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 Who is this guidance for?

This guidance relates to the evaluation component of the [CRMP Strategic Framework](https://www.ukfrs.com/index.php/community-risk-management-planning-strategic-framework). It is designed to support those individuals tasked with leading, managing, and developing Community Risk Management Plans (CRMPs) in UK Fire and Rescue Services (FRSs). It provides advice on the application of evaluation techniques in relation to the **development and delivery** of the CRMP. It does NOT address evaluation of the impact and effectiveness of the actions drawn from the information within the CRMP. Despite this, the outcomes and impact of previous activities are a necessary starting point in developing or updating a CRMP.

Additional Guidance to complement the CRMP Framework is being developed for Evaluation of FRS Interventions and for the Competencies that may be required throughout CRMP development.

This guidance should be considered in conjunction with the following NFCC Guidance (those currently approved in bold)

1. ***Data and Business Intelligence***
2. ***Defining Scope***
3. ***Equality Impact Assessment***
4. ***Stakeholder and Public Engagement.***
5. *Hazard Identification*
6. *Risk Analysis*
7. *Decision making*

#### Why is there a need to Evaluate?

Evaluation is not an add-on to CRMP, it is a key component that runs through each theme and each other component.

Unfortunately, one of the reasons effective evaluations are sometimes poorly constructed and carried out is that it is seen as an add-on to a process, rather than an integral part. The consequences of this lack of emphasis and importance can be severe, and in the case of CRMP, inadequate evaluation may restrict and limit the effectiveness of planning. This can lead to knock-on effects, such as missing data, overlooked issues, inadequate risk mitigation, and the endurance of addressable risks within communities.

To be properly effective, evaluation will need to be both a starting point and an end point of the CRMP Framework. Evaluation activities need to be implemented appropriately and objectively from the start of the CRMP to demonstrate and develop ideas and practice.

Evaluation does create an additional workload, but there are ways to simplify the process. For example, one way to ease the workload is to incorporate evaluation activities into ongoing project or programme activities. This will be discussed further in Section 3.

Objectives

* To provide UK FRSs with step-by-step support to assess the extent to which it has achieved a comprehensive and data-led CRMP that has incorporated considerations from consultation feedback.
* The ensure the completeness of each theme of the CRMP Framework is verified, both as a CRMP is being developed – and again as a final review.
* To succeed in the above by providing guidance that is accessible to any member of the team developing the CRMP, no matter what previous exposure they have to evaluation techniques.

Introduction and Acknowledgements

In order to achieve these objectives, the guidance covers two main aspects: **understanding good practice in evaluation** and **applying good practice in relation to the CRMP**. The guidance does not cover outcome and impact evaluation guidance in any great depth. Where references to outcome and impact evaluations are made, this is done to ensure that FRS staff understand the differences (and linkages) between outcome and impact evaluations, and a process evaluation (such as developing and delivering the CRMP).

In following this guidance, FRS staff will be able to either carry out a process evaluation internally, or confidently commission and manage external evaluation experts to carry out a process evaluation. For those wanting to consult more technical and theoretical guidance, reference to the Magenta Book (central government’s guidance on evaluation) can be found in the accompanying bibliography.

Where practicable, individual FRSs (or a partnership of multiple fire and rescue services) may consider appointing an external evaluation expert to support the development of the CRMP and all linked processes.

Acknowledgement of Shared Risks

In carrying out an evaluation of the CRMP, it will be important to acknowledge and address occasions where an identified risk is not limited to the consideration of one FRS. Therefore, in considering and mitigating risk, FRS staff should assess the extent to which it is a shared risk and identify which other services / organisations might need to be consulted.

Shared risks could include (but not be limited to) the following types of risk – those which:

1. Impact on / cross over into adjacent boundaries
2. Involve local authorities
3. Involve other emergency services
4. Exhibit characteristics that might present a similar risk in other (non-adjacent) areas
5. Involve other organisations due to their location and the risks attached to them – e.g. a local airport

FRS staff should consider which (if any) other parties might be involved in an identified risk and enter into dialogue with those parties to consider their opinions and to develop a shared evaluation strategy.

Applying this consistent approach to evaluation will ensure a more assured CRMP, one that can withstand scrutiny from internal and external governance, inspection, and public consultation.

Shaping the Guidance

This guidance has been designed and co-created with FRS Subject Matter Experts with due regard to the following:

1. Reference to existing CRMP materials provided by the NFCC.
2. Access to individual CRMP materials.

And with input from:

1. Consultation, discussion, interviews with FRS staff - including those working closely on CRMPs within their own Fire and Rescue Service.

In assimilating all the information, views, and ideas provided, the guidance has been shaped to best meet FRS requirements, and in recognition of the impact and requirements of different structures and governance models for the FRS. Central to this has been the need to ensure the information contained within is applicable to the whole of the CRMP Framework. This ensures consistency in its application, however, it can also be used as a template that can be tailored for each component, as required.

