

Evaluation plan: University of York - Departmental Ethnicity Degree Awarding Gap Framework

Authors: Amanda Aldercotte (Advance HE) and Kierra Bunting (Staffordshire University)

Contributors: Jill Webb, Jan Ball-Smith, Jess Penn, Adrian Lee, Nick Glover, Fran Trzeciak, Tamlyn Ryan, Jess Burchell, Amy Simkin (University of York)

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 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 the capacity of 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):	Jan Ball-Smith, Jill Webb, Jess Penn, Amy Simkin, Jess Burchell
Contact Person:	Name: Jan Ball-Smith Contact email: jan.ball@york.ac.uk Position title: Interim Head of Academic Affairs Department: Student Administration and Academic Affairs

Table of Contents

<i>Evaluation Objectives</i>	3
Purpose	3
Scope	3
Research questions	3
<i>Intervention</i>	5
Why was the intervention developed?	5
What is the intervention?	6
Who is the intervention for?	7
Who is delivering the intervention?	8
How is the intervention delivered?	8
Where is the intervention delivered?	9
How long is / how many times will the intervention be delivered?	9
Will the intervention be tailored?	9
How will the intervention be optimised?	9
<i>Evaluation design</i>	10
Methodological approach	10
Impact evaluation	10
Implementation and process evaluation (IPE)	11
Data collection	11
Staff feedback surveys (pre- and post-session)	11
Feedback from Faculty Learning and Teaching Leads	12
Structured mid- and end-point reflections via semi-structured interviews	12
Sample selection	13
Outcome measures and data collection	14
<i>Project management of the evaluation</i>	18
Evaluation stakeholders	18
Reporting requirements	19

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 intervention (i.e., the support from the working groups (WGs) and the resources developed) is an effective cross-institutional and systematic approach to improving the quality and implementation of ethnicity degree award gap (EDAG) related interventions at the University of York. The goal of the intervention (described in detail in section 2) is to help departments develop their own context-specific enhancement activities by providing collaborative support and delivering resources that contribute to knowledge and accountability amongst departmental staff. As such, the purpose of the evaluation is to explore whether the intervention successfully engaged the pilot department in the development of these EDAG-related enhancement activities and whether engagement produced critical changes in staff understanding of and generate actions to address awarding gaps.

Scope

As this is a pilot, the evaluation will be exploratory, investigating whether the support and resources developed are an effective means of generating a greater sense of confidence amongst departmental staff and an increase in evidence-based EDAG-related activities within the pilot department.

Within the scope of the current evaluation is also identifying whether the individual elements (e.g., sessions on data literacy, workshops, etc) generated the expected outcomes in terms of staff knowledge, confidence, and ability to address awarding gaps.

Research questions

Primary: The main question addressed by this evaluation is deciding whether, as a cross-institutional process, the establishment of an Oversight Group and two WGs was an effective approach to support the pilot department's development of evidence-based enhancement activities to address the EDAG in their context. This question was explored through a series of sub-questions, including:

- Did the support provided by the WGs increase the number of evidence-based activities to address the EDAG in the pilot department (compared with the previous academic year and comparable departments)?

- Did the support result in Theories of Change, action plans and evaluation plans for the evidence-based EDAG-related activities selected by the pilot department?
- With regards to implementation, was the workload associated with supporting the pilot department manageable for the members of the WG and the Oversight Group and were these the correct individuals to have deliver the intervention?

Secondary: The secondary purpose of this evaluation is to determine whether the support provided by the WGs resulted in changes in staff knowledge, confidence, and ability to address awarding gaps.

- Did participating in data literacy sessions and data exploration sessions increase staff knowledge of the EDAG in general and in their own department?
- Did working with the WGs to identify and select relevant EDAG activities increase staff confidence to implement and evaluate these activities independently?
- Did working with the WGs increase departmental leaders and staff confidence to engage with EDAG-related activities?

Exploratory: To inform how best to roll out this support with more departments, the Oversight Group and WGs need to explore whether the resources developed through the pilot are fit-for-purpose and applicable to other departmental contexts (e.g., feedback on these from Faculty Learning and Teaching Leads and departmental staff).

- Has the intervention resulted in the production of resources that are fit-for-purpose and applicable to other departmental contexts?

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?

