

Measuring the contribution of culture and sport to outcomes

The current context: stage one research

Final report

Yvonne Barker and Angela Watson
Associate Consultants

February 2010

Contents

Executive summary	3
Introduction	6
Methodology	7
Analysis of the current position	8
Key findings	8
Examples from the culture and sport sector	11
Examples from other sectors	40
Drivers, learning points and challenges	48
Conclusions and recommendations	52
Appendix 1 – List of consultees	53

Executive summary

This research report presents the findings and recommendations from stage one of the 'Measuring the Contribution of Culture and Sport to Outcomes' Project. It has been produced by the Improvement and Development Agency (IDeA) on behalf of Arts Council England, English Heritage, the Museums, Libraries and Archives Council, Sport England and the Department for Culture, Media and Sport.

The overall project aim is:

'To develop and provide an appropriate form of guidance and support to assist the culture and sport sector to better measure and evidence its contribution to local priority outcomes as efficiently as possible from April 2011'.

The objectives of stage one of the project are to:

- understand where we are now and provide a composite view on the state of progress in measuring the contribution of culture and sport to wider outcomes
- identify good and/or new practice in this area
- recommend whether the project should proceed to the next stage: the development of a model or framework.

The research methodology consisted of desk based research supported by telephone and face to face consultation. Consultees included representatives from local authorities, the cultural non departmental public bodies, lottery distributors, cultural trusts, sports partnerships, the Department for Culture, Media and Sport and consultants. Preliminary findings were also presented to an 'Expert Panel' prior to preparation of the final report.

Analysis of the current position

Our research and consultation identified that a wide range of activity is taking place across the culture and sport sector that is defined¹ as an 'outcome based approach' and that seeks to demonstrate the impact of culture and sport on wider socio-economic outcomes. There is no single consistent outcome based approach in use in the sector, although there are similarities between many of the approaches being developed and implemented.

From the examples we reviewed we found differences between the:

- overall approaches (frameworks, models, tools, repeated or longitudinal research)
- the level they are being used (project/programme, individual service, cross cultural service/directorate, whole organisation, sub regional/regional/national)
- the types of outcomes being measured.

We found inconsistent use of common terms and different definitions relating to outcome measurement across the sector, along with patchy reporting of the findings from outcome based approaches.

¹ As described by the organisations developing and implementing the approach.

It is also clear that development and implementation of outcome based approaches within the culture and sport sector are at an early stage, meaning that the effectiveness of the different approaches is not yet known.

Our review of approaches to outcome measurement in other sectors, particularly in the health, children and young people and adult social care sectors, identified similarly diverse examples but again some common strands.

An overview table showing outcome based approaches in the culture and sport sector, along with a brief description of each example reviewed from within and outside of culture and sport, is contained in the main report.

Drivers, learning points and challenges in measuring outcomes

Consultation with local authorities and other organisations revealed several reasons why they are developing or using outcome based approaches for culture and sport. These include to:

- support advocacy and position the sector
- respond to financial pressures
- improve performance management
- drive better commissioning of culture and sport
- show accountability for public funding.

Most local authorities and organisations could identify aspects of their outcome based approach that had worked well and others could learn from. The main learning points that will need to be taken into account in the development of any new outcomes framework for the sector are:

- involve local partners in the development process
- strike a balance between flexibility and standardisation
- make sure the ease and cost of data collection are proportionate
- provide effective leadership.

Despite the progress and learning by organisations already involved in developing outcome based approaches for culture and sport, significant challenges remain. These include issues around:

- how to collect and collate consistent data and interpret it, along with the sector's capacity to do so
- the weakness of the existing evidence base in culture and sport
- the length of time sometimes needed to show an impact on life outcomes
- reporting arrangements that may not lend themselves to showing the impact of culture and sport.

Conclusions and recommendations

The review of outcome based approaches has identified that significant effort is being made by local authorities and other organisations to improve outcome measurement. Within the examples we considered we found some potentially robust and workable approaches. However, within culture and sport because so many are in their first year of implementation, or are only just being developed and piloted, their full effectiveness is not yet known.

Analysis of the constituent elements of the many different outcome based approaches reviewed does reveal some commonalities. These include:

- clear identification of different 'tiers' of measurement and related performance measures
- the use of logic models, linking activity to outputs and outcomes, supported by evidence
- recognition of differences between individual and wider community outcomes
- creation of 'menus' of outcome indicators to select from, enabling local priorities to be reflected
- the provision of tools or guidance to support the adoption and implementation of outcome based approaches.

Most people involved in our research felt that developing a consistent outcomes framework for culture and sport would be valued and that there was merit in progressing to the next stage of the project. However, this was qualified by a widely held view that significant flexibility would be needed to ensure a single outcomes framework for the sector could accommodate differing local priorities.

Based on the research and consultation undertaken our recommendation is that the project should proceed to stage 2 and that a draft outcomes framework for culture and sport should be developed and piloted with a cross section of authorities and cultural trusts.

In so doing a number of factors will need to be considered:

- The scope of the framework
- Key terms and definitions
- Alignment where appropriate with the CASE project.

Introduction

1. This research report presents the findings and recommendations from stage one of the 'Measuring the Contribution of Culture and Sport to Outcomes' Project. It has been produced by the Improvement and Development Agency (IDeA) on behalf of Arts Council England, English Heritage, the Museums, Libraries and Archives Council, Sport England and the Department for Culture, Media and Sport.
2. The overall project aim is:

'To develop and provide an appropriate form of guidance and support to assist the culture and sport sector to better measure and evidence its contribution to local priority outcomes as efficiently as possible from April 2011'.
3. The objectives of stage one of the project are to:
 - understand where we are now and provide a composite view on the state of progress in measuring the contribution of culture and sport to wider outcomes
 - identify good and/or new practice in this area
 - recommend whether the project should proceed to the next stage: the development of a model or framework.
4. Research has focused on examples from both the cultural and other sectors of current approaches to measuring outcomes, with an emphasis on how culture and sport can demonstrate their contribution to the following key outcomes:
 - Economic development, including worklessness, inward investment and regeneration
 - Providing better outcomes for children and young people
 - Health improvement (both physical and mental health)
 - Providing better outcomes for older people
 - Community safety
 - Community cohesion
 - Environmental sustainability (where appropriate and feasible)
5. The report is presented in four sections:
 - This introduction
 - A brief overview of the research methodology
 - Analysis of the current position, consisting of key findings followed by a more detailed insight into examples from the culture and sport sector, and from other sectors
 - Conclusions and recommendations.
6. We are grateful to everyone who has shared information and given their time to inform this research report.

Methodology

7. The research methodology consisted of desk based research **supported by telephone and face to face consultation**. This sought to identify:
 - a cross section of approaches to outcome measurement currently in use or being developed within the culture and sport sector, and particularly within local authorities
 - examples of generic approaches to outcome measurement and approaches from other sectors, in particular the children and young people, health and third sectors, where it was felt lessons could be learnt.
8. Examples of approaches and potential consultees were sourced from:
 - a call for information and examples of outcome measurement for culture and sport from the IDeA
 - web based research
 - suggestions made in the meetings and telephone interviews undertaken.
9. Consultees included representatives from local authorities, the cultural non departmental public bodies, lottery distributors, cultural trusts, sports partnerships, the Department for Culture, Media and Sport and consultants.
10. We presented our preliminary findings to an 'Expert Panel' consisting of individuals and organisations actively engaged in the measurement of outcomes particularly, although not exclusively, for culture and sport. This helped identify any gaps in the research and challenged the project's initial conclusions, prior to preparation of the final report.
11. A full list of consultees is provided in Appendix 1.

Analysis of the current position

Key findings

12. Our research and consultation identified a range of activity taking place across the culture and sport sector that is defined² as an 'outcome based approach' and that seeks to demonstrate the impact of culture and sport on wider socio-economic outcomes. We also found interesting examples of how other sectors are approaching outcome measurement.
13. The diversity of the examples reviewed confirms that although there are similarities between the various outcome based approaches, there is no single consistent outcome based approach in use. Differences exist between the overall approaches, the level they are being used and the types of outcomes being measured.
14. We identified four key groups of outcome based approach, which we categorised as:
 - frameworks
 - models
 - tools that help:
 - outcome focused service planning and measurement
 - gather information and perceptions from individuals
 - demonstrate the financial value of outcomes
 - measure economic impact
 - repeated or longitudinal research
15. We also identified a few examples of computer software that help with data entry and reporting, but are also described² as outcome frameworks or tools.
16. Examples of each of these approaches are provided in more detail later in this section.
17. Within these outcome based approach groups we found that the actual measurement may be taking place at different levels. They are being used at a:
 - local project or programme level
 - individual service level (for example, arts, heritage or libraries)
 - cross cultural service or directorate level
 - whole organisation level, particularly in leisure and cultural trusts
 - sub regional, regional or national level.
18. The outcome based approaches are also measuring different types of outcome:
 - Local measurement may be measuring outcomes:
 - at an individual (personal) or community level, or both

² As described by the organisations developing and implementing them.

- from a key strategy such as the sustainable community strategy (SCS) or cultural strategy
 - from the local area agreement (LAA)
 - National and regional measurement may be measuring outcomes:
 - relating to private and public value (for example, the CASE research)
19. We also found differences in definition of culture and sport in the context of outcome based approaches. Some local authorities are using their outcome based approach solely to measure outcomes from the provision they directly deliver. Others are seeking to measure outcomes from culture and sport organisations they fund as well. A few are grappling with finding ways to measure outcomes from the whole of the culture and sport sector in their area, whether or not organisations are publicly funded.
20. Inconsistent terminology has proved a challenge in collating examples of outcome based approaches. In particular we found different definitions of:
- outcomes
 - impact
 - outputs
 - framework, model and tools.
21. We also found patchy reporting of the findings from using outcome based approaches. This means that even where evidence had been collected of the contribution culture and sport had made to wider outcomes, this data had a very limited audience or was seldom being used.
22. It is also clear that development and implementation of outcome based approaches to measurement within the culture and sport sector is at an early stage. Most of the examples identified are still at development stage or are newly implemented. Only a handful of organisations we talked to have completed more than one full year of data collection and reporting. This report therefore comments on the different approaches being used or developed, along with the drivers, learning points and challenges in measuring outcomes, but does not express a view on which particular outcome based approaches are the most effective.
23. The remainder of this section provides further detail of some of the examples of outcome based approaches we reviewed. An overview of outcome based approaches in the culture and sport sector on the next page is followed by a brief description of each. This is then followed by examples from other sectors.

An overview of outcome based approaches in the culture and sport sector

	Framework	Model	Tools – service planning / measurement	Tools – information / perceptions from individuals	Tools – financial value on outcomes	Tools – economic impact	Repeated / longitudinal research
Project / programme				Kent – Folkestone Forward outcomes star Suffolk - impact evaluation toolkit Warrington - WEMWBS questionnaires			Dorset - economic impact of arts activities and events HLF - benefits of volunteering / economic impact Knowsley - GP referral scheme evaluation Play England - BIG Lottery Fund Children's Play Programme evaluation
Service	Museums Galleries Scotland - outcome based framework Newham - leisure service performance framework	DCMS - logic model capturing public library impact Sport England - logic model	Gateshead - impact based library service review Play England - local play indicators Sport England - key performance indicators	MLA - GLOs and GSOs Sunderland - Wellness Service user information system Tunbridge Wells - questionnaire on health impact (sport / physical activity)	MLA - Social Return on Investment (SROI)		
Cross culture service / directorate	Birmingham Cultural Partnership - performance monitoring framework Havering - cultural impact framework Knowsley - cultural service impact framework Manchester - performance framework Shropshire - culture and leisure performance framework		Dorset - turning the curve London - measuring social impact tool Swindon - reporting against LAA delivery milestones	Gateshead - use of GLOs Havering - annual user / non user survey Manchester - social impact toolkit Trafford - violent gangs case study		Manchester - economic toolkit	
Organisation (Trust)	Hertsmere - cultural impact framework Wigan - impact framework		Tyne & Wear - planning framework based on GLOs/GSOs	Tyne & Wear - GSO indicator/question bank			
Sub regional / regional / national	DCMS - CASE drivers and values framework Leicestershire - impact framework Nottinghamshire - cultural enrichment indicator set					Liverpool - multiple impacts model	Liverpool - European Capital of Culture research programme (Impacts 08)

Examples from the culture and sport sector

24. The examples set out below represent a cross section of approaches to outcome measurement that are currently in use or are being developed for culture and sport within local authorities and the wider culture and sport sector. The review does not claim to be exhaustive but aims to give a good overview of the scope of current approaches and tools.
25. Consultation took place with a wide range of local authorities and other organisations, only some of which are referenced below. For a full list of organisations consulted about their approach to outcome measurement see Appendix 1.
26. The following examples give more detail on the range of approaches summarised on the previous page. In most cases where an organisation appears more than once in the overview table, descriptions of the different approaches and tools developed by that organisation have been brought together under a single heading.