Structure of the Guidance

The following report structure is designed to enable FRS staff to be well-placed to confidently identify (and respond to) the strengths and weaknesses within the CRMP process.

***Section One*** covers a more in-depth outline of the objectives of this guidance, and provides answers to general evaluation questions such as ‘What is evaluation?’ and ‘What is monitoring?’

It is critical that those tasked with overseeing evaluation of the CRMP have a basic understanding of how to respond to these questions.

***Section Two*** presents a brief description of the different types of evaluation that can be applied to projects and programmes (further detail is provided in Annexe One).

Although this evaluation is concerned with the process of developing the CRMP Strategic Framework, it cannot be disassociated with linked disciplines such as outcome and impact evaluations, as review of past activities based on the CRMP is a starting point in reviewing the next iteration.

***Section Three*** contains the ‘good practice’ that should be followed by FRS staff in evaluating their approach to, and their development of, the CRMP. ***This is the key section in terms of guidance***. It contains all the steps necessary for the application of a robust evaluation and starts with a visual guide to the step-by-step procedures that FRS staff should follow.

At appropriate intervals within the guidance there are:

1. ***Learning points***- indicate specific learning that staffwill acquire from the guidance.
2. ***Action points* -** that will help FRS staff to identify and put into place the main process evaluation activities.

Section One: Evaluation or monitoring?

Both evaluation and monitoring are essential in any work that intends to improve a process. They form the basis of effective measurement in the chain, from baseline to impact. In terms of the CRMP Strategic Framework, it will be particularly important to know the difference between evaluation and monitoring. These are often complimentary disciplines and activities, but they are not designed to cover the same aspects.

While monitoring is essential to understand, the focus of this guidance is on evaluation, and so more in-depth information is provided on evaluation in the remainder of the document when compared to monitoring.

|  |
| --- |
| **Learning Point**Following use of this section, you should have a greater understanding of what evaluation is, why you need to evaluate, and what the differences are between ‘evaluation’ and ‘monitoring.’ |

What is evaluation?

Evaluation seeks to justify and improve processes, interventions, projects, pilots, and products – in this case the CRMP process, and its application.

In carrying out evaluations, both the process and the outcomes and impacts can be assessed to deliver better services. A separate set of NFCC Guidance addresses the impact of FRS interventions that result from the CRMP.

This guidance evaluates the process of the development of the CRMP, and explains how the CRMP Strategic Framework has been developed so that it identifies the risks of the particular community served by the FRS, explains how they were informed by Stakeholder and Public Engagement, and how the FRS Code of Ethics underpins each step.

What is monitoring?

Monitoring usually involves continually capturing a wide range of data that compliments the more periodic evaluations that seek to explain that data and make recommendations for improvement. For example, business intelligence is required throughout the whole CRMP process - therefore this will require data collection and monitoring throughout; however, there will still be a need for it to be part of the process evaluation. This means that data monitoring activities will be concerned with measuring results such as levels of participation from stakeholder groups that reflect both the diversity of the community and vulnerable groups within it. By contrast, evaluation will be concerned with the process of each aspect of the themes that support the CRMP Fire Standard.

Evaluation and monitoring are complimentary but differ in the focus of the questions being asked, the frequency and scope of data collection, and what we are aiming to achieve:

Monitoring should:

1. Capture data relevant to (and beyond) the evaluation.
2. Provide checks on quality control.
3. Ensure data is fit for purpose.
4. Measure KPIs.
5. Account for spending on the process.
6. Record activities and outputs that inform the CRMP.

It is important that monitoring is rigorous and transparent and covers the following questions:

1. What data needs to be gathered to give reliable and consistent measurement against CRMP objectives?
2. Who will be responsible for gathering CRMP data and intelligence (across all themes and components), and what resources are required?
3. How will CRMP data be gathered and stored?
4. How will CRMP data be verified to ensure it is accurate and consistent with the relevant requirements?
5. How will CRMP data be collected and reported, when, and for whom?
6. Can CRMP data be aligned with the schedule for auditing and evaluation?
7. How much use can be made of existing internal and external data sources?

To reiterate, the focus of this guidance is on evaluation; the above should be considered a starting point to, and outline of, the basic principles of monitoring in relation to CRMP development – it is not intended to be used as a complete set of monitoring guidance.

Section Two: Evaluation types

|  |
| --- |
| Learning Point:By the end of this section, you should understand the different evaluation types and how they link together and be confident about the specific evaluation type related to this guidance. |

Although the focus of this guidance is on the development and application of CRMP, this section should be read in conjunction with Annexe One, which provides a brief overview of two other evaluation types (‘outcome’ and ‘impact’).

