The Mayor of London is committed to delivering inclusive growth across London.

The Good Growth Fund provides an exciting opportunity for the GLA to work with partners across the city to deliver against our three overarching objectives: Making Better Places, Growing Prosperity and Empowering People.

As a fundamental part of the Good Growth Fund, we want to better understand how London is changing, and the impact that our investment is having on London’s places and communities.

To support this, we are asking Good Growth Fund project partners to prioritise the collection of evidence on the environmental, social and economic impact of their interventions and to evaluate the performance of their projects once delivery is complete. Equalities monitoring and understanding who benefits from regeneration interventions is an integral part of this.

We want project delivery partners to work with us to deliver a rounded and robust assessment of impact and performance, which does justice to the ambition of their ideas.

Strong evidence will help us to continue to make the case for investing in London’s places and communities, and to have stronger and better-informed conversations about the impact we are having.
WHAT IS THIS HANDBOOK?

This handbook has been produced to provide guidance to Good Growth Fund project partners on collecting evidence, demonstrating impact and undertaking evaluation. The Greater London Authority (GLA) and the LEAP (London Economic Action Partnership) are committed to understanding the impact of our investment. As part of the Good Growth Fund, we want to work with you to develop robust and bespoke approaches to demonstrating the impact of your projects. As a formal requirement of the funding, you will need to:

- Develop an Evaluation Strategy before Grant Agreements are signed, which sets out your baseline position and a clear approach to collecting evidence
- A self-evaluation report at project completion which provides final information on project impact and performance
- Participate in programme wide evaluation undertaken by the Regeneration team (or their consultants)

We have drawn on our experience and that of project partners in collecting evidence and demonstrating impact over previous rounds of funding, both in terms of technical approaches to evidence collection, and practical considerations about what is achievable within the scale and scope of different projects.

This handbook is intended for guidance only. In each case we want to work with projects to develop an approach to collecting evidence which best reflects the specifics and nuances of your project.

Alongside the guidance in this handbook, we have developed a number of tools to support the evidence collection process:

- A glossary of monitoring and evaluation terminology – see Appendix A
- A summary to help you plan your Evaluation Strategy – see Appendix B for further details
- A summary to help you plan your self-evaluation and undertake reporting on impact and performance at project completion – see Appendix C for further details.

Information on support available to project partners in collecting evidence is provided throughout this handbook.

For more general advice or information, please contact us at GoodGrowthFund@london.gov.uk
This handbook aims to help practitioners to design stronger approaches to evidence collection: approaches which reflect project identity and distinctiveness, while remaining robust, transparent and consistent.

We have distilled the guidance into a checklist of ten principles which we think should underpin good evidence collection and evaluation. These should be kept in mind as you plan your evaluation strategy, undertake monitoring, and complete your self-evaluation.

GOOD EVIDENCE COLLECTION: A CHECKLIST

1. A clear understanding of **project context** and **baseline** conditions
2. A thorough mapping of expected **project beneficiaries**
3. A set of clear and S.M.A.R.T. **objectives**: specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time specific
4. A **balanced basket** of output and outcome measures, covering a range of economic, social, environmental and strategic considerations
5. **Robust evidence** collection from which lessons can be learnt and recommendation and decisions informed
6. **Qualitative insights** underpinning beneficiary case studies and assessment of strategic value
7. Consideration of **additionality** demonstrating causality between delivery and outcomes
8. An **open and inquiring** approach to evaluation which gathers value adding insight
9. **Long term thinking**, focusing on project legacy, and an on-going commitment to tracking change
10. A realistic assessment of **resource and capacity** required to collect evidence and undertake evaluation.
The strategic themes of the Good Growth Fund have grown out of the Mayor’s ‘City for all Londoners’ vision document. The Fund promotes good growth and recognises that whilst London is a growing dynamic place, the benefits of this are not always shared and in some case, partners need to intervene to create more inclusive prosperous places.

The Good Growth Fund

The Good Growth Fund is open to a broad range of public, private and third-sector organisations including: London boroughs, sub-regional partnerships, town teams and business improvement districts, workspace providers, community groups, social enterprises, small and medium-sized enterprises, and charities within London that wish to drive and lead regeneration in their local area.

It has been designed to support three strategic themes:

- Empowering People,
- Making Better Places
- Growing Prosperity

Each theme comes with its own set of challenges and opportunities, and no theme can be considered in isolation. The Good Growth Fund represents a new approach for the GLA and it is hoped that this will lead to a wider range of partners delivering a broader set of projects. Fundamental to the fund’s success is projects that deliver in their local context, targeting specific issues and contributing to the successful evolution of their locality.

The Role of Good Information and Evidence

If we are to achieve our objectives to deliver Good Growth, it is important that we collect evidence of change and the positive effect our projects are having. We want our partners not only to celebrate success, but also to provide lessons for others both in terms of impact and process. To do this we need good information and reflection on experience.
We want Good Growth Fund partners to develop bespoke and proportionate approaches to monitoring and evaluation which befit the scale and ambition of your intervention. As a core part of this, we want partners to consider the social impact of their investments, alongside the economic and the financial.

We want the collection of this information to be a fundamental part of the delivery process and not an administrative burden that detracts from delivery. We also want partners to build in time to reflect and report on their experiences and local insight to give us a richer picture of how London is evolving.

**Understanding Social Impact**

Understanding the impact of different types of investments on residents and local communities is critical to understanding their value. However, the social impact of physical regeneration projects is perhaps the most difficult to capture, so we have prepared this guidance and a list of indicators to help our delivery partners in the development of their Evaluation Strategies.

