Review of evaluation plans workshop

Activity: Developing impact evaluation capacity

The purpose of the activity is to discuss and review some examples of evaluation plans submitted by other institutions to develop:

- Insight into how others are planning to evaluate their projects.
- Develop your understanding about narrative summary, indicators, evidence and baselines.

The overall aim is therefore to support institutions to develop their impact evaluation capacity, and so improve their evaluation plans and improve the quality of the evaluation of Evidence for Enhancement projects and the learning for institutions and the sector as a whole.

Instructions

As a group review each evaluation plan, using the criteria and supplementary prompts below to aid your discussion. Individually apply the learning from this process to your own evaluation plan(s).

Review criteria

1. How well does the narrative impact summary spell out the links between the activities and the short-term benefits, medium-term outcomes and longer-term impacts?

- Is the evaluation plan focused on the role of 'Evidence for Enhancement?
- Is it written as a narrative summary spelling out the relationship between activities, short-term benefits, medium-term outcomes and longer-term impacts?
- Are the links between the steps logical (or it reasonable to expect them to occur as a result of the activities being implemented)?
- Does it identify impacts over time, or just more activities (output indicators)?
- Does it help you to assess the rest of the evaluation plan? If not, what is missing?

2. How well do the short-term indicators identify and verify the benefits to all relevant stakeholders, as indicated in the narrative summary?

- Do the indicators measure a benefit, or just verify that the activity takes place?
- Do the indicators relate to all the stakeholders identified in the narrative summary (e.g. staff and students)?
- Is the evidence suggested likely to be available, or relatively easy to collect?
- Would the evidence suggested help you to know if the indicator has been achieved?

- Would an alternative or additional source evidence help to verify the indicator?
- If a baseline is suggested will it be available and likely to help assess the changes indicated?
- If a baseline is not suggested, is it needed to assess progress/benefits, and if so, could it be generated using a different or additional evidence source?

3. How well do the medium-term indicators identify and verify the outcomes to all relevant stakeholders, as indicated in the narrative summary?

- Do the indicators measure outcomes (e.g. changes in behaviour by others), or verify that subsequent activities take place (e.g. rather than further activities by the project team)?
- Are the indicators specific about the changes/outcomes that will occur?
- Do the indicators relate to all the changes identified in the narrative summary?
- Is the evidence suggested likely to be available, or relatively easy to collect?
- Would the evidence suggested help you to know if the indicator has been achieved?
- Would an alternative or additional type or source evidence help to verify the indicator?
- If a baseline is suggested will it be available and likely to help assess the changes indicated?
- If a baseline is not suggested, is it needed to assess intermediate outcomes, and if so, could a baseline be generated using a different or additional evidence source?

4. How well do the longer-term indicators identify and verify the wider impact of the project for stakeholders and the institution (perhaps beyond the life of the project)?

- Do the indicators relate to improving the student experience, contributing to an institutional culture that utilises evidence and/or other longer-term goals?
- Are the indicators sufficiently specific that they could be measured?
- Are the longer-term indicators likely to be influenced by the project being evaluated?
- Is the evidence suggested likely to be available, or relatively easy to collect?
- Is there likely to be other national (or institutional) data that could be used?
- Would the evidence suggested help you to know if the indicator has been achieved?
- Is a baseline suggested, and if not what would be a suitable baseline?

