

INDEX

- Abertay Students' Association (ASA), 130–131
- Abertay Teaching and Learning Enhancement Fund (ATLEF), 134
- Academic self-efficacy, 110
- Academic self-perception, 112
- Aimhigher, 1–2
- Apparent doubling, 20
- Apprenticeships Programme, 66–70
 - TOC for, 68
- Arts
 - challenges of outcome evaluation in, 82–84
 - diversity in, 84–85
 - value for TOC in small specialist performing arts institutions, 86–88
- Aspiration-raising
 - persist as conceptual framework, 13–16
 - simplistic logic chain for, 14
- Aspirations, 13–15
- Attitudes, 42–43, 60, 88
- Authenticity through student-led change, 130–133
- Behaviour, 88, 170–171
- Benefits of TOC, 70–72
- Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic background (BAME background), 58–59
- 'Black box' evaluation processes, 36–37
- Boundary-spanning approaches, 121–122, 127–129
- Boundary-spanning leadership practices, 127–128
- British Research Association (BERA), 168
- Building capacity, 95–96
- Causal model, 4
 - heuristics for developing, 44
 - using TOC, 42–43

- Causally-focussed impact evaluations, 38
- Causation
 - and evaluation research, 37–38
 - models of, 38–42
 - in social research, 40–42
- Change
 - boundary-spanning approaches to, 127–129
 - challenges to implementing change through students, 129–130
 - theories, 122
- Citizenship, 146–147
- Collaboration, 146–147
- Commitment, 146–147
- Common purpose, 146–147
- Complexity
 - level of, 127–128
 - of WP, 102
- Congruence, 146–147
- Consciousness of self, 146–147
- Consequential manipulation, 39–42
- Conservatoire for Dance and Drama (CDD), 82, 85–86
 - building evaluation capacity in, 91
 - challenge for, 95–96
- Contemporary dance, Rambert School of Ballet and, 94–95
- Contextual admissions, 22
- Contingency theory of leadership, 142
- Contribution analysis, 103–106
- Controversy with civility, 146–147
- Counterfactual-based designs, 38
- Covid pandemic, 6–7, 28
- Creativity, 83
- Crude geo-demographic measures, 17
- Data processing, 168
- ‘Deadweight’ in outreach work, 17–19
- Decision-making processes, 27–28
- Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Collaborative Outreach Programme (DANCOP), 64
 - benefits of approach, 70–72
 - delivery model and activities, 64–65
 - engagement, 73
 - experience, 73–74
 - facilitating factors, 70
 - strengthening theories of change, 75

- Theory Of Change case study, 64–73
- theory of change for planning evaluation, 65–70
- Diversity
 - in arts, 84–85
 - in higher education, 1
- Education, 6–7
- Educational inequality, 26
- Effectiveness
 - of intervention-based resources, 6
 - Theory of Change, and, 163
- Elite universities, 20–23
- Embedding social change leadership
 - developing social change competencies, 145–148
 - group values, 156–158
 - literature review, 143–144
 - methods, 148–150
 - pre-unit and post-unit surveys, 149–150
 - results, 150–151
 - results for pre and post intervention, 152–153
 - social change leadership model, 145
- Enablers of student-led change, 124–126
- Engagement, 73
- boundary-spanning approaches to, 127–129
- stakeholders, 165–166
- student, 124
- Evaluation
 - causally-focussed impact evaluations, 38
 - causation and evaluation research, 37–38
 - challenges of outcome evaluation in arts, 82–84
 - embedding evaluation in practice, 92
 - theory-driven evaluation, 37
- ‘Expectations’, 16
- Experience, 73–74
- Feedback, 70–71, 135–136
- Feedback loops, 111–112
- Forum for Access and Continuing Education*, 12
- Foundational policy, 14
- Future intentions, 23–24
- GCSE, 26
- Global HE policy, 2
- Group values, 156–158
- HE Access Tracker (HEAT), 110
- Heuristics for developing causal models, 44
- Higher education (HE), 1–2, 57–58, 101

- access and participation
 in, 3
 accessing, 24
 cumulative need for,
 2–3
 disadvantage impact on
 higher education
 access, 26
 global HE policy, 2
 inequality and inequity
 in, 164
 leadership competencies
 in, 142
 practice/intervention or
 research grants in,
 2–3
 providers, 123
 ToC in, 3–4
 Higher Education Access
 Tracker (HEAT),
 87–88
 Higher Education Funding
 Council for England
 (HEFCE), 101–102
 Higher education policy,
 81–82
 Impact on higher education
 access, 26
 Individual values,
 154–155
 Inequality in higher
 education, 164
 Inequity in higher
 education, 164
 Information, advice and
 guidance (IAG), 60
 Informed consent, 168
 Institutional Access and
 Participation Plan,
 2–3
 Institutional context,
 84–86
 Institutional enablement of
 student-led change,
 134–136
 Institutions, 23–24
 International Centre for
 Guidance Studies
 (iCeGS), 65
 Intervention, 13
 intervention-based
 resources, 6
 relationship between
 intervention and
 comparison groups,
 19
 Joseph Rowntree
 Foundation, 15
Jude the Obscure (Hardy),
 27
 ‘Kick Off Boys Dance
 Project’, 92–93
 Leadership, 143–145
 capability, 141–142
 competencies, 141–142
 in higher education, 142
 skills, 141–142
 Leakage, 17
 Learning, 59, 72, 88,
 91–92, 125,
 141–142
 Logic chain
 for aspiration-raising, 14