**NB:** While ‘outcome’ and ‘impact’ are distinct types of evaluation, evidence of outcomes and impacts (definitions on pg.15) are considered within this guidance to be indicators within a process evaluation - which may be a source of potential confusion, especially to staff new to evaluation. The steps laid out in Section 3 are not intended to be used to evaluate outcomes or impacts, but evidence pertaining to both may be important to consider as they provide a baseline from which further activities may be developed to respond as a result of the current CRMP.

Process evaluations

*Process evaluations* describe and assess services, activities, policies, and procedures. They provide feedback as to whether a project, programme, or intervention (in this case the CRMP process) is being implemented as intended, what barriers have been encountered, and what changes or variations to delivery might be required. Most importantly, they may reveal why outcomes were, or were not achieved. This process can be visibly captured in a project’s logic model (see Annexe 2).

The focus of a process evaluation tends to be on the types and quantities of activities to inform the process; how input was captured from those impacted by identified risks; the adherence to plans; the resources used to deliver them; the practical problems encountered; and the ways such problems were resolved.

For example, in order to secure intended outcomes and impacts within the CRMP, the activity of identifying and mitigating hazards will include the following (all of which are part of the process of delivering the CRMP):

1. Consultation with stakeholders.
2. The implementation and administration of a project plan.
3. The collection and interpretation of relevant data.
4. A range of associated inputs .
5. Regular process reviews.

Process evaluations are focused on those activities and decisions made during the development and lifetime of a process. The process evaluation should seek to:

1. Explain and assess the steps that have led to the CRMP’s intended (and unintended) outputs, outcomes, and impacts resulting from previous iterations of the CRMP.
2. Complement and refine CRMP data and interpretation to improve the accuracy, robustness, and usefulness risk identification.
3. Contribute case studies to the NFCC so they may be used to inform best practice.
4. Investigate and learn from local variation in the development of a CRMP .

This is accomplished through an assessment of the following:

**Economy**

Assessment of the cost of effort and resources employed in developing the CRMP.

**Effectiveness**

The extent to which the CRMP process employs data to inform its assessment of risk, how effectively it engages with relevant stakeholders and evaluates and responds to their feedback, how it accesses people with the right skills to undertake analysis and consultation, etc.

**Efficiency**

Whether the processes and methodologies, data sources, and analytics processes and methods chosen made best use of available resources for maximum outcome.

**Relevance**

Whether the CRMP reflects input from relevant participants and stakeholders, and whether the process has used the most current and verified as accurate data sources from which to identify risk. Also, whether the final CRMP reflects the Code of Ethics of the FRS.

**Sustainability**

How issues of sustainability in terms of communities, economy, and environment have been encompassed in the CRMP.

To measure the above, the process evaluation should seek to ask:

1. **Who is involved** in the development of the CRMP? **Why** are these individuals or organisations involved? **How** are they involved?
2. **Who** has been **engaged** and **consulted.**
3. Have wider FRS organisational processes been i**ntegrated where relevant to identify community risk.**
4. **Has** the **process worked** in the way it was **expected** to work? If not, in what ways and why not? What worked well? What didn’t?
5. What **barriers** were encountered in implementing the CRMP process? Were they **overcome**? How, and to **what conclusion**?
6. **How** does the CRMP **interact** **with the monitoring** of data?
7. Was the **resourcing right** in terms of staff and budgets?
8. Does the CRMP process work across **all levels of staff** - strategic, tactical, and operational? Do others need to be involved in future iterations?
9. What can be **improved**?

With the answers to these questions in hand, evaluators should be able to evidence and review the following:

1. Success characteristics and areas of good practice.
2. Processes adopted in setting up and delivering the CRMP.
3. The barriers and enablers associated with setting up and delivering the CRMP Strategic Framework.
4. The expectations of stakeholders in relation to the CRMP Strategic Framework.
5. The extent to which the CRMP Strategic Framework has met (or is working towards) objectives.
6. How the evaluation of the whole CRMP Strategic Framework aligns with other research and evaluations (either those targeted at certain aspects of the CRMP or other evaluations which touch on CRMP related activities).
7. Gaps and potential gaps in the development and delivery model of the CRMP Strategic Framework.
8. How the factors have motivated or incentivised change at an individual, departmental, or organisational level.
9. How the plans were adhered to and carried out. Any related variations and the impact on systems and people should be captured and reported in the final report (any variations could lead to negative or positive impacts).

Section 3 will outline a step by step guide to achieving each of these points.

Section Three:

Evaluating the CRMP process – a ‘step by step’ guide

This section is central to the understanding and application of ‘good practice’ in terms of implementing the guidance. It is structured in an easy-to-use format and takes a step-by-step approach in describing how to apply a consistent and robust evaluation across all aspects of the CRMP Strategic Framework. It is designed to equip FRS staff with the knowledge to make informed decisions on the approach to take. It does this by addressing the whole as a seamless process in which the evaluation is applicable across all components of the CRMP, and where the themes and components are built into one evaluation.

