Appendices

Supplementary Materials

Table A

Sub-Sample Analysis of Model VI

Variable	Model VI — All	Model VI — Urban	Model VI — Reg & Remote	Model VI — WP Schools	Model VI WP Schools — Urban	Model VI WP Schools — Reg & Remote
(OP+IBD)/SEP	0.746***	0.762***	0.697***	0.601***	0.417***	0.685***
	(61.685)	(44.752)	(40.383)	(27.097)	(9.543)	(26.030)
Region (Base = Metro)						
Regional	-0.064***	-	-	-0.036***	-	-
	(-13.578)	-	-	(-3.990)	-	-
Remote	-0.053***	-	0.001	-0.017	-	0.022**
	(-4.729)	-	(0.154)	(-1.225)	-	(2.216)
IRSAD quartile (Base = highest)						
4th quartile (lowest)	-0.035***	-0.005	-0.006	-0.062***	-0.076***	-0.013
	(-5.667)	(-0.563)	(-0.338)	(-5.811)	(-5.925)	(-1.395)
3rd quartile	-0.047***	-0.056***	0.000	-0.064***	-0.067***	-0.020**
	(-8.192)	(-6.821)	(0.029)	(-5.873)	(-4.676)	(-1.998)
2nd quartile	-0.045***	-0.048***	0.005	-0.057***	-0.058***	-
	(-8.856)	(-7.750)	(0.303)	(-5.079)	(-4.550)	-
New Engage Yr12 Depth (Base = no engage)						
Low engage	-0.007	0.003	-0.009	-0.012*	-0.007	-0.009
	(-0.837)	(0.135)	(-1.139)	(-1.819)	(-0.511)	(-1.222)
Medium engage	0.006	0.021	-0.006	0.004	0.019	-0.005
	(0.703)	(1.420)	(-0.597)	(0.605)	(1.520)	(-0.535)
High engage	0.027*	0.046**	0.034	0.027**	0.045**	0.028
	(1.825)	(2.272)	(0.834)	(2.312)	(2.134)	(0.811)
Constant	0.101***	0.088***	0.031	0.212***	0.299***	0.080***
	(8.277)	(5.071)	(1.528)	(9.332)	(7.721)	(3.336)
N	2,662	1,446	1,216	928	308	620
r2	0.83	0.82	0.81	0.63	0.50	0.70

Note: Parameter estimates, with t-values in parentheses. ***, ** and * denote the statistical significance at one, five and ten percent levels, respectively.

Table B

Institutional Factor Analysis: Urban and RRR Differentials

THEMES RELEVANT TO SCHOOL CASE STUDIES	URBAN EXPERIENCE		REGIONAL EXPERIENCE		DIFFERENTIAL
	Prominence	Most Observed Sentiment	Prominence	Most Observed Sentiment	
PROGRAM DESIGN					
I.a. Duration and depth/intensity	HIGH	Positive	HIGH	Neutral	✓ sentiment
I.b. Cohort or opt-in, rigid scaffold vs. menu style	MODERATE	Positive	MODERATE	Positive	
I.c. Size of Cluster	MODERATE	Positive	MODERATE	Negative	✓ sentiment
I.d. Intersection with marketing and other non-WP activities	HIGH	Positive	HIGH	Neutral	✓ sentiment
DEGREE OF ENGAGEMENT BY SCHOOLS					
I.e. Strategic integration of WP program	HIGH	Positive	HIGH	Neutral	✓ sentiment
I.f. Partnership arrangements	HIGH	Neutral	HIGH	Neutral	
I.g. Support by school leadership	MODERATE	Positive	MODERATE	Positive	
I.h. Parental engagement with WP programs	MODERATE	Neutral	MODERATE	Neutral	
FUNDING LEVELS					
I.i. Consortium vs 2015 and beyond	MODERATE	Positive	MODERATE	Neutral	✓ sentiment
I.j. Non-program funding	LOW	Neutral	LOW	Neutral	
IMPLEMENTATION					
I.k. Challenges during implementation	MODERATE	Neutral	MODERATE	Neutral	
I.l. Coordination and program logistics	LOW	Negative	LOW	Negative	
I.m. Staff turnover of WP program officers	LOW	Neutral	LOW	Negative	✓ sentiment

