

Practical approaches to measuring success

Laura Fisher – Senior researcher, Local Trust

Jack Loughnane – Senior researcher, Local Trust



Local Trust



Local Trust's approach to measuring success across Big Local

- Informed by the programme's values
 - Resident-led, flexible, non-judgemental
- The programme's outcomes were intentionally broad
- Minimal reporting expectations for Big Local partnerships

Local Trust's approach to measuring success across Big Local


- Big Local partnerships were able to take more risks with what they delivered - trying new things and funding work that may not otherwise be funded.
- They also made the decision on how they would measure success, including if they would do it at all
- Keen to be accountable to the local community or to bring in additional funding

Local Trust's approach to measuring success across Big Local

- Local Trust used a range of methods and research studies to understand success
- This included encouraging partnerships to reflect on their plans (plan reviews) or specific support to measure the changes they were making in their community (Measuring Change support offer)


How did Local Trust understand success across the programme?

- Publicly available data
- Reviews of Big Local partnerships
- Surveys of individual partnership members



Local Insight

- A neighbourhood data platform containing hundreds of indicators (e.g., population, employment, housing, health, crime) at very local levels (like wards or small custom areas).
- Developed and maintained by the UK research organisation OCSI (Oxford Consultants for Social Inclusion).
- Enables mapping, dashboards, reports and visualisations that make complex data easy to interpret.
- Our custom account allowed us to investigate variables at Big Local area level.



Population

Population Composition

The table below provides insight into the population composition in Big Local Broad Green. These population figures provide detail of the structure of the population by broad age bands and sex. This data is taken from the Office for National Statistics (ONS) 2024 Mid-Year Population Estimates.

There are 17,836 people in Big Local Broad Green. This is smaller than the population of England (58,620,101) and smaller than the population of London (9,089,736).

Indicator	Big Local Broad Green		England		London	
	Count	Rate	Count	Rate	Count	Rate
Total	17,836		58,620,101		9,089,736	
Male	8,854	49.64%	28,724,339	49.00%	4,409,526	48.51%
Female	8,982	50.36%	29,895,762	51.00%	4,680,210	51.49%
0 to 15	4,189	23.49%	10,768,248	18.37%	1,698,384	18.68%
16 to 64	12,465	69.89%	36,870,761	62.90%	6,275,855	69.04%
65 and over	1,182	6.63%	10,981,092	18.73%	1,115,497	12.27%

Source: Office for National Statistics (ONS)



Evaluation of publicly available data

- Data used for retrospective analysis of impact in Big Local areas
- Census data used to compare Big Local areas with comparable areas
- Research conducted by commissioned research organisations and bodies supported by Local Trust



Partnership Review

Conducted annually from 2015 to 2023

Primary function to check that partnerships match required criteria

- Minimum of 8 members
- 51%+ resident membership

Additionally

- Track the makeup of Big Local partnerships
- Demographics
- Role on the partnership
- Partnership reflections on their work

Big Local partnership review 2023: List of questions

These are all the questions for the 2023 Partnership review as they appear on 'the Community'.

Part one: the partnership members

Forename
Surname
Age (Up to 24, 25 to 44, 45 to 64, 65 and above)
Ethnicity (Asian/Asian British, Black/African/Caribbean/Black British, Mixed/Multiple Ethnic Groups, White, <u>Other</u> ethnic group)
Resident (yes/no)
If yes to resident, what is your postcode?
Role (Chair, Resident member, <u>Locally</u> trusted organisation representative, Worker, <u>Other</u> member (please specify))
Gender (male, female, other, prefer not to say)
Is this the gender you were assigned at birth? (yes/no/prefer not to say)
Email address
Voting rights (yes/no)
I agree to be contacted by Local Trust for Big Local research
I agree to be contacted by Local Trust for Big Local news and updates
How are you confirming this partnership member? (By signature, by email, by other digital means)

