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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Annotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen, M. (2010). In defence of targeting? The Open University’s Community Partnership Programme, <em>Widening Participation and Lifelong Learning, 12</em> (SI): 138-153.</td>
<td><strong>Context:</strong> Post-Dearing/ New Labour expansion targets in UK (late 1990s) and WP agenda in UK. Examines targeted community-based outreach for widening participation to the Open University (distance university in the UK) – focused on part-time distance learners and in poorest areas. Notes literature that comments on WP not impacting the gap between rich and poor, and the argument that WP = recruitment to expand student numbers. Author comments on role/engagement of middle class parents “in a range of activities geared to ensure the transmission of educational privilege” (p.139; see Devine, 2004). Targeting = government response to middle class parents gaming the system (SB’s words). Targeting = problematic: perceived as top-down, bureaucratic. Definitions of what/who should be targeted = most difficult because of slippage with terms like ‘class’ and the inherent issues with using postcodes to identify SES, which can increase deficit notions and push responsibility (failure) onto individuals and communities. Short time frames and insufficient funding contributes to the lack of efficacy of targeting. On the other hand, without targeting, the wealth gap is not addressed. Scopes literature and arguments about outreach: notes debates that outreach is narrowly focused on individual rather than system: outreach “implicitly perceives the problem as the potential learner, who lacks motivation and aspiration, rather than the structural barriers that prevent access” (p.141) <strong>Aim:</strong> To describe how the Community Partnerships Programme (CPP) at the OU offers targeted outreach with community partners, “to recruit students who live in areas of high deprivation and have no previous HE experience” (p.141) <strong>Theoretical frame:</strong> None <strong>Methodology:</strong> Critical description of CPP, drawing on data from students via telephone interviews (n=24) and telephone feedback from OU staff. CPP took place in 5 regions and Northern Ireland; data presented = collected 2007-2009. 236 students were supported by CPP over the period; just over half had no prior HE experience (compared with 15% of OU students nationally). These 128 students = ‘WP’ students. Findings compared with national OU student data. CPP offered local, face-to-face ‘study skills’ sessions that brought CPP students together <strong>Findings:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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WP students = more likely to be female (but could be reflective of partnerships with childcare centres)
Half of the WP students = non-white (CPP in Yorkshire = large Asian communities)
WP students = more likely to be unemployed, home worker, part time worker (but see large number of women looking after children)
WP students = more likely to have no educational qualifications on entry (14.1% compared to 9% national sample).
‘Less ready’ WP students = reflected in achievement rates. CPP students = less likely to complete studies.
23/24 students interviewed had no prior HE qualification (one had degree from home country and = ESL). All = FinF; 10 =unemployed; 4 = homeworkers; 4 = part-time. 23/24 = female; 7 did not complete but one moved into other OU course; 6 of students who completed moved on to other courses with OU. Most had not previously considered HE. 20/24 = had concerns relating to doing study after a period out of education. First academic writing (assessed) = ‘crunch point’ (p.147). Face-to-face ‘study support’ = crucial for these students. Most valued opportunity to meet others in same situation. One student who dropped out = too many commitments; another = dropped out because of writing load of course (see p.148). Overall, most students = positive about their engagement and were either in or planning to progress to further studies and had developed increased confidence and learnt new skills. Challenges = experienced at level of costs (e.g. course fees and childcare) and expectations about home technology

**Core argument:**
Students need good advice before enrolling (about expectations like academic writing). For successful uni-community partnership, commitment to time and resources on both sides = fundamental; “short-termism” = challenging for both (p.150)

---


**Context:**
Low SES students and their underrepresentation and policy on social inclusion in Australia. Sets the scene by arguing that Sydney University broke the norm by admitting students on merit rather than background when it opened in 1852 (but did not extend to women/adult learners). Notes that ‘inclusive education’ is an opaque/ under-defined term that needs to be understood in particular social context/ particular assumptions = there are particular social/policy contexts where inclusive teaching/ social inclusion sit; there are particular practices that advance inclusion. Authors discuss opportunities/challenges of engaging with policy/practice in USYD = long-term outreach program: ‘Compass – find your way to higher education’ (started 2008) – focus on social capital building in low SES communities/schools. Argues that WP initiatives are usually one-off events (including USYD pre-2008) and that much WP work fails because it is atheoretical (Archer, Hutchings & Leathwood, 2001). Maintain that education will always be socially selective: “In workforce planning, it is assumed
that there is a part of the population that does not need higher education” (p.921) – assumed to be 60% if HE participation target is 40%

**Aim:** Poses these questions: “What does it really mean to have an education system that is ‘inclusive’? Who is thought to be in need of inclusion and why? If education should be inclusive, then what practices is it contesting, what common values is it advocating, and by what criteria should its successes be judged?” (p.918)

**Theoretical frame:** Draws on reproduction theory (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977)

**Methodology:**

**Findings:**

Language of social inclusion/ equity = superficial, thus fuelling ‘the problem’ – who can be against social inclusion?: “The language of social equity obfuscates assumptions about economic productivity and wealth creation (for whom?)” (p.921). Argues that ‘social inclusion’ cannot improve until universities engage with it beyond the notions of access and participation; as it is, the language = “a parody of itself”... it “becomes the language of a new form of exclusion dressed up in a rhetoric that allows us to be blissfully disengaged from the genuinely transformative power of education” (p.922) – thus, how can a research-intensive (or any) university contribute to building capacity without engaging in introspection and reflexive exercise?

**Outreach:** cannot be undertaken with idea that engagement/participation might improve league table results/ or hero-mentality of ‘saving’ disadvantaged communities (be careful of patronizing/ deficit assumptions)

**Compass** (as an example of a university=community partnership) = built on 4 principles generated from research:

1) engagement early in schooling;
2) parents are influential on career choices/ post-school education or training;
3) teacher/school capacity makes a big differences;
4) need to increase awareness/understanding of educational pathways.