The step-by-step approach can be visualised as follows:



The challenge for FRS staff will be to apply these steps to the whole CRMP in a consistent, robust manner. The skills acquired can then be transferred across themes and components if required, using the same techniques, applying the same types of questions (albeit with slight variations) and employing the same disciplined approach.

|  |
| --- |
| Learning PointFollowing steps one and two that follow, you should understand the difference between defining the parameters of the evaluation and defining the scope of the CRMP.You should be able to explain what your evaluation will, and will not cover, the timeframes involved, funding sources, and resource requirements (how much, who is to be involved). You will also learn how to construct a simple logic model. |

Step 1: Define and refine process evaluation parameters

This step relates to defining and developing the parameters of the evaluation – or scope. It should not be confused with developing the scope of the CRMP; these are two different things, the latter being a component within the CRMP.

Defining the ‘evaluation parameters’ in this guidance focuses on setting the range of the evaluation - ruling things in, and ruling things out.

To ensure consistency, the most practical approach will be to design one evaluation which can be tailored to each theme and component within the CRMP Strategic Framework, if required.

In terms of the whole CRMP, the evaluation should begin with a clear statement of what is to be evaluated so that this can be shared and consulted upon. It should contain timeframes, resource plans, funding sources, objectives, and any other relevant information.

The following should then be considered as potential parameters of the evaluation:

1. Effectiveness of project structure and delivery mechanisms
2. Risk in terms of methods of developing the process
3. Changing environment or context that need to be reflected
4. Lessons learned
5. Highlighted examples of good practice
6. Practical recommendations for future development
7. Communication of the CRMP across the organisation once developed

In order to help this process, ask:

* What are the limits of these parameters?
* What do we aim to find out relating to each parameter?
* What can we exclude?

In this step of the evaluation, it is helpful to look at already existing evidence available from monitoring (particularly any gaps), or to the recommendations made by prior evaluations.

These sources can help to define parameters more precisely to create an agreed scope. To visualise this scope in terms of all the expected inputs and outputs, it is advisable to create a simple logic model, which takes us to Step 2.

Step 2: Create a logic model

A logic model illustrates an overview of a project or process in a simple one-page diagram. It tells the story of how project activities will lead to its anticipated results.

The benefit of producing a simple logic model is that it willprovide a clear overview that can be used to explain the CRMP Strategic Framework and how objectives, processes, outputs, and other elements link together. It provides a useful monitoring and evaluation tool, and it highlights assumptions which may need to be acknowledged and treated as a risk.

Logic models are usually constructed by drawing from the following categories. In terms of the CRMP, a logic model should cover the following (see Annexe Two for a worked example):

***Context* -** demonstrates why the CRMP has been developed and which stakeholders have been identified to provide input.

***Inputs* - describe w**hat will be invested in the development of the CRMP : things like funding (cost and source), staff, equipment, buildings, and any other resources utilised.

***Activities*** - describe what will happen as part of CRMP developemnt and who will be involved.

***Outputs*** – these will document the specific risks that the data used in development of the CRMP highlights

***Outcomes* – these will be the intended results from** developing a CRMP: things like improved service, or community safety.

***Impact*** – this will capture the expected impacts on the decision-making process for activities and resource commitments to mitigate the risks identified.

***Assumptions* -every project works from a series of asumptions. It is important to be clear about what these are, so that risks can be managed. Assumptions should consider** things such as wider issues that may impact on the success of the project (an example being the Covid-19 pandemic), any relevant dependencies or constraints (things like the CRMP’s dependence on funding, or other projects that can impact the CRMP’s development), and facts that are fundamental to the project, such as capacity and specialist knowledge held within the FRS and whether there is appropriate access to this or if external expertise or data is required.

Logic models are very useful in visualising the linkages between processes so that interdependencies of data, hazard or risk types can be mapped to be made visually more comprehensive. *See Annexe two for a logic model template.*

|  |
| --- |
| **Action Point**Think about the scope of your evaluation. What do you want to achieve in terms of the CRMP and how do you want to get there?Write this down in a document that can be shared. Consider:1. All the inputs: finance, resources, professional judgement, and others that are relevant.
2. The activities you need to undertake.
3. Who you need to involve, including staff engagement, and wider consultations.
4. The outputs you want to see, things such as Equality Impact Statement, reflection of the FRS Code of Ethics, etc.