Frameworks

Museums Galleries Scotland

27. Museums Galleries Scotland (MGS) is developing an outcomes based framework for use internally and by external organisations. It will enable evaluation of MGS funded projects and programmes and the overall contribution of MGS to achieving outcomes in the new performance framework for Scotland.
28. The work is being carried out by BOP consulting. Although work is still underway, the framework is expected to incorporate:
 - an overall logic model for MGS
 - a set of indicators to populate the logic model
 - data capture processes and systems to capture standardised information from funded museums and galleries.

For further information contact:

Richard Naylor, Head of Research, BOP Consulting: richard@bop.co.uk Tel: 0207307 3090

London Borough of Newham

29. The evaluation of the London Borough of Newham's Cultural and Sporting Programme 2006-08, conducted by ECOTEC, assessed the impact of the culture and sport programme in relation to four key outcome areas:
 - Connection to the community
 - Offending levels
 - Perceived levels of health, and
 - Educational attainment.

30. The evaluation methodology was based around the Newham-ECOTEC Assessment Technique which was developed during 2004-06 and has been built on in a number of the more current examples quoted in this report.
31. More recently Newham is in the very early stages of developing a new performance framework for leisure projects and leisure services. Preliminary thinking is that this will build on the evaluation toolkit developed by public art think tank 'Ixia', based around identifying values and outcome measures and asking questions of the public about:
 - whether services are delivering what they want
 - how much of a priority something is.
32. Key 'values' include:
 - economic value
 - social value, for example community involvement and development of skills
 - environmental value, including sustainable communities and safety
 - artistic and aesthetic value.
33. As part of developing the new framework Newham is also intending to create a bank of questions and criteria to ensure consistent measurement of all aspects of the service, particularly when public questionnaires are used.
34. Both the framework and question bank are at the scoping and development stage.

Supporting documents available:

Evaluation of Newham's Cultural and Sporting Programme 2006-08 - Final Evaluation Report, ECOTEC for the London Borough of Newham, 2008
Public Art – A Guide to Evaluation, Ixia, January 2009

For further information contact:

Becky Furnell, Principal Service Manager: Becky.Furnell@newham.gov.uk Tel: 020 3373 9698

Birmingham Cultural Partnership

35. Birmingham Cultural Partnership is developing a performance monitoring framework to measure progress towards the LAA cultural targets. These are to:
 - increase adult participation in sport and active recreation
 - increase the use of cultural facilities in the four constituencies with low participation (Perry Barr, Erdington, Hodge Hill and Ladywood)
 - improve perceptions of Birmingham as a cultural capital.
36. The Partnership commissioned Knight, Kavanagh and Page to carry out a review of options for developing performance monitoring. This involved:
 - identifying current key datasets (quantitative and qualitative)
 - analysing the relevance, cost-effectiveness and practicality of producing or boosting current data more regularly
 - identifying key data gaps and suggesting proxies or ways of filling those gaps

- setting out a series of options
- making recommendations on implementation.

37. The consultants' recommendations included rewording the LAA cultural targets and definitions, as well as ways to improve data quality, collection and analysis. Implementation is at an early stage.

Supporting documents available:

A coherent, cost effective, evidence based framework for performance monitoring, Knight, Kavanagh and Page, July 2009

For further information contact:

Simon Bennett, Birmingham Cultural Partnership Manager: Simon.Bennett@birmingham.gov.uk Tel: 0121 675 3121

London Borough of Havering

38. A framework has been developed to measure and report on the outcomes delivered by the Havering Cultural Strategy. The outcomes relate to the cultural strategy themes of:

- Better health and welfare
- Increasing community participation
- Protect and improve the environment
- A safer community
- Improved lifelong learning
- A more prosperous community

39. The framework, developed on behalf of Havering Council in 2007 by ECOTEC, incorporates a menu of potential indicators under the headings of:

- Output indicators
- Service outcome indicators
- Personal outcome indicators
- Long-term outcome indicators.

40. Implementation of the full framework has not yet taken place but a key aspect that has been implemented is an annual survey to gather data from users and non users of Havering's parks, heritage sites, arts facilities, leisure centres and libraries to evidence the personal outcome indicators. Two years worth of data is now available. Measures reported on in the 2008 survey included visits and satisfaction along with a range of 'personal outcome measures' based on the perceptions of users and the extent to which they agree with key statements. For example, for libraries under the respective cultural strategy themes these included:

Increased Community Participation

- 72% agreed that visiting the local library helps them feel a part of the community
- 74% agreed that user groups are a good way of getting local people to improve libraries

Safer Communities

- 82% agreed that libraries give young people a place to go and more things to do

Improved Life-long learning

- 85% believed that library activities help improve reading, writing and/or ICT skills
- 64% agreed that library activities make young people more interested in going to their lessons at school/college
- 60% agreed that library activities can assist in educational learning in school/college.

41. The data and evidence from the survey is currently being used within the cultural service. The next stage of its implementation will involve looking outside of the service to report corporately and to other partners on the contribution of culture and sport to local priority outcomes.

Supporting documents available:

Development of Outcome Measures to Support the Cultural Strategy, A Final Report to the London Borough of Havering, ECOTEC 2007

Culture and Leisure Services, Annual Survey Report, London Borough of Havering 2008

For further information contact:

Guy Selfe, Cultural and Leisure Services: guy.selfe@haverling.gov.uk Tel: 01708 433866

Knowsley Council

42. Knowsley Council is developing an Impact Framework to measure and demonstrate the impact of culture and sport on the SCS and LAA priority outcomes. Development of the Framework is being carried out by DC Research in three phases:
- Phase 1 – identifying the impact of leisure and culture on key priorities and developing intermediate measures
 - Phase 2 - producing a robust performance management framework to ensure the right outputs and outcomes are collected
 - Phase 3 – developing a commissioning framework for leisure and cultural services to position the service for commissioning opportunities and to prepare them for the commissioning process.
43. The Impact Framework is built around the 7 SCS ‘drivers’, or themes, and 34 of the 64 LAA Indicators, although it is expected that the focus will be on 4 of the drivers (shown in bold):
- A diverse and prosperous economy
 - A well connected Knowsley
 - **Improving the offer and quality of space**
 - Increasing economic activity at all levels
 - **Raising attainment and skills**
 - **Safer more cohesive communities**
 - **Unlocking the potential and raising aspirations.**

44. The Impact Framework is service-wide but recognises that different areas of service make different levels of contribution to different priority targets. The scale of contribution (any/small/moderate) of each area of service towards indicators that underpin the SCS drivers has been identified. For example, libraries are identified as making:
- no contribution to 'A diverse and prosperous economy', 'A well connected Knowsley', 'Improving the offer and quality of space' and 'Increasing economic activity at all levels'
 - at least a small contribution to 'Safer more cohesive communities' and 'Unlocking the potential and raising aspirations'
 - at least a moderation contribution to 'Raising attainment and skills'.
45. The basis of the Impact Framework is a set of intermediate measures to make the linkage between the leisure and culture service outputs and the wider priority outcome. These have been discussed with key partners (local strategic partnership thematic partnerships and managers) to test that they make the case for them between activities and outcomes, and that data can be collected.
46. The first phase is nearing completion, with intermediate measures available in draft form. Developing clear definitions for each of the intermediate measures will form part of the next phase of work. As an example, the intermediate measures identified under the SCS objective 'Unlocking the potential and raising aspirations' and corresponding national indicators in the LAA are:
- Number of 'activities' that include anti-smoking message/advice/information; Number of attendees at such 'activities'
 - Number of young people from local areas with high levels of anti social behaviour participating in leisure/culture (NI111 - First time entrants to Youth justice system)
 - Number of 'activities' that include sexual health message/advice/information; Number of attendees at such 'activities' (NI112 - Under 18 conception rate)
 - Number of 'activities' that include substance misuse message/advice/information; Number of attendees at such 'activities' (NI115 - Substance misuse by young people)
 - Level of participation in leisure and culture from local areas/groups with highest levels of health deprivation/highest mortality rates; Percentage improvement in health measures for 'sample' participants (NI120 - All age all cause mortality rate)
 - Level of participation in leisure and culture from local areas/groups with highest levels of health deprivation/highest mortality rates; Percentage improvement in health measures for 'sample' participants (NI121 - Mortality rate from all circulatory diseases at ages under 75)
 - Number of those aged over 65 participating in leisure/culture activities; Satisfaction levels with home/neighbourhood of those aged over 65 who participate in leisure/culture (NI138 - Satisfaction of people over 65 with both home and neighbourhood)
 - Number of primary school children participating in leisure and culture (NI56 - NI 56 Obesity among primary school children)
47. Knowsley is developing a Culture Plan ('Connect Knowsley'), a vision and strategic document showing the direction of leisure and culture to maximise impact on SCS priorities. It is also commissioning a longitudinal evaluation of the GP referral scheme 'Activity for Life'.

Supporting documents available:

Measuring and Demonstrating Impact on Priority Outcomes: Leisure and Culture Services Knowsley MBC, DC Research, 2009.

For further information contact:

Paula Williams, Head of Cultural Services, Knowsley Council: paula.williams@knowsley.gov.uk Tel: 0151 443 3468

Manchester City Council

48. Manchester is in the early stages of developing a comprehensive performance framework for culture to measure and demonstrate achievement of the outcomes set out in the new cultural ambition for the city. The cultural ambition details how Manchester can become a genuinely distinctive, world class cultural city in the new decade. Desired outcomes (mainly cultural) are identified for each of the five overarching themes of:
- Culturally distinctive
 - Community inspired
 - Creative investor
 - Talent city
 - Culturally connected
49. Three pieces of work will together form the performance framework:
- Social impact toolkit - research and development of a longitudinal impact or outcomes monitoring system for projects to measure, for example, changes in attitude. This is being developed by Substance, a social research company
 - Economic toolkit – a methodology for consistent measurement of economic impact of events that allows comparisons. This will be a fairly simple but robust toolkit that will sit alongside the social impact toolkit. This is being developed by Arts About Manchester, the audience development agency for Greater Manchester
 - International benchmarking - comparisons with comparable cities. This is likely to be commissioned from a university.
50. The purpose of the performance framework is to:
- provide a baseline against which future performance can be measured
 - enable the city's Cultural Partnership to effectively monitor and evaluate the cultural ambition
 - provide a methodology that aligns with the regional cultural agencies and Manchester's LAA
 - provide a basis for national and international benchmarking of the city's cultural performance
 - inform investment decisions through a clear statement of success criteria and value for money indicators that will demonstrate leverage from public investment
 - source evidence, case studies and arguments on which to base advocacy for the social, economic and cultural impacts of the cultural ambition.