**Core argument:** Engaging in outreach that does not reproduce dominant hegemonic systems: “To be inclusive, we need to learn from working with others and adopt strategies that are owned within schools and communities, not imposed on them from outside” (p.926). Necessitates a “self-critical” approach from all stakeholders (especially universities)

“It is reasonable for universities to be asked whether in doing so they are producing leaders in their own image (and in the image of social groups who have traditionally benefited from and reproduced their advantages through these networks) and if not then to be asked how they understand their relationship to the wider communities and what implications this relationship has for their practice” (p.926)
Context: Describes how University of Canberra’s Aspire UC program seeks to inspire aspiration in rural and remote (R&R) high schools/communities in the Canberra area. Sets out an argument for focusing on R&R because of cost and distance associated with attending university - R&R and likely to also be low SES. R&R = have lower educational attainment and thus parents have limiting aspirations/expectations for their children (with a gender divide evident = girls more likely to aspire to university – perhaps to escape macho rural lifestyle/less opportunities for women).

Aspire UC is a school outreach program that works with Years 7-10. Program is “age-appropriate, interactive and engaging” – working with each year level three times a year.

Methodology: Reports on survey of almost 3000 students from Year 7-10 from 23 schools relating to post-school aspirations and plans. Pre and post-program responses collected and analysed: 2890 pre-program and 2605 post-program responses collected. Data from 2012. Pre-program Q = ‘After I finish school, I plan to…’ and students chose from list of options (including ‘don’t know’); same Q repeated in post-program survey. Four areas on primary interest: going to uni/ going to TAFE/ apprenticeship/ FT work – these ascribed ‘yes’ or ‘no’ category and % calculated on that basis. Not just one option per person. Acknowledges that mean change could be acquiescence (limitation).

Findings: Broad analysis (collapsing age and gender) showed that positive mean change of 7.5% to attend uni, 8.25% to attend TAFE, 2.1% to attend apprenticeship, 7.88% to find FT work. Negative values found in TAFE (females, Year 8), apprenticeship (Year 7 females, Year 8 males, Year 9 males) = Aspire UC contributed to students being more likely to consider all (but slightly less for apprenticeship) after attending the program. Females more likely on average to change their minds post-program. Year level also appears significant: pre-program Year 7 average % for aspiring for 4 options = 65.25%; Year 10 = 48.5%. All Year groups experienced positive mean change in post-program surveys (Year 10 change % = highest). Main findings:

• Decreased interest in apprenticeships is significant for R&R students
• Pre-program results were highest in university category
• Girls more likely to want to go to university (all Year levels) and more likely to want to go to TAFE (except Yr 10)
• Both genders inspired to consider further education after attending Aspire UC.

Core argument: Year 10 is a critical time for outreach engagement

Context: Discusses rural and remote students’ transitions through ACT Experience camp (a joint venture with Country Education Foundation (CEF) Australia, Uni of Canberra and ANU) providing “academically able”

KEYWORDS: Widening participation; rural students; university access; barriers; higher education

(abstract) Rural students with taster of urban/university life. CEF’s mission is in part to support rural and regional communities/young people to participate in post-school education and training. ACT Experience = HEPPP funded. Every year, 50 students (Years 9-11) travel to Canberra – students chosen on basis of ‘academic ability’. Purpose of camps “to provide a unique experience relevant to rural youth who, despite performing well academically and perhaps already considering university, have difficulty envisioning themselves at university” (p.3). Camps also offer information about finances and scholarships. Discusses: adolescents’ post-school decisions, rural students’ views on university

**Theoretical frame:** Draws on discussion of ‘imagined futures’

**Methodology:** Mixed methods (quantitative and qualitative). Pilot study: 41 (31f:10m; 35 = Yr10, 6 = Yr9; 3 = Indigenous) from 5 high schools in 2012; students asked about views of university at start/end of camp (survey = demographic data, questions about future plans; students asked write down 3 words that come to mind). Words rated as positive, negative, neutral. Main study: 48 (24f:24m; 39 = Yr10; 9 = Yr11; 3 x Indigenous) from 5 high schools. Pre/post-course surveys + focus groups 7 weeks after.

**Findings:** Pilot study: 82% interested in uni before camp; 17% undecided. Students = positive words about university got more positive

Main study: went into 2014 camp with “the intention of more accurately ascertaining students’ attitudes toward university, and addressing potential barriers” (p.6), particularly knowledge of university, confidence to transition and successfully live in city. Also included parents’ and friend’s plans for future. Students were surveyed and had to complete reflection (various formats) of what the camp meant to them (small groups).

Findings (main study): prior, 70% intended to go to university. Little change post camp. Focus group data themes: positive expectations/learning something interesting; concerns about university (financial cost, accommodation/moving away from home; students’ impressions of university: most students had not seen a university before; students’ changed views of university: after visiting two campuses, students were more positive; imagined selves as university students (expectations about workloads, work, friends, classes + going home at weekends); imagined selves beyond university.

**Core argument:** Rural students are generally “less confident about their ability to succeed at university given their self-perceptions as being different to urban/metropolitan young people” (p.11). “[S]tudents reported (1) greater understanding of university, of their post-school options and of living in a city; and (2) increased confidence in their decision-making and in their ability to move away from home” (p.9); latter point= particularly

**Context:** Describes impact of UC 4 Yourself university experience day (part of HEPPP-funded Aspire UC outreach) for students from low SES (‘financially disadvantaged backgrounds’). Navigates literature on SES and aspirations (lower rates of Yr 12 completion/ lower levels of parental education/ lack of support networks/ stratification of school system =reproduces inequity. Barriers to study = distance, cost, low academic achievement, and low motivations/ aspirations (Gale et al. 2010). Imagined futures (draws heavily on Sellar/Gale et al.)

**Methodology:** 2 x surveys (n=525 students; 231 m/ 294 f from 29 high schools – most Yr 9. 31 = indigenous) administered before/after visit. Survey 1: students rated 3 statements 1) ‘I have often considered going to university’; (2) ‘I like the idea of going to university’; and (3) ‘My plans for after high school don’t include university’. Survey 2= (i) ‘I like the idea of going to university’; (ii) ‘I feel more comfortable on a university campus’; (iii) ‘I can imagine myself as a uni student’; (iv) ‘I feel more confident that I could attend uni’; (v) ‘I want to find out more about uni’; and (vi) ‘I want to go to university’.