Example 1

Project title	Developing a Learning Analytics, student-led ethical policy
Description of key activities or changes	- Review approaches in the sector - Seek input for internal and external experts - Raise awareness with staff and students what learning analytics are - Identify with academics and students types of Learning Analytics which are helpful and ways of communicating these - Produce a policy - Consult with students and staff on the draft - Policy - Launch the policy
Impact narrative	The project will develop a co-produced student led ethical framework for use of learning analytics. By developing this framework we will increase student understanding of data and its uses for staff and students through the process of student and staff information and consultation during its development. We will then change behaviours of staff and students in their use of data. Students will be empowered to use data within the terms of the framework. Through better understanding of the uses of data and the protections in place, student trust and engagement will increase. In the longer term institutional culture will be improved by a sense of partnership between staff and students through the co-production of University policy; trust will improve with a better awareness of ethical frameworks by students to this aspect of University life.
Short-term indicators, evidence and baseline (Y/N)	Student engagement in consultation on the policy from a range of students.
	An indicator of this benefit is the number of students taking part in consultations.
	Baseline: N/A
Medium-term indicators, evidence and baseline (Y/N)	Students will be empowered to use data within the terms of the framework. Through better understanding of the uses of data and the protections in place, student trust and engagement will increase.
	Indicators of this will be students engaging with learning analytics available to them, measured by quantitative data on students accessing analytics.
	Baseline: no baseline available
Longer-term indicators, evidence and baseline (Y/N)	Institutional culture will be improved by a sense of partnership between staff and students through the co-production of University policy; trust will improve with a better awareness of ethical frameworks by students to this aspect of University life
	Indicators of this will be student engagement with further partnership projects evidenced by Student Union and Governance Committee minutes. Student satisfaction increasing in the NSS/PTES in response to questions on the Institution valuing student voice Qu 23-26
	Baseline: number of partnership projects between Students' Union and University in 2017-18 NSS response to 23-26 2015-18

Example 2

Project title	Growing confidence in reflecting DLHE/Graduate Outcomes for Curriculum Development
Description of key activities or changes	This work will improve the level of staff engagement with graduate outcomes recorded via annual monitoring process. This will be done by offering programme leaders the opportunity to attend workshops designed to demonstrate the importance of engagement with Graduate Outcome evidence and detailing the resulting pedagogical impact of utilising this evidence.
Impact narrative	An increase in staff members' knowledge of and engagement with graduate outcome metrics will inform curriculum enhancements designed to develop students' employability and enterprise attributes.
Short-term indicators, evidence and baseline	Engagement with Graduate Outcomes workshops Evidence: Staff participation rates in workshops, feedback received through workshops
Medium-term indicators, evidence and baseline	Evidence generated through Graduate Outcomes workshops will be used to inform the annual monitoring process. Evidence: Notes from each workshops and reference to workshop evaluation forms
Longer-term indicators, evidence and baseline	Enhanced use of evidence apparent in annual monitoring process. Evidence: The completed pro-formas

Example 3

Project title	Supporting Programme Leaders to Use Evidence for Enhancement
Description of key activities or changes	Workshops and resources are being developed and promoted to support PLs to engage with evidence for enhancement. Key activities: - Support for PLs using university planning and data tools and resources. - Support for preparing annual Programme Reviews - Workshop on critical engagement with breadth of E4E. - Focus on engaging with diversity of student voices, including support for Staff-Student-Liaison Committees (SSLC).
Impact narrative	Programme leaders will be more confident in their use of a broad range of evidence to enhance student experience across their programme of study. PLs will feel empowered to make evidence-based decisions and feel supported in developing the skills to create effective change. As a result, students will have an enhanced student experience and will be partners in processes of change and enhancement in the programmes they study.
Short-term indicators, evidence and baseline (Y/N)	*Baseline:* Drawn from review of programme leadership across university and associated PL discussions; insights from pilot workshops; SSLC review.
	Indicators and Evidence sources include: • Attendance and engagement with workshops and resources. • PL Report review • SSLC minutes • Engagement and discussion at L&T conference.
Medium-term indicators, evidence and baseline (Y/N)	*Indicators:* • PLs report enhanced confidence in using evidence to make decisions about their programme • Programme teams and students report feeling more engaged and involved in programme enhancement.
	Evidence to draw on includes: -Interviews / review workshop(s) with School Leads for L&T / Quality, PLs and class / programme reps re use of evidence. - SSLC minutes and PL reports. - Use of planning tools and E4E resources. - Feedback from across the university on use of evidence for enhancement.
Longer-term indicators, evidence and baseline (Y/N)	*Indicators include:* - Improvements in relevant student survey questions. - Staff engagement with / as programme teams. - Enhanced sense of ownership of change from PLs - Enhanced sense of engagement of student representatives. - Enhanced student experience of students across the programme.
	Evidence to draw on includes: • NSS, PTES and internal student survey results. • Staff survey feedback • SSLC notes • Programme Annual reviews and Periodic review documentation and School level reflection and action planning documents. • ELIR documentation. • Bespoke review workshop(s) with staff and students focused on culture of enhancement at programme-level.