Capture this visually by creating a logic model to illustrate the evaluation scope.Use the simple logic model in Annex Two: add to it with your ideas relating to the overall CRMP. In addition, to help measure progress, you can keep the Risk Register in Annexe four updated.In terms of focusing on a ‘whole’ process evaluation, you will find that many of the stakeholders will be the same throughoutCreating one over-arching model for the whole CRMP Framework (including all its themes and components) will be important to ensure a consistent approach, and in visually capturing the links between activities. However, although inputs and outputs might be common across the whole CRMP framework, there will be some that are linked to specific components or themes. These can be captured in the logic model (as headlines), and then, if it is helpful, you could drill down into these through the creation of sub-logic models that relate to a particular theme or component. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Learning Point**Following this step, you should understand how important it is to identify and engage both internal and external stakeholders. In addition, you begin to construct a model of those with whom you will communicate with and use input from these stakeholders. |

Step 3: Engage internal and external stakeholders

Stakeholders (both internal and external) are critical to the success of an evaluation. A decision needs to be made as to who these stakeholders might be and how they might best be utilised - either to be directly involved in evaluation design, or to be sounding boards as the evaluation progresses. They can helpfully provide the following in terms of their engagement with the evaluation:

1. Design input
2. Developing evaluation questions
3. Expert guidance
4. Consultation
5. Co-creation
6. Sponsorship of the project
7. Dissemination

The next step is to begin to identify which stakeholders fit into which categories and understand their interests and expectations. Key stakeholders can be categorised into three groups (however, each may not belong to just one of these groups):

Individuals involved in the CRMP (Project teams, FRS staff, communities, local businesses), for example, through informal engagement and questions community members may be involved in the development stage.

1. Individuals who are influenced by the CRMP (Intended beneficiaries such as the public, other agencies, FRS staff).
2. Individuals who may use the CRMP evaluation findings (governing bodies, strategic managers, HMICFRS, external partners).

It is important to identify and include stakeholders early in the design process. For example, there may be a need to negotiate access to information that can help define KPIs. Also, in considering the perspectives and interests of stakeholders as early as possible, this can support better co-creation and increases the probability of the evaluation findings being used to initiate change.

### Step 4: Create a stakeholder map

A stakeholder map lists each stakeholder associated with the CRMP, defines their relationship to the evaluation, captures their expertise, identifies beneficiaries, documents their intended use of the evaluation, and assigns agreed inputs. As with a logic model, it provides a visual record of this step that can be shared and provides evidence of collaboration. See Annexe 3 for a stakeholder map template.

**NB:** while it has been placed here as Step 4 – it is recommended that Step 3 and Step 4 are best conducted in tandem. A complete map can be difficult to plot without first engaging some stakeholders; however, having a stakeholder map is a useful resource when trying to understand the range of stakeholders and plan the best way to engage with them.

### Step 5: Agree resources

**Learning point**

Following this step, you should have a better idea of how to calculate the resource implications related to your evaluation, in terms of personnel and funding required.

Evaluations need to be proportionate to their relationship with the project, process, or programme in question – in this case the CRMP. Many organisations neglect to conduct an evaluation of any type within their projects due to cost and resource implications, however, it is all about scale. It would be rare to spend as much on the evaluation of a project as is spent on the cost of the project itself **– but it is essential to spend something**. Budgeting nothing for evaluation (in other words, not evaluating at all), will almost certainly result in misspending or overspending elsewhere, and it will not help to inform sustainability, especially as the CRMP is a long-term, iterative document.

It is true that evaluations can be time-consuming and expensive, therefore, to ensure the CRMP evaluation is proportional, an assessment is required to determine scale and scope. This should include consideration of such things as:

1. Attributed funds.
2. Resources available.
3. In-kind support (for example the re-deployment of staff, the use of external premises).
4. Governance, approval, and reporting processes.
5. Strategic imperatives.
6. Timeline for implementation and completion.

When assessing this, consider and review the following:

1. Clarity regarding what needs to be evaluated re: components of the CRMP
2. The reasons for the CRMP evaluation (internal audit?).
3. That the scope of the evaluation has been consulted on and agreed.
4. How useful (and used) an evaluation will be to inform overall FRS Risk Management.
5. The extent to which there is leadership buy-in regarding strategic support and need for the evaluation.
6. Whether adequate resources are available to undertake an evaluation .
7. How much the results of the evaluation might influence the shape of the CRMP and resource allocation in the future.

|  |
| --- |
| **Action Point**Use your planning (scope and logic model) to determine what type of evaluation is needed. Establish the resources and budget that is required through engagement of your stakeholders. There is no ‘hard and fast’ rule about evaluation cost, but it is reasonable to assume that evaluation will cost 5-10% of the cost of the development of the CRMP. |

### Step 6: Develop the evaluation questions

As many stakeholders as possible should be consulted in developing evaluation questions to ensure all needs are met and to ensure that the focus is on process questions, not on questions of outcome, or impact.

As a reminder, the process evaluation will address the extent to which the CRMP has been (or is being) implemented as planned and is reaching its intended populations.

To focus the evaluation more precisely will require consideration of the types ofindicators to be used to provide evidence of the process (how you will know what has happened). The following types of indicators will provide useful guidelines about what information should be collected. In other words, these are the data sources needed to demonstrate progress or change.