**Findings:** Attendees = more likely to attend university and better able to imagine themselves as university students

Survey 1= no differences found between students on basis of year level, indigineity, previous experience with Aspire UC. Revealed ‘high levels’ of interest in HE. Females reported more interest than males but scores for both genders =high

Survey 2 = difference found between students who had experienced Aspire UC before (“additional visits further enhance the capacity to picture oneself in the situation, that is, to conceive of oneself as a student of the university” (p.91). No gender effects with regards to barriers. Students reported uni = less expensive than expected

**Core argument:** Provision of information = paramount (p.92); tangible experience (physical experience) = important and facilitates imagination of self as uni student.

---


**Context:** DEEWR-funded project: *Interventions early in school as a means to improve higher education outcomes for disadvantaged (particularly low SES) students*. Based on CSHE (2008) report that claims educational disadvantage = result of patterns that begin in the earliest years of schooling.

International context: UK = high SES are 5-6 times more likely to enter HE, and is even more pronounced in Oxbridge/ Russell Group universities. Canada = experience of indigenous Canadians is similar to that of indigenous Australians (only 65% of ind.Can. graduate from high school, compared with 80% of non-ind. Youth),

---
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Component A

AUS/UK/CAN/US/NZ

especially for those living on reservations. USA = low SES students more likely to attend community college (shorter courses, no RHD)

**Aim:** To identify early interventions in schools, where early means before Year 11, primarily in Australia but also in other OECD countries. Asks these questions:

(i) In what ways might higher education institutions and schools collaborate on sustainable equity initiatives?

(ii) How might a program of longitudinal research studies be designed to provide evidence of impact of various strategies and initiatives?

(iii) How might the best practices of specific interventions be implemented in ongoing infrastructure and policy? (p.5)

**Theoretical frame:** Uses Anderson & Vervoorn (1983): 4 As (conditions of entry) – availability, accessibility, achievement, aspiration as organizing heuristic to explore and discuss key examples of early equity interventions.

**Methodology:** Literature review

**Findings:**

The review identifies four major barriers to student participation in higher education:

(i) the restrictions of distance and time;

(ii) the cost of higher education;

(iii) non-completion of schooling and low academic achievement; and

(iv) student expectations, motivations and aspirations (all p.5)

**Availability**

- The bond/ guaranteeing availability (scholarships/ guaranteed [early offer] places [ p.18
- The pledge [dangling a carrot – e.g. reduced fees/ free places – on successful completion of academic course/ demonstrating particular behaviours/standards – p.19
- The sponsored: reserving availability (sponsorship programs) – p.20

**Accessibility**

- Access via philanthropy (e.g. Smith Family/ World Vision) – p.24
- Access via example (expose/taster/ ‘warm’ information) – p.26
- Question of cost - p.27

**Achievement**

- Targeting the talented – p.30
- Targeting the academic middle – p.30
- Targeting national priority areas – p.33
- Targeting particular under-represented groups (holistic schooling/ targeted approach/ staff training/ holistic student support/ parental engagement/ intensive learning support/ school-based VET/ scholarships) – p.36
- Targeting the middle years – p.39

**Aspiration**
- Aspiration inspired by knowledge – p.43
- The taster: aspiration by experience – p.44
- The combo: aspiration inspired by collaborative networks – p.46

Discussion of Canada’s national interventions (p.52-56)
Discussion of the USA’s national interventions (p.56-59)
Discussion of the UK’s national interventions (p.59-63)
Discussion of NZ’s national interventions (p.63-69)

**Core argument:**
“Interventions which foster higher participation are characteristically: (i) collaborative; (ii) early, long-term and sustained; (iii) people-rich; (iv) cohort-based; (v) communicative and informative; (vi) experiential (familiarising students with university sites and how they operate); (vii) cognisant of difference; (viii) academically challenging; and (ix) financially supportive” (p.5). Little systematic evaluation conducted of initiatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context:</strong> DEEWR-funded project: <em>Interventions early in school as a means to improve higher education outcomes for disadvantaged (particularly low SES) students.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> Presents analysis of survey data (26 universities responded = 70% of all Table A universities, reporting on 59 programs) – survey conducted 2008. No responses from TAS/NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methodology:</strong> Online survey/ additional comments emailed directly to research team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Findings:**
- Most initiatives aimed at Year 10
- Most common type = aspiration-raising; financial assistance = least common
- Many = one-off events (tasters/campus visits)
- Equity Units in universities = drive/fund large amount of activity (40%)
- Universities receive between $10,001 and $50,000 per program (most funded for 5 years +) |
- 39% include 20+ schools; 27% involve 6-10 schools
- 31% of programs include 201-500 students
- Low SES = most common target group, then indigenous, then rural/remote
- Most programs were evaluated on basis of participant feedback
- Most common outcome = rise in student aspirations, then better familiarity with admissions/enrolments/procedures (all p.6)

**Institutional Issues**
26 unis, 59 programs. Half of universities reported on one activity; 2 SA unis reported on 6 programs each. 36% direct responsibility of Equity Unit; some indicated collaborative activity with faculty/academics; 5% responsibility of Indigenous Unit. 12% = responsibility of Marketing Dept.
70% of programs started after 2003; 20% started after 2008; 12% = anticipated (2009) start date; 5% started pre-2000
65% = university-initiated; 10% came from school/ 8% from federal gov’t dept./4% from community organisation.
In-house, Equity Units = major funding source
34% of programs = state-wide; 21% in particular area/region/ 35% in particular group of schools; 5% in particular school

**Programmatic issues**
Most common aim = build aspirations (19%) followed by familiarise students with university (17%), career planning (13%), subject-specific intervention (10%), finances/accommodation (12%). 25% focus on improving student achievement.
Most common approach/strategy = school visit by uni staff or students or campus visits. Common approaches = mentoring/working with parents/uni students tutoring school students/scholarships/holiday programs.
83% of programs are evaluated; 71% rely on participant perceptions. Very few programs have publicly-available evaluation reports (often scant in content and narrow in scope). Most evaluations (58%) undertaken by university staff, 33% by program partners, 22% of which by school partners. 9% = undertaken by external evaluators. Figure 15 (p.28 = overview of program outcomes)

**Qualitative data**
Analysis of program titles reveals many different themes, activities and relationships. Qualitative data suggests respondents have a strong commitment to equity work/outreach. Also provide overview of barriers/challenges.