Part two: the partnership

1. Inclusivity and values of the partnership

Thinking about the last year, did the partnership broadly reflect the wider community in terms of:	1 -Very reflective	2- Somewhat reflective	3- Not very reflective	4 - Not at all reflective
Age	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ethnicity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gender	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Disability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Class and socioeconomic background (i.e. income, employment, education, etc)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
All geographical parts of the Big Local area	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please tell us if the partnership agrees or disagrees with each of these statements	1 -Strongly agree	2 - Agree	3 -Disagree	4 - Strongly disagree	N/A
The partnership has been welcoming to new people who have joined the partnership in the last year	<input type="checkbox"/>				
The partnership is open to new or different ideas about how to deliver Big Local (i.e. how to spend the money, set priorities, develop plans, organise meetings, etc)	<input type="checkbox"/>				



Partnership Member Survey

(every 2 years from 2016-2024)




Where we ask all partnership members across all Big Local areas about their experiences of Big Local



Gather information across a range of topics relevant to the stage of the Big Local programme – intangible outcomes



Help us better understand Big Local from those who are at the centre of the programme



Participation voluntary, completed by approx. 50% of partnership members



Partnership Member Survey



Outcomes

- Informed changes in approaches to support by identifying needs of partnership members
- Indicates different experiences of the programme in different regions
- Provides context for research projects and policy work

Partnership Member Survey

Adapted to investigate issues relevant to various stages of the programme

- Involvement in Big Local: Time spent on Big Local, previous volunteering, role on partnership, events
- Experience of the National Big Local programme: Sense of community, knowledge and skills, progress and legacy, decision making
- Support: National and local level, relationships and connections
- Wellbeing: General health, mental wellbeing



Local Trust



How did Local Trust understand success within Big Local areas?

Plan Reviews

- Open questions where partnerships could reflect on what they had learned and achieved while delivering their Big Local plan.
- Local Trust's intention was to support strong and strategic decision-making from partnerships, not to collect monitoring and evaluation information.
- The variety in the information Local Trust received made it hard to use to systematically understand the programme's successes

How did Local Trust understand success within Big Local areas?

Measuring Change

- Partnerships wanted to better understand the changes they were making, but lacked the capacity or knowledge to do this
- Aimed to build these skills and confidence by matching partnerships with specialist community evaluators for tailored support.
- Rooted in qualitative approaches - outputs included evaluation frameworks, Theories of Change, graphic illustrations or impact reports

Local Trust's learning

- A focus on enabling residents to take the lead resulted in a trade-off for Local Trust – less insight and varied evidence
- Many partnerships did not prioritise understanding their impacts on a broader level while others developed or commissioned their own evaluations



Local Trust



Local Trust's learning

- More input was required from Local Trust to understand achievements at community and programme level and we did get more insight from areas as the programme came to an end.
- Some impact analysis possible utilising publicly accessible data without additional burden on residents
- Capturing baseline measurements would have improved Local Trust's ability to understand success across the programme, but may have impacted partnerships setting up.

Local Trust's learning

- Flexibility is key but some direction (e.g. through a 'menu of support') can help
- Partnerships were less interested in building their own skills and knowledge, but they did gain confidence
- Skilled community evaluators were best placed to adapt to local needs and work flexibly.
- While outputs from the support were considered valuable, the reflective conversations were felt to have the biggest benefit

Local Trust's learning

- It can take a long time for resident volunteers to see the value of evaluation and some left this work too late to be meaningful.
- Demonstrating impact to the wider community or to future funders were the key motivations
- It may have been valuable as a funder to more clearly demonstrate to Big Local partnerships the benefits of understanding their impact and successes from an earlier stage.

Evaluation led by residents

- Chance to get to grips with evaluative outputs generated by residents as part of their work to measure success in their area
- In groups of 2 or 3, you'll be given 2 documents to take a look at
- Imagine you have received a document like this from a Pride in Place Neighbourhood Board:
 - How can you use this document to understand success locally?
 - How can you use this document to report to your stakeholders?
 - Who else might this be useful for?
 - What else would you want to see or know about?