As such, as part of the Good Growth Fund, we want to understand the social impact of our investments, alongside economic, environmental and strategic impacts. Social impact captures the impact of an initiative on people who are living in the area, or using a new service or facility, as well as thinking about the future effect on residents and communities. We are particularly interested in how our investments impact on the protected characteristic groups within local areas.

There are a number of different ways in which evidence on social impact can be collected; the guidance provided in this handbook and in the supporting outputs and outcomes framework introduces some of these approaches.

If all projects include at least one social impact indicator which relates to its theory of change or logic model, then it will become possible to get new insights into the social impact of regeneration investments for Londoners.

**WHY IS EVALUATION AND IMPACT ASSESSMENT IMPORTANT?**

We view the collection of evidence on project performance and impact as an integral part of the delivery process. This is why we require all projects funded by the Good Growth Fund to identify a set of indicators against which performance can be tracked, and to complete a self-evaluation at project close.

Collection of evidence will help you and your partners better understand the difference your project has made in practice to the local economy, communities and beneficiary groups.

It will provide you with reliable evidence of the efficiency, effectiveness and value for money of your project, as well as insights into what and why interventions work (or not). This analysis can assist during the implementation of the project and provide lessons for future interventions. It can also be used to support your case for future funding.

Evidence collected will also provide valuable information for the GLA and the LEAP to understand the impact of our programme of investment across London as a whole, providing learning to help us shape and design future investment programmes.
Good Evidence Collection: Overall Scope and Principles

This handbook highlights the important factors that need to be taken into account when collecting evidence about your project.

We encourage a targeted approach to collecting evidence which reflects the specific scope and context of your project. Given the wide range of project types, this handbook does not aim to provide a standard methodology for undertaking all assessments. Instead, it aims to provide common guidance and principles which can be used to shape your specific approach.

In addition to this document, there is a lot of existing information and guidance that you can draw upon to inform your approach. Information on relevant sources is provided throughout the text and is collated in Chapter 7.

Evidence Collection Scope

Primarily, this is all about understanding the difference that your Good Growth Fund project makes, the experience of implementing it, whether it has provided value for money, and the lessons which can be learnt from the experience.

While the approach to collecting information and the type of analysis will vary depending on the scale and nature of your project, all assessments need to cover the following themes:

- **What are you trying to achieve?** What are the overall aspirations for your project? What are the places and who are the groups that your project will benefit? What would constitute success?

- **What progress are you making?** With delivery underway, how is the project performing against its targets. Are there elements of underperformance? If so, what can be done to address these during the delivery phase?

- **What difference did you make?** Final reporting should show the impact attributable to the project, demonstrating, where possible, evidence of causality. How has the project impacted on the different beneficiary groups identified at outset?
What did people think? Alongside quantitative measures, we encourage projects to track and map impacts which are not measurable; qualitative insights from beneficiaries and delivery partners can form the basis of powerful case studies about your economic, social or strategic impact. Were there any unexpected impacts, either good or bad?

What worked and what didn’t? Final evaluation should explore the experience of implementing and managing the project and any lessons which have emerged from this.

Was it worth it? Where possible, final evaluation should examine the cost-effectiveness of the project in light of its intended and unintended outcomes and impacts, and hence its value for money.

It is important that evidence collection is undertaken in a way which contributes to our understanding of the Good Growth Fund programme as a whole, while still meeting your needs and those of your delivery partners. To help achieve this, there are a small number of principles which should be followed:

1. Scale and Depth of Evidence Collection

While assessments need to be comprehensive, they should reflect the size of the project and the complexity of its activities:

- **All projects** will be expected to show a good understanding of their baseline context, and a clear logic model which identifies project beneficiaries and expected impacts.

- As a minimum, **all projects** will need to collect information against a set of core Good Growth Fund performance metrics. In addition to demonstrating the impact of your project, these programme level metrics will enable the impact of the Good Growth Fund programme as a whole to be understood.

- Larger and more complex projects will be expected to select a broader set of measures against which progress and impact can be tracked.

- We expect that larger and more complex projects should devote more effort to understanding the attribution of impacts, demonstrating causality between impacts recorded and the activities of the project.

- The largest and most complex projects, or those which are taking place as part of wider regeneration programmes, will be encouraged to adopt a broader and longer-term approach to monitoring which provides a stronger basis for understanding and tracking ‘area change’.

PRINCIPLES
Broad Project Typologies

The GLA will work with partners to and during grant agreement stage to discuss project scale and complexity, and to agree an appropriate depth of evidence collection. While this will be agreed on a project by project basis, the following categories will be used as a starting point:

- Small projects: total project value up to £500,000 (including match)
- Medium sized projects: total project value £500,000 to £2m
- Large projects: total project value £2m or more
- Major regeneration programmes

2. A Balanced Basket of Measures

We encourage projects to select a balanced basket of impact measures which are a true reflection of the objectives and footprint of your project.

Depending on the nature of your project this may include a mix of economic, social, environmental, financial and strategic impact measures.

As part of our commitment to Good Growth, we expect all projects to consider the impact of their activities on different equalities groups.

Time should be taken at project design stage to fully map out the expected beneficiary groups and impact typologies of your project, with an appropriate set of monitoring measures then selected accordingly.

Measures should only be selected if there is a clear and realistic method to collect relevant information against that measure.

3. Clear targets and consistent definitions

Once measures have been selected, it is important that you are clear on the definitions being used, and on the targets which are being set.

While there is flexibility on this, the Good Growth Fund Outputs and Outcomes framework provides initial guidance on definitions. You will be expected to provide full and final definitions for your basket of measures, as part of the Evidence Collection Strategy you agree these with the GLA before Grant Agreements are signed.