**Core argument:**
Future research agenda could include: investigation of how equity policies are developed; best practices (initiatives and implementation); investigation into extent equity policy is marginalised/mainstreamed in unis; exploration of effect of equity policy on HE ‘market’; research into collaboration between schools and universities; more research into relationship between aspirations and attainment; exploration of long-term effects of outreach (longitudinal research); research-driven interventions to improve equity policies/practices (p.7)

One more characteristic for successful outreach: research-driven interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Context:**
- Presentation on behalf of National VET Equity Advisory Council

**Overview:**
- Design and Evaluation Matrix for Outreach (DEMO): summarised in Figure 1 (p.12)

**Aim:** To offer case studies of leading practice in early intervention/outreach in Australia:
- Access and Success (Victoria University): Sam Sellar and Trevor Gale
- Uni-Reach (Griffith University): Deborah Tranter
- Uni Connections (University of Wollongong, Shoalhaven Campus): Dianne Bills
- Koori Express (RMIT University): Robert Hattam
- Make it Reel (Sydney Summer School Program, University of Technology Sydney): Barbara Comber
- YuMi Deadly Maths (Queensland University of Technology): Sam Sellar and Trevor Gale
- Regional Schools Outreach Program (University of Ballarat): Dianne Bills

**Findings:**
- ‘Equity orientation’ evident in each of case studies is based on 3 characteristics: “researching ‘local knowledge’ and negotiating local interventions; unsettling deficit views; and building capacity in communities, schools and universities” (p.4)

**Core argument:** There is no simple formula for designing successful outreach activities. Activities should involve consultation/partnership with range of stakeholders, secure funding, and “sophisticated equity orientation” (p.5)
AUS

Groups 10 characteristics into four strategies (see Fig.1); program composition = “assessed in terms of a balance between the total number of program characteristics (depth) and the number of program strategies from which they are drawn (breadth)” (p.13) – see Fig.2 (p.14). Both axes measure the number of characteristics (1-10) rather than particular characteristics or strategies. “The strength of a program’s composition increases from Weak, through Moderate and Strong to Very Strong as its depth and breadth increases” (p.14). Weak = 3 or fewer characteristics from just one strategy; Moderate = 3 or more characteristics from at least 2 strategies; Strong = 4 or more characteristics from at least 3 strategies; Very Strong = 5 or more characteristics from all 4 strategies. Program effectiveness connected to ‘comprehensive equity orientation’: unsettling deficit views, researching ‘local’ knowledge, building capacity in communities, schools, universities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assembling resources</th>
<th>Engaging learners</th>
<th>Working together</th>
<th>Building confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People-rich</td>
<td>Recognition of difference</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Communication and information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial support and/or incentives</td>
<td>Enhanced academic curriculum</td>
<td>Cohort-based</td>
<td>Familiarisation/site experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early, long-term, sustained</td>
<td>Research-driven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Core argument: Although research is unable to answer the question ‘how early is too early?’, long term appears to be important (typically beginning in middle school)


Context: Discusses the use of student ambassadors in marketing HE in context of widening participation in STEM outreach in UK in two contrasting universities. Critiques discourses of aspiration as individual improvement project (quotes Burke, 2012). Student ambassadors positioned as aspirational role-models for school pupils. While the research literature suggests that there are benefits to ambassadors, there is less information/research on benefits to/voice of pupils. Ambassadors can be source of hot or warm knowledge

Aim: To trace and analyse discourses around ambassadors and positioning within learning contexts, relationships with pupils and learning that takes place (abstract)
### Theoretical frame:

**Methodology:** Ethnography: 2 year engagement in two London universities (one ‘new’, one ‘old’) in field of WP outreach in STEM in 2008-9 (programs funded by different sources – see p.7). Interviews conducted with 41 pupils/16 ambassadors in old uni/ 71 pupils and 16 ambassadors in new uni. Pupils all Year 8-11 and most students from low SES schools in ‘deprived’ areas of south-east London.

**Findings:** Identifies 4 groups of main learning attributes: process/ location and setting/ purposes/ content.

Discourse analysis

With teachers, Gartland identifies discourse of credentialism as a regime of truth (ambassadors requested to help raise C/D borderline (p.9) – gives examples of ambassadors supporting Year 11 pupils with GCSE Maths exam papers: didactic and formal assessment in school classroom – in this context, ambassadors were viewed as “inadequate substitutes for real teachers” (p.10). Teachers also wary of ambassadors’ ability to ‘teach’ on basis of undergraduate discipline “Positioning ambassadors as teachers simply because of their mathematical expertise is problematic” (p.10) when aim of them being there was to drive up grades. Students’ perceptions of ambassadors (p.10-11). Ambiguity noted in teachers/ organisers’ understandings of ambassador role to manage behaviour. Activities described could be placed on continuum of formal – informal attributes. Example of ‘Train Tracks’ day = informal because no curriculum learning (instead mostly subject learning) with ambivalent purposes (aspiration raising/ subject knowledge/ promoting key messages) – experiential learning. Contrast with Maths Workshops.

**Core argument:** Generalised discourses about ambassadors as aspiration raisers/ role-models = commonplace but no shared understanding of how it works in practice. Stakeholders have vested interests in ambassador work which influences how they are constructed through discourse and positioned in institutional spaces. Positioning of WP in marketing spaces positions pupils as consumers. Dominant discourses of credentialism/ school cultures position ambassadors and pupils in particular ways. “The current government focus on pupils as rational choosers of HE who need access to better information (Department for Business Innovation and Skills [BIS] 2011) entrenches further individualised discourses of pupils as consumers in the HE marketplace” (p.18)

---

### Context:

Seeking to showcase successful mentoring program which takes a different approach [from individualist-neoliberal, deficit-based programs] – takes a cultural wealth approach so as to inspire participants (resisting deficit approaches/ views) and recognise aspiration. AIME connects indigenous school students (Yr 7-12) with university students in 5 Australian states (18 universities in NSW, VIC, SA, WA, QLD and ACT). Program works
from idea ‘indigenous = success’ and recognition of aspiration = foundational. Dominance of western cultural knowledge = imposes white middle class norms. Has produced series of materials; in university, mentors sit with mentees to help complete tasks (uni based); school based = AIME curriculum delivered in schools 2 hours from uni campus. In 2013, 1066 mentors & 2789 mentees = effective for improving school retention and engagement