There is a persistent ethnicity degree awarding gap (EDAG) between white and Black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) students at the University of York. Specifically, there is a 13.7 percentage point gap between white students and Black students, and a 10.5 percentage point difference between white students and Asian students. These gaps are also present amongst mature students and students from Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) quintiles 1 and 2, both individually and intersectionally (e.g., the EDAG is widening for the most disadvantaged BAME students compared with the most advantaged white students). The University of York has already developed a range of inclusive learning, teaching and assessment initiatives designed to address the EDAG, including the Inclusive-learning@York toolkit, student-led learning communities projects, the Award Gap Research Project and the decolonising and diversifying the curriculum project. Findings from the Award Gap Research Project indicate that Black and Asian students feel less connected with their academic department and the curriculum content, and do not always feel that their lived experiences are recognised or represented with learning, teaching and assessment.

The 'drivers' of the EDAG at the University of York include:

- That the need to address the EDAG is not embedded within existing accountabilities and processes.
- That support is offered for staff to implement best practice, but the uptake of this support is optional and the support is delivered by a variety of teams.
- That there are too few incentives/drivers to change practice on a systematic basis.
- That the culture is rooted in existing traditional research cultures and Western culture.

Some of these drivers have been uncovered through feedback from staff across the annual review process.

There is a need to join-up processes, define accountabilities and provide support as part of a formal process and to systematically draw-on and enhance knowledge at departmental level.

What is the intervention?

The 'intervention' is the piloting of a new process for engaging departments in actively reviewing their EDAGs and guiding their selection of appropriate interventions to address the EDAG in their own context. Piloting this new process with a single department enables the *Departmental EDAG Framework Oversight Group* (herein referred to as the Oversight Group) to co-create resources to support departments through this journey in subsequent years. This Enhanced Theory of Change covers this initial piloting, though the intention is to roll-out this process with the rest of the University's departments, refining the activities and resources developed along the way and formally integrating it into the University's annual review process. The pilot department is the School of Business and Society within the Faculty of Social Sciences, as this department received its EDAG data in the most recent annual review cycle. This department has volunteered to participate in the pilot as members of its senior leadership team overlap with the Oversight Group and WG members. Their involvement is anticipated to facilitate easier buy-in and effective engagement with the pilot programme.

The intervention (i.e., the process that is being piloted) will be delivered via a series of progressive activities grouped into work packages:

Intervention set-up: Preparing and forming the Oversight Group and confirming the members of the two delivery working groups.

Work package 1 (WP1): Launching the EDAG data dashboards with the pilot department.

Work package 2 (WP2): Working in collaboration with the pilot department to *understand their data* and explore what might be driving EDAGs in their context (e.g., contextualising with existing data, the collection of new data, examining external evidence, etc).

Work package 3 (WP3): Facilitating the identification and prioritisation of department-level interventions to address the 'drivers' of their EDAG.

Work package 4 (WP4): Synthesising departmental action plans (both new and existing interventions to avoid overstretching resources and assign responsibilities).

Work package 5 (WP5): Identifying which interventions require local and institutional level evaluation, co-constructing Theories of Change and evaluation plans for these interventions.

Intervention take-down: Evaluation of pilot outcomes and outputs, planning of next steps for rolling out the tested process.

These activities will be delivered through two working groups, with oversight from senior leadership, who will work closely with the pilot department to signpost and develop the necessary resources to successfully complete each step. More specifically, the Oversight Group will lead the development of curated EDAG data dashboards, including

dissemination and training on their use, and then work with the pilot department to help them understand their awarding gaps by considering other data sources (e.g., the National Student Survey (NSS), module evaluations), collecting their qualitative data to identify ‘drivers’ of their EDAGs, drawing on external evidence, and so on. Within each of these sub-steps, the Oversight Group will translate the input from the pilot department into a curated set of resources (e.g., guidance documents, workshops, wikis, scoring tools, etc) that can be used in the next phase of the project, when the process is rolled out to all departments.

While it is unclear exactly what these outputs will look like, as their content will be determined through the piloting of the intervention, we anticipate that this intervention will yield the following resources:

- Guidance document on “Exploring and understanding awarding gap data”.
- Training workshops on navigating sensitive conversations with staff and students from diverse backgrounds.
- Reflective workshops that facilitate departments’ interrogation of other data sources such as findings from the University’s Awarding Gap Project, NSS results, module evaluations, and so on, to gain an understanding of why their gaps exist.
- ‘What works’ resources or wiki-type tool that enables departments to explore potential interventions to address the factors underpinning their EDAG and select which are appropriate / can be adapted to their context.
- Action planning workshops to move departments forward in implementing their EDAG interventions.
- A scoring tool for departments to rate and prioritise possible interventions.
- Signposting (and possibly updating) existing resources offered by the Research and Evaluation Officers.
- Signposting additional training and professional development opportunities to staff (e.g., on inclusive education and assessment, building cultural competence, anti-racism training, and so on).