4. Standards of Evidence

Those using the evidence will need to rely on the information in making future decisions. Evidence collected will also need to be of a level which stands up to internal or external scrutiny.

It is therefore important to ensure a minimum standard of quality across projects. You are expected to draw on appropriate guidance on collecting evidence and undertaking evaluation (including this document) in planning and carrying out your assessment.
5. Resource and External Expertise

It is important that you incorporate evidence collection and final reporting as an integral component of your project resource plan.

This should consider who is going to be responsible for collecting evidence during delivery, and ensuring that resource is available at project end to deliver a robust final report.

Consideration should be given at an early stage to whether evidence collection and reporting can be undertaken in house, or whether some form of external support is needed.

For the largest and most complex projects, final evaluations should be undertaken by evaluators who are independent of the project and who have appropriate evaluation expertise. The GLA’s ESF Programme works to tackle barriers to employment and improve and develop the skills of London’s workforce. It has a vital role to play in creating an effective approach to sustainable economic development and regeneration in London. It supports activity to:

– Help young people who are Not in Employment, Education or Training (NEET) and unemployed and economically inactive individuals into sustained employment or education for a minimum of 26 weeks
– Assist those in low paid employment, particularly those in disadvantaged groups, to improve their position in the labour market
– Enable improvements in skills provision leading to individuals gaining skills relevant to the labour market requirements of SMEs and Micro businesses

GOOD GROWTH FUND – EUROPEAN SOCIAL FUND (ESF) FUNDED PROJECTS

As such the Good Growth Fund ESF Projects will explore ways to link physical regeneration, support to people who are disadvantaged in the labour market and business support activities so that resulting employment opportunities benefit local communities.

ESF projects are required to participate in the ESF Programme Evaluation in addition to reporting into the Good Growth Fund Evaluation. Where possible we will seek to align the evaluation requirements for co-commissioning organisations with those of the wider GGF evaluation framework. However, requirements for ESF delivery organisations will differ in some respects from the wider GGF evaluation requirements. For example, for ESF purposes delivery organisations will need to submit evidence to support delivery of outputs and outcomes on at least a quarterly basis in order to claim payment.

The GLA ESF Co-Financing team has commissioned an independent evaluator to support ESF delivery organisations to meet the ESF evaluation requirements through a programme of workshops and 1:1 support. This will ensure ESF requirements are met and enable ESF programme evaluation against common measures.

Typical measures in ESF projects include (but are not limited to):
– Participants enrolled onto projects
– Qualifications gained (including sustained training)
– Progression into education or employment
– Sustained employment (minimum 26 weeks)
– Increasing SME employer engagement
– Activities delivered with SMEs
– Training and support for entrepreneurship

We will work with co-commissioning organisations to confirm specific ESF-eligible output and outcomes indicators and evidence requirements during the specification development phase.
More information on the GLA’s ESF Programme and the projects it supports can be found at:


Guidance on the UK ESF Programme can be found at


We want to work with partners to collect evidence throughout the project life-cycle: starting with detailed planning during the design stage, through to final evaluation, and, for larger / more complex projects, longer term tracking of impact.

The GLA team will be available to provide information and support where needed throughout the project life cycle. Please contact us at GoodGrowthFund@london.gov.uk for assistance.

IN PRACTICE: FOUR STAGES TO SUPPORT GOOD EVIDENCE COLLECTION

We want to work with partners to collect evidence throughout the project life-cycle: starting with detailed planning during the design stage, through to final evaluation, and, for larger / more complex projects, longer term tracking of impact.

The GLA team will be available to provide information and support where needed throughout the project life cycle. Please contact us at GoodGrowthFund@london.gov.uk for assistance.
STAGE 1: GETTING GOING

Overview

Snapshot: setting a firm basis for collection of evidence by establishing your baseline, mapping out your logic chain, and defining your measures and evidence collection methodology

When?: Before grant agreement stage

Who? All projects

Formal Requirement: Evaluation Strategy to be reviewed by your GLA project lead before Grant Agreements are signed.

As part of the Good Growth Fund Stage 2 Application you will be required to develop an Evaluation Strategy. We strongly recommend this process is as collaborative and participative as possible. As part of developing your Evaluation Strategy, we strongly advise you hold a workshop or series of workshops and this is a collaborative process with key stakeholders and the local community if relevant. The aim of this is to help you map out expected impacts and beneficiaries, and to develop a robust plan to collect evidence against these.

There are three main components of your Good Growth Fund Evaluation Strategy:

– The project logic model
– Your outputs and outcome targets
– Your methodology for collecting evidence

Further information on the Evaluation Strategy is provided in Appendix B. Important considerations in developing your strategy are outlined below.

Establishing Your Logic Chain

As part of your bid process, you are likely to have considered (either formally or informally) the long-term goals that you are trying to achieve, and the necessary preconditions which must be in place for these goals to be achieved.

As part of the grant agreement stage, we want all projects to distil this thinking into a clear project logic model. The project logic model is an important foundation as it provides a clear way to think about the essential components of your project.

Once complete, the logic model will provide a summary of the rationale for the project, the activities being delivered and, importantly, the manner in which these activities support various outcomes and impacts.

While much of this intervention logic will have been developed as part of the project development process, this is a key opportunity to test the appropriateness and realism of these linkages.

The main components of the logic chain are introduced in a simplified form in the diagram below.

Logic Chain example

Part 1: Context and Rationale

This should identify the challenges the project is trying to address, the policies that already exist to tackle these challenges and what needs to happen for these challenges to be overcome.

The context should be as specific as possible, containing baseline data which tells the story of your place, community or organisation. Projects should map expected project beneficiaries.