51. The social impact toolkit may be based on Manchester's existing Cultural Impacts Toolkit, previously developed by BOP Consulting. This was designed to evaluate the short to medium term social outcomes that culture and sport projects contribute to, linked to the priorities set out in Manchester's Community Strategy. The toolkit identifies 17 potential social outcomes that a project, programme or service may contribute to and provides a framework for:
- identifying the most appropriate respondents for the evaluation (individual participants, primary carer, intermediaries, project staff, partners)
 - clarifying the impact that is to be measured (impact on individuals, group, community, partnerships)
 - identifying which social research tool or tools to use (questionnaire, interview, group work), based on the specified social outcomes/impacts.
52. The Cultural Impacts Toolkit provides guidance and sample questions to help staff develop the content of the chosen tool(s) and design their own set of bespoke tools. It also provides guidance on monitoring, collating information and reporting protocols.

Supporting documents available:

Reframing Manchester's cultural ambition: notes towards a performance framework (draft specification), 2009
 Manchester Cultural Impacts Toolkit: sample questions, BOP Consulting, 2008
 Manchester Cultural Impacts Toolkit: prototype toolkit, BOP Consulting, 2007

For further information contact:

Pauline Clarke, Principal Policy Officer, Cultural Partnership: p.clarke2@manchester.gov.uk Tel: 0161 234 4267

Shropshire Council

53. Shropshire Council has developed a new culture and leisure performance framework for the cultural services that form part of the new Shropshire unitary authority. It will be used to demonstrate their contribution to the objectives of the SCS and LAA. The framework reports on performance against indicators grouped under the following themes:
- Increasing participation
 - Increasing satisfaction
 - Increasing engagement and capacity
 - Maximising economic impact
 - Preserving, promoting and researching Shropshire's wealth of assets (where relevant)
54. Twelve generic measures have been identified, along with sub sets of the generic measures that are specific to the arts, leisure, outdoor recreation, museums, archives and libraries services. For example under the theme 'Increasing engagement and capacity':
- Generic measure – the number of people receiving a service from Culture and Leisure Services that supports them to live independently
 - Arts service specific measure – the number of people receiving an arts service that helps support them to live independently.

55. The data that is being collected to populate the measures includes quantitative data such as attendances, visits and users plus qualitative data, capturing outcomes and peoples experiences, through methods that will include Vox Pops, social networking sites such as Twitter and Facebook and case study material.
56. Both the framework and evidence collection methodologies are in their first year of implementation.

Supporting documents available:

Shropshire Performance Management Framework – Final, Shropshire Council, 2009

For further information contact:

George Candler, Assistant Director Culture and Leisure: George.Candler@shropshire.gov.uk Tel: 01743-255003

Hertsmere Council

57. Hertsmere Council is working with Hertsmere Leisure Trust to develop a 'Cultural Impact Framework' that will identify how the work of the Trust contributes to corporate goals and the local priorities of the SCS and LAA. The Impact Framework is being developed by Leisure-net with the University of Hertfordshire. The key themes are:
- Safer communities
 - Healthier communities
 - Equalities of Access
 - Building capacity
58. The impact framework is still under development but the draft identifies impact/outcome indicators and how they will be measured against the current or planned initiatives of the Trust. For example under the theme 'Safer Communities' is the 'Be There Do It' programme of holiday activities for young people. The impact/outcome indicators proposed for this programme are:
- Percentage of young people participating who come from target groups/areas
 - Levels of anti social behaviour by youths
 - Attitudes and perceptions of participants
59. It is proposed that data will be collected through post code analysis of participants, police statistics, pre and post participant surveys and pen portraits of individuals.
60. Hertsmere are also in the process of developing a new sports development strategy and want to be able to measure its impact. Within the draft strategy 11 objectives are proposed each of which have related outcome measures. The outcomes relating to non sporting local priorities are:
- Contribute towards reducing crime and fear of crime
 - Engage and empower communities
 - Provide and improve facilities
 - Improve health and wellbeing
 - Contribute to economic wellbeing

61. As an example the outcomes that will be measured described under the 'Contribute towards reducing crime and fear of crime' priority are to:
- Increase the number of positive activities for young people in the borough
 - Increase the number of young people aged 16-24 taking part in sport and active recreation
 - Reduce public perceptions of anti-social behaviour by young people.

Supporting documents available:

Hertsmere Cultural Impact Study (Draft), Leisure-Net/University of Hertfordshire Jan 2010
Hertsmere Borough Council Sports Development Strategy 2009-2012(Draft)

For further information contact:

Ed Sandham, Sports & Cultural Services Manager: ed.sandham@hertsmere.gov.uk Tel: 020 8207 7801

Wigan Leisure and Culture Trust

62. Wigan Leisure and Culture Trust (WLCT) have implemented the Wigan Leisure and Culture Impact Framework, developed with the support of ERS research and consultancy. This links WLCT activities to the LAA priorities of:

- Healthier communities and older people
- Economy, culture, environment and housing
- Children and young people
- Safer and stronger communities

63. The relationship between the WLCT activities and 13 wider outcomes have been identified and a range of intermediate (proxy) measures agreed with the LAA block leads. For example:

LAA Priority:	Reduce the level of worklessness
National Indicator:	NI153 - Working age people claiming out of work benefits in the worst performing neighbourhoods
WLCT impact measure:	The number of people on out of work benefits offered employment and employment development opportunities within Wigan Leisure and Culture Trust
LAA Priority:	Improving the range of things to do and accessibility of positive activities for all
National Indicator:	NI 110 - Young people's participation in positive activities
WLCT impact measure:	Participation in organised events led or provided by Wigan Leisure and Culture Trust for young people, aged 13 -15 years.

64. Both qualitative and quantitative data to populate the measures is being collected by WLCT and through a survey that has been commissioned from IPSOS/MORI.
65. Quarterly reports are provided to the LAA block leads along with an annual review. The first year of data collection (to October 2009) has just been completed.

Supporting documents available:

Wigan Cultural Impact Framework Final Report, ERS for Wigan Leisure and Culture Trust, 2008
Wigan Leisure and Culture Trust Cultural Impact Framework Schedule of Intermediate Measures and Performance Targets that contribute to the Wigan Borough LAA, agreed between WLCT and Wigan Borough Partnership, Draft, Effective 1 April 2009

For further information contact:

Chris Derbyshire, Performance Management Officer: Chris.Derbyshire@wlct.org Tel: 01942 828511

Department for Culture, Media and Sport

66. The Culture and Sport Evidence Programme (CASE) is a £1.8m research programme funded over three years and led by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) in partnership with Arts Council England, English Heritage, Museums, Libraries and Archives Council and Sport England. It aims to strengthen understanding of how best to deliver culture and sporting opportunities of the highest quality to the widest audience generating the best outcomes for society.
67. As part of the CASE programme, DCMS commissioned the EPPI-Centre (Institute of Education, University of London) and the Matrix Knowledge Group to carry out a research project into the drivers and value of engagement with culture and sport. This involved:
- a comprehensive, systematic review of research literature assessing what is known about why people do and do not engage in culture and sport, the interventions that work in changing engagement, and the impacts of engagement
 - a model of the drivers and impacts of engagement.
68. The key deliverables from this work will be:
- a model of engagement and estimations of the value derived from engagement that policy makers can use to inform their decisions
 - reviews summarising the state of the knowledge on key areas for different sectors
 - a searchable database of the mapped literature, including a small subset of the literature which has been quality assessed and the key research for making the strongest arguments.
69. Initial research reports have been published and further work is ongoing.

Supporting documents available:

Reports available at: <http://www.culture.gov.uk/case/index.html>

For further information contact:

Adam C Cooper, DCMS Head of Research and CASE programme manager: adamc.cooper@culture.gsi.gov.uk

Leicester and Leicestershire sub-region

70. The Leicester and Leicestershire impact framework forms part of the Beacon Research Project to develop a mechanism for sharing data and improving the evidence base across the sub-region. It is being developed by ECOTEC in conjunction with Leicestershire Culture and Sport Chief Officers Partnership (CSCOPS) and the Cultural Improvement Partnership East Midlands (CIPEM). The aim of the framework is to demonstrate the impact of culture and sport on outcomes, linked to the sustainable community strategies and LAAs of both Leicester City Council and Leicestershire County Council. Development of the framework is being funded by CLG, East Midlands RIEP (through CIPEM), Leicester City Council and Leicestershire County Council.
71. The framework, currently in draft form, sets out three levels of evidence gathering against identified outcomes:

- Level 1 is focused on output monitoring. This is data already widely collected by culture and leisure services and projects in the sub-region
- Level 2 links in secondary outcome data. This is data collected through secondary sources, including national surveys (such as Active People and Tellus) and partner agencies external to culture and sport (such as youth offending teams and education services)
- Level 3 shows how primary research can be used to provide evidence of outcomes and impact. This is data that is not currently collected and would require user surveys, interviews, focus groups or qualitative research.

72. Level 2 and 3 indicators were set following consultation with partner agencies external to culture and sport who will be asked to supply some of the data. Level 1 is the minimum level of data that partners will collect. The three sets of data together are seen as providing the 'gold standard' for demonstrating impact.

73. An example of the three levels of indicator, identified under the 'Prosperous and Dynamic Economy/Investing in Skills and Enterprise, Investing in our Children' theme, is set out below.

Level 1 indicators: output monitoring

- Number of creative practitioners/businesses supported to gain skills
- Number of professionals benefiting from museums and galleries CPD activities
- Number of adults undertaking formal courses/training in libraries (including UK Online centres)
- Number of adults undertaking family/informal learning in libraries
- Number of young people participating in informal library learning activities
- Total number of students participating in formal museums and galleries learning activities
- Number of students using museums and galleries loans service in schools (and associated number of schools and loans involved)
- Number of people (NEETS/ unemployed adults) gaining employment through sports/arts/libraries volunteering or training

Level 2 Indicators: outcome monitoring (secondary sources)

- Number of businesses in creative industries (and % of total business base) (Data source – Annual Business Inquiry)
- Number of qualifications achieved through UK Online centres (Data source – UK Online records)
- School performance (Data source and collection – School performance audit/Ofsted scores for schools who have had contact with museums/libraries)
- Pupil achievement (Data source and collection - Developing links with participating schools to compare actual and predicated grades for small cohorts of schools involved in learning projects/before and after comparison of student grades achieved for specific assignments)
- % of young people still in employment after six months (Data source and collection - Connexions data)

Level 3 Indicators: outcome monitoring (primary research)

- Questioning beneficiaries to explore impact of support on business growth (Data source and collection - Surveys or focus groups with sample of businesses supported)
- Surveys to explore extent to which beneficiaries have learnt new skills and experienced other impacts such as personal development, or have progressed into training/education or employment (Data source and collection - Surveys or focus groups with sample of beneficiaries/participants).

74. The proposal is to implement levels 1 and 2 initially with all local authorities in the sub-region and to trial parts of level 3 in one or two places. Data will be brought together into a central database although the decision has still to be made on who will do this and how often.

Supporting documents available:

Demonstrating the Impact of Culture and Sport: Revised Draft Impact Framework, ECOTOC, 2009.

For further information contact:

Liz Blyth, Cultural Strategy and Improvement Manager, Leicester City Council: Liz.Blyth@leicester.gov.uk Tel: 0116 2526738

Nottinghamshire County Council, City Council and District Councils

75. Nottinghamshire County Council, Nottingham City Council and seven district councils in the county, with the support of the Cultural Improvement Partnership East Midlands, have together developed the 'Nottinghamshire Cultural Enrichment Indicator Set'. The cultural enrichment indicator set looks at the performance of the service and its impact on strategic outcomes in six key areas:

Service:

- Improving the quality of the cultural infrastructure
- Improving access and participation
- Value, perception and satisfaction

Impact:

- Improving health and wellbeing
- Children and young people
- Safer and stronger communities

76. Thirty-five indicators have been selected covering the different culture and sport sub sectors including archives, arts, libraries, museums, parks, play and sport. For example, under the theme 'Improving health and well being' the outcome identified is 'Improving physical & mental wellbeing and reducing health inequalities'. A measure being used to demonstrate the contribution of culture and sport is 'The number of people supported through health referral programmes', with data being gathered from service level agreements with PCTs.