Example 4

Project title	Using evidence to improve the design of learning and teaching space
Description of key activities or changes	• Innovative teaching spaces introduced • Brief survey evaluation of student and staff views on the introduced spaces conducted • In depth student and staff survey evaluation on the impact of new spaces to learning and teaching approaches • Development of a strategy document for the refurbishment of the university estate • Informed strategic development of university learning and teaching spaces over the long-term
Impact narrative	This project will use evidence to improve the design of new learning and teaching spaces. Student and staff opinions of innovative learning and teaching spaces will be gathered. If staff and student views on the strengths and weaknesses of new learning and teaching spaces is gathered, it will inform decisions as to the environment and style in which students would like to be taught and staff wish to teach. If we know how students wish to be taught, and staff wish to teach, we can use this evidence to inform the development of further learning and teaching spaces. If new and effective spaces are developed, it will encourage staff to develop their approach to teaching and students will feel more engaged with the environments in which they are learning. If students and staff have access to effecting learning and teaching spaces, the learning and teaching experience will be improved. If the learning and teaching experience is improved, the overall student experience will be enhanced.
Short-term indicators, evidence and baseline (Y/N)	**Indicator:** Staff and students share their views on learning and teaching spaces they would like to use and feel more engaged in the development of the university estate and learning and teaching. **Evidence:** This information will come from the two evaluation stages of the project, generating new data via surveys, module evaluations, qualitative discussions with students and room evaluations. **Baseline:** No
	Indicator: Increased demand from staff and students to utilise recently developed learning and teaching spaces. Coupled to this, a shift in the style of teaching undertaken in some modules. **Evidence:** Information on room requests can be obtained from central timetabling services, providing valuable information as to whether staff are keen to use the new spaces. **Baseline:** No
Medium-term indicators, evidence and baseline (Y/N)	**Indicator:** Learning from this project will inform future a strategy document to inform the refurbishment of the existing university estate. Evidence from this project will be linked to existing evidence on the university estate presented by a firm of architects. **Evidence:** The presence of the strategy and its use in refurbishing existing spaces. The impact of the strategy will be determined by the direction of long-term teaching space refurbishment and demand by staff and students to use these spaces. **Baseline:** No

	Indicator: The rolling refurbishment of learning and teaching spaces will be informed by the evidence gathered during this project. **Evidence:** Refurbished learning and teaching spaces that are popular with students and staff as judged by ongoing analysis of room satisfaction. Changes in learning and teaching approaches as evidenced by the change in demand for different room types and by changes in new curriculum submissions. **Baseline:** Yes, previous new curriculum submissions can be compared to new curriculum submissions occurring after the refurbishment of rooms.
	Indicator: Increased staff reflection on their approaches to teaching. **Evidence:** This will be evidenced from room evaluations, changing demand for the use of newly developed rooms, staff submissions to the university's curriculum approval group to change their teaching practice. **Baseline:** Yes, submissions to the curriculum approval group prior to the introduction of the innovative spaces provide evidence of preferred teaching style prior to implementation of the new spaces and this can be compared to submissions post introduction of the new spaces.
Longer-term indicators, evidence and baseline (Y/N)	**Indicator:** Strategic and informed development of the university estate. **Evidence:** The successful impact of the strategic development of the university estate will be judged by high levels of satisfaction among students and staff as to the learning and teaching spaces available to them. **Baseline:** Yes, core student survey results before significant estate refurbishment could be compared to results post significant estate refurbishment.
	Indicator: Enhanced learning and teaching practices within the institution. **Evidence:** Continued high levels of student satisfaction in their learning and teaching experience as evidenced by MEQ, NSS and Student Digital Tracker survey results. Changes to curriculum submissions that reflect a desire to use refurbished spaces to enhance pedagogy. **Baseline:** No