

Sheffield Hallam University Evaluation Repository: Submitting an Item

Step 1: Read the guidance and contact STEER

A detailed overview of the process of submitting items to the evaluation repository is provided in this document, while the steps involved are also [covered in a video on the site](#). Prior to submitting, we encourage authors of evaluations to look at the guidance on the submission process and, if they have not already done so, to arrange to speak with a member of STEER by contacting us at evaluationrepository@shu.ac.uk. This will provide an opportunity to ask any questions about the repository and to clarify any expectations about the submission process.

Step 2: Complete the online submission form

Authors are required to outline the key details of the evaluation and to upload any relevant outputs (e.g. report, briefing, presentation) by [submitting this online form and providing the following information](#):

- the title and authors of the evaluation;
- key terms (ideas and topics) that define the evaluation;
- the start and finish dates of the evaluation;
- stage of the student lifecycle the evaluation relates to (if any);
- the type of evaluation evidence and the claims that are being made;
- if ethical approval was received for the evaluation;
- the abstract, which briefly highlights the evaluation purpose, key evaluation questions, evaluation findings and recommendations;
- any relevant documentation and outputs, such as the evaluation report or briefing.

Step 3: The submission will be reviewed

Once submitted, the submission will be 'screened' by a member of STEER to ensure that the submission is broadly suitable for inclusion, where the following criteria will need to be met:

Initial criteria

- The project or work that has been undertaken is focused on the evaluation¹ of an intervention.
- Author(s) submitting the item must be a staff member or student at Sheffield Hallam University or a partnership organisation (e.g. Sheffield Hallam Students' Union, HeppSY, Hepp).
- The item being submitted is the work of the author.
- The evaluation must be written in English.
- The phase or entire evaluation must have been completed.
- The evaluation item must be unpublished (i.e. it has not been published elsewhere).
- The evaluation has received ethical approval where it is required².

Following the initial screening, the content of the output will be checked more thoroughly by a reviewer. The purpose of this review is to ensure that the submission is sufficiently detailed to help users understand the evaluation and the evidence that was generated.

Each submission also needs to demonstrate that it meets a set of expectations relating to evaluation practices, which are in place to ensure that the evidence base on the repository is relatively robust. Within each submission and any outputs which are attached, the following expectations should ideally be met:

Expectation

- The issue or challenge that is being addressed through the intervention has been articulated, alongside the reasons why this is necessary.
- The changes that are anticipated through the intervention have been identified (the outcomes) and a description is provided of how the intervention is expected to achieve those changes.

¹ 'Evaluation involves making judgements about the merit, value, significance, credibility, and utility of whatever is being evaluated: for example, a program, a policy, a product, or the performance of a person or team' (Patton).

² Ethical approval is expected for all evaluations that involve primary data collection and secondary data (data that has already been collected through primary sources (e.g., by other researchers) that is accessible for others to use). There could be some examples of projects where ethical approval is not necessary but this will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

- It is clear how existing evidence has been used to inform the evaluation and to show why the intended changes are realistic. In the absence of any existing evidence to provide this support, the assumptions about how the intervention is expected to work and how the changes will happen have been stated.
- The questions that the evaluation is aiming to address have been articulated (see [Better Evaluation for further information about evaluation questions](#)).
- Decisions about the evaluation methodology (e.g., data collection methods, analytical approach, data sources) have been clearly communicated and explained to allow others to understand and interpret the work that has taken place.
- A description is provided of the procedures in place for addressing relevant ethical considerations (for example, consent, confidentiality, transparency in data use).
- Acknowledgement of limitations associated with the evaluation methodology and approach.
- The evidence gathered has been analysed appropriately, the findings address the evaluation questions and cover any expected and unexpected results (for example, if something has not worked or if the evidence is inconclusive).
- Conclusions made are reasonable considering the quality of evidence that has been generated.

The reviewer will follow a set of guidelines based around these expectations and the author will be notified of the outcome. If the reviewer has identified any areas where particular aspect(s) do not appear to have been met, or if clarification on a matter is needed, the author will have the opportunity to resubmit or provide further information. If there is a disagreement about the outcome, the reviewer and/or the author will have the option to escalate the review to the Head of Research and Evaluation to resolve the matter (please see Figure 1, which provides a process map diagram).

Step 4: If the submission is accepted, the item will be uploaded onto the evaluation repository

If the submission is accepted, the item will be uploaded onto the evaluation repository and the author will be notified by email when this has happened. At this point, the evaluation will have a unique page on the repository site that will display its details and it will appear on external scholarly indexes (e.g., Google Scholar). This will hopefully help audiences use the learning for their own practice, provide greater visibility, awareness and take up of 'what works' in different contexts, and raise the profile of the work that has been undertaken.

Please get in contact with us at evaluationrepository@shu.ac.uk if you have any questions about the evaluation repository in general or specifically about the submission process.

Proposed submission and review process (Figure 1)