Who is the intervention for?

The intervention targets university departments to address the ‘drivers’ outlined in the situation. Specifically, the intervention aims to improve staff understanding of existing racial inequalities and enable them to take action to address the awarding gaps. By facilitating informed and targeted action at the department level, the intervention ultimately aims to improve Black, Asian and minority ethnic students’ feelings of connectedness and belonging to their department and the content of the curriculum. It also aims to improve students’ feelings of being recognised and represented. With

regards to this pilot, students in the School of Business and Society (SBS) are expected to be shorter-term beneficiaries of this intervention.

With regards to staff participating directly in the intervention, the more immediate beneficiaries of this pilot include:

- Members of the Oversight and working groups (described in the 'Who is delivering the intervention' section).
- Department leadership teams (SMTs) including Learning and Teaching leads.
- Student services managers
- Departmental and central professional support staff services
- Departmental staff (e.g., opportunities for professional development, increased job satisfaction, more effective ways of working, and so on).

Who is delivering the intervention?

The intervention will be delivered through:

1. A *Departmental EDAG Framework Oversight Group* who will have oversight of all activities and include Faculty and pilot department Learning and Teaching (L&T) Leads, the Associate PVC for Teaching, Learning and Student Experience, and strategic leadership roles within Inclusive Education (IE) Team, Access and Participation Plan (APP) Team, Academic Quality and Development Team.
2. Two working groups, responsible for specific activities:
 - I. **Data exploration and Theory of Change working group:** Representatives from the APP team and the IE team, as well as academic experts, senior leads from pilot department, and relevant faculty leads (responsible for WP2 and WP5).
 - II. **Identifying interventions working group:** Representatives from the IE team, academic experts, senior leads from pilot department, and relevant faculty leads (responsible for WP3).

The shelf life of these groups will initially be the duration of the pilot with the possibility of extending these as the intervention is rolled out to all departments. The make-up of the working groups and Oversight Group will be reviewed at the end of the pilot based on whether there is additional expertise or input required to expand the intervention to more departments.

How is the intervention delivered?

The individual activities in this intervention will be delivered as appropriate; for example, workshops and training sessions for departmental staff will take place face-to-face or online, depending on staff availability, learning outcomes of the sessions, etc. It is

expected that a number of the initial workshops will be delivered in-person given the sensitivity of the topic and the data being discussed. All resources developed throughout the pilot will be housed on the university's [Inclusive-Learning@York website](#).

Where is the intervention delivered?

The intervention will be delivered through the Oversight and working groups that include colleagues from across the university's central services teams and pilot department. Working Group meetings will be held virtually or in-person depending on colleagues' availability and the purpose of the meeting. For example, meetings aimed at developing a resource to include in the framework, such as reflective workshops, will be co-created in a face-to-face session, while regular update meetings can be conducted online.

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

The piloting of the intervention will be delivered with a single department within the 2023-24 academic year. In 2024-25, the intervention will be implemented in all departments and the EDAG data dashboards will be fully integrated into the university's annual review process.

Will the intervention be tailored?

Initially, the intervention (both the process and the resources developed within the pilot) will be relatively tailored to the context of the pilot department. However, the intention is that these resources will be 'live', undergoing continuous expansion, refinement and review, to enable the intervention to be rolled out to all departments and integrated into the university's annual review process.

How will the intervention be optimised?

The implementation of the intervention will be optimised through the iterative co-creation of support and resources with the pilot department. By allowing staff on the working groups to develop these resources and refine the process in smaller steps, it reduces the amount of staff resource required overall, which is paramount given there is a high degree of overlap in the members of the two working groups and the Oversight Group. It optimises the quality of the resources developed by incorporating the 'departmental voice' and ensures that these account for the multiple demands departments currently face and the need to develop and build upon existing knowledge and resources (especially in race equality). It provides the department with a sense of ownership and accountability by including them in the process but does so with the support of colleagues with expertise in inclusive education and evaluation.

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

A large degree of the evaluation will focus on implementation and process to understand whether a whole institution approach can effectively address the EDAG and be embedded within core university processes. However, triangulating evidence from surveys, observations, and semi-structured interviews throughout the pilot strengthens the conclusions that can be drawn about the impact of this intervention and provides invaluable information to guide the implementation and evaluation of rolling out the intervention with additional departments in the future.