77. Every authority has committed to collecting and sharing the data required to populate the model and the performance indicators. A baseline has been established wherever possible for each indicator using 2008/09 data and targets have been set through to 2010/11.

Supporting documents available:

Nottinghamshire Cultural Enrichment Indicator Set, 2009

www.cipem.org.uk/DOCS/NottsCulturalEnrichmentIndicatorSet.xls

For further information contact:

Sarah Dawes, Head of Leisure and Culture: sarah.dawes@newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk Tel: 01636 655700

Models

Department for Culture, Media and Sport

78. A logic model capturing public library impact has been developed by DCMS as part of a literature review and research carried out by BOP consulting for the Public Libraries Modernisation Review.
79. 'Capturing the Impact of Libraries' aims to identify how the library sector can capture evidence to demonstrate impact. It focuses on how well libraries perform and meet the agendas of local authorities, government department Public Service Agreement (PSA) targets and Departmental Strategic Objectives (DSOs), as well as Treasury priorities.
80. It includes a logic model for capturing the impact of public libraries, which links library services, activities and resources to 'intrinsic benefits' (knowledge and learning, enjoyment, and participation), through to 'extrinsic benefits' (intermediate and long term outcomes). It provides a data framework setting out the types of indicator to be collected at each stage of the logic chain for capturing the impacts of public libraries. At the centre of the model is how public libraries contribute to the development of 'intermediate' or short term outcomes, that are known through research evidence to contribute to longer term outcomes, such as economic growth, longer life expectancy and enhanced local democracy and legitimacy.

Supporting documents available:

Capturing the Impact of Libraries: Final Report, DCMS/BOP Consulting, 2009

For further information contact:

Richard Naylor, Head of Research, BOP Consulting: richard@bop.co.uk Tel: 0207 307 3090

Sport England

81. Sport England's (SE) impact measurement is currently focused around the delivery of its three core outcomes of Grow, Sustain and Excel. Funded programmes and partners, including the National Governing Bodies of Sport, are expected to demonstrate their impact in delivering these outcomes. SE advocates a three-tier model for evaluating the impact of projects and investment in sport:
 - Tier 1 - Basic Evaluation, measures key quantitative information across all activity
 - Tier 2 - Focused Evaluation, collects additional quantitative information and qualitative data from a sample of activity
 - Tier 3 - Experiment and Innovation is 'action research' examining what works, how and why in close detail in controlled settings.

82. At the heart of the SE approach to evaluation, and a tool provided to assist organisations implement evaluation, is the 'Logic Model'. The Logic Model involves setting out in a flow diagram how an intervention or project will contribute to the achievement of one of the three strategic outcomes – Grow, Sustain and Excel. The diagram identifies:
- Inputs – the resources that the intervention or project consumes, typically capital and/or revenue funding, but could include other aspects such as volunteer time or use of facilities
 - Activities – the work the intervention or project does with the resources, for example, running sports camps or coach education courses
 - Outputs – the direct products of the activities, for example, people attending sports camps or coaches gaining higher level qualifications
 - Project Outcomes – measures of how far the intervention or project has achieved its real purpose, for example, development of the sporting talent pool or an increase in the number of coaches equipped to develop and support more talented athletes
 - Strategic Outcome – measure of how the intervention or project has contributed to the achievement of one or more of the three Sport England strategic outcomes – Grow, Sustain and Excel
 - Wider Social and Economic Outcomes – any anticipated wider social and economic outcomes, for example, educational qualifications, improved employment opportunities, or reduced risk of offending.
83. The model requires the theoretical arguments (shared assumptions) that are built into the service design (in other words, the assumption that if you do 'A' it will lead to 'B', which in turn will lead to outcome 'C') to be made explicit, and evidenced, wherever possible,.
84. Sport England has defined key performance indicators (KPIs) around throughput, participation, active membership, coaching and volunteering, which are measured at a national level through the Active People annual survey of adult participation in sport. In addition the 'Quality of sporting experience (satisfaction)' is a key strategic outcome indicator which is being measured through a separate national survey.
85. The logic model and KPIs are in the early stage of implementation for both national programmes, such as the SE evaluation of the impact of free swimming and the impact of the NGB Whole Sport Plans, as well as at a funded project level.

Supporting documents available:

Guidance on Measuring the Impact of Interventions for National Governing Bodies of Sport, Sport England, 2009
Additional information and guidance on Sport England's approach to measuring impact is available at http://www.sportengland.org/research/evaluating_impact.aspx

For further information contact:

Maria Reader, maria.reader@sportengland.org Tel: 0207 273 1534

Tools that help outcome focused service planning and measurement

Gateshead Council

86. Gateshead is carrying out an impact-based review of its library service. The six month review includes three phases of gathering evidence of the impact of the service on individuals and communities:
- National scene-setting
 - Service impact on health, lifelong learning, ICT and digital citizenship. This is focused on how libraries can support the PCT, adult learning and other key areas of service by looking at the challenges and issues they face and how the library service can help
 - Service impact on stronger communities, and community cohesion and inclusion. This will involve working in partnership with a community development organisation to carry out consultation to find out what libraries can do to make communities stronger.
87. Following the evidence gathering sessions the next stages of the review will be:
- making recommendations to elected members
 - members agreeing the future direction of the service
 - MLA peer review to assess and challenge the current position of the service and help identify a way forward
 - identifying the future shape and investment requirements of the service.
88. The review is involving key partners such as Gateshead College, PCT and Community Network. It is helping to raise the profile of the service and make the case for how libraries do or can support key areas of service such as community health and adult learning.
89. Gateshead currently uses the Generic Learning Outcomes (GLOs) across libraries, arts and heritage activities to evaluate their learning impact. Self evaluation sheets and questionnaires based on the GSOs are used to collect qualitative data on:
- skills
 - knowledge and understanding
 - activity, behaviour and progression
 - enjoyment
 - inspiration
 - creativity.

For further information contact:

Ann Borthwick, Head of Libraries and Arts: AnnBorthwick@Gateshead.Gov.Uk Tel: 0191 433 6929

Play England

90. Play England's approach to the local measurement of impact focuses on a set of four local indicators that local authorities can use to measure their performance in providing appropriate facilities and spaces for play and informal recreation. The local play indicators are concerned with:
- children and young people's use of spaces and facilities for play and informal recreation
 - children and young people's access to spaces and facilities for play and informal recreation
 - children and young people's experience of spaces and facilities for play and informal recreation (satisfaction)
 - the quality of local spaces and facilities available for play and informal recreation.
91. Play England has produced guidance and a toolkit on using the indicators and collecting and reporting on the data, including sample questionnaires.
92. Play England has also commissioned further research on demonstrating impact, including case studies that demonstrate the impact of play on families and local communities and a research project on the costs benefit of play.
93. In terms of national initiatives and programmes, evaluation of the Big Lottery Fund Children's Play Programme includes the progress of the projects in delivering against the programme outcomes:
- Children achieving greater independence and self esteem through play
 - Children acquiring greater social skills and respect for others through play
 - Children being able to test boundaries while kept safe from harm
 - Children developing greater well being through play
 - Children having more choice and control over their play
 - Local communities having greater involvement in play projects
 - More children experiencing barriers to free play being included in play provision
 - More children taking part in a wider range of good play experiences
94. The evaluation runs for three years until August 2011 and involves a range of quantitative and qualitative research approaches including: case study visits, surveys of portfolios, projects and beneficiaries and desk based analysis of programme level monitoring data and portfolio evaluations. Case studies are both snapshot and longitudinal and involve a range of interactive techniques to collect children's feedback. The Year One interim report was published in May 2009.

Supporting documents available:

Tools for evaluating local play provision, Play England, 2009

Evaluation of Children's Play Programme - Report to Big Lottery Fund, ECOTEC, May 2009

Further information and reports on Play England web site <http://www.playengland.org.uk>

For further information contact:

Issy Cole-Hamilton, Head of Policy Research and Projects: icole-hamilton@ncb.org.uk Tel: 020 7843 6304

Neil Coleman ncoleman@ncb.org.uk

Dorset County Council

95. Dorset is planning to use Mark Friedman's 'Turning the Curve' approach to measure the impact of its new cultural strategy. The cultural strategy was produced for the Dorset Local Strategic Partnership in partnership with the LSP thematic groups.
96. Cultural strategy impact measurement will focus on creating a better quality of life, specifically:
 - A thriving, competitive economy that delivers better quality employment for people in Dorset
 - A sustainable infrastructure which provides improved access to cultural and leisure opportunities
 - Safeguarding, understanding and enjoying Dorset's environment with planning for the future
 - Improved well-being with increased opportunities for people to enjoy and achieve within safe and thriving communities.
97. These outcomes are based on the SCS 'challenges', or outcomes, slightly tailored for culture in the light of discussions with the LSP thematic partnerships.
98. The cultural strategy sets out strategic aims and actions under each of the four outcomes. The LSP culture theme group will commission multi-disciplinary task groups (wider than cultural partners) for each of the strategic aims and actions. Task groups will be responsible for deciding what needs to be delivered, measured and monitored, and for linking the strategic aim or action to the outcome, using 'Turning the Curve'.
99. Currently Dorset measures the economic impact of festival and events in the county, such as the Dorset Arts Week and Inside Out (a programme of 'extraordinary events in extraordinary places'). These assessments clearly demonstrate their contribution to the economic development of the county.

Supporting documents available:

Dorset Cultural Strategy 2009 – 2014, Dorset Strategic Partners, 2009

For further information contact:

Paul Leivers, Head of Cultural Services, Dorset County Council: p.leivers@dorsetcc.gov.uk Tel: 01305 224455

London Cultural Improvement Group

100. The London Cultural Improvement Group has been working with the London Boroughs on a number of projects to support improvement within the culture and sport sector. One of the projects being implemented is the 'Measuring Social Outcomes' (MSO) pilot which aims to equip local authority cultural services and performance managers with the tools and confidence to measure social impact and demonstrate the value of what they do, particularly in relation to four areas:
 - Stronger communities
 - Safer communities
 - Children and young people
 - Adult health and wellbeing

101. MSO involves a training programme and toolkit for service managers. It has evolved from the MLA Generic Social Outcomes framework and helps practitioners to focus on what they want to find out and why at a number of different levels, for example, as part of an evaluation framework for a service, a service plan or individually for a programme or project. It can be used to measure LAA National Indicators or other priorities such as those within a SCS or service specific (museums, arts, etc.) development plan. MSO is currently being rolled out across the London Boroughs.
102. The approach provides guidance on the possible participant outcomes that practitioners might want to demonstrate impact against and introduces a variety of methodologies to collect evidence. These include questionnaires, feedback forms, interviews, focus groups, observation and tracking, collecting comments, accompanied visits and personal meaning mapping. It also provides advice on analysing, coding and interpreting the data collected.
103. Other strands of work from the London Cultural Improvement Group include:
- a cultural data improvement programme which has involved working with cultural services performance managers to review current data needs and gaps
 - a project working with three museums in London looking at how to collect and manage audience data so that it can be used to demonstrate service delivery against wider policy areas.

Supporting documents available:

Measuring Social Outcomes Tool and training materials, LCIG, December 2009

<http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/networks/lcip/mso.htm>

A range of other information and reports available from LCIG on their web site

<http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/networks/lcip/default.htm>

For further information contact:

Sue Thiedeman, Cultural Services Improvement Manager: Sue.Thiedeman@redbridge.gov.uk Tel: 07852 915 789

Swindon Borough Council

104. In Swindon a number of 'High level delivery milestones' have been identified for culture and sport that are seen as directly contributing to the following themes and National Indicators in the LAA:
- *Safer, Stronger Communities*
 - NI2 Percentage of people who feel that they belong to their neighbourhood
 - NI8 Percentage of adult participation in sport and active recreation
 - NI11 Percentage of the adult population who are engaged in the arts
 - *Healthier Communities and Older People*
 - NI120 All age – all cause mortality rates (per 100,000 population)
 - *Children and Young People*
 - NI56 Obesity primary school children year 6 (% of children in yr 6 who are obese)
 - NI110 Young people's participation in positive activities (%)
 - NI117 Percentage of 16-18 year olds who are not in education employment or training (NEET)

105. For example a delivery milestone under Safer Stronger Communities and NI2 (the percentage of people who feel that they belong to their neighbourhood) is to 'Encourage and support the creation and delivery of neighbourhood events and celebrations'. Evidence is fed into the Swindon Strategic Partnership by reporting on the key delivery milestones to the lead person for each of the National Indicators.