- developing robust, 95–96
- Logic Model, 57–58, 61, 63, 69–70
 - and indicator bank templates, 66
- Macro level of change, 125, 128–129
- Meso level of change, 125, 128–129
- Micro level of change, 125, 128–129
- Mixed methods, 60
- Motivation, 65
- Multi-institutional study (MIS), 145–148
- National Collaborative Outreach Programme (NCOP), 5, 57–59, 101–103, 106
 - proximate NCOP consortium stakeholders, 104–105
 - TOC used by NCOP consortia, 62–64
- National Union of Students (NUS), 124
- NERUPI framework, 62
- Non-specialist evaluators, 82
- Northern School of Contemporary Dance (NSCD), 92–94
- Office for Fair Access (OFFA), 37–38, 101
- Office for Students (OFS), 2, 37–38, 85–86
- Online tutoring activity, 112–114
- Outreach work, 17–19
- Participation in HE, 3
- Participatory action research (PAR), 45–46
- Partnership, 123–124, 129–130
 - approaches to change, 125
- Peter Pan*, 16
- Planning
 - theory of change for planning evaluation, 65–70
- Pointe*, 94–95
- Practice
 - embedding evaluation in, 92
 - TOC in, 107–109
- Programme
 - implementation, 101
- Quality Assurance Agency (QAA), 123–125
- Quality of evidence, 23
- Quasi-experimental evaluation, 18
- Questionnaires, 23–24
- ‘Radical change’, 125
- Radicalism, 124–125

- Rambert School of Ballet
 - and contemporary dance, 94–95
- Reliability witnesses, 23–25
- Robust dependence, 39–42
- Robust evaluation
 - strategies, 2–3
- Russell Group, 20–21
- Self-assessment tool, 4
- Self-awareness, 155
- Self-development, 154–155
- Seven C's change approach, 145–147
- Simple tick-box
 - questionnaires, 23
- Small specialist performing arts institutions,
 - value for TOC in, 86–88
- Social change competencies
 - development, 145–148
- Social change model of leadership (SCM), 6, 142, 145, 151, 154
- Socially responsible leadership scale-revised 2 (SRLS-R2), 145–148
- Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, Timely, Evaluated, Reflected objectives (SMARTER objectives), 169
- staff buy-in, 82
- Stakeholders
 - identification and engagement, 165–166
 - proximate NCOP consortium, 104–105
- Structural inequalities, 15
- Student Partnership
 - Agreements, 124–125
- Student-led change, 5, 121–122
 - authenticity through, 130–133
 - boundary-spanning approaches to engagement and change, 127–129
 - context for, 126
 - enablers of, 124–126
 - institutional enablement of, 134–136
- Student(s)
 - challenges to implementing change through, 129–130
 - engagement, 124
 - reliable witnesses, 23–25
- Targeting
 - to access higher education, 18
 - heuristics, 18
- Temporal horizons, 24

- Theory of Change (ToC),
 - 1–2, 5, 11, 14–15,
 - 35–37, 101–102,
 - 129–130, 163
 - causation and evaluation
 - research, 37–38
 - constructing causal
 - model using,
 - 42–43
 - and context, 58–61
 - DANCOP Theory Of
 - Change case study,
 - 64–73
 - developing testable
 - hypotheses, 47–50
 - ethics, data protection
 - and data sharing
 - implications, 168
 - evaluation, 170–171
 - in HE, 3–4
 - marshalling different
 - forms of evidence to
 - build causal
 - hypothesis, 43–47
 - models of causation,
 - 38–42
 - NCOP, 103–106
 - online tutoring activity,
 - 112–114
 - in practice, 107–109
 - review, reflection,
 - enhancement,
 - 171–172
 - specific and align your
 - activities to,
 - 166–168
 - specify indicators of
 - success, 169–170
 - used by NCOP
 - consortia, 62–64
 - value for TOC in small
 - specialist performing
 - arts institutions,
 - 86–88
 - Y9 mentoring,
 - 109–112
- Theory-based approaches,
 - 81–82, 89–90
 - benefit of, 82
 - challenges of outcome
 - evaluation in arts,
 - 82–84
 - creating conditions,
 - 90–91
 - embedding evaluation in
 - practice, 92
 - giving practitioners tools
 - to developing TOC,
 - 88–89
 - institutional context,
 - 84–86
 - NSCD, 92–94
 - Rambert School of Ballet
 - and contemporary
 - dance, 94–95
 - value for TOC in small
 - specialist performing
 - arts institutions,
 - 86–88
- Theory-driven evaluation,
 - 37
- Theory-focused evaluation
 - approaches, 45
- Time Higher around
 - Randomised
 - Control Trials, 3

- Training, pre-entry
 - widening participation, 86
- Trial-based designs, 38
- Uni Connect. *See* National Collaborative Outreach Programme (NCOP)
- Universities and Colleges Admissions Service (UCAS), 86–87
- University, 126
 - traditionally change in, 121–122
- ‘White box’ mixed methods evaluation approach, 60
- Widening Access and Success Strategy (2016–2020), 89–90
- Widening access work, 11
- Widening Participation (WP), 1–2, 84–85, 101
- WonkHE, 3
- Y9 mentoring, 109–112
- Young people, 24
 - end up on different pathways, 26–28