Impact evaluation

Due to the limited number of staff participating in this initial pilot, we have selected **an exploratory approach** to identify whether the pilot resulted in:

- An increase in evidence-based EDAG activities in the pilot department (i.e., the number of EDAG-related activities in the department before and after the pilot; the number of EDAG-related activities in comparable departments, before and after the EDAG data dashboards being made available).
- Supporting documents for these activities, including Theories of Change, action plans and evaluation plans.
- Increased staff understanding and knowledge of the EDAG and their confidence to address it.
- Adaptable and fit for purpose resources for use with future departments.

The rationale for selecting an exploratory approach is that while the Theory of Change (ToC) documents a number of hypothesised outcomes, there is a lack of evidence to confirm these or describe whether there are additional unintended outcomes not currently represented in the ToC.

Both the outcomes identified in the ToC and potentially unidentified ones, will be explored by:

- Monitoring the number of EDAG-related activities and their supporting documents (e.g. as described in their application forms for internal funding and support, submissions to centralised teams supporting evaluation and access and participation initiatives, etc.) from the pilot department in the previous academic

year (2022-23) and year of the intervention (2023-24), compared with other departments within the Faculty of Social Sciences (e.g., those who also have access to their EDAG data dashboard).

- Short feedback surveys with staff participating in workshops or training sessions.
- Feedback from Faculty Learning and Teaching Leads collected through multiple methods, depending on the type of resource (e.g., via email, comments on documents or slides, short calls with WG members, etc).

Implementation and process evaluation (IPE)

As this is a pilot project, there are a number of implementation and process elements that need to be addressed in the evaluation to ascertain whether this kind of cross-institutional process is feasible with all of the university's departments. The primary question of whether the workload associated with supporting the pilot department through this process was manageable for members of the WG and Oversight Group, as well as questions related to their capacity, resourcing, and reflections on the quality of the outputs generated will be collected via semi-structured interviews. Delivery staff will be asked to reflect on the intervention's implementation in terms of:

- Fidelity (e.g., did the WPs follow the expected order or were there steps in between that need to be added to improve implementation).
- Perceived impact (e.g., whether the activities selected by the department were sufficiently informed by existing evidence, the student voice, staff feedback, etc., whether they felt the support had increased staff confidence to engage with EDAG-related activities, or increased skills amongst departmental leaders, etc.).
- What worked well and lessons learned (e.g., whether there were resources that were particularly useful for participating staff, whether a certain approach was more effective in improving staff confidence, etc.).

Data collection

To minimise the workload associated with this evaluation, the main data collection methods have been selected as they either align with existing practices (e.g., feedback surveys are already sent to staff after training sessions, workshops, etc) or require less time to design or standardise (semi-structured interviews with reflective prompts).

Staff feedback surveys (pre- and post-session)

The purpose of these surveys is to explore the individual level outcomes amongst departmental staff hypothesised in the short- and immediate-term in the ToC. While the workshops, training sessions, and so on will only include a small number of staff, this approach was selected as it can be integrated into current practice amongst the IE and

APP teams to send participants pre- and post-session feedback surveys for their training sessions and workshops. The content of these existing surveys will be expanded to cover the learning outcomes described in the ToC and assess whether this support/resource increased their understanding, knowledge, confidence, etc (depending on the intended outcome of that session). The surveys will include open-ended questions to allow staff the opportunity to reflect on their current practice or knowledge, and how they might apply the content of the sessions to these. The surveys will be hosted online and completed within a week before attending the session (pre-survey) and within a week of participating in the session (post-survey). [Table 1](#) summarises the impact-related research questions, the methodological approach, and the target participants associated with each.

Feedback from Faculty Learning and Teaching Leads

The resources developed through the pilot intervention will be sense-checked with other Faculty Learning and Teaching Leads to ascertain their applicability to their own departmental contexts. Feedback will be sought throughout the intervention and through a variety of methods, depending on what the resource is – for example, if the resource is a checklist of existing data sources to review, Faculty Learning and Teaching Leads will be asked to comment directly on the document. Feedback will be collated by the WGs at the end of the pilot.