Supporting documents available:

Swindon Local Area Agreement Delivery Plan for Culture and Sport, April 2009-April 2010

For further information contact:

Helena Robinson, Leisure Strategy Manager: HERobinson@swindon.gov.uk Tel: 01793 466210

Tyne and Wear Archives & Museums

106. Tyne and Wear Archives & Museums (TWAM) has developed a planning framework, as a direct result of the findings and recommendations of a social impact study. The framework is primarily about planning rather than gathering evidence. It helps staff plan activities, projects and programmes by encouraging them to think about why they are doing them, where they fit into the corporate plan and how they will contribute to outcomes. It also encourages staff to think about outcomes from the outset and informs the data collection process and evaluation.
107. The planning framework consists of a series of tools:
- A planning grid
 - Test the logic map
 - Data collection form
 - Performance measures tool.
108. TWAM has also developed an 'indicator bank', working with CHE Associates, based on the Generic Social Outcomes (GSOs) developed by MLA. The GSOs sit alongside the Generic Learning Outcomes (GLOs), also developed by MLA, as part of the 'Inspiring Learning' framework.
109. The GSOs outline ways museums, libraries and archives impact on three social and community themes:
- Stronger and safer communities
 - Strengthening public life
 - Health and well-being
110. Each of these three GSOs is subdivided into a set of social outcome themes.
111. The indicator bank subdivides each of the social outcome themes into more in-depth outcomes, which are mapped against the Generic Learning Outcomes (GLOs). For each of these a set of generic questions provides a guide for evaluation, with examples of evidence drawn from case studies. An example is set out on the following page.

GSO

- Stronger and safer communities

GSO social outcome theme

- Improving group and inter-group dialogue and understanding

GSO Indicator

- People from different cultural or socio-economic groups say that they have increased awareness or understanding of each other.

Possible questions to ask

- What has surprised you about the different people you have met during this experience?
- What have you found out about local communities in this area?
- What memorable things have you learned about others during this experience?
- I have a greater understanding of the different people in my community. (true / false)

112. The indicator bank is a practical tool that staff draw on to:

- inform the service and project planning
- inform the review and evaluation process
- capture the difference museums, libraries and archives make to people's lives in terms of stronger and safer communities, strengthening public life, and health and well-being.

Supporting documents available:

Planning framework (planning grid, test the logic map, data collection form and performance measures tool), TWAM, 2009

GSO Indicator Bank, TWAM, 2008

For further information contact:

Alec Coles, Director: alec.coles@twmuseums.org.uk Tel: 0191 232 6789

Ann Fletcher-Williams, Hub Project Manager for the Regional Museums Hub: ann.fletcher@twmuseums.org.uk Tel: 0191 232 6789

Tools that gather information and perceptions from individuals

Kent County Council (Folkestone Forward)

113. Kent County Council is undertaking the Folkestone Forward programme within East Folkestone to make adult education and library services as well as sports and arts activities more accessible to communities. Working together with other groups and organisations within the area a series of projects is being run with and for local communities. The programme started in September 2008 and will run to August 2011. Folkestone Forward aims to:

- engage communities through sports and arts projects
- raise aspirations and a sense of empowerment
- foster a sense of pride within communities
- improve skills for employment and wellbeing.

114. The evaluation programme for the project has commenced and will be using a combination of qualitative and quantitative evidence. The qualitative evidence being collected is intended to demonstrate the impact on both individuals and the community. Individual impact is being measured through the use of an adapted version of the 'Outcomes Star' with individuals involved in projects that last for one month or more. They complete the star at the start of the project, rating 1-10 against each of 10 outcomes (for example, choose to engage in arts and sports activity, confidence and self esteem, skills for employment and well being) and then again at the end. This will be supplemented with evidence from interviews, case studies, comments books/boards, verbal comments and participant diaries.
115. Evidence to measure the impact on the community as a whole is being undertaken using focus groups, questionnaires and a consultation film project. Over the course of the project evidence will also be collected on aspects such as levels of graffiti, participation in community initiatives such as Neighbourhood Watch and the extent to which residents feel empowered and are active in the community, for example, writing letters to councillors, attendance at public meetings. Quantitative data is primarily attendance or visits data, for example, number of library users pre and post project from particular groups.
116. The evaluation programme and collection of the evidence are in their first year of implementation.

Supporting documents available:

Folkestone Forward Evaluation Paper and Outcomes Star, Kent County Council, September 2009

For further information contact:

Lucy Ann Bett, Folkestone Forward Manager : lucyann.bett@kent.gov.uk Tel: 07920 526559

Suffolk County Council

117. Suffolk has developed an Impact Evaluation Toolkit with the aim of:
- collecting qualitative, mainly perception-based data, systematically
 - drawing together and building over time an overall picture of the impact of cultural programmes and projects directly funded by Suffolk County Council
 - providing a quantitative measure of outcomes that support the SCS themes and LAA priorities.
118. The Toolkit comprises guidance on carrying out project evaluation, a sample self-completion survey, a template for logging results and a series of impact statements that suggest questions to ask. The impact statements ask the person being surveyed to state how much they agree or disagree with them. They were developed following consultation with the lead officers who support the Suffolk Strategic Partnership on health, community safety, learning and skills, environment and social inclusion/community cohesion.
119. The Toolkit supports each of the five themes of the SCS:
- Enhancing learning and skills
 - Promoting Suffolk as the greenest county
 - Improving the health of our communities

- Promoting inclusive communities
 - Enhancing the safety or the feeling of safety within our communities.
120. Suffolk County Council has led on the development of the Toolkit. A Suffolk LAA Culture and Sport Delivery Partnership has since been formed and is expected to take forward implementation.
121. Participation in projects that contribute to 'Access to Everyday Life', the county's adult social care programme, is also being measured. A standard data collection sheet is used to log how projects funded or partnered by the Council may be contributing. This quantitative data is collated by the performance officer and supplemented with storyboards and human interest stories. This is seen as a way of:
- testing the reach of the service to older people as participants and volunteers and quantifying the size of the contribution
 - measuring the impact of 'Everyday Life' activities that support Adult and Community Services' priorities on health and well-being.

Supporting documents available:

Suffolk County Council Impact Evaluation Toolkit, 2009
Access to Everyday Life data collection sheet

For further information contact:

Richard Hunt, Head of Service Development (Culture, Sport and Communities): Richard.Hunt@suffolk.gov.uk Tel: 01473 264626

Warrington Borough Council

122. Warrington has evaluated the impact on mental well-being of an arts programme for people with low level mental health needs, 'Creative Remedies', using the Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS). WEMWBS is a scale for assessing positive mental health developed by University of Warwick and University of Edinburgh for NHS Health Scotland. It comprises a set of 14 statements on positive thoughts and feelings covering most aspects of positive mental health, for example:
- I've been feeling optimistic about the future
 - I've been feeling useful
 - I've been feeling relaxed
 - I've been feeling interested in other people
123. Individuals are asked to complete a questionnaire that provides written evidence of the impact activity has had on their mental well-being. They rank themselves against some or all of the 14 statements by ticking one of five responses boxes against each that best describes how frequently they have experienced that particular feeling or thought in the past two weeks.
124. Although the sample size Warrington used to evaluate 'Creative Remedies' was small initial results from nearly a year's worth of data show some improvement. The Council is now planning to use the WEMWBS methodology for a physical exercise scheme that also has well-being objectives, 'Reach for Health', alongside lifestyle questions and physical tests such as blood pressure.

Supporting documents available:

The Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS), NHS Health Scotland, University of Warwick and University of Edinburgh, 2006

For further information contact:

Alan Boughey, Performance Development Manager, Neighbourhoods and Culture Service:
aboughey@warrington.gov.uk Tel: 01925 444156

Museums, Libraries and Archives Council

125. The Museums, Libraries and Archives Council (MLA) has developed Inspiring Learning (IL), an improvement toolkit for museums, libraries and archives. The IL Framework helps museums, libraries and archives to capture and evidence their impact by identifying generic learning and social outcomes (GLOs and GSOs) for individuals and communities. The GLOs are grouped under five overarching themes:

- Knowledge and understanding
- Skills
- Attitudes and values
- Enjoyment, inspiration, creativity
- Activity behaviour and progression

126. Each of the overarching themes has a number of areas of potential benefit or impact identified under it, for example under 'Knowledge and understanding' these are:

- Knowing what or about something
- Learning facts or information
- Making sense of something
- Deepening understanding
- How museums, libraries and archives operate
- Making links and relationships between things

127. The framework provides guidance on capturing, coding and analysing data through quantitative and qualitative methodologies. For example, the following statement on a customer feedback card is attributed to 'Knowledge and understanding' and to the sub theme of 'Knowing about something':

"It has given me an understanding of using computers. The Internet is the only way I can find the information I am after."

128. A number of local authorities are now using the GLOs to gather evidence and demonstrate the contribution of their services to local priority outcomes.

129. In addition to the use of the GLOs and GSOs, evaluations of national MLA programmes have adopted an approach consisting of an Evaluation Framework and Logic Model. The Logic Model maps the logical relationship from programme actions, through indicators to the intended impacts, and in doing so seeks to confirm the causal relationship between activities, outputs and outcomes. This in turn is informed by the data captured with reference to the Evaluation Framework.
130. MLA also led on the preliminary work undertaken on behalf of the cultural Non Departmental Public Bodies and a range of other partners on the development of a tool which could help to evidence the contribution of the culture and sport sector to positive outcomes for communities in the context of the National Indicator Set (NIS). This focused on five key national indicators (NIs):
- NI 1 - % of people who believe that people from different backgrounds get on well together in their local area
 - NI 6 – participation in regular volunteering
 - NI 7 – environment for a thriving third sector
 - NI 110 – positive activities for young people, and
 - NI 119 – self-reported measure of people’s overall health and well-being.
131. Initial work was undertaken to look at the cultural sector’s contribution to each of these NIs, appropriate performance measures and their associated data collection methodology, although no further development has taken place.

Supporting documents available:

Inspiring Learning improvement framework and tools <http://www.inspiringlearningforall.gov.uk>

For further information contact:

Jennifer Ngyou, Policy Adviser: Communities & Local Government: jennifer.ngyou@mla.gov.uk Tel: 020 7273 1409

Sunderland City Council

132. Sunderland Wellness Service uses an advanced user information system to monitor individuals’ physical activity levels and feeling of well-being by collected quantitative and qualitative data.
133. The Wellness Service aims to improve the health and well-being of individuals through the provision of physical activity opportunities, lifestyle advice and education. It targets individuals who are not yet engaged in physical activity and provides a range of preventative services, targeted interventions and specialist support services at a local level. The key principles of the Wellness Service are to shift the balance from treatment services to preventive measures and provide Wellness opportunities as an alternative or support for treatment. There are currently 7,597 Wellness Centre people using the city citywide network of state of the art Wellness Centre ‘hub’ sites, ‘spoke’ sites and neighbourhood level Community Wellness venues. The Service is delivered through a strategic alliance between the Council and health partners that brings together all those working in health promotion, sport and leisure services.

134. To access Wellness Centre equipment users log on with a SMART key. This provides them with information about their personal performance and asks questions periodically about how they feel about themselves. Data is aggregated in the Wellness Service system to show direction of travel.