1. **Process indicators (includes inputs and outputs):** These measure the extent to which planned activities took place. Examples will include the tracking of intended meetings relating to the CRMP, the distribution of timetabled update reports, the level to which those involved in the design contribute feedback about the evolution of the process, and other such indicators.
2. **Input indicators – these measure the quantity, quality, and timeliness** of the contributions necessary to enable the CRMP to be implemented (such as funding, staff, other resources, key partners and collaborators, infrastructure, data availability and access, ability to engage relevant parties).
3. **Output indicators –** in the case of the CRMP this is **the information drawn from the process of a level that creates clarity of local risk definition** to inform decision-making in deciding the best allocation of resources to mitigate the specific risks.

In developing evaluation questions for the CRMP based on the above indicators, the following should be considered:

1. The CRMP logic model should be consulted to construct input/output questions.
2. Questions should relate to the specific stages of development of the CRMP (for example the planning, implementation, or completion stage).
3. Any previous evaluations that may relate to the CRMP and the activities associated with it should be reviewed to help generate any themes or questions.
4. Decisions that may need to be taken based on the questions should be identified: for example, if the CRMP stakeholder base needs to be broadened, questions might be asked of current stakeholders regarding any barriers associated with their engagement.

|  |
| --- |
| **Possible questions** |
| 1. Was the CRMP development process appropriate and effective?
2. Were CRMP partnership arrangements satisfactory?
3. Which stakeholders were engaged? Were these the right stakeholders? Are there ‘missing’ stakeholders
4. How has leadership and organisational structure affected delivery of the CRMP?
5. What is the learning and best practice that emerges?
6. What budget was set for the CRMP and for which activities? Was it appropriate?
7. Were there sufficient resources in place to deliver the CRMP to the desired level of data-led analysis?
8. What outputs were expected?
9. What were and are the experiences and perceptions of effectiveness from those engaged in development of the CRMP?
10. How is the CRMP used, and by whom, or by which group? How and why does it or does it not work?
11. What were and are the barriers and facilitators for organisations?
12. How could the barriers be minimised, and facilitators maximised?
13. Are current CRMP KPIs realistic and achievable?
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Possible indicators** |
| 1. Number of stakeholders involved in the CRMP
2. Number of stakeholder types (internal and external) involved
3. Number of CRMP milestones achieved or not achieved
4. Participant views on the process of delivering the CRMP
5. Stakeholder experiences of the CRMP, measured against their expectations.
6. What variance was there between budget and spend?
7. The extent that resource allocation differed from planned allocation
8. Level of input from stakeholders
9. Number of ‘intended’ outputs and outcomes achieved
10. Number of ‘intended outputs and outcomes not achieved
11. Number of ‘unexpected’ outputs and outcomes achieved
12. Number (and types) of barriers encountered
13. Impact on outputs of barriers
14. Number of KPIs met
15. Number of KPIs not met (and by how much?)
 |

### Step 7: Asking the evaluation questions

This Step, together with Step 8, relate to, and interact with the gathering and analysis of evaluation data. This headline guidance is designed to cover an aspect of process evaluation; however, it should be used in conjunction with the much more ‘data specific’ guidance contained in the NFCC CRMP [‘Data and Business Intelligence](https://www.ukfrs.com/community-risk/data-and-business-intelligence-guidance)’ Guidance which forms a component of the CRMP Strategic Framework, and which covers in-depth advice on such issues as:

1. Collection of data
2. Data quality
3. Data ethics
4. Data protection
5. Organising data
6. Data cleaning and validation
7. Data analysis

Issus to consider:

Did the method(s) employed in seeking responses to data questions and providing evidence prove effective? How will this be measured?

Was a data collection plan used and how effective were the following elements:

1. The themes to be measured and how they were to be measured.
2. The dates and timeframe for the collection of data (or when research was to be conducted) and the timeline for doing so.
3. How data was be collected (and if it would be qualitative or quantitative or both).
4. How data collection offered the best possibility the involvement of all representative groups
5. That suitable data collection legalities (GDPR, data protection, anonymity, confidentiality, and informed consent) were considered.
6. If demographic data and ‘protected characteristics’ data relating to equality, diversity, and inclusion was included.

#### Research methods

Once the evaluation questions have been determined, a decision will need to be made regarding the type(s) of research methodology that will be applied to ask these questions. This could be a decision to select just one method (such as surveys), or a combination of methods (surveys and interviews). The decision will depend on the type of outputs required from the evaluation, using both quantitative data (measuring specifics of things like how much or how many), and qualitative data (asking how and why), which will entail deeper investigation.

The NFCC CRMP [‘Data and Business Intelligence](https://www.ukfrs.com/community-risk/data-and-business-intelligence-guidance)’ will provide further support on this, however, the following table illustrates the differences between a quantitative and a qualitative approach to evaluations.