**Aim:**

**Theoretical frame:** Engages with Appadurai’s theory of the capacity to aspire/ Yosso’s Community Cultural Wealth framework, especially ‘aspirational capital’ (building on Bourdieu, 1986): “an individual’s ability to maintain hope and dreams for the future despite real and perceived obstacles” (p.220)

**Methodology:** Ethnographic observations of 150 AIME sessions (over 56 days/ in 15 uni campuses) = repeat visits. 6 unis = single visit. Semi-structured interviews with 86 mentees and 79 mentors. Also, 91 mentees completed surveys (indigenous/culturally-sensitive)

**Findings:**

AIME “significantly and positively impacts Australian Indigenous high school students’ aspirations to finish school and continue to further study, training or employment” (abstract)

Majority of mentees aspire to complete year 12 (89%)

44% aspire to go to university

74% have clear post-school aspirations

AIME= developing strong(er) sense of self-perception [but notes: no control group; difficult to make substantiated claims]

Qualitative data: macro level= all mentees sign contract: “The philosophy behind the practice is not one of compulsion, but rather, communicating a belief in the young people’s capacity and right to completing their education and exploring further opportunities with employment, training and university” (p.277)

Micro level = program sets high expectations in every AIME day: “At AIME, Stepping up is communicated as a means for developing confidence and skills that underpin success both at school and in future careers” (p.228).

**Core argument:** AIME celebrates aspiration capital of indigenous students by “perpetually link[ing] the past, present and future in aspirational terms, and in so doing, recognise the navigational capacity that the young people already possess” (p.230)

---


**Context:** Explores equity of access and aspirations of low SES students from perspective of mentoring program. They note the focus can be skewed by research and practitioners so that focusing “on the funding and development of programmes, and the construction of evidences of impact, rather than speaking back to the
**context, design and evaluation of an Australian government-funded mentoring programme, Journal of Education Policy and Management, 37(2): 144-158.**

AUS

Keywords: academic performativity; academic practice; de Certeau; equity and access; evidence-based approaches; higher education participation

ASPIRATIONS

deficit discourses that often underpin these agendas “(p.144). Paper situated in 3 levels of context: performative, policy and local. Works from policy moves that have framed outreach in context of raising aspirations

**Aim:** To explore issues in design, implementation and evaluation of mentoring program designed to address low SES representation in HE – working at nexus of aspirations, problems and solutions; to “relays a particular account of the origins of a mentoring programme, the types of impacts that were observed and the efficacy of the data in terms of documenting change” (p.145). Authors note conflict between aspirations agendas and a desire ‘to give voice’ to educationally disadvantaged students and teachers. Locates funding bid as part of ‘new managerialism’, which privileges evidence-based, quantitative research (see Oriel, 2011)

**Theoretical frame:** Take a pragmatic approach to presenting research [basically they reflexively acknowledge the dynamics at stake and selections made to represent the world/ their research/ the mentoring program in particular ways]. Authors explicitly position themselves as locals – low SES/ FiF/ regional students themselves – who interact with school in question on multiple levels (alumni, school council members) and interact with students in local area

**Methodology:** Draws on gov’t policy docs, university funding guidelines, questionnaire responses and interview data. Participants = university staff, school students, school teachers (all partners in mentoring program) 12 Yr 9 students (4 m, 8 f) in pilot chosen on basis of unlikelihood to go to university without intervention but who were seen as ‘on track’ academically (authors note influence of funding criteria as driving these selection criteria). Participants completed pre/post-program questionnaires to measure change (to meet quantitative data requirements of HEPPP funding). 10 completed pre and post questionnaires (8 = matched)

**Findings:** Mentoring program described = HEPPP-funded (partnership component) between university and large local regional secondary school (40% of students = low SES, receiving family payment). Program = Yr 9 “to experience, and gain confidence with, a range of spaces and information” (p.150) = 12 activities over 2 terms done alongside university mentors (but constrained by HEPPP 12-month funding cycle). Questionnaire data: rather than suggesting an increase in students’ desires to go on to HE, the post-program questionnaire shows that from the 4 students who chose uni pre-program, 0 chose it post-program, with a 4-point increase in ‘don’t know’ category. However, qualitative data tells stories of increased confidence and aspirations. Authors argue that ‘don’t know’ could be a more mature response that ‘I’m going to be…’ Offers case study of two students (Aden and Charlie) – both from 4-children, single parent families.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core argument:</th>
<th>Quantitative funding frame and reliance on numerical data as indicative of tracking and change= “is likely to underestimate the significance of smaller qualitative changes” (p.156). Authors argue for power of small changes, rather than ‘education revolutions’.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Naylor, R.; Baik, C.; & James, R. (2013). Developing a Critical Interventions Framework for advancing equity in Australian higher education. Melbourne: Centre for the Study of Higher Education.** | **Aim:** To add to the evidence base – to help build a stronger platform for research and evaluation  
**Context:** Critical Interventions Framework (CIF) was designed “to assist in advancing equity in higher education” (p.5). Report includes – summary of patterns of access and participation post-Bradley Review, literature review, typology of equity initiatives (CIF), summary of plausibility and evidence base for initiatives in CIF, broad summary of national patterns of equity initiatives (analysis of HEPPP reports) against CIF.  
**Access/Participation since Bradley Review:** uncapping system (demand-driven system) “may have been the single most significant factor in the rising numbers of students from equity target groups who have been admitted to higher education” (p.5), but rise in numbers = “across the board”, meaning that proportional representation has not changed. HEPPP funding has allowed “institutions, often working in partnerships, to influence particular key points in the student ‘life cycle’ to encourage more students from equity target groups to, among other things, consider higher education to be a possibility for them, to build academic attainment and to be more fully conversant with the opportunities available to them” (p.6).  
**Key issues**  
Student share (1.0 = parity):  
- low SES = 0.62  
- indigenous = 0.55  
- remote = 0.39  

2  
**CIF typology** (Fig. 1.1): 1) plausibility or theoretical case for types of equity initiatives based on timing and method; 2) available evidence on effectiveness; 3) analysis of HEPPP reports  
Typology “derived from widespread assumptions about potential barriers or inhibitors for low SES students rather than a comprehensive empirical conception of the terrain, for none exists” (p.9). Literature suggests there are 5 broad periods in a student’s life cycle: a) prior to seeking access, b) at point of selection/admissions, c) during transition, d) during studies, e) post-completion period of finding work. Outreach is core of initiatives for aspiration-raising but there is little effectiveness. Literature points to school performance/ low SES so there is “an argument for implementing early initiatives aimed at improving students’ academic achievement and year 12 retention rates; scholarships/ financial support are important but cost might not be the only barrier to
participation. Literature strongly supports idea that transition/orientation initiatives are valuable. Evidence suggests that low SES students less likely to make use of support services – better/ more extensive support services doesn’t necessarily increase retention.