For further information contact:

Mike Poulter, Head of Project and Service Improvement, Sunderland City Council:
Mike.Poulter@sunderland.gov.uk Tel: 0191 561 7549

Tunbridge Wells Borough Council

135. Tunbridge Wells Borough Council is collecting data and evidence at a programme level of the impact on the health of individuals of participating in sport, physical activity, recreation and GP referral activities. The activities are being funded by West Kent Primary Care Trust as part of their health improvement programme.
136. A number of proxy measures are being used which have been agreed as demonstrating the contribution to health. These include:
- contacts/attendance data
 - participant perception questionnaires recording 'positive outcomes'
 - reporting on the number and nature of the activities that have taken place.
137. Project participants are asked to complete an activity questionnaire every quarter that includes socio-demographic data and asking them to confirm what the positive benefits (outcomes) have been to them as an individual from a pre determined list. For example, by stating whether the activity has helped them to:
- become physically fitter
 - learn a new skill
 - exercise more often
 - lose weight (adults only)
 - eat more healthily
 - feel happier.
138. Activity leaders are asked to record the number of contacts and attendances, and to complete evaluation forms highlighting positive and negative aspects of the project. Reporting to the PCT on delivery of the outcomes is made quarterly and they are now in the second year of data collection.

Supporting documents available:

Choosing Health Activity Leaders Evaluation Form and Participant Monitoring Form, Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, 2009
Healthier Communities Co-ordinator's Report, Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, Quarter One 2009-2010

For further information contact:

Helen Wolstenholme, Healthier Communities Officer: Helen.wolstenholme@tunbridgewells.gov.uk Tel: 01892 554230

Trafford Council

139. Trafford has produced a case study on how partners have worked together to tackle gun crime and gang violence. A two to three year programme has focused on young people at risk of getting involved with gangs and who might have access to guns, and has been underpinned by culture and sport activities. For example, young people made a DVD, 'Living to Die', which was used to prompt discussions among other young men and women affected or at risk. Drama techniques have been used to get the message across. These included theatre in education projects with young women and extended schools programmes to show risk factors, identify why people get involved in gangs and what might have kept them out of gangs. More than 400 targeted young people regularly attended the Kickz Project with Manchester United players, local musicians and artists.
140. Trafford collected evidence showing that culture and sport activities had a direct impact on the overall reduction in levels of gun crime and gang violence. For example, the youth offending team used risk assessment to identify individual young people at high risk of getting involved in gangs to participate in Kickz Project. They have since tracked them and found that most have not got involved in gangs or committed crime.
141. Trafford's exceptional performance in tackling gun crime and gang violence was recognised by a green flag as part of the first round of comprehensive area assessment in 2009.

Supporting documents available:

Tackling gun crime and gang violence green flag,

<http://oneplace.direct.gov.uk/infobyarea/region/area/pages/flags.aspx?region=53&area=417>

For further information contact:

Helen McFarlane, Director of Community Safety, Culture and Sport: Helen.mcfarlane@trafford.gov.uk Tel: 0161 912 3434

Tools that demonstrate the financial value of outcomes

Museums, Libraries and Archives Council

142. Research commissioned by MLA on methodologies to capture the social and economic value of cultural organisations concluded that the sector needed to strengthen its capacity to identify, implement and communicate the results of studies using better impact methodologies. It highlighted the need to communicate using a new language of 'triple bottom line' (for example, economic, social and environmental) outcomes and return on investment.
143. MLA subsequently commissioned nef consulting to write a think-piece on the potential importance for the sector of Social Return on Investment (SROI) and followed it up with an event to discuss the SROI approach. MLA is also undertaking two pieces of evaluation working with ERS to capture the SROI of:
 - Investment in Community Engagement activities at Renaissance-funded museums. This evaluation is tracking a number of projects, to capture the full impact of community engagement activities and to calculate the financial and social returns on investment by identifying the costs of these activities and quantifying the outcomes and impacts. Specifically, the evaluation has sought to:

- identify the outputs of community engagement activities and track progress of outcomes
- capture the effectiveness of organisational development activities undertaken to deliver these activities.

The final report is due in May 2010.

- The Big Lottery Fund investment in Community Libraries. This evaluation is currently underway and seeks to capture the social returns on investment of the Programme, encapsulating its outputs, outcomes and assessing the effectiveness of the processes underpinning its delivery. It consists of three phases:
 - development of an evaluation framework and logic model
 - data capture, including working with six local authorities on in depth case studies
 - reporting and dissemination.

Findings are due in March 2010.

Supporting documents:

Economic Impact Methodologies for the museums, libraries and archives sector: What works and what doesn't. Report by Jura Consultants for the MLA Council and MLA South East, June 2008
<http://research.mla.gov.uk/evidence/view-publication.php?dm=nrm&pubid=924>

For further information contact:

Ailbhe McNabola, Head of Research and Evidence, MLA: ailbhe.mcnabola@mla.gov.uk

Tools that measure economic impact

Liverpool City Council

144. 'Impacts 08', commissioned by Liverpool City Council, is a five year research programme designed to establish the economic, environmental, social and cultural impact of the Liverpool 2008 European Capital of Culture (ECoC). It is being delivered jointly by the University of Liverpool and Liverpool John Moores University. The research has identified a series of benchmark indicators to measure impact in the areas of:
- Economic impact, including the strength of the local economy, economic growth, employment and skills levels and impacts on tourism
 - The City's Cultural System, including the shape and profile of the sector and sustainability of the system (investment, earned and total income, staff employed, subsidy levels, known attendances at events etc) and the Liverpool Culture Company's contribution
 - Cultural access and participation, including cultural participation and satisfaction levels, demographic breakdown of participants and audiences, volunteering, local interest in culture and cultural events
 - Image, identity and sense of place, including amount, attitude and economic value of media coverage and personal impressions of Liverpool by people outside of the region
 - Physical infrastructure and sustainability, including physical infrastructure investment, travel and transport and cultural company activity to minimise environmental impact

- Philosophy and management of the process, including income and expenditure, sponsor and partner involvement, local and national knowledge and satisfaction with Liverpool ECoC and information management.
145. Research methodologies being adopted to inform the evaluation include in depth interviews, media impact analysis, business impact analysis, local area studies focussing on the experiences of local people using mainly qualitative techniques, assessment of secondary data collected by Liverpool City Council and the Culture Company, as well as data from external sources in the region and the rest of the UK.
146. One of the broader aims of Impacts 08 is to develop a research model for evaluating the multiple impacts of culture-led regeneration programmes that can be applied to events across the UK and beyond. Significant work has already taken place on developing this model, particular in relation to measuring key areas such as economic impact.
147. The Impacts 08 team at the University of Liverpool, and the University for the Creative Arts have also worked together with Arts Council England to run a programme of workshops to explore interpretations of quality within arts and cultural experiences, and approaches to measuring their impact. These particularly focused on two cultural spheres: the digital and the public realm.

Supporting documents available:

Impacts 08 Benchmark Indicators, University of Liverpool and Liverpool John Moores University, December 2008

Impact Workshops: Measuring Audience Engagement, Impacts 08 and partners, October 2009

Wide range of other information and research reports available on the Impacts 08 web site (see below)

For further information see:

<http://www.liv.ac.uk/impacts08/About/about.htm>

Repeated or longitudinal research

Heritage Lottery Fund

148. Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) evaluates the social impact of the programmes and projects it funds, with a specific focus on volunteering. A methodology has been developed by BOP consulting based on the GSO framework for carrying out surveys of volunteers involved in HLF-funded activity through self-completion questionnaires, in both electronic and paper forms. The survey identifies the benefits to both individuals and communities of volunteering. It covers:
- Impact on individuals:
 - Social inclusion and access
 - Skills development and exchange
 - Well-being and health
 - Impact on communities:
 - Social capital formation
 - Strengthening public life
 - Community focus
 - Community cohesion

149. It also uses some of the same questions as the General Health Questionnaire, for example:

- Have you recently felt that you are playing a useful part in things?
- Have you recently felt capable of making decisions about things?

This enables comparison between HLF volunteers with general volunteering.

150. The first year results show a significantly higher than average increase in HLF volunteers feeling they are 'playing a useful part in things'. This evidence can be used to help make the case that volunteering in HLF-funded projects brings greater benefits than other forms of volunteering.

151. Now in its second year, evaluation of volunteering outcomes will cover a bigger sample of projects and include more in-depth work with some organisations around health and mental health as well as some detailed quantitative work.

152. HLF also assesses the economic impact of the projects it funds, working with GHK Consulting. This covers the impact of projects on the local economy during the development of the project (for example, how many person days of employment the project has bought, and whether this has stayed in the local economy) and after completion. Results show that on average £90,000 of HLF grant supports one job in regional businesses, which is higher than general regeneration schemes. This evidence can be used to make the case that heritage makes an effective contribution to the local economy, especially when projects are sourced locally.

Supporting documents available:

Assessment of the Social Impact of Participation in HLF-funded projects: Final Report, BOP Consulting, 2009

For further information contact:

Isla Campbell, Research Manager, Heritage Lottery Fund: islac@hlf.org.uk Tel: 020 7591 6038

Examples from other sectors

153. The examples set out below represent a cross section of approaches to outcome measurement in other sectors that are currently in use or that are being developed by local authorities and non cultural organisations, with a particular focus on the health, children and young people and adult social care sectors. The review does not claim to be exhaustive but aims to give a good overview of the scope of current approaches and tools.
154. As with our research within the cultural sector we found significant diversity of approaches and levels of application, but some common themes. We have grouped the examples under the headings of:
- Frameworks/Models
 - Tools and guidance that help:
 - outcome focused service planning and measurement
 - gather information and perceptions from individuals
 - demonstrate the financial value of outcomes
 - data entry and reporting

Frameworks/Models

The Every Child Matters Outcome Framework

155. The Every Child Matters (ECM) Outcomes of Be Healthy, Stay Safe, Enjoy and Achieve, Make a Positive Contribution and Achieve Economic Well Being outline the government's ambitions for all children and young people. Children's Trusts are responsible for delivering these outcomes, working within the ECM Outcomes Framework. The Framework shows the links across government between the ECM outcomes and the Children's Plan 2020 Goals, National Public Service Agreements and DCSF Departmental Strategic Objectives and the National Indicators.

Further information: <http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/everychildmatters/about/aims/outcomes/outcomescyp/>

Health Improvement Outcomes Frameworks

156. NHS Health Scotland in collaboration with the Scottish Government, NHS Boards, local authorities and third sector organisations is currently developing a series of outcome frameworks for particular areas that contribute to health improvement, including Physical Activity.
157. The outcomes frameworks include three key tools:
- An Outcomes Triangle, that sets out national outcomes, high level outcomes, intermediate outcomes and service delivery outcomes
 - Logic models that map out the link between activities and outcomes
 - Multiple results chain states the contribution of different sectors to the specified outcomes.

158. The frameworks also include the evidence or theory that underpins the logic model and guidance on how to measure the outcomes and how good particular outcome indicators are.

Further information: <http://www.evaluationsummerschool.com/AX4598753/index.html>

The Outcomes Framework for Mental Health Services

159. The Outcomes Framework for Mental Health Services has been developed as part of the work of the National Social Inclusion Programme. It provides a menu of suggested outcomes with associated performance indicators for use by commissioners and service providers working with adults of a working age with mental health problems. It distinguishes between outcomes for individuals and service outcomes.

160. Individual outcomes are identified under eight domains:

- Community participation
- Social networks
- Employment
- Education and Training
- Physical health
- Mental well being
- Independent living
- Personalisation and choice

161. Service outcomes are identified under three domains:

- Service user satisfaction
- Service user involvement
- Diversity

162. Each domain has defined two intended outcomes and two key outcome indicators plus between three and nine additional outcome indicators. Some measures are of direct relevance to culture and sport.

Further information:

http://www.socialinclusion.org.uk/publications/Broadened_Social_Inclusion_Outcomes_Framework.pdf

World Class Commissioning Assurance Framework

163. The World Class Commissioning Assurance Framework is intended to support Primary Care Trusts (PCTs) achieve better health outcomes and the reduction of health inequalities and also provides a framework within which they can be held to account. Within the Framework PCTs are assessed against three core elements: Outcomes, Competencies and Governance. The outcomes reflect the overall improvement in health and well-being of the population and reduction in health inequalities. Competencies reflect improvements in the PCT's skills and behaviours as commissioners. Governance reflects the underlying grip that the board and the organisation have on their core business.