**NB:** Good practise is to overlap both qualitative and quantitative data within an evaluation. The differences are important to understand so that the advantages of different methods can be recognised, and the strengths of each approach can be effectively pursued in tandem. When answering evaluation questions, depending too heavily on either one of qualitative or quantitative data to the exclusion of the other will result in compromised answers.

#### Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches

|  |
| --- |
| **Difference between quantitative and qualitative research approaches** |
| **Difference in…** | **Quantitative** | **Qualitative** |
| **Meaning** | Quantitative research seeks to quantify a phenomenon. It is more structured, objective, and helps reduce bias.  | Qualitative research is descriptive and is used to discover details that help explain things. It conveys the richness and depth of peoples’ thoughts and experiences.  |
| **Data type** | Data that can easily be measured or quantified. For example, the number of people who will placed in danger by an identified risk.  | Data that represent opinions or feelings and cannot be represented by a numerical statistic such as an average. For example, what type of danger is posed by an identified risk, to whom, and what will be the result. |
| **How such data is used** | To numerically measure – things like who, what, when, how much, how many, how often. | To analyse how and why. |
| **Objectives** | To assess reach, causality, and to reach conclusions that can be generalised. For example: 50% of people in x location will be in danger due to the identified risk. | To understand processes, behaviours, and conditions as perceived by groups of individuals being studied. For example, the identified risk will result in ‘this type’ of injury, but could be mitigated by ‘xyz’ actions |
| **Recommended data collection** | Standardised interviews / Surveys / Questionnaires | In-depth open interviews / participant observation / focus groups / workshops |
| **Analysis** | Predominantly statistical analysis (using appropriate software) - often generalised to make wider comments on coverage and impact. | Triangulation - using multiple data sources to produce understanding - often using quotations and case studies to substantiate and illustrate findings. |
| **Types of findings / responses** | 25% of survey respondents stated that they felt they had participated in a thorough consultation in the development of the CRMP’s Equality Impact Assessment.40% of respondents stated that the budget allocated to the EIA had not been spent as they had expected. | There was evidence that one identifiable group of respondents stated that the EQI did not cover the themes required to ensure that they were satisfied with its final assessment.One budget holder said that due to a change in plans caused by a reduction in the original budget allocated to the EIA, the number of stakeholders involved had to be reduced. |

#### Who should ask the questions?

Another aspect of evaluation (and of the research element in particular) that will need to be considered is, who should carry out the CRMP process evaluation, and to what extent are objective, independent results required: should this be the role of internal FRS staff, an external contractor, or a combination of the two?

There are several factors to consider when making this decision. For some projects and programmes it may be a compulsory requirement that an external evaluator completes the task. However, sometimes evaluations are conducted internally.

It may be tempting to opt for the less costly route of using an internal member of staff to conduct the CRMP evaluation, however, if it adds to an individual’s workload and they do not have the necessary expertise, it may be a false economy and could run the risk of poor evaluation.

Another option would be to include both internal and external individuals for the evaluation. For instance, an external evaluator could be contracted to support some of the technical aspects of the evaluation (the research methods), which could combine the benefits of bringing in expertise without losing the advantage of access to insider knowledge and understanding.

The following table outlines some of the benefits and limitations related to commissioning an external evaluator, as opposed to using internal staff.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Internal** | **External** |
| **Benefits** |
| **Cost** - less costly.**Perspective** - will have more understanding of project or programme and organisations environment.**Working relationships -** with staff and stakeholders is already established | **Expertise** - will have skills and knowledge in evaluation methods and practice. **Credibility** - brings in an outsider’s perspective and is therefore more objective.**Time** - will have more time to dedicate to the evaluation. |
| **Limitations** |
| **Expertise** - may lack evaluation skills and knowledge in methods and practices.**Credibility** - it may be more difficult to be objective.**Time** - may have limited time to dedicate to evaluation. | **Cost** - it may be more costly to hire external evaluators.**Perspective** -may not have as much understanding of project or programme and organisational environment |

Step 8: Analysing your responses

As previously stated, this step contains a brief overview of guidance in relation to data analysis. As with the previous step, more detailed support can be obtained through consulting the NFCC CRMP [‘Data and Business Intelligence](https://www.ukfrs.com/community-risk/data-and-business-intelligence-guidance)’ Guidance.

The logical step following the collection of data is to analyse and interpret that data. This usually takes the form of entering (or capturing) data, checking quality, ensuring consistency, and analysing the data to identify your evaluation results.

Analysing evaluation data is a way of creating individual stories and making them relevant to the stakeholders involved in the CRMP. The types of analyses will depend on the types of data (qualitative or quantitative) to be analysed, the evaluation question being asked, and how (and to whom) the data is to be presented. It may also depend on who is analysing the data (internal or external individuals). The following provides some ideas on the types of analysis that could be used to evaluate the CRMP Strategic Framework.