The rationale should explain why partners have chosen to deliver a particular type of activity. It should explain why public sector funding is needed, and it should also highlight the efficiency and effectiveness of this approach compared to other ways of achieving the similar objectives.

Part 2: Aims and Objectives

This should set out the overall objectives of the project. As a guide, these will often reflect the outcomes projects are hoping to achieve as a result of the investment.

Effort should be made to develop objectives which are S.M.A.R.T: specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-framed.

Part 3: Project Design and Activities

This part of the logic model sets out how the project has been designed to respond to its context and rationale.

It sets out the financial inputs required to deliver the project (including match funding), the specific activities which will be delivered, and the structures and mechanisms which will be used to deliver and govern the project.

Part 4: Project Outputs & Outcomes

This section sets out the specific output and outcome measures that you have selected to demonstrate the impact and achievements of your project.

The Good Growth Fund Outputs and Outcomes guidance should be used as a starting point to select a basket of measures which reflect the specific of your project.

This should include a number of the core Good Growth Fund Output and Outcome measures which will be used to assess the performance of the programme across London as a whole.
Selecting Output and Outcome Measures and Setting Targets

Taking time to select an appropriate basket of output and outcome measures is a critical part of the project planning process: getting this right will provide a platform to collecting powerful intelligence on the performance and success of your project.

We expect all projects to distinguish between the outputs and outcomes that their project will deliver:

- **Outputs** are the measurable activities/deliverables that the project will provide. These will, in the main, reflect those that you have already set out in your bid/expression of interest.

- **Outcomes** are the wider benefits which are expected to accrue within places and among different beneficiary groups because of your outputs.

**Our Outputs and Outcome Framework**

The GLA has developed an Outputs and Outcomes Framework which provides a list of over 200 measures which could be applicable to Good Growth Projects.

These measures have been categorised according to the GLA’s three Good Growth Fund objectives:

- **Growing prosperity**: over 40 measures, grouped into 7 baskets. These cover a range of themes focused on business, employment and economic growth
- **Empowering people**: over 80 measures, grouped into 10 baskets. These cover a range of themes focused on people, skills, access to employment, wellbeing and social cohesion
- **Making places better**: over 60 measures, grouped into 7 baskets. These cover a range of themes focused around physical improvements, new buildings or facilities, the environment and infrastructure

In addition, the Outputs and Outcomes handbook sets out a number of cross cutting themes that we want all Good Growth Fund projects to consider:

- **Equalities**: how has the project impacted on different equalities groups?
- **Resilience**: how the project helped to improve resilience within organisations, places and beneficiary groups?
- **Partnerships**: how has the project strengthened local partnerships?
- **Perceptions of change**: how has the project affected perceptions among different groups and places?

The baskets of measures are summarised below.
Selecting Your Output and Outcome Measures

Measures selected should be specific to your project, and reflect the full breadth of and interventions delivered and beneficiaries affected; this should be reflected in to your project logic chain. As noted previously, we are keen that projects select a balanced basket of measures, drawing out a range of economic, social and environmental impacts.

All projects will be expected to select at least three from a set of core Good Growth Fund measures which will be used to assess the performance of the programme across London as a whole. These core measures are summarised in the graphic below.

**GOOD GROWTH FUND: PROGRAMME WIDE OUTPUT AND OUTCOME MEASURES**

**EMPOWERING PEOPLE**
- Number of people who actively participate in a project
- Number of volunteering opportunities created
- Sense of belonging to an area
- Number of people progressing into work

**MAKING BETTER PLACES**
- The amount of public realm being created or improved, and the increase in its use
- Number of vacant units brought back into use
- Increase in visitor satisfaction
- Increase in footfall

**GROWING PROSPERITY**
- New jobs being created and existing jobs being protected and safeguarded
- Number of businesses receiving support
- Commercial/business space being created or improved, and its value measured
- Increase in business turnover

These core measures are intended to be a starting point: we encourage projects to complement these with a wider set of indicators which reflect the aims, objectives and beneficiaries of your project.

In selecting your baskets of measures, you should bear in mind the four cross cutting themes: Equalities, Strategic Impact, Resilience, and Perceptions.

There is no limit on the number of measures you can select. We ask projects to select as many measures as are needed to reflect the scale, complexities and nuances of your project, while being realistic about what can be measured in practical and resource terms.

Broadly speaking, it is expected that the number and breadth of indicators will increase with project size; larger projects will also be expected to do more to track ‘harder to measure’ or longer term impacts.

**Note: Output and Outcome For ESF Projects**

Good Growth Fund ESF projects will need to select outputs and outcomes in line with the wider ESF Evaluation expectations. Please refer back to page 18 in this handbook for more information on this.

**Setting Your Targets**

At this stage, you will be required to provide a very clear target for each output and outcome measure. This should be supported by information on the baseline position (as agreed) and any other wider contextual information (such as impact geographies).

It is important that the targets that you have agreed are both ambitious and realistic.

In setting targets, consideration should be given to your baseline position, the scale of your intervention, what has been achieved in the past by similar types of projects, impact geographies, and impact timescales.

At this stage, you should also set out clearly how you plan to ‘verify’ your output information.
Defining Your Evidence Collection Processes

As a final part of your Evaluation Strategy, you will be expected to plan out your approach to collecting evidence throughout the project lifecycle.

This will need to set out:

– Your approach to collecting your output and outcome evidence:

– Outputs: in many cases, outputs will relate to project ‘deliverables’ which can be collected on an ongoing basis as part of your formal monitoring systems

– Outcomes: generally, outcomes will be more difficult to measure and may take longer to emerge. In many cases, more detailed work will be required to collect this evidence, such as surveys or other primary research. While for some measures it may be possible to collect this on an ongoing basis, in many cases you will need to collect the information at the end of, or after, project delivery. As part of your Evaluation Strategy, you will need to set out the research approaches you will use, and the expected timescales and resources for these.