Structured mid- and end-point reflections via semi-structured interviews

As noted, there will be a small sample of potential participants in this evaluation, and giving reflective feedback offers an opportunity for staff in the WGs and Oversight Group to describe the outcomes of the intervention in greater detail. For example, amongst the WG members, conducting semi-structured interviews¹ with reflective questions and specific prompts will be used to understand issues such as the communication between groups, the division of responsibilities across WG members, whether there were additional colleagues that needed to be included in these groups (or who could be removed from these groups to improve their efficiency), and so on. Staff insights into how this process or group set-up could be changed to improve their effectiveness and ability to work with multiple departments will be integral in these reflections. Finally, the reflective prompts will encourage WG members to consider their perceived impact of the intervention on the confidence of departmental leaders and staff to engage with EDAG-related activities.

The structure and timing of the semi-structured interviews will correspond to (i) the completion of the WPs (e.g., all members of the WGs to complete a brief survey at the

¹ <https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/computer-science/semistructured-interview>

end of each WP); or (ii) post-intervention (e.g., to holistically assess the effectiveness of the intervention).

Future evaluations

The university intends to roll out this cross-institutional support process with all remaining departments. The pilot evaluation explores whether the use of two WGs and an Oversight Group with members from across centralised support teams and departments is an effective means of generating increased evidence-based activities to address the university's EDAG. Future evaluations should consider the impact of the resources shared and ongoing support, building on the lessons learned from this pilot (e.g. recommendations made by staff in the feedback surveys/reflections), and adopt more rigorous approaches to evaluating causal pathways, such as a difference-in-difference design (e.g., pre- and post-surveys with staff participating in the workshops and training sessions, compared with a comparison group of staff either in the same department who did not attend the sessions or in a separate department but similar role). Similarly, an interrupted time series analysis of the number of EDAG-related activities in these versus comparable departments would be an appropriate means of identifying whether the intervention is effective in general and gain insight into whether its effectiveness varies across different types of departments. The longer-term impact of this intervention should be explored through: (i) reviewing the evaluations of the individual EDAG-related activities; (ii) EDAG data for these departments; and (iii) existing data sources on other outcomes (e.g., NSS results, student feedback surveys, etc).

Sample selection

Two main target samples are contributing to this evaluation, the WG and Oversight Group members and the departmental staff participating in the workshops and training sessions (e.g., the data literacy session, workshops on selecting appropriate EDAG activities).

- The WG members include those responsible for facilitating the workshops and training sessions, or signposting and developing resources, to the staff within the pilot department. This will consist of approximately seven to 10 participants.
- The staff survey samples will vary depending on the content of the session or training being provided and may not be consistent across sessions (i.e., different members of staff may attend a session on handling difficult conversations to those who attend a session on developing a ToC). Likely participants will include departmental staff leading the department's participation in the pilot, including Faculty Learning and Teaching Leads, academic experts, and departmental leaders. This sample will consist of approximately eight to 10 participants.

Finally, Faculty Learning and Teaching Leads make up a third sample that will be engaged in the exploratory evaluation of the pilot outputs.

No exclusion criteria will be applied due to the exploratory nature of this pilot evaluation and the small number of potential participants.

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** – these relate to whether the cross-institutional process of supporting a department through the identification and selection of an EDAG-related enhancement activity is an effective approach to increasing the number and quality of these activities. Alongside this, questions address the efficiency of the WGs and the delivery of the WPs.
- **Secondary** – these measure change at the individual level, seeking to understand whether the intervention increased staff knowledge, confidence, and skills.
- **Exploratory** – these align specifically with the resources generated through the pilot and feedback related to its ability to be applied in other departments.

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	Has the number of evidence-based EDAG-related activities increased in the pilot department?	Quantitative data monitoring	Pilot department; comparison sample of similar departments	Pre- and post-intervention
Primary	Has the number of supporting documents (e.g., Theories of Change, action plans, evaluation plans) for evidence-based EDAG-related activities increased in the pilot department?	Quantitative data monitoring	Pilot department; comparison sample of similar departments	Pre- and post-intervention
Primary	Did the intervention increase staff confidence and ability to engage with EDAG-related activities?	Reflections via semi-structured interviews	WG members	Post-intervention
Secondary	Has staff knowledge of the EDAG within department increased?	Staff surveys	Workshop/training participants	Pre- and post-workshop/training
Secondary	Has staff knowledge of how to close the gap increased?	Staff surveys	Workshop/training participants	Pre- and post-workshop/training
Secondary	Did participants gain a practical understanding of Theory of Change and evaluation resources and their uses?	Staff surveys	Workshop/training participants	Pre- and post-workshop/training
Secondary	Has staff confidence around discussing the EDAG and engaging in these activities increased?	Staff surveys; Reflections via semi-structured interviews	Workshop/training participants; WG members; Oversight Group members	Pre- and post-workshop/training ; post-intervention

