primary and secondary outcomes)* | *How many participants were included in the study relating to this outcome?* | *Report the p-value derived from the statistical tests* | *Report the size of the effect - confidence intervals/Cohen’s d / Cohen’s h*  | *Where possible, please translate the effect size into a tangible example of the size of the effect - e.g., 13 more students apply to HE* | *See evaluation security note[[1]](#footnote-1)* | *Is it Type 1,2 or 3 evidence - according to the* [*OfS standard of evidence*](https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/media/6971cf8f-985b-4c67-8ee2-4c99e53c4ea2/access-and-participation-standards-of-evidence.pdf)*?* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. *Based on the decisions made around the evaluation, you will be able to assess the security of your evaluation – that is, how confident you can be when making claims about the findings. The most robust evaluations with large samples, low attrition levels and no threats to validity will receive the highest score of 5/5.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-1)