– The added value of your project: at this stage you should give initial thought to how you will assess the added value that your project has delivered over and above the baseline situation. Questions to consider include:

  - Attribution of impact: to what extent are the outcomes and impacts reported directly linked to your delivery activities? Are there other interventions / processes taking place which might have contributed to the impact reported?
  - Additionality of impact: To what extent are the outcomes and impacts reported ‘additional’ within the context of your baseline? Would they have happened anyway in the absence of your intervention? Have there been any social or economic knock on effects locally (e.g displacement of jobs from one part of the economy to another, or multiplier impacts)? To what extent are impacts being retained within your local area?

– Evaluation plan: an initial plan for your project evaluation: including approach, timescales and resources. You should give initial thought as to whether this will be completed in house or via external support. While this is at the discretion of individual projects, larger and more complex projects may benefit from external and independent evaluation expertise; while likely to be broader in scope, external evaluations will still need to cover GLA self-evaluation information requirements as a minimum.

– Resource: finally, you should consider the resource implication of your Evaluation Strategy. This includes ensuring that your project team has sufficient capacity and expertise to undertake monitoring during delivery, and that sufficient resource is set aside to undertake evaluation at project completion. If you are planning to commission external support, budget lines should be identified to accommodate this.
STAGE 2: COLLECTING EVIDENCE

Overview

Snapshot: ongoing monitoring throughout the delivery period to understand delivery progress and keep a track on performance against targets

When? During the delivery period

Who? All projects

Formal Requirement: Completion of monthly monitoring forms, with information on performance against targets, as agreed within Grant Agreement

During the delivery of your Good Growth Fund, you will need to ensure that you collect the evidence identified in the Evaluation Strategy and report back according to GLA requirements.

This includes:

- Monthly reporting on project progress, highlighting issues as and when they arrive so the GLA can offer support as and when available
- Contractual spend, this will be reported as part of quarterly payment claims
- Evidence on outputs and beneficiaries should ideally be reported on a quarterly basis as and when support starts; this should also help avoid the burden of bulk reporting at the end of the project
- Evidence on any additional output or outcome indicators that have been identified as delivery progresses and which help to further articulate progress

Generally speaking, evidence relating to outcomes and impact, cannot be reported until the support has been provided, and hence is not required during project delivery. That said, larger and longer term projects may consider undertaking a ‘formative evaluation’ to understand performance as delivery progresses and to enable real time feedback to enhance the delivery process.

As delivery progresses, the project should collect ‘verification’ evidence which confirms that outputs have been achieved. Projects should ensure that direct and indirect beneficiaries are aware of the contractual obligations to share various types of information with the GLA and other project partners where applicable.
STAGE 3: REPORTING

Overview

Snapshot: final reporting on project performance, taking into account impacts achieved and the effectiveness of the delivery process

When? Within 6 months of project delivery ending

Who? All projects

Formal Requirement: project self-evaluation to be completed at project close with sign off required by GLA project lead

At project close, you are required to complete a project self-evaluation.

A suggested outline for the self-evaluation is provided in Appendix C. This standard structure and format is intended to ensure a consistent and approach across all projects.

Self-Evaluation Timings

Specific timings for this will need to agreed with your GLA project manager, but in most cases these should be completed within 6 months of the end of delivery.

Given the timing of the final report it is acknowledged that not all outcomes and impacts will have been captured by this point.

Where projects are planning to continue to collect evidence following the submission of the final report for their own monitoring purposes, they are encouraged to share this evidence with the GLA too, to help with programme level evaluation.

Establishing your Evaluation Questions

In setting the objectives for the self-evaluation, projects will need to think about the purpose of evaluation. This will allow projects to identify the specific research questions on which to focus. While each self-evaluation will be different, there are some common questions which all should consider. These relate to the design of the project, the delivery of activities, the effectiveness with which impacts are secured and the efficiency with which these benefits are realised.

Case Studies and Stories

The self-evaluation will be expected to bring together a range of information of the performance and impact of the project in addition to demonstrating performance against output and outcome measures in quantitative terms, a good evaluation will draw on a range of qualitative insights, including:

- Individual case studies: individual stories of your impact can help to bring your evaluation to life and demonstrate achievements in an easy to identify with way
- Partner consultation: wider partner consultation can help to establish areas of strategic added value; innovation in approaches; and the leverage of additional resources
- Reflection on your journey: taking the time to consider the process you have been through in delivering the project is important. We will be asking our partners to share their experience on an ongoing basis to help us refine future iterations of the fund

Assessing Impact and Value for Money

An important part of the self-evaluation process is to consider the economic and social impacts which have been achieved because of the project. There is specific guidance on how this should be done, with the level of analysis required dependent on the size of your project:

- For smaller Good Growth Fund projects, output and outcome intelligence may be sufficient to understand the impacts of a project; basic benchmarks may be used to assess gross and net impacts and value for money
- For larger and more complex projects, additional analysis is likely to be required to consider the gross and net impacts which can be attributed to the project within a defined geographical area. This will allow the value for money of the intervention to be understood.

In undertaking impact assessment, there are a number of considerations:

- Impact types: a broad range of impacts can be quantified in monetary terms, from core economic impacts (such as Gross Value Added and Land Value Uplift), to social impacts (such as wellbeing benefits), and financial impacts (such as tax benefits to the public purse). It is important that an appropriate impact methodology is chosen which reflects the specificities of your project, but which also avoids duplication or ‘double-counting’ of impacts
Impact areas: in undertaking an impact assessment it is important to set out clearly the impact area of your project; this will help to ensure a better understanding of the extent to which impacts realised are ‘local’ or are relevant across broader geographies.