Sentiment Key: 🙂 Positive 😐 Neutral 🙁 Negative

Appendices (Supplementary Materials)
Zacharias, N., & Mitchell, G. (2020). The importance of highly engaged school-university partnerships in widening participation outreach. *Student Success*, *11*(1), 35-45. https://doi.org/10.5204/ssj.v11i1.1458

Table C

Impact of Widening Participation Program — School Case Studies

THEMES RELEVANT TO SCHOOL CASE STUDIES	URBAN EXPERIENCE		REGIONAL EXPERIENCE		DIFFERENTIAL
	Prominence	Most Observed Sentiment	Prominence	Most Observed Sentiment	
IV.a. Demystify university as a post-school option	HIGH	☺	MODERATE	☺	✓
IV.b. Changes in student attitudes and/or behaviour	MODERATE	☺	LOW	☺	✓
IV.c. Changes in parent attitudes and/or behaviour	LOW	☺	LOW	☺	
IV.d. Changes in school culture and/or reputation	LOW	☺	LOW	☺	
IV.e. Changes in understanding of post-school options and pathways	HIGH	☺	MODERATE	😐	✓
IV.f. Changes in ability to navigate secondary and tertiary education systems	LOW	☺	LOW	☺	
IV.g. Changes in applications to university	LOW	☺	LOW	☺	
IV.h. Changes in student achievement levels	N/A		LOW	☺	✓
IV.i. Presence of university within the school	MODERATE	☺	LOW	☺	✓
IV.j. Improved transition to university	LOW	☺	LOW	☺	
IV.k. Specific WP activities or strategies that made a difference	HIGH	☺	MODERATE	☺	✓
IV.l. Impact of WP program on different sub-groups	LOW	☺	MODERATE	☺	✓

Sentiment Key: ☺ Positive   😐 Neutral   ☹ Negative

Appendices (Supplementary Materials)
Zacharias, N., & Mitchell, G. (2020). The importance of highly engaged school-university partnerships in widening participation outreach. *Student Success*, *11*(1), 35-45. https://doi.org/10.5204/ssj.v11i1.1458

Table D

Impact of the Widening Participation Program — Current University Students

THEMES RELEVANT TO UNI STUDENT SAMPLE	URBAN EXPERIENCE		REGIONAL EXPERIENCE		DIFFERENTIAL
	Prominence	Most Observed Sentiment	Prominence	Most Observed Sentiment	
IV.a. Demystify university as a post-school option	MODERATE	🙁 Negative	MODERATE	🙁 Negative	
IV.b. Changes in student attitudes and/or behaviour	MODERATE	🙂 Positive	LOW	🙁 Negative	✓
IV.e. Changes in understanding of post-school options and pathways	MODERATE	🙂 Positive	MODERATE	🙂 Positive	
IV.f. Changes in ability to navigate secondary and tertiary education systems	MODERATE	🙂 Positive	MODERATE	🙂 Positive	
IV.h. Changes in student achievement levels	N/A		LOW	🙂 Positive	✓
IV.i. Presence of university within the school	LOW	😐 Neutral	LOW	😐 Neutral	
IV.j. Improved transition to university	MODERATE	🙂 Positive	MODERATE	🙂 Positive	
IV.k. Specific WP activities or strategies that made a difference	HIGH	🙂 Positive	HIGH	🙂 Positive	
IV.l. Impact of WP program on different sub-groups	LOW	🙂 Positive	LOW	🙂 Positive	

Sentiment Key: 🙂 Positive   😐 Neutral   🙁 Negative

Appendices (Supplementary Materials)
Zacharias, N., & Mitchell, G. (2020). The importance of highly engaged school-university partnerships in widening participation outreach. *Student Success*, *11*(1), 35-45. https://doi.org/10.5204/ssj.v11i1.1458