



## Student & Staff Intervention

### GROWTH MINDSET

Believe intelligence is *malleable* and can be *developed* through hard work and persistence



### FIXED MINDSET

Believe intelligence is *something you are born with* and that you *can't* do much to change it

**Changing Mindsets** is a student and staff workshop-based intervention that builds a growth mindset: the belief that ability develops through effort and by embracing challenge (Dweck, 2017). Initially developed at the University of Portsmouth, the intervention aims to close the attainment gap in student experience, retention, progression, academic attainment and employability by changing mindsets and eroding stereotype threat (Steele, 1997) and implicit bias (Devine et al, 2012) as barriers to learning. The pedagogic approach taken in both staff and student workshops is to present concepts, evidence and strategies in an engaging and interactive way, using, as appropriate multi-media presentation, self-assessments, illustrative examples, sharing of own experience, discussions, practical exercises, modelling language, and exploring common scenarios.

**Flexibility/Adaptability of the Intervention:** The intervention, by design, is flexible and adaptable. While there are key learning outcomes, each university is empowered to embed the intervention in a way that fits with their institutional needs and existing programmes. In order for any intervention aimed at addressing unequal degree outcomes to be successful and to be widely adopted, it must be adaptable and flexible to meet the unique needs and challenges of a wide range of higher education providers.

**Theoretical Framework:** The intervention and evaluation is underpinned by psychological (Dweck, 2017; Devine et al, 2012), sociological (Bhopal and Preston, 2012), and educational (Apple, 2015) concepts and theories.

**Conceptual Framework:** Utilising the conceptual framework proposed by Mountford-Zimdars et al (2015) the Changing Mindsets intervention will address the impact of mindset, stereotype threat and implicit bias on student retention, progression, experience and attainment, by focusing on the macro, meso and micro levels:

- Macro**
  - Exploring socio-historical and cultural stereotypes around factors such as race, ethnicity, gender, age and social background and supporting the development of Growth Mindset beliefs in staff and students that are mutually exclusive to fixed attainment stereotypes;
- Meso**
  - Exploring the implicit bias of staff and students within institutions that form the social contexts within which BME and students from low socio-economic backgrounds learn, and using 'habit breaking' techniques shown to be effective to erode implicit bias;
- Micro**
  - Exploring students' own salient identities that result from individual student and staff interactions in the HE environment, that may make them prone to stereotype threat, supporting them to develop personal coping strategies and beliefs in order to support resilience and persistence in the face of challenging situations.

## Focused on Students



The intervention is focused on closing the attainment gap in student experience, retention, progression, academic attainment and employability for two student populations: **socio-economically disadvantaged students** (as measured by POLAR3, Quintile1 (P3/Q1) and Quintile2 (P3/Q2) and qualification for income-based bursaries) and **Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) students**. Additionally, there will be demonstrable benefits for other student groups (e.g. based on gender, age, disability). Across the project partners the overall target intervention sample (over two cohorts) will be approximately 4,250 students and 680 academic staff. Intervention targets per partner institution:

University of the Arts, London Students: 1050 Staff: 200	University of Brighton Students: 1250 Staff: 200	University of Portsmouth Students: 1400 Staff: 200	University of Winchester Students: 550 Staff: 80
--	--	--	--

## Strong Partnership

All four institutions in the partnership have clear strategic priorities that align with this project. The project partnership includes staff with excellent credentials including a Learning Gain Project lead, TEF panel member, Principal Fellows of the HEA and National Teaching Fellows. They have a track record of conducting empirical research into student diversity and learning, and translating this into successful interventions to address inequity in education.

- University of Portsmouth: Professor Paul Hayes, Pro-Vice Chancellor Education and Student Experience (responsible for project delivery and success); Professor Sherria Hoskins, Dean of Science (PI/lead academic for the project); Dr Jessica Gagnon, Senior Research Fellow; Juan Batley, Learner Analytics Specialist; Charley Bentley, Project Administrator
- University of the Arts, London: Professor Susan Orr, Dean of Learning, Teaching and Enhancement and Professor in Creative Practice Pedagogy; Lucy Panesar, Educational Developer (Diversity and Inclusion); Vikki Hill, Project Officer
- University of Brighton: Professor Gina Wisker, Professor of Contemporary Literature and Higher Education; Jennie Jones, Research Fellow, Centre for Learning and Teaching; Catherine McConnell, Senior Lecturer in Learning Development; Jenny Terry, Project Officer
- University of Winchester: Dr Nicola Barden, Director of Student Services; Laura Watson, Project Officer

## Robust Evaluation Methods

**Core Evaluation Methods:** For ease of data analysis and comparison, all four partners have adopted the same core evaluation methods, which includes the following **pre-intervention data**:

- Attainment and outcome student data for the past five years in the schools in which the intervention will be run
- Online student survey data from the intervention cohorts (including quantitative and qualitative responses)
- Online staff survey data from the intervention cohorts (including quantitative and qualitative responses)

**Post-intervention data** will be collected at each institution in the following ways:

- Attainment data for the cohort of students who participated in the intervention at the end of their first year
- Online student survey data from the intervention cohorts (including quantitative and qualitative responses)
- Online staff survey data from the intervention cohorts (including quantitative and qualitative responses)
- Individual interviews with a sample of student participants
- Individual interviews and focus groups with a sample of staff participants

**Longitudinal data** will be collected through Higher Education Access Tracker (HEAT).

**Additional Evaluation Methods:** To enable use of appropriate impact evaluation methods in each partner institution there will be flexibility. In addition to the core evaluation methods, each partner institution may choose which optional or additional methods (of their own design) to adopt.

	Learner Analytics using existing student records data	Online Survey Tools (cohort 1 intervention staff and students)	Individual Interviews with student participants and focus groups with staff participants to assess the intervention learning outcomes
<b>Ten Impact Goals to be Assessed</b>	1. Narrowed retention, progression and attainment gaps for BME and P3/Q1 students; 2. Narrowed employability gaps for BME and P3/Q1 students (after the life of the project)	3. Improved BME and P3/Q1 student learning experience. 4. Improved staff and student growth mindset, reduction in stereotypes and bias habits. 5. Improved lecturer efficacy in creating equal learning experiences.	Improved understanding of: 6. their own mindset 7. the interaction between stereotype threat, implicit bias and mindset 8. the impact of their own and others' mindset on their own and others' behaviour, language use, and expectations 9. the impact of behaviour, language use, and expectations on learning and educational outcomes 10. strategies for developing their growth mindset, inclusive behaviours, high expectations for all and enabling language.
<b>Data analysis</b>	Lens modelling and probability statistics	Multiple regression analysis	Thematic analysis
<b>Level of impact assessed</b>	Quantifying the impact (primary impact)	Quantitatively identifying what has led to the impact (secondary impact)	Qualitatively identifying what has led to the impact (secondary impact)