Prior to starting HE – discussion of Year 12 (p.15); aspirations (p.16); VET-HE (p.17)
Selection/ Admissions – scholarships and grants (p.18-9)

During transition – transition/ transition programs (p.19-20)

During studies – effective factors in successful completion for low SES, childcare, mature age, not seeking/using support services p.21-2

Methodology: Draws on gov’t (DIIRSRTE) data to examine % representation. Two methods use for determining low SES: postcode and census collection districts (CD measure) = see page 31-2. Examined 38 HEPPP reports for 2011

Findings: Data analysis shows that population parity was still far off in 2011 (disability = 5.07 std pop v. 10.6% Aus pop; indigenous = = 1.38 std pop v. 2.5% Aus pop; NESB = = 3.1 std pop v. 3.8% Aus pop; WINTA = = 17.47 std pop v. 50.6% Aus pop; low SES = = 16.76 std pop v. 25% Aus pop; Regional = 18.63 std pop v. 29% Aus pop; Remote = 0.91 std pop v. 2.3% Aus pop). Students from equity groups “are almost as likely to successfully complete their studies as any other student” (p.25) – but see lower retention and success rates of indigenous students and attrition rates of remote students, especially in Year 1. Chapter 4: CIF and evidence/ plausibility table.

Chapter 5: Distribution of HEPPP against CIF. 49.3% of HEPPP = pre-entry initiatives; 34.5% on post-entry and 16.2% on costs associated with management of equity programs. Highest % of HEPPP funding spent on provision of student services, scholarships and later-year outreach to schools. Lowest % was spent on marketing, school curriculum enhancement and adult ed outreach


Context: Offers reflection on one approach to supporting diverse students in Australian university (presumably UOW), based on community of practice model. Notes need for students to be inculcated into university practices/ routines/ conventions etc. Discusses transition program = ‘Uni-Start’ (began in 2007) which drew “on the experiences of the experts within the university community to provide the skills and knowledge necessary for the “novice” or newcomer to cope with this new environment” (p.153). Set in context of increased participation in HE and in the marketised HE sector (student-as-client and brand establishment) – working towards call for need to understand importance of student-institution relationships and communication. Cites AUSSE statistics from 2010 that suggest students were unhappy with level of familiarity with staff – many had not received
| Keywords. higher education; peer-led support; transition; orientation; student equity | ‘timely’ feedback from teachers, and a decreasing number believe their teacher knows their name (“sense of isolation and disjuncture” (p.154)) – foregrounds need to attend to social dimension of transition/learning
Aim:
Theoretical frame: Based on Lave and Wenger’s concept of communities of practice, which are “built on the idea of shared understandings that characterize an environment, much of which is not taught formally” (p.154)
Methodology:
Findings: Uni-Start = 2-day program: systematic and individualised approach: students encouraged to learn in socially situated context. Program = led by student facilitators (students in higher years of study) who apply for the position and are trained in adult learning principles/techniques for facilitation/given book vouchers as incentive-payment: “This peer-led transition program utilizes experiential, situated learning activities, building on a constructivist approach that recognizes the need for learning to be situated within the environment where these new skills and knowledge will be used” (p.155). Program content based on what student-facilitators view as ‘missing’ and engage new students in ‘meaningful dialogue’. New students encouraged to reflect on skills and knowledges they bring to university. Activities include: ice-breakers, orientation/scavenger hunts/trivia tests; also, sometimes = presentations on university terminology/essay writing etc. (decided by student facilitators). Discussion of evaluations and feedback gained: mostly satisfied and considered relevant. Follow up phone call data = all students would recommend attending the program. More discipline-specific focus desired. Opportunity for student-facilitators to ‘give back’ = “unexpected outcome” (p.157). ‘A number of’ facilitators expressed that they would be happy to do it in voluntary capacity
Limitations: Very descriptive, not very reflective or critical, not much actual description of what happens, limited/not-super-robust empirical work – unclear = methodology/ethics. |
| --- | --- |
| Peacock, D.; Sellar, S.; & Lingard, B. (2014). The activation, appropriation and practices of student-equity policy in Australian higher education. *Journal of Educational Policy*, 29(3): 377-396. AUS | **Context:** Explores student-equity policy and practice in Queensland in two universities (one is UQ, the other a smaller/newer metro QLD university) and including the Queensland consortium, focusing on low SES students. Makes point – drawing on Bourdieu – that in the contested field of academia, there will always be elite/isolated institutions and less autonomous/more networked institutions – this is rationale for choice of case study institutions – but the creation of a state-wide consortium suggests possibility of collaborative practices and enactments of policy. HEPPP encourage(s/d) competitive market for low SES students.
Aim: To trace the activation and appropriation of student-equity across different stakeholders in one state of Australia |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keywords: higher education; equity policy; institutional ethnography; student recruitment; university outreach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theoretical frame:</strong> Draws on Bourdieu’s conceptual tool of the contested field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methodology:</strong> Employs Smith’s (2005) institutional ethnography “to map how student-equity workers’ local practices are articulated and aligned, via the locally produced policy statements of the Group, to federally established social inclusion targets for each university and to the accomplishment of ruling neoliberal policy relations established by the federal government” (p.379). Key = tracing the coordination of activities to ‘ruling relations’ = capitalist societies, which are “text-mediated” systems of communication, knowledge, information, regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings:</strong> The consortium split up the schools in the state and assigned them to universities – working to negate the negative impact of competition – but left a clause in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that permitted competition [poaching] when a student expressed interest in a university outside of the ‘catchment’ area their school fell in. Discusses the enactments of student-equity policy - partnership component of HEPPP:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• UQ: restricted their outreach to Year 10-12 and some outreach in Year 8-9 (but much smaller), No primary school outreach. UQ based equity outreach on targeting ‘best and brightest’ low SES students (but did not change entrance requirements; hence forcing low SES students to adapt – see p.388). UQ were keen to shift their mix of students, rather than grow (because they were in process of reducing UG numbers and increasing PG numbers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ‘Dawson’: engaged in outreach from Year 6-12 (aka: primary and secondary) and engaged in this work so as to “grow strongly”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The UQ consortium were able to collectively appropriate federal policy in 5 ways:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Chair of the Group advocated for more collaborative, non-competitive funding which impacted on final HEPPP guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Government encouraged remaining states/territories to collaborate similarly to QLD consortium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) The Group was consulted on key elements of HEPPP, such as being able to move participation funding into partnership funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Despite indigenous students not being part of HEPPP (because ISP offers separate funding), the Group made this a part of their (successful) bid and thus refracted/ reappropriated policy to suit indigenous students/ units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Due to cooperation, most of partnership funding went to regional universities [who are perhaps less competitive than Go8s/research intensive universities??]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core argument:</strong> Tension in both case study universities around outreach/widening participation practices and recruitment (made clear in UQ’s persistent poaching of ‘best and brightest’ from Dawson’s school pool). In the context described (UQ consortium), collaborative equity practice is OK as long as it doesn’t challenge the status quo: “Cooperative student-equity practices amongst universities become strained, however, where there is a potential change in the allocation of academic and reputational capital within the field and a disturbance to the existing institutional hierarchy of the field” (p.390)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context:</strong> Examines ‘UniReady for Multicultural Groups’ at UniSA (in Whyalla) – aim is to attract ‘immigrant families’ to university. Pilot study = introduced participants to [idea of?] university study, degrees available and future planning for university. Set in context of widening participation. According to ABS data, in 2010, 719,600 migrants (unclear how they arrived; presumably economic migrants??) – 76% = born in LBOTE countries; 91% 15-41 years of age on arrival. 477,800 = temporary visas [457 visas??]. Describes educational backgrounds (e.g. 65% had ‘non-school qualification; 31% had received non-school qualifications since arriving in Australia; 46% of whom = BA or higher) – but unclear if these numbers include NES (UK/CAN/US etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theoretical frame:</strong> None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methodology:</strong> 15/18 (83%) community members participated in pilot program = paper draws on experiences of participants and 4 staff members. Survey tool used = quantitative and qualitative data collected. Program advertised via flyers [unclear if these were translated]. Program consisted of 5 hours = intro to program, intro to pathways to study, discipline information sessions for Foundation studies, Engineering, Business, Social Work and Nursing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings:</strong> Potential students: Most important information = ‘how to get started’ and clarity of information given. Staff: “reported the need to encourage people to consider studying in the area of Business” (p.76) and ‘opportunity to spread the word’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limitations:</strong> Program = recruitment exercise; little attention given to nuanced differences between national groups; very small mention of language barriers (not included as part of ‘empirical work’). No acknowledgement of who authors are and where they are located.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context:</strong> Discusses a model of ‘engaged outreach’ –based on principles of community engagement to develop stronger links between universities and local communities –as an alternative to traditional outreach. Outreach program is specifically focused on two Pacific Island communities in southeast QLD (area of ‘high social deprivation’). Purposes of outreach = building aspirations and increasing access to HE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theoretical frame: Initiative based on notion of ‘engaged scholarship’: “engaged outreach seeks to promote a framework based on active engagement with multiple stakeholders, who work collaboratively to address factors impacting on higher education access” (p.60) – working with broad group of stakeholders – developing a sense of [co-]ownership of the program