164. In terms of the outcomes, each PCT's performance is assessed against 10 outcomes. Two outcomes - improving life expectancy and reducing health inequalities - are compulsory for all PCTs, with each PCT then selecting a further 8 outcomes from a predetermined list of 63 outcomes defined by the Department of Health. PCTs are expected to choose outcomes that are reflected in their strategic plan priorities and that have been agreed with their partners and stakeholders. Performance against the outcomes is reported on an annual basis.

Further information:

http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/Publicationsandstatistics/Publications/PublicationsPolicyAndGuidance/DH_105117

Tools and guidance that help outcome focused service planning and measurement

The Charities Evaluation Service National Outcomes Programme

165. The National Outcomes Programme (NOP) has been developed by the Charities Evaluation Service initially with funding from the Big Lottery Fund and more recently with Capacitybuilders funding. The programme encourages third sector organisations to adopt an outcome focused approach so they can demonstrate the effect the organisation is having and whether they are successful in achieving their aims.
166. The NOP involves the use of the CES 'Planning Triangle' to define and confirm an organisations aims and objectives, along with the subsequent outcomes and outputs that will be delivered and related performance indicators. NOP also involves a comprehensive cascaded training programme delivered by 'Outcomes Champions'.

Further information: <http://www.ces-vol.org.uk/index.cfm?pg=116>

Outcomes Based Accountability

167. The concept of Outcomes Based Accountability (OBA) has been adopted by a growing number of local authorities and other organisations, particularly in relation to the Every Child Matters Outcomes. OBA is a conceptual approach to planning services and assessing their performance that focuses attention on the results – or outcomes – that the services are intended to achieve.
168. Key features include the involvement of stakeholders, including service users and the wider community, in achieving better outcomes and a clear distinction between:
- population accountability, and
 - performance accountability.
169. Population accountability is where the aim is to achieve better outcomes for particular groups (such as all children and young people) in a defined geographical area, whereas performance accountability is intended to improve outcomes for the users of individual services, agencies and departments as a contribution towards achieving better outcomes at population level.

170. Turning the Curve is a toolkit for implementing OBA into action. It describes a process that enables stakeholders to identify the priority outcomes they wish to improve. By analysing and understanding trend data, they can construct a strategy for achieving better outcomes. When presented in graphic terms their plans demonstrate how future investment in better services coupled with the contribution of non-governmental partners is expected to shift the indicator or performance measure data in a positive direction – thereby Turning the Curve.
171. OBA provides a staged approach and a series of questions that service managers can use to ensure they plan effectively and identify whether they are delivering the intended outcomes.

Further information: <http://www.idea.gov.uk/idk/core/page.do?pageId=9525926>

Results Based Management and Contribution Analysis

172. Results-Based Management (RBM) is a management strategy widely used in international development work but that is also informing the Scottish Government's approach to measuring outcomes. RBM and the associated Management and Accountability Framework emphasise the importance of defining expected results with the involvement of key stakeholders, assessing the risks that may impede expected results, monitoring programmes designed to achieve these results through the use of appropriate indicators, reporting on performance in achieving results, and acting on performance information.
173. A 'results chain' is at the core of this process: human and financial resources (inputs) generate activities that produce results in the short term (outputs); in the medium, end-of-project, term (outcomes); and in the long term (impacts). At its heart, RBM guides all management activities towards the ultimate achievement of defined results. RBM encourages the use of the outcomes information in decision-making and for the purposes of service improvement and accountability.
174. Further development of the RBM approach in Canada has produced what is known as 'Contribution analysis'. This particularly addresses the issue of partnership working, of identifying what each partner might most effectively contribute to improving population level (or area-wide) outcomes and how these contributions might be assessed and reported.
175. Contribution analysis uses theory-based evaluation methods, existing evidence and a participatory process to clarify the 'intervention logic' of an organization's contribution to improving shared social outcomes. It builds up a picture of the full set of plausible interventions required by a partnership that together would be expected to bring about the desired changes in key community outcomes. Robust performance monitoring and evaluative information is then collected and used as the basis for telling, and revising, the performance story. Case studies of contribution analysis are now being developed in Scotland.

Further information:

Results Based Management http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/rma/rbm-gar_e.asp

Contribution Analysis <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/175356/0091400.pdf>

Tools that can help gather information and perceptions from individuals

The Outcomes of Social Care for Adults

176. The Outcomes of Social Care for Adults³ (OSCA) project is described as ‘developing a gold standard preference weighted measure of social care outcome’. The measure being developed (the ASCOT measure) is part of the Adult Social Care Outcome Toolkit (ASCOT), which in turn is being developed as part of the Quality Measurement Framework (QMF) project led by the Office for National Statistics.
177. The ASCOT measure is designed to capture information about an individual’s social care related quality of life and will also assist adult and social care services to demonstrate the ‘outcome improvement’ that has taken place as a result of people using their service. The aim is for the measure to be applicable across as wide a range of user groups and care and support settings as possible.
178. Significant research has gone into the development of ASCOT and is continuing to ensure that when it is finalised it will be robust and validated. However, at its simplest, the measure captures the views of service users in nine key outcome domains, for example, personal cleanliness, control over daily life, safety, social participation and use of time. Within each domain a series of questions is asked (either through interview or self completion) to determine their current position, whether they believe the support and services of social services helps them with that aspect of their life and what the impact would be if social services did not provide that service. These questions are designed not only to help identify whether services are meeting the needs of service users, but also to enable the social service to directly attribute its role to the achievement of an improved outcome. An example of the questions for the social participation domain is shown below.

Thinking about how much contact you’ve had with people you like, which of the following statements best describes your social situation?

I have as much social contact as I want with people I like

I have adequate social contact with people

I have some social contact with people, but not enough

I have little social contact with people and feel socially isolated

Do the support and services that you get from Social Services help you to have contact with people you like?

Yes

No

Don’t know

If 17 = yes then

Imagine that you didn’t have the support and services from Social Services that you do now and no other help stepped in. In that situation, which of the following would best describe how much contact you have with people you like?

I would have as much social contact as I want with people I like

I would have adequate social contact with people

I would have some social contact with people, but not enough

I would have little social contact with people and would feel socially isolated

³ The Outcomes of Social Care for Adults, PSSRU

179. The reliability and validity of the measure is still being tested, with further research taking place during 2009-2010.
180. The ASCOT toolkit that is being developed to support its implementation is slightly broader than the measure itself and includes guidance on:
- validated self-completion questionnaires, interview and observational techniques
 - surveying techniques
 - data interpretation tools
 - draw-down of existing data.

Further information:

OSCA <http://www.pssru.ac.uk/pdf/p081.pdf>

QMF <http://www.statistics.gov.uk/about/data/methodology/specific/PublicSector/output/qmf/reports-updates.asp>

The Outcomes Star

181. The Outcomes Star⁴ was developed as a tool to help services focus on the needs, potential and development of homeless people. Through encouraging individual recording of positive progression in key areas of people's lives against a 10 point ladder of change, it supports an individual to bring about change. The key areas are:
- Motivation and taking responsibility
 - Self care and living skills
 - Managing money
 - Social networks and relationships
 - Drug and alcohol misuse
 - Physical health
 - Emotional and mental health
 - Meaningful use of time
 - Managing tenancy and accommodation
 - Offending
182. Participants rate themselves on the ladder of change:
- 1-2 = Stuck
 - 3-4 = Accepting help
 - 5-6 = Believing
 - 7-8 = Learning
 - 9-10 = Self Reliance
183. It also enables a service to collect evidence at different stages of an intervention to demonstrate how specific outcomes are being delivered.

⁴ The Outcomes Star, London Housing Foundation and Triangle Consulting Second Edition 2008

184. The model is increasing in popularity and use, not just by services working with homeless people but also in adapted forms in other services such as young people, youth offending and cultural services. One example is 'The Recovery Star' used in mental health services.
185. The Outcomes Star is supported by the Outcomes Star System, an online IT system to support its use.

Further information: http://www.homelessoutcomes.org.uk/The_Outcomes_Star.aspx

The Soft Outcomes Universal Learning Record

186. The Soft Outcomes Universal Learning Record (SOUL)⁵ is a framework that helps organisations, in particular third sector organisations, to monitor and measure progress in 'soft' outcomes and informal learning. It is also being used to demonstrate delivery by some organisations against the five Every Child Matters Outcomes. It consists of questionnaires for both adults and children that enable an initial assessment to be made of how an individual feels about their current situation and then over time the distance travelled in relation to soft outcomes. Over 80 soft outcomes have been identified including self esteem, confidence, aspirations, non verbal communication, listening skills and inter-personal skills. Questionnaires can be created based on the objectives an organisation needs to deliver against and that an individual is seeking to achieve.
187. The questionnaires include a series of statements such as 'I am a confident person' or 'I am willing to take on responsibility' and asks people to rate themselves on a scale between one (strongly disagree) to six (strongly agree). Participants complete them at the start of an intervention or provision of a service and ideally at least twice more during the intervention or service provision.
188. The questionnaires help participants and service providers diagnose where they might need more support as well as what they have achieved. Various worksheets to support progress have also been developed and staff can select the most appropriate for the individual client. There are also versions to use with children and young people based on the ECM outcomes. Organisations using the SOUL Record can collate this quantitative data and feed it into a spreadsheet results package to produce bar charts and summaries of data.

Further information: <http://www.soulrecord.org/>

Tools that help demonstrate the financial value of outcomes

Social Return on Investment

189. The social return on investment (SROI) methodology is an outcomes approach originally developed for social enterprises from traditional cost-benefit analysis. The methodology puts a monetary value on the social and environmental benefits of an organisation relative to a given amount of investment. The process involves an analysis of inputs, outputs, outcomes and impacts leading to the calculation of a monetary value for those impacts, and finally to an SROI ratio or rating.

⁵ Developed by the Research Centre, City College Norwich 2006

190. SROI studies have now been applied to organisations producing social returns, such as helping ex-offenders into employment, where benefits can be seen as clients cease to receive benefits and start to pay taxes, all of which result in savings to the criminal justice system. It is recognised that the methodology may not be suitable or appropriate for some organisations, but the SROI methodology could help make a good case for providing certain types of services and is especially useful if an organisation's funders require outcomes information in financial terms.

Further information: <http://www.thesroinetwork.org>

Tools that support data entry and reporting

Substance Views

191. Substance Views is currently being developed with the support of the National Endowment for Science, Technology and the Arts (NESTA) and the UK Government Cabinet Office. It is a new online platform that is designed to support projects to more effectively capture the information they need to demonstrate social impact whilst lowering the burden of data collection. It represents a new phase of development of the current Substance Project Reporting System (SPRS) which provides an online monitoring, evaluation and reporting framework. Substance Views is also intended to help with the move towards outcome based commissioning.

192. Substance Views consists of four 'views' that support the capture and input of various forms of evidence and data, and help create reports that demonstrate how a project or service is delivering its intended outcomes. These are the:

- contacts view
- work view
- evidence view
- reports view.

193. Piloting of Substance Views is due to take place in early 2010.

Further information: <http://network.substanceviews.net>

Valuemap

194. The Big Lottery Fund Way of Life programme in Wales consist of 14 projects that will test new ways of promoting healthy eating and physical activity among children under 12 years old and their families. As part of the evaluation of the programme, projects are using Valuemap, an online reporting tool. Each project has a unique 'Valuemap' that identifies the performance indicators and targets that are being used to evaluate the success of the project. Project managers are required to enter data about the project and individual participants on the programme into the Valuemap system. Individual projects can generate their own reports and BIG can also aggregate the data. In depth case studies are also being collected to supplement the project data.

Further information: <http://www.valuemapping.co.uk/VMWOL>

To see an example of Valuemap at the login page enter username admin001, password 5098.

