Appendix 1 – Monitoring and Evaluation

1   Monitoring the COL programme will allow an understanding of whether activities are proceeding as planned. The data will be reported to SRG to enable decisions that allow effective delivery. Monitoring data for each action will be held by the Program Manager and published on the City Observatory website. The data will also be distributed to the CPMO and the HSF Team at the DWP. It will be reported to Cabinet. Each bid to the SRG will require a clear logic framework.

2   Monitoring information will include inputs and expenditure against budget; staffing levels; activities and outputs; profile data on beneficiaries – such as protected characteristics; feedback data on the quality of activities and outputs; and outcomes. All such information will be useful for evaluation purposes.

3   Following the approach taken for CoL Phase 1, the new programme will also be subject to a thorough evaluation. The exercise will comply with the key principles identified in the UK Government guidance (The Magenta Book). These guidelines state that evaluation should be useful to key stakeholders and tailored to meet key decision points, mobilise robust methods and evidence, be credible and objective, and be proportionate to the activity delivered and funding provided.

4   Three forms of evaluation are important to consider for the programme – each has the potential to provide insight for both follow-on activities and also other future BCC and partner assistance programmes:

    I.   Process: what can we learn from how the specific workstreams, and overall programme were delivered?
    II.   Impact: what difference have the workstreams and overall programme made?
    III.   Value-for-money: were the interventions and overall programme an effective use of resource?

5   In undertaking the process and impact evaluation, key issues will be established: 'what works, for whom, in what respects, to what extent, in what contexts, and how?' Key evidence will be used in the evaluation, including: those responsible for appraisal and approval of interventions; those responsible for design and delivery; the general public; those receiving assistance; beneficiary individuals and organisations; and independent experts – example: academics and researchers.

6   Table 1 below provides an initial set of proposed evaluation questions, presented at workstream and programme level. The questions below cover the evaluation themes identified above, the evaluation questions will be further refined through discussion with delivery leads and the SRG. Individual CoL project managers may also wish to add additional questions or sub-sets of these questions. This depends on what is most useful to understand and inform potential future related activity.

Table 1: Specific Evaluation Questions

Issue	Action level questions	Programme level questions
Effectiveness of the actions and programme	• Did actions reach the target beneficiaries or organisations? • What outputs were achieved? • How did this compare to targets? • Can observable impacts be attributed to the intervention (short-term)? • What other impacts are expected to be achieved and by when? (longer-term) • Could actions have been delivered in a more effective way? (i.e.: achieved more outputs, reached greater numbers or a wider profile of beneficiaries?) • Was support targeted to those most in need? - Could it have been targeted more effectively?	• Did the way the interventions were identified, set-up, and operationalised, facilitate effective delivery? • Were communications and promotion activities effective? • What are the lessons for effective design of future interventions? • What are the lessons for monitoring and course correction of similar interventions in future?
Efficiency of the actions or wider programme	• Were the expected outputs obtained at a reasonable cost? • To what extent did the actions make best use of existing capacity to deliver such activity? • Have adequate resources been allocated to each intervention and to the promotion of their outputs in particular?	• Overall, has adequate resource been allocated to the programme and promotion of activities? • To what extent did the interventions make best use of existing citywide capacity to deliver such activity? • Was there any overlap in activity funded by BCC and those provided by national / WMCA? • How successfully was the design of each of the interventions translated into procurement and implementation?

Issue	Action Level Questions	Programme Level Questions
Relevance of the actions or programme	• To what extent are the activities relevant to the specific issues in Birmingham? • Are there gaps in need not addressed by specific actions? Gaps that could have been addressed. • Did the actions target the most relevant beneficiaries? • Have interventions worked with the most relevant stakeholders and community groups to design and deliver activity	• Are the objectives of the programme appropriate given the nature of need in Birmingham? • Are there issues that the programme does not address? • Are some interventions more relevant to the needs of residents than others? • Did the CoL programme collaborate with relevant stakeholders and community groups to design and deliver the programme?
Coherence of the actions and the programme	• How well integrated are actions with other support provided to residents in the city?	• Does the CoL programme integrate with other forms of support that BCC provides?
Added Value of BCC involvement	• Do the actions or programme add volume and or increase scope of what would have otherwise happened? • Do the actions or programme strengthen delivery capacity of other organisations operating in the city? • Are there any aspects which can be mainstreamed by organisations operating across the city?	