Methodology: 2-year study to develop engaged outreach with two identified communities (based on a view of multiple disadvantage: low SES/CALD). Intentional move away from school-based outreach to collaboration and negotiation with range of stakeholders (see fig. p.63) = community-based participatory action research approach

Stage 1: preliminary scan of area for issues relating to access to HE for CALD communities = informal meetings with 76 different people (via snowball recruitment). Stage 2: interviews/ committee meetings/ literature review. Also recruitment of community liaison officers and community leaders identified. Stage 3: stakeholder analysis, community leaders’ workshop, action planning meetings. 24 interviews conducted in Stage 2: 11 young people/13 parents

Findings:
1. Access to HE is an issue for low SES/ CALD students
2. Lack of RPL = issue for adults from these communities
3. English language proficiency and time needed to acquire appropriate level for tertiary study = concern for many

Findings specific to Pacific Islander participants:
- Cost = significant issue
- Parental involvement in children’s education = minimal
- School engagement and attainment = ‘major issue’
- HE perceived to take a lot of time and investment and thus, while highly regarded, HE = not always prioritised
- Few HE-educated role models in the communities studied

Three key strategies identified through community consultation:
- Provision of accessible information
- Provision of better support at school
- Raise aspiration to higher education

Limitations: time-frame of project; research fatigue for community; unreliable participants; concerns regarding validity - possible sample bias because many were reluctant to talk

Core argument: “Key to facilitating increased access is a comprehensive understanding of current community attitudes and aspirations towards higher education and of the specific constraints impacting on higher education access” (p.71)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context: ‘Practice Report’. Working from context of underrepresentation of equity groups, especially in Group of Eight universities, the paper offers strategies for forming productive relationships with partner schools to widen participation = Aspire UWA program, which has partnerships with 24 schools (6 in rural area, 18 in outer-metropolitan Perth). Aims to raise aspirations with students from Year 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aim:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical frame: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology: Description of program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion/ description:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWA Aspire = outreach program. Started in 2009 directly due to Bradley Review targets [and new compacts and HEPPP presumably]. Program “aims to raise aspirations and improve academic readiness of students in high schools with a low transfer to higher education” (p.78). Has been ‘received enthusiastically’ by schools = program has ‘whole of university’ approach via reference groups with various schools and faculties. There is also teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AUS**

