

UKCRF – Project Evaluation Appendix A

‘This project is funded by the UK Government through the UK Community Renewal Fund.’

The UK Community Renewal Fund is a UK Government programme for 2021/22. This aims to support people and communities most in need across the UK to pilot programmes and new approaches to prepare for the UK Shared Prosperity Fund. It invests in skills, community and place, local business, and supporting people into employment. For more information, visit

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/uk-community-renewal-fund-prospectus>

Report content

The Project evaluation will cover the following areas:

- appropriateness of initial design
- progress against targets
- delivery and management
- outcomes and impact
- value for money
- lessons learnt

Below further detail is set out regarding what should be considered for each element.

Appropriateness of initial design

This element should be based around the project’s planned outcomes and impact and include critical analysis about the appropriateness of the project’s design given these objectives.

Drawing on the available evidence, this part of the report should discuss whether there has been a change in the context within which the project was originally planned. If there have been changes, whether these have had any implications for the practical delivery of the project and the benefits which could be realised for beneficiaries and the local economy. The key questions that need to be explored here are:

- What was the project seeking to do?
- What was the economic and policy context at the time that the project was designed?
- What were the specific market failures that the project was seeking to address? Was there a strong rationale for the project?
- Was it appropriately designed to achieve its objectives? Was the delivery model appropriate?
- Were the targets set for the project realistic and achievable?
- How did the context change as the project was delivered and did this exert any particular pressures on project delivery?

- Bearing in mind the project design itself and any changes in context could the project reasonably be expected to perform well against its targets?

Progress against targets

This element should consider the progress with the implementation of the project, drawing in particular on annual and lifetime performance against the expenditure, activity and output targets. Variations from the targets should be carefully explained and supported by the available evidence.

The key questions here are:

- Has the project delivered what it expected to in terms of spend and outputs?
- What are the factors which explain this performance?
- When the project draws to a close, is it expected to have achieved what it set out to?

Delivery and management

This element of the report will need to provide a more qualitative analysis of the implementation of the project. As appropriate this could cover procurement, selection procedures, delivery performance, governance and management.

The key questions that the summative assessment will need to explore here include:

- Was the project well managed? Were the right governance and management structures in place and did they operate in the way they were expected to?
- Has the project delivered its intended activities to a high standard?
- Could the delivery of the project have been improved in any way?
- For projects with direct beneficiaries: did the project engage with and select the right beneficiaries? Were the right procedures and criteria in place to ensure the project focused on the right beneficiaries?
- How are project activities perceived by stakeholders and beneficiaries? What are their perceptions of the quality of activities / delivery?

Outcomes and impact

The analysis under this element will need to set out the progress that the project has made towards the project's intended outcomes and impacts. Any analysis in this element of the report would benefit from forecasts of lifetime outturns, where it is possible to calculate realistic forecasts.

The overarching question that this section will need to explore is whether or not the project has made a difference. In answering this critical question, projects will need to consider:

- What progress has the project made towards achieving the intended outcome and impacts?
- To what extent are the changes in relevant impact and outcome indicators attributable to project activities?

- What are the gross and net additional economic, social and environmental benefits of the project (where relevant and applicable to project activities)?
- Can these benefits be quantified and attributed to the project in a statistically robust way?
- How has the project contributed to the wider strategic plan under which it was developed?

Value for money

This element of the report will need to provide a clear analysis of the value for money that the project has provided. As a minimum, reports should provide cost per output analysis.

Where appropriate this can also be supplemented by benefit cost ratio analysis to provide additional insight. Various methods can be used to assess benefits and costs of an intervention from the perspective of society or government which has helped to fund the activity. The Green Book provides a fuller explanation of these methods.

Lessons learnt

It is suggested that the lessons learnt element of the report is structured around identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the project. They should also highlight specific lessons for the following audiences:

- The grant recipient / project delivery body
- Those designing and implementing similar interventions
- Policy makers

They should be objective and constructive and wholly evidenced by the analysis within the report.

Further information:

[UK Community Renewal Fund: further monitoring and evaluation guidance for project deliverers - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/612222/UK_Community_Renewal_Fund_further_monitoring_and_evaluation_guidance_for_project_deliverers.pdf)