Additionality and the counterfactual: an important consideration when assessing impact is making judgements on the net impact reported and attributed to the investment. To deliver a robust assessment of impact, projects should consider leakage, deadweight, displacement/substitution impacts associated with investments.

The Counterfactual: to further demonstrate additionality, larger and more complex projects will need to consider the counterfactual position: what would have happened in the absence of investment. There are a number of approaches which can be taken to do this:
- Self-reported by beneficiaries – Surveying business and individual beneficiaries to report on what would have happened to their situation without the support.
- Self-reported by project manager – Project managers to identify scale of uplift. Note this is the least reliable of the three methods and should only be used where alternative methods are not possible.
- Control group – Identification of a control group which replicates as far as possible the context in which the project is located, but which has not benefited from investment. In reality, this is complex to achieve, and is therefore only likely to be relevant to the very largest interventions.

Robust impact assessment requires a certain amount of technical expertise; where this is required, consider whether external support would help with the delivery of robust analysis.

Further Reading

There is a wealth of guidance available on evaluation theory and practice. The What Works Centre for Local Economic Growth has spent the last two years assessing the evaluation evidence for a wide range of local economic growth interventions. It has also set out what it considers to be important principles for effective evaluation.

There is also a wealth of further reading on approaches to undertaking economic and social impact assessment, particularly within the HM Treasury Green Book and Magenta Book.

Further information and links are provided in Chapter 6.
### Summary of the Evidence Collection Stages

Requirements and expectations across the four evidence collection stages are summarised in the diagram below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE</th>
<th>PLANNING DESIGN STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of Logic Chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consideration of ability to demonstrate performance against the four Output and Outcome cross-cutting themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selection of at least 3 core Good Growth Fund Output and Outcome Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selection of wider basket of Good Growth Fund Output and Outcome Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completion of Evaluation Strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE</th>
<th>DURING DELIVERY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing collection of output and wider KPI information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formative evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full self evaluation reporting on KPIs and wider impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE</th>
<th>AT END OF DELIVERY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long term tracking of change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CHECKLIST AND FURTHER READING

While this handbook provides an introduction to monitoring and evaluation approaches for the Good Growth Fund, there are a large number of external resource available which will support your work. These include:

#### Planning your Evaluation

There are a number of central government resources which provide overarching advice on evaluation, including:


- **What Works Centre for Local Economic Growth**: research body established by government to support local economic development. A wide library of resources, including a series of blogs on how to undertake good evaluation [http://www.whatworksgrowth.org/resources/how-to-evaluate-eight-things-to-consider/](http://www.whatworksgrowth.org/resources/how-to-evaluate-eight-things-to-consider/) and wider resources on how to evaluate projects across a range of policy areas [http://www.whatworksgrowth.org/resources/](http://www.whatworksgrowth.org/resources/)
Understanding your baseline

There are a large number of resources available to support you collecting statistical evidence on your baseline. These include:

- **Nomis** – The official ONS website for up-to-date UK labour market statistics. Datasets are free and include the Annual Population Survey, UK Business Counts, the Business Register and Employment Survey, the Census etc. Data is available at different geographical scales: https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/

- **London datastore** – a free and open data-sharing portal for data relating to London created by the GLA. Data covers a wide range of areas including jobs and the economy, communities, and housing. You can search for data by topic, geography or publisher: https://data.london.gov.uk/dataset.

- **London Datastore Ward / LSOA mapper** – the London datastore also provides a number of interactive data tools which allow local analysis of baseline performance. The ward data mapper is available at https://data.london.gov.uk/dataset/ward-profiles-and-atlas, and the LSOA data mapper is available at https://data.london.gov.uk/dataset/lsoa-atlas

- **London Town Centre Health Check** – an ongoing series providing a snapshot of the health of London’s town centres. The data covers 221 town centres identified in the London Plan, along with some neighbourhood and more local centres. https://data.london.gov.uk/dataset/london-town-centre-health-check-analysis-report

Assessing Economic Impact

Central government provides formal and accepted methodologies for assessing economic impact. In particular:


- **HCA Additionality Guide**: formal guidance on assessing additionality within economic impact assessment. The guidance includes ready reckoner benchmarks which can be applied to move from gross to net economic impact: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/additionality-guide

Measuring social impact

There are a number of widely used formulations of measures for assessing perceptions. For example:

- When measuring wellbeing, the Office of National Statistics’ four wellbeing questions (https://gss.civilservice.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Personal-Well-being-June-17-Pending-informing-SPSC.pdf), or the Warwick Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale (http://the-sra.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/ethics03.pdf) are often used.

- A second example is the set of questions used to assess how people from different backgrounds get on used in the Understanding Society Survey (https://www.understandingsociety.ac.uk/documentation/mainstage/dataset-documentation/wave/1/datafile/a_indresp/variable/a_scopngbhh).

- The Mayor’s strategy for Social Inclusion is a plan on how to create a fairer and more equal city (https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/communities/mayors-strategy-equality-diversity-inclusion)

- Good practice is also available on measuring social connections and social networks (e.g. J. Rowson, S. Broome and A. Jones (2010) Connected Communities: How social networks power and sustain the Big Society Jones, London: Royal Society of Arts at http://www.orgnet.com/sna.html).
There are also a number of frameworks and tools available which help to quantify or monetise social impacts, including:

- **HACT** provides a number of tools to help measure and evaluate social impact using wellbeing:
  - Their Social Value Bank provides methodologically consistent and robust social values which can be used to assess social impact, evidence value for money, and to compare the impact of different programmes. The Social Value Bank can be accessed here: http://socialvaluebank.org/the-bank/. Use is on a license basis.