**Keywords:** disadvantage; class; participation in higher education; community-based education; aspirations

**Keywords:** disadvantage, higher education, aspirations, class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context:</strong></td>
<td>Community-based university study. In context of Australia, which is “deeply confused and conflicted around a policy discourse of inclusion that is sutured within an existential context heavily committed to the tenets of neoliberalism” (p.155). For low SES students in particular (authors problematise this term and ‘disadvantaged’) it is difficult to access university (as seen in steady figures of under-representation of people from lowest SES quartile). Authors describe misappropriation of ‘social justice’ orientations into neoliberal discourses/policies as “The middle class has become somewhat adept at pursuing its own interests, while at the same time, seeking to claim otherwise” (p.156) = concealment of power. Class = relational and lived (not a set of attributes or characteristics). Offers critique of higher education as high level exercise in power – particularly seeking to conceal admissions procedures, in particular the lack of nuance in the use of ATAR: “The short story about what is problematic about the ATAR is that it pays no heed to socio-cultural circumstances”(p.158). Describes neoliberalism as “re-framing identity by inscribing it with a particular ensemble of notions: the supremacy of invisible market forces as the ultimate means of regulating all social activities; the inevitability of competition as a result of the operation of global forces; the retreat of the state to a focus on performative policy indicators; success based on meritocracy with rewards following by dint of personal efforts; and the cultivation of an entrepreneurial self through self-responsibilisation” (p.159). Neoliberalism forces the blame for ‘failure’ on students for having made ‘bad choices’ and positions them as ‘flawed consumers’ (Bauman, 2007).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong></td>
<td>To explore experiences of one student (case study) who took part in community-based program and challenges and obstacles he faced because of HE system and neoliberal policy discourses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theoretical frame:</strong></td>
<td>Takes a ‘capacities’ approach (as opposed to focus on barriers) – see Sellar and Gale (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methodology:</strong></td>
<td>To describe BA_Griffin (community engagement program: not its real name) – aimed at young people without conventional entry requirements (e.g. not good VCE preparation) in low SES regional city in Victoria. Students accepted into program on basis of EOI and/or recommendation of someone who knew them well. Program based on pedagogical model = democratic and engaging and uses familiar school/community settings: 3 hour workshop based on ‘critical dialogue’ model (critical pedagogical underpinnings). Not presented as second chance education; “The key aim of the programme is to prepare students to succeed in a mainstream university setting in second year and have flexibility in programme choice” (p.163). Paper draws from larger critical ethnographic longitudinal tracking study over 3 years (same students into UG study). Presents case study of ‘Jake’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

sally.baker@unsw.edu.au
Findings:
Challenges faced by Jake = the volume and diversity of reading to be undertaken and the new experience of writing and referencing essays
Jake drew on peers, support staff in program (teachers in secondary college + UG students from university)...
interesting silence on academic staff
Suggestion that direct school-university transition = ‘too daunting’.
Analysis = Jake = missed out on ‘the structure of feeling’ (Williams, 1989) that makes university feel ‘normal’ or ritualized and he has lack of access to grapevine knowledge. Jake had to move away from friends/old peers, “and he had to sacrifice old values for the new ones he was taking on” (p.167).
Core argument: Common elements of participating in BA-Griffin = familial/community expectations of reproduction of working-class lives; working-class educations = typical focus on vocational education (‘hands on’ stream); ‘fitting in’ = related to home/working-class identities and perceptions of (from students, cultivated by institutions?) higher education

Aim: Identifies key issues to assist practitioners – commissioning/planning/starting evaluations of equity initiatives
Core argument:
Evaluation in general: “requires systematic, rigorous and objective approaches to answer specific questions about how well initiatives and strategies are working” (p.1). Evaluation should be: scoped, planned, reported on. Need clarity on objectives. Evaluations = address performance at different levels of ‘performance hierarchy’ (inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, impacts). Evaluation should address each individual objective.
Equity evaluations: needs conceptual frameworks; clear identification of equity groups in planning stages should be matched in monitoring/evaluation; engaging in research analysis can help to differentiate disadvantaged students and see who benefits from interventions
Student equity evaluations; equity-focused initiatives grouped as outreach, access, support; understanding those who do/don’t enroll is important; contribution analysis could enable the significance/ interplay of participation, retention and success; Group of Eight proposed evaluation framework for equity initiatives.
Offers list of references relating to evaluation. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context:</strong> Examines federal policies which relate to students’ aspirations for university – Transforming Australian HE (2009), based on Bradley review – SES targets – cites Bok’s critique of the individual nature of this policy, which fails to recognise the social and cultural/complex community connections with aspirations. Based on <strong>Aim:</strong> To explore intersections between pedagogical practices, curriculum based on a well-being framework, and the shaping of subjectivities and aspirations of young people in a region characterised by socio-economic challenge (abstract)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assumptions:</strong> aspiration is social/cultural – not individual; last 2 years of school = too late for outreach; action research facilitates ‘professional conversations’ which enables change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thematic frame:</strong> Well-being, based on South Australian DECS Learner Well-being Framework (2007). <strong>Methodology:</strong> Draws from data collected in ‘School of Education Aspirations Project’ (SEAP) 2-year case study/action research project in high school (R-12) in South Australia (2010 = 4 networks of schools; 2011 = 6 networks). Data include: narratives, field notes, student work samples and professional conversations (abstract). Series of interventions in curriculum were co-designed with schools, including experiential learning for schools teachers, school and university students; curriculum redesigns and “a performative expectation for student learning” (p.934). School described = 40% of students have school cards (low SES marker) and increasing number = NESB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings:</strong> 3 themes: Pedagogies and learning activities, Relationships, caring and connections, Places, spaces and belonging. Describes pedagogical strategies of ‘Dee’ with critical support from ‘Marnie’ = Dee believes that self-awareness is key to aspirations: “Explicit teaching and learning included work on ‘strengths and values’ resource cards, learning styles, aspirations and student conceptualisations of well-being” (p.937) and catered to diverse learning styles. Connections made to Dee’s recognition of emotional and modeling role she plays in classroom. Also foregrounds Dee’s belief in place-based experiences – worked hard to create a sense of belonging and social/emotional connectivity. Part of project = university visits as part of Group Adventure Initiative Tasks (GAITs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Core argument:** Low SES students have aspirations. Foregrounds importance of identity and subjectivity to aspiration-forming. Pedagogy and curriculum are significant for student engagement; the role of the teacher is highly important in social and emotional domains “which connect student life-worlds within their particular contexts, building cultural capital and broadening capabilities, self-awareness, aspirations and achievement” (abstract). “…a sense of ‘place’ underpinned Dee’s classroom curriculum and was strengthened through socially critically pedagogies that incorporated, developing student voice around how they learn, building emotional
connectivity and relational trust within the classroom community, developing a sense of student ownership, identity and belonging and creating spaces for dialogue” (p.943)