*Annexe One: Evaluation types*

### Outcomes Evaluation

*Outcomes* are the developmental changes observed and experienced between the completion of outputs and the achievement of impact. They are the changes that can be attributed to organisational or project activities.  These can be intended outcomes or unintended outcomes, they may be positive or negative, and they will be linked to any pertinent impacts. For example, one of the intended outcomes from ‘Hazard Identification’ could be that a ‘particular hazard’ that might impact on a specific vulnerable group is identified and this hazard is mitigated. Outcome evaluations move away from the approach of assessing project results against project objectives and move towards an assessment of how these results contribute to a change in development conditions.

Outcome evaluation measurements include the following:

1. whether an outcome has been achieved or progress made towards it
2. how, why and under what circumstances the outcome has changed
3. contributions to the progress towards or achievement of the outcome, and
4. strategies employed in pursuing the outcome

As well as planned changes, projects often produce outcomes that are unexpected, so it is important that information is collected in a way that that can provide evidence of this. Longer-term outcomes may often be less easy to evaluate than intermediate ones. The CRMP provide a service which is a link in a chain of services, or part of a multi-functional agency intervention. For these processes, final outcomes in one part (such as Hazard Identification) may be intermediate outcomes as part of the whole CRMP.

**Key consideration**

Outcome indicators measure the results generated by programme outputs. They often correspond to any change in the behaviour of people or of organisations as a result of the project/programme.

### Impact Evaluation

**Impact evaluations** are designed to value the results of outcomes. For example, if an intended outcome from ‘Hazard Identification’ is to mitigate the risk to a vulnerable group (the outcome), the impact might be that less people from that vulnerable groups are hospitalised, something that can be monetised in terms of less cost to the NHS (impact).

Impact evaluations assist with:

1. assessing outcomes for groups directly and indirectly affected by projects and processes
2. providing an explanation of how the outcomes come about and how they vary in different contexts
3. providing evidence on the impact and economic and social value generated by projects, and
4. ensuring robustness and sensitivity

Essentially this involves comparison with:

1. *baselines* – the prevailing levels and trends that were identified prior to the project or processes commencing, this is especially relevant when reviewing a previous CRMP
2. *counterfactuals* – the levels and trends that might have been seen in the outcomes without the Strategic Framework being in place
3. *further analysis of research evidence*, secondary data sources and any benchmarks relating to the outcome and its drivers
4. *looking forward* in order to measure persistence effects; wider take-up; sustainability. This involves monitoring beyond a project’s lifetime to understand the actual ‘reach’ of the project, the ‘potential’ reach of the project (including such things as possible deployment to other areas), and future requirements in terms of things such as funding and environmental considerations.

**Key consideration**

Impact indicators measure the quality and quantity of results generated by project and programme outputs and outcomes, such as measurable change in quality of training provision, reduced incidence of absence, increased income for women, increased investment in training, decrease in drop-out from training provision.