- **New Economy**: Like the Social Value Bank, the New Economy Unit Cost database provides a resource to help monetise a range of economic and social outputs: http://www.neweconomymanchester.com/our-work/research-evaluation-cost-benefit-analysis/cost-benefit-analysis/unit-cost-database Use is on a licence basis.

**Theme specific impact assessment**

In addition, a large amount of research and guidance exists to support research and evaluation of specific project types or theme. This includes:

- **Workspace projects**: the GLA report “Start me Up” (https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/valueofworkspace-ippr2016.pdf) explores the value of London’s workspaces and is a useful starting point in thinking about the value of your workspace project. As part of this, the GLA has also produced a number surveys and forms which can be used by workspace projects to monitor impact: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/0B8DrctOtfrUDZ09rTk1MVXJCdTQ Please contact the GLA Regeneration team for more information on these.

- **Public realm projects**: assessing the impact of public realm interventions can be challenging. The What Works Centre for Local Growth has produced a summary of some of the challenges, and the things which should be taken into account when developing your strategy: http://www.whatworksgrowth.org/policy-reviews/public-realm/


- **Skills and employment projects**: the What Works Centre for Local Growth offers information and guidance on evaluating employment and skills projects (http://www.whatworksgrowth.org/policy-reviews/employment-training/) and apprenticeship projects (http://www.whatworksgrowth.org/policy-reviews/apprenticeships/). There is a large amount of guidance on measuring and evaluating the impact of skills and employment projects. In this case, the best starting point is GLA and government guidance produced to inform the ESF programme: www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/funding/european-social-fund/gla-co-financing-organisation/funded-projects, and www.gov.uk/government/publications/european-social-fund-operational-programme-2014-to-2020. The wider guidance above on economic and social impact assessment is also relevant.

- **Community initiatives**: HACT have produced a useful guide on valuing the social impact of community investments: http://www.hact.org.uk/sites/default/files/uploads/Archives/2014/3/MeasuringSocialImpactHACT2014.pdf?sid=9120. This focuses on wellbeing impacts, and should be used alongside wider economic measures where relevant.
Technical terms referred to throughout this handbook are summarised with definitions below. Many of these terms relate to standard evaluation methodologies; please refer to the sources referenced in Chapter 5 for more information on these.

Terminology Specific to the Good Growth Fund

- **Evaluation Strategy**: a strategy to be developed by Good Growth Fund projects which will set out a proposed approach to monitoring and evaluation. This will cover the project logic chain (see below), project objectives, proposed approaches to evidence collection, and an overview of resources to be used. All projects will be asked to develop their strategy before delivery commences. A template for the Evaluation Strategy will be provided by the GLA.

- **Self-evaluation**: evaluation to be undertaken by all Good Growth Fund projects at the end of the delivery period to understand how your project has performed and what lessons can be learnt from the future. Self-evaluations can be completed either internally or using external support. A template for the self-evaluation will be provided by the GLA.

- **Outputs and Outcomes framework**: guidance produced by the GLA on the measures that can be used to track the performance and impact of your project. The guidance covers a broad range of economic, social, environmental, strategic and financial measures. The guidance distinguishes between:
  - **Outputs**: the specific things directly delivered by your project. These usually relate to strands of delivery activity (e.g. m2 of floorspace deliver, number of trees planted, number of businesses support), and are usually measurable on an ongoing basis as delivery progresses.
  - **Outcomes**: the result of the outputs. These are normally longer-term and could be a change in conditions or behaviour (e.g. uplift in footfall, change in business turnover, creation of employment, improvement in wellbeing). Outcomes may take longer to emerge and may require additional or bespoke research to measure/track.
– **ESF Good Growth Fund Projects**: certain Good Growth Fund projects will be accessing ESF (European Social Fund) funding as part of their package. Where this is the case, projects will need to adhere to ESF specific evaluation guidance which will be provided by the GLA.

**General Evaluation terminology**

– **Theory of Change**: A Theory of Change is a diagram that explains how a project will impact on its beneficiaries. It outlines all the things that the project does for its beneficiaries, the ultimate impact that it aims to have on them, and all the separate outcomes that lead or contribute to that impact. It should not refer to the scale, or operational details of the project itself (this is the purpose of the logic chain as described below). It should effectively describe and explain the impact of the project from a beneficiary’s point of view.

– **Project Logic Chain**: the project logic model is an important foundation for monitoring and evaluation. It provides a clear way to think about the essential components of your project: including the project context, the rationale for the project, the activities being delivered and, importantly, the manner in which these activities support various outcomes and impacts. Good Growth Fund projects will be required to develop their logic model as part of their Evaluation Strategy. A template for this (including worked examples) will be provided by the GLA.

– **Project Evaluation**: an evaluation is a systematic and objective assessment of an ongoing or completed project, focusing on its design, implementation and results. The aim is to determine the relevance and fulfilment of objectives, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. Types of evaluation include:

  - Summative evaluation: an evaluation that takes place at the end of implementation, focused on coming to conclusions on the performance and impact of the project, and lessons learnt. The Good Growth Fund Self-Evaluation will be a summative evaluation.
  - Formative evaluation – evaluation that takes place during a project’s implementation. This enables performance to be reviewed at an interim stage, and for recommendations to be provided on how the project could be enhanced as delivery progresses. In the Good Growth Fund, larger projects or regeneration programmes taking place over longer time periods might want to consider a formative approach to evaluation.