Secondary	Has staff confidence to contribute to EDAG-related activities increased?	Staff surveys; Reflections via semi-structured interviews	Workshop/training participants; WG members; Oversight Group members	Pre- and post-workshop/training ; post-intervention
Exploratory	Has the intervention resulted in the production of resources that are fit-for-purpose and applicable to other departmental contexts?	Feedback/ comments	Faculty Learning and Teaching Leads	Post-WP; post-intervention

Table 2. Research questions addressed in the IPE, methodological approach and target sample.

Type of Research question	Research question	Outcome measure / data source	Sample	Point of collection
Primary	Did the Oversight Group and WG members have sufficient capacity and resource to support this intervention?	Reflections via semi-structured interviews	WG members; Oversight Group members	Post-intervention
Primary	Did the WGs consist of the right colleagues from the centralised professional services teams and the department/faculty?	Reflections via semi-structured interviews	WG members; Oversight Group members	Post-intervention
Primary	Was the delivery of this intervention in terms of timelines, workload, and administration manageable?	Reflections via semi-structured interviews	WG members; Oversight Group members	Post-intervention
Primary	Are there ways to improve the efficiency of the intervention (e.g., reducing the number of colleagues on the WGs, assigning WPs to specific WG members, clarifying reporting and communication processes, etc)?	Reflections via semi-structured interviews	WG members; Oversight Group members	Post-intervention

	Did the intervention include the right combination of departmental staff?	Reflections via semi-structured interviews	WG members; Oversight Group members	Post-intervention
Primary	Did participants require additional support (e.g., asking follow-up questions or extra meetings) after engaging with the resources?	Reflections via semi-structured interviews	WG members; Oversight Group members	Key touchpoints – completion of each WP
Exploratory	Was the delivery method (e.g., online versus face-to-face) appropriate for the learning outcomes and intended outputs for the sessions?	Reflections via semi-structured interviews	WG members; Oversight Group members	Key touchpoints – completion of each WP

Section 4: Project management

This section is designed to ensure relevant staff and stakeholders are held accountable for their involvement in the evaluation and that findings from the evaluation are disseminated internally (and externally) as appropriate. It should be used internally for HEPs to address issues such as buy-in and accountability and allows HEPs to provide a breakdown on the budget and resources needed to secure sign-off from senior stakeholders.

Project management of the evaluation

Evaluation stakeholders

List the key stakeholders the evaluation is designed for and how they will use the findings

Audience <i>(Who are the audiences for the information from the evaluation? e.g., students, teachers, management, staff, partners, etc.)</i>	How evaluation findings will be used <i>(How can they apply new knowledge from the evaluation study?)</i>
Oversight Group	To evaluate the pilot and inform the roll out of the approach with other academic departments, as a way of embedding work to address gaps in business as usual processes
Teaching & Learning Leads (for the pilot) this includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Associate Dean for Teaching, Learning and Students (Faculty of Social Sciences) ● Deputy Associate Dean for Teaching, Learning and Students (Faculty of Social Sciences) ● Associate Dean for Learning and Teaching (School for Business and Society) ● Deputy Associate Dean for Learning and Teaching (School for Business and Society) ● Director of UG studies (School for Business and Society) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● To evaluate the pilot from a departmental perspective and share learning to inform the roll out to other departments ● To consider next steps for taking the work forward at a department level

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chair of Board of Studies (School for Business and Society) 	
APP Strategy Group	Report on the effectiveness of the pilot as an intervention to address awarding gaps
APP Delivery Group	Report on the effectiveness of the pilot as an intervention to address awarding gaps
University Teaching Community (UTC)	Report on the effectiveness of the pilot as an intervention to address awarding gaps
UEB	Report on the effectiveness of the pilot as an intervention to address awarding gaps
EDI Committee	Report on the effectiveness of the pilot as an intervention to address awarding gaps, aligned with the EDI strategy.

Reporting requirements

Specify any outputs that will be developed as part of the evaluation, such as interim and final reports, and the stakeholders who will review the findings.

Date	Report type	Writer/s	Audience
TBD	TBD	TBD	APP Strategy Group
TBD	TBD	TBD	University Teaching Committee
TBD	TBD	TBD	Faculty Executive Board