For the purposes of evaluation of the CRMP process it will probably suffice to use descriptive statistics in analysing quantitative date. These types of statistics are used to present the data in a meaningful way and one which helps to highlight trends and make sense of patterns. Some of the main types of descriptive analysis methods include:

1. ***Measures of frequency*** – these are used to display counts, percentages, or frequencies. Researchers will apply this method when they want to showcase how often a response is given. For example: *65% of respondents to the survey on the effectiveness of hazard identification believe that the implementation of the CRMP Strategic Framework has resulted in fewer incidents over the last 12 months*
2. ***Measures of central tendency*** – these relate to the *mean*, *median,* or *mode* response. This method is often used to demonstrate the distribution of responses. Researchers use this when they want to highlight the most commonly or averagely indicated response. For example: *the mean number of hazard incidents over the last 12 months to which the CRMP has been applied (as recorded by respondents) is eight.*
3. ***Measures of variation***– these relate to the spread of responses and can include range, variance, and standard deviation. For example: *the number* *of consultations with vulnerable groups over the last 12 months ranges from two to four..*

‘Inferential statistics’ is another method that can be used to make predictions about a larger population following data analysis of the sample of respondents. For example, if in a survey on hazards 300 out of 500 respondents in a given region state that they believe that because of the CRMP, the likelihood of hazards has been reduced, researchers might then use inferential statistics to reason that about 60% of all people within that same region believe the same. Inferential statistics require more sophisticated application than descriptive statistics and are often used when researchers want something beyond absolute numbers to understand the relationship between variables.

It should be noted that data analysis is a skill that requires some learning in terms of understanding and application.

However, it is worth considering some of the commonly used methods for analysis in research that might be applied in relation to evaluating data derived from the CRMP - particularly by evaluators with the necessary expertise.

Some of the easier to grasp methods include:

1. ***Correlation*** – this relates to the relationship between two or more variables, for example it may be instructive to analyse the relationship between the degree of a stakeholder's involvement in developing the CRMP with their perception of the impact the CRMP has had on hazard incidents.
2. ***Cross-tabulation***- thiscan be usedto analyse the relationship between multiple response variables.  It is used to understand more granular responses to a question. For example, in evaluating the degree to which the public feels it has been consulted on the CRMP, it would be helpful to disaggregate responses in terms of demographics such as age, gender, and ethnicity.
3. *Content Analysis* - this is awidely accepted and used technique employed in analysing information from text and images and, for example, would be a useful tool to use in reviewing documents relating to the development of the CRMP .
4. *Narrative Analysis*- this method is used to analyse content gathered from sources such as personal interviews, observation, focus groups, and surveys. Experiences and opinions shared by individuals are always shaped by personal experiences and these can be interpreted in many ways by researchers. For example, conducting an interview with semi-structured questions might elicit more reflective responses than running an interview with very fixed questions.

*Key* [*considerations in analysing data related to evaluation of the CRMP*](https://www.questionpro.com/blog/data-analysis-in-research/)

1. Evaluators and researchers must have the necessary skills to analyse the data. Ideally, those charged with the task should possess more than a basic understanding of the rationale of selecting one analytical method over the other to obtain better data insights.
2. Getting statistical advice from an expert at the beginning of analysis will help to ensure that the research design is right in terms of how to ask questions, what to ask, and in framing the potential types of analysis.
3. The primary aim of data research and analysis in relation to evaluation is to arrive at unbiased insights.  Constructing an unbiased evaluation is essential. The key to good data analysis is to be open minded in that analysis – to reflect what people are saying, and to tell their stories.

### Step 9: Report and disseminate

|  |
| --- |
| **Learning Point**You will understand how to ensure your findings are communicated in a way that targets a variety of audiences. You will also learn about the different types of reporting formats. |

All the actions and results of the previous steps are captured in the reporting and dissemination phase. This is where the evaluation findings are shared, audiences engage with the findings, decisions are influenced, change in delivery is documented, outcomes and impacts are captured, and recommendations are made. Previous evidence and analysis of interdependencies within the process should be referenced in terms of good practice; however, this type of information should not be used to make a judgment on outcomes or impact.

Emphasis should be placed on communication and dissemination with a view to increasing knowledge, raising awareness, influencing behaviour, and assisting decision making. The main challenge is to ensure that any interpretation of the findings is anchored to the original research questions. To do this, original questions should be grouped into themes, with the linked findings from analysis and this information used to create the materials to communicate your findings.

Presentation of evaluation findings can take many forms, such as a written report, slide show presentation, infographics, or an informational video. Visual aids can be powerful methods for communicating evaluation results. Make results available to various stakeholders and audiences; tailor what is disseminated to their specific interest in the evaluation and how they plan to use the results.

Review your recommendations with stakeholders to identify and agree actionable outcomes and discuss what has been learned from conducting the evaluation and agree next steps to incorporate and use the results. Prioritise actions arising for your recommendations and co-develop an action plan with those people and groups who will be impacted by the CRMP, the evaluation or both.