**Impact Typologies**

– **Economic impact**: impacts relating to the economy within a defined economic area, such as jobs and economic value created

– **Social impact**: the wider, non-financial impact of projects, for example on individual wellbeing, group social capital and area-level physical environment

– **Financial impact**: impacts generating fiscal benefits for the public purse (e.g. increased rental income or business rates), or helping to improve the financial resilience of organisations

– **Strategic impact / strategic added value**: the extent to which a project generates wider impacts which support the aspirations, activities and operations of delivery organisations and their partners. This may include:
  - **Strategic leadership**: articulation and communication of regional development needs, opportunities and solutions to partners in the region and elsewhere, which improves confidence and capacity for growth.
  - **Strategic influence**: Stimulating activity that defines the distinctive role of partners, gets them to commit to shared strategic objectives and to behave and allocate their funds appropriately. Generating cross-regional partnerships.
  - **Leverage**: Provision of financial and other incentives to mobilise partner and stakeholder resources – equipment, people as well as funding.
  - **Synergy**: Using organisational capacity, knowledge and expertise to improve transfer and coordination and/or integration of the design and delivery of interventions amongst partners.
  - **Engagement**: Setting up mechanisms and incentives for more effective and deliberative engagement of stakeholders in the delivery of regional and sub-regional priorities and programmes.
Economic Impact Assessment Terminology

- **Additionality**: the extent to which activity takes place at all, on a larger scale, earlier or within a specific designated area or target group as a result of the intervention (HM Treasury Green Book). The additional (or net) impact of an intervention is the difference between the reference case position (what would happen anyway) and the position if the intervention option was implemented (the gross impact). Key components of additionality include:
  - **The Reference Case**: the impacts which would occur anyway if the project did not go ahead. Outputs or outcomes produced under this scenario are known as deadweight and should be deducted from the gross direct impact (see counterfactual below).
  - **Gross Direct Impacts**: an estimate of the total impacts of an intervention, before deadweight has been taken into account.
  - **Displacement**: the degree to which an increase in productive capacity promoted by government policy is offset by reductions in productive capacity elsewhere. For example, to what extent are jobs created by a project ‘new’ or have they merely ‘displaced’ from somewhere else? Displacement effects should be deducted.
  - **Leakage**: the extent to which benefits created by a project are retained locally or whether they also benefit those outside of the spatial area or the group which the intervention is intended to benefit. Leakage effects should be deducted.
  - **Substitution**: arises where a firm substitutes one activity for a similar one (such as recruiting a jobless person while another employee loses a job) to take advantage of public sector assistance. These effects need to be deducted.
  - **Economic Multiplier impacts**: the indirect impacts created by a project, such as increased supply chain activity, or increased spending within a local area.

Further guidance on these additionality factors, and others, can be found in the HCA Additionality Guide: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/additionality-guide

- **Counterfactual / reference case**: the counterfactual or reference case is a way of exploring what would have happened to the beneficiaries of the intervention had they not been exposed to it. There are a number of different ways in which the counterfactual can be assessed, including the use of a control group, from observed trends, or ‘self-reported’ by beneficiaries.

APPENDIX B – EVALUATION STRATEGY: SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

The aim of the Good Growth Fund Evaluation Strategy is to help you to take a proactive and robust approach to evidence collection and evaluation.

This Strategy is an opportunity for you to outline how you intend to monitor and evaluate your project, including allocation of resource, strategy, and key areas of focus.

Contents of the Strategy are summarised below.

**Good Growth Fund Evaluation Strategy: Summary of Contents**

1. **Overview of project context and rationale**: the socio-economic conditions your project is responding to, the local strategic context, and the beneficiaries that you project is targeting.
2. **Project objectives**: a clear set of objectives which are **S.M.A.R.T**: specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-specific.
3. **Outputs and outcomes**: a summary of the outputs and outcomes against which you will measure your project performance, including a snapshot the current baseline position.
4. **Project logic chain**: your completed project logic chain, setting the foundations for your evaluation.
5. **Approach to data collection**: a summary of how you will collect data to measure performance against each of the output and outcome measures, and to understand wider qualitative and strategic aspects of project performance.
6. **Resources and practicalities**: a summary of the resources you will use to collect evidence, focusing on the need for robust and timely reporting.
7. **Future tracking**: consideration of how you might track the impact and legacy in the longer term, once Good Growth Fund delivery has finished.
All projects will be required to complete a self-evaluation at project end. This may be undertaken internally or externally depending on project scale and complexity.

While self-evaluations will need to cover a set of minimum GLA information requirements, we encourage projects to develop a bespoke approach to evaluation which reflects the information needs of you and your partners.

Contents of the self-evaluation are summarised below.

**Good Growth Fund Self-Evaluation Contents**

1. **Project overview:** a concise description of the project and what it was trying to achieve, and a headline summary of overall performance against objectives
2. **Project context:** a refresh on the context for the project and the rationale for intervention
3. **Project design:** a review of how the project was designed to respond to this context, project objectives, and the logic model summarising specifically how it would do this
4. **Project delivery:** a review of the delivery process, including activities delivered, performance in terms of delivery timescales, funding, and outputs (deliverables), and reflections on the efficiency and effectiveness of the delivery and governance mechanisms
5. **Project impacts:** a review of project impacts, focusing on achievement of outcome targets, and any wider strategic, economic and social impacts achieved. Quantitative analysis backed up with qualitative insights (e.g. case studies where possible)
6. **Project achievements and lessons:** reflection on performance against objectives, overall achievements, and lessons learnt for the future
7. **Project legacy and forward plan:** a consideration of the legacy of the project, including any areas of ongoing delivery, and any recommendations to inform future delivery.