Drivers, learning points and challenges in measuring outcomes

195. This section sets out why local authorities and other organisations are developing and using an outcome based approach for culture and sport, aspects of their outcome based approaches that have worked well and others can learn from, and the challenges they face. It is based on consultation with the organisations listed at Appendix 1. The drivers, learning points and challenges experienced by those already attempting to measure outcomes for culture and sport will need to be taken into account in the development of any new outcomes framework for the sector.

Main drivers

196. Consultation with local authorities and other organisations revealed several reasons why they are developing or using outcome based approaches for culture and sport.

Support advocacy and position the sector

197. Increasing awareness and understanding among decision makers of the sector's contribution to local priority outcomes emerged as one of the main reasons for developing outcome based approaches for culture and sport. This means being able to demonstrate evidence of the contribution of culture and sport to SCS themes, LAA targets and corporate objectives.

198. Culture and sport are felt by many to have a low profile in LAAs, even where they feature strongly in the SCS. Building a better evidence base is believed to be essential in strengthening the credibility of the sector to enable it to have greater influence with partners. This would help position culture and sport more firmly within the thinking of Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) operational, or thematic, partnerships and LAA negotiations.

199. Recognising the area-based and partnership focus on delivering outcomes, local authorities believe it is important that the culture and sport organisations they fund contribute to local priority outcomes and that evidence of their contribution is captured. This presents a new way of thinking and working for some culture and sport sector partners. Influencing delivery partners to realign their work to meeting SCS priorities and LAA targets therefore forms a key part of authorities' advocacy work.

Respond to financial pressures

200. Many authorities feel they need to develop outcome based approaches for culture and sport to justify current funding levels and to protect services from future cuts. Some believe it necessary to secure commitment to future service development or additional investment in the sector in their area. Evidence showing how culture and sport provision can help manage demand and financial pressures on statutory services has been found by some to be effective in making the case for continued investment.

Improve performance management

201. Developing an outcome based approach for culture and sport is seen as a crucial part of improving performance management of the sector. It is expected to help share learning on 'what works' and provide a means of challenging service performance to inform service design.

202. Performance management of culture and sport is felt to lag behind statutory sectors, so it is time to make up lost ground and respond to outcomes frameworks and evidence approaches used in other sectors, such as health. Contributing to the evidence base for comprehensive area assessment (CAA) and the London 2012 legacy were also identified as reasons for developing outcome based approaches for culture and sport.

Drive better commissioning of culture and sport

203. A few authorities see developing outcome based approaches for culture and sport as a crucial step in enabling the sector to respond to future strategic commissioning opportunities. It should provide evidence of the impact of culture and sport that the sector can use to make the case for how culture and sport can deliver local priority outcomes. This in turn should strengthen the position of culture and sport service providers in the public, community and voluntary sectors within commissioning processes and help them win contracts. An outcomes framework for culture and sport would also provide a range of measures commissioned organisations would need to report on their performance.

Show accountability for public funding

204. One organisation argued that every organisation funded from the public purse should be assessing its impact on people's lives as a matter of course to demonstrate accountability for public funding.

Learning points

205. Most local authorities and organisations could identify aspects of their outcome based approach that had worked well and others could learn from. The main learning points that will need to be taken into account in the development of any new outcomes framework for the sector are set out below.

Involve local partners in the development process

206. Actively involving LSP and other key external partners in developing an outcomes framework for culture and sport helps them buy into it. A well structured and managed process can enable partners to identify for themselves the contribution culture and sport can make to their priorities. It also provides opportunities to develop and test assumptions linking cultural and sports activities to short and long term outcomes for individuals and communities. This provides a means of validating the framework locally. It ensures indicators used to make the link between culture and sport provision and local priority outcomes provide evidence that partners see as credible and convincing.
207. Involving an internal corporate performance perspective in developing an outcomes approach for culture and sport is also important in securing buy-in and ensuring alignment to corporate performance arrangements.

Strike a balance between flexibility and standardisation

208. Frameworks, models and tools need to accommodate the different contributions and degree of contribution different parts of the culture and sport sector make to different outcomes. A 'one size fits all' approach is not flexible enough to reflect the outcomes and impacts of specific areas of service. It risks either over-stating or over-generalising the sector's contribution. Frameworks covering several authorities need to accommodate the different stage of development each authority has reached in their own performance management arrangements.
209. Within this overall flexible approach measures and methodologies for collecting data should be standardised as far as possible. This allows results by different areas of service and service providers to be aggregated and compared. Using externally validated or quality assured tools such as the General Health Questionnaire or Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS) enables benchmarking against 'control' groups. It may also boost the support of partners working in other sectors, such as health, who are familiar with and value the use of these tools in other contexts.

Make sure the ease and cost of data collection are proportionate

210. Authorities have struggled to decide the right data to collect and the optimum number of indicators or measures to use. They have found they risk relying too much on existing data sets and measuring what can be measured rather than focusing on what should be measured. Some recognise they may have too many measures, or the data has proved too difficult or resource intensive to collect. As a result, in some cases data has not been collected properly or at all.
211. The data needed to populate an outcomes framework for culture and sport needs to be capable of being collected in a way that is consistent, proportionate and cost effective. Some authorities have found using data collected by partner organisations helps the ease and cost of data collection.
212. A minority argued that it may be better for the culture and sport sector to focus on gathering evidence of its contribution to a small number of outcomes well, rather than risk spreading resources too thinly by trying to capture evidence of the sectors' contribution to many outcomes.

Provide effective leadership

213. Authorities have found effective leadership is needed to ensure performance frameworks, models and tools are actually used and data is collected systematically. This can prove a particular challenge where culture and sport provision is split between local authority directorates or where frameworks cover several local authorities or organisations. Without the necessary leadership in place implementation can fail completely.

Challenges

214. Despite the progress and learning by organisations already involved in developing outcome based approaches for culture and sport, significant challenges remain.

How to collect and collate consistent data

215. One of the major challenges local authorities and other organisations face is how to collect and collate consistent data from a range of sources. A lack of high quality output data in parts of the sector makes it difficult to collect even basic usage data across services. Limited understanding by some culture and sport service providers about the importance of outcomes, why they need to demonstrate impact and how to go about it means gathering reliable data from them can be difficult. Even where partners have agreed to collect data, different data collection systems can mean they collect different information for the same indicator. Encouraging other agencies to share data they already collect can also be problematic.
216. Incompatible data capture, entry and reporting systems make collating data collected from partners difficult, and a lack of data sharing protocols means some concerns about ownership and data protection have not been resolved. The cost of collecting data, especially primary data such as individuals' perceptions remains a barrier.

The sector's limited capacity

217. The capacity of the sector to collect and collate data is limited although it does vary. Local authorities within a sub-region have differing levels of capacity and small authorities in particular can struggle if data collection is too onerous. Where capacity is limited it takes longer to reach agreement between partners on indicators, definitions and collection and reporting methodologies.
218. Even where data is collected and collated, the sector does not always have the skills to analyse and interpret it.

The strength of the existing evidence base

219. Some organisations argue that a weak research evidence base in some parts of the culture and sport sector means the existing evidence base is not strong enough to support outcome based approaches across the sector.
220. The length of time needed to show an impact on life outcomes also presents a challenge: impact may not always be immediate or year on year change may be too small to measure.

Reporting arrangements may not lend themselves to showing the impact of culture and sport

221. Even where local authorities and other organisations are making efforts to measure culture and sport outcomes they do not necessarily use or report the data, either internally or externally. Reporting the impact of culture and sport does not always fit well with local authority corporate performance management arrangements. This may be because corporate arrangements are focused exclusively on performance against the national indicator set or LAA targets, or are not outcomes-based. Sometimes it is because corporate performance managers do not view the data as robust.
222. External reporting can also prove problematic. Different partners require different data, which means data collection and reporting is not always joined up or linked to local priorities.

Conclusions and recommendations

223. The review of outcome based approaches has identified that significant effort is being made by local authorities and other organisations to improve outcome measurement. Within the range of outcome based approaches we considered from both within and outside of the culture and sport sector we found some potentially robust and workable approaches. However, within culture and sport because so many are in their first year of implementation, or are only just being developed and piloted, their full effectiveness is not yet known.
224. Analysis of the constituent elements of the many different outcome based approaches reviewed does reveal some commonalities. These include:
- clear identification of different ‘tiers’ of measurement and related performance measures, for example national outcomes, high level outcomes, intermediate outcomes and service delivery outcomes, or inputs, outputs, project outcomes, strategic outcomes, wider socio-economic outcomes
 - the use of logic models, linking activity to outputs and outcomes, supported by an explanation or evidence
 - recognition of differences between individual and wider community outcomes
 - creation of ‘menus’ of outcome indicators to select from, enabling local priorities to be reflected
 - the provision of tools or guidance to support the adoption and implementation of outcome based approaches, including standard questions for inclusion in surveys or guidance on the process to be followed.
225. Most people involved in our research felt that developing a consistent outcomes framework for culture and sport would be valued and that there was merit in progressing to the next stage of the project. However, this was qualified by a widely held view that significant flexibility would be needed to ensure a single outcomes framework for the sector could accommodate differing local priorities.
226. Based on the research and consultation undertaken **our recommendation is that the project should proceed to stage 2 and that a draft outcomes framework for culture and sport should be developed and piloted with a cross section of authorities and cultural trusts.**
227. In so doing a number of factors will need to be considered:
- **The scope of the framework.** This will need to be confirmed in terms of:
 - who it is for (in other words, is it just for local authorities or for a range of organisations in the culture and sports sector)
 - what is the intended level(s) of outcome measurement (for example, programme, service, whole organisation or all levels)
 - the constituent elements (for example, a logic model, menu of indicators, practical tools)
 - **Key terms and definitions.** Certain terms need to be agreed and defined (for example, impact and outcome)
 - **The CASE project.** Development, where appropriate, needs to be aligned with the CASE drivers and value framework.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees

Arts Council England	Patricia Stead
Audit Commission	Tricia Kilsby
BOP Consulting	Richard Naylor
DC Research	Stephen Connolly
Department for Culture, Media and Sport	Adam Cooper and Mabel Wanogho
Dorset County Council	Paul Leivers
ECOTEC	Jonathan France
English Heritage	Owain Lloyd-James
Gateshead Council	Ann Borthwick and Louise Rule
Glasgow Council	Susan Deighan
Heritage Lottery Fund	Isla Campbell
Hertfordshire 2012 Partnership	John Fuller
Hertsmere Council	Ed Sandham
IDeA	Martyn Allison, Adrian Barker, Hannah Deacon, Liam Hughes and Martyn Seymour
Kent County Council	Lucy Ann Bett
Leisure-net	David Albutt
London Borough of Havering	Guy Selfe
London Borough of Newham	Becky Furnell, James Anderton and Adrian May
London Cultural Improvement Group	Sue Thiedeman, Nicky Boyd
Knowsley Council	Paula Williams
Leicester City Council	Liz Blyth
Manchester City Council	Pauline Clarke
Museums, Libraries and Archives Council	Ailbhe McNabola and Jennifer Ngyou

Newark and Sherwood District Council	Sarah Dawes
Nottingham Trent University	Pete Murphy
Play England	Issy Cole-Hamilton and Neil Coleman
Shropshire Council	George Candler and Kim Wootton
Sport England	Maria Reader and Darcy Hare
Suffolk County Council	Richard Hunt
Sunderland City Council	Robin Pepper and Mike Poulter
Swindon Borough Council	Helena Robinson
Tunbridge Wells Borough Council	Helen Wolstenholme
Trafford Council	Helen McFarlane
Triangle Consulting	Sarah Burns
Tyne and Wear Archives & Museums	Alec Cole, Ann Fletcher-Williams and John Hentley
University of Edinburgh	Erica Wimbush
VOCAL	Rod Stone
Warrington Borough Council	Alan Boughey
Wigan Leisure and Culture Trust	Chris Derbyshire