



SROI Report

EVALUATION OF THE
BUILDING BETTER OPPORTUNITIES
GCGP COMMUNITY CONNECTIONS NORTH PROGRAMME
FUNDED BY THE NATIONAL LOTTERY COMMUNITY
FUND AND EUROPEAN SOCIAL FUND

Justine Cawley
Care Careers Limited

Contents

Headline Findings	2
Introduction – Background on the Community Connections Programme	3
Programme Outcomes	4
Partners	5
SROI Approach	8
Methodology	9
Impact Mapping Establishing a theory of change	11
Stakeholders	11
Financial Indicators	11
Non-Monetized Benefits	26
Impact measures	27
Sensitivity Analysis – Deadweight, Displacement, Attribution and Drop-off	27
Conclusion	30
Recommendations	31
Appendix 1 Impact Map	

Headline Findings

The Social Return on Investment ratio for the GCGP programme is for every £1 spent £10.11 of social value is created.

Beneficiaries reported a number of positive outcomes, in particular:

- Jobs
- Volunteering
- Progress towards employment though CV support received.
- Increased confidence
- Mental Health Support
- Less lonely – increased social networks
- Ex-offenders – which have been prevented from re-offending.
- Housing – prevented from being evicted or have found homes as a result of the programme.
- Supported living to semi supported living (Facet)
- Independence Skills (from one organization Facet).
- Prevention of Sectioning (Facet).

Many beneficiaries found employment. There were 303 who found employment of these 92 were previously economically inactive and the other 211 were unemployed.

308 participants found volunteering opportunities and continued to volunteer after the course had ended and this has been given a financial proxy. There is reasonable probability that a number of these will have found jobs as a result of the volunteering. This has not been possible to monetize based on the information available although it is likely that social return would be shown to be higher if a longitudinal study was in place.

One of the main exit routes for this programme was Job search which was an outcome in its own right. Although we did not monetize this. We did put a monetary value on having a CV.

Mental Health was a big issue on the programme with many participants having poor mental health. This varied from partner to partner but it is clear that how partners responded to this was a major contribution to the programme's success particularly with supporting participants through the pandemic. One partner, Participants presented with a variety of mental health challenges including suicidal thoughts, depression and feeling of isolation and loneliness. We monetized a proportion of the participants with mental health challenges as it was clear that many had received mental health support from partners equivalent to a mental health intervention as a result of the programme.

There was one participant who attributed not being sectioned down to the support they received from the programme. There may well have been others, but the recording systems prevented us from monetizing more than one.

Participants increased their social networks and stated that they were less lonely. This also contributed to improved mental health and had a positive impact on their lives.

The programme had a number of ex-offenders who found work or accessed education as a result of the programme, and this has a great deal of social value. Although not all of the offenders were stopped from re-offending a proportion were helped significantly (See Case study from Kickstart in Part 2)

The programme has helped a number of individuals who would have undoubtedly become homeless if they had not received support, it helped them to get either work or helped with their benefits to enable them to stay in their accommodation.

Independent living – which included IT Skills, independent travel, travel and prevention of sectioning – This was from the records of one partner who worked extensively with learning disability participants. These are small numbers but the effect of the lives of the participants is massive.

Introduction

GCGP - Community Connections - Background

The programme started in June 2016 and finished in March 2023. The programme focuses on people with complex or multiple barriers to employment.

Community Connections aims to transform support for some of the most disadvantaged residents of Greater Cambridgeshire and Greater Peterborough LEP who are described as the hardest to reach. The project brings together a unique combination of organisations from different sectors working together to jointly meet the multiple and complex needs of participants.

Community Connections worked with 1206 participants, providing them with 1-2-1 case worker support and unique interventions, as well as linking them to specialist services in order to help them move towards the labour market. Community Connections delivered a range of complementary outcomes that will ensure any progression is sustainable.

The programme had different targets to meet – some had hard outcomes and others softer outcomes.

Participants were exited from the programme through 3 different hard outcome routes.

- If they obtained a job
- If they had gone into education or training.
- Or if they had got to the stage where they could be exited on job search.

In addition, soft outcomes were recorded. There were a number of measures that were recorded. As the programme was setting out to cater for complex needs and those termed hardest to reach. This meant that the focus of the programme was not just the hard outcomes (employment, education and training and job search) but soft skills and distance travelled were equally important. This was very different from a lot of employment programmes and meant that the partners did not have a time limit on how long they worked with a participant, and this gave them an opportunity to work on soft skills and barriers that prevented them from getting into the labour market.

Programme Outcomes.

The programme had targets it reported on, and these are presented in the box below. With both the target and what was achieved.

The Results of the programme

Table 1

	Target	Achieved	Percentage Achieved
Number who move into education or training on leaving	237	305	129%
Unemployed participants into employment	196	211	108%
Economically inactive into employment, including self-employment, or into job search on leaving	279	259	92%

Soft Outcomes

Table 2

	Target	Achieved	Percentage
Participants are more connected to the labour market	640	799	125%
Participants stating more self confidence	1328	1418	107%
Participants completing goal setting session	1106	1190	108%
Participants engaged in supported job-search	794	853	107%
Participants complete work-related activity / experience	610	664	109%
Participants registered with JCP	444	480	108%
Participants are more connected to their community	501	690	138%
Participants are able to travel independently	638	664	104%
Participants reporting being less lonely	899	597	66%
Participants starting volunteering activities	285	308	108%
Participants complete group activities	726	759	105%
Participants are more connected to local services	820	882	108%
Participants given signposting to all relevant services	790	785	99%
reporting fewer issues with housing, childcare, etc.	521	515	99%
participants independently accessing local services	794	895	108%
Participant satisfaction levels with local services	562	643	109%
Support organisations are better connected	55	39	71%
Partners report 'higher' knowledge of local services	53	38	72%
Frontline staff report knowing how and when to refer for impact	52	37	71%
Organisations cross-referring participants based upon need	51	36	71%

Partners

Throughout the course of the programme and since the interim evaluation took place a number of organisations dropped out. There were 15 original partners – a couple dropped out in the first few months and since the interim evaluation was produced another 5 partners have left the partnership. The latter, however, did contribute to the overall success of the programme and some of their case studies are included in part 2 of this evaluation.

Cross Keys Homes

Cross Keys Homes delivers skills support including, self-confidence, access to services (IT) and home maintenance. They support people in Peterborough and the surrounding area in their own premises and other premises including community venues.

Early Years Alliance

Early Years Alliance are expert partners tackling childcare needs and supporting women and their families in returning to the labour market. They facilitate arrangements for childcare and education, and support women participants to access available funding. They have several case workers trained to deliver “better off in work” calculations and will help women to identify potential employers who offer flexibility for caring responsibilities to meet their needs. They provide bespoke support and IAG for young families, lone parents, families and carers across the GCGP area to achieve their agreed goal. They also provide access to vocational accredited qualifications in the children’s workforce for interested participants.

FACET

Facet is an accredited training provider with Gateway and delivers qualifications in Enterprise and Employability skills, etc, all delivered in practical work-based settings. Training is also delivered in Independent Living and Employability skills to boost confidence and wellbeing. FACET supports participants who live in the Fenland area and who have a learning disability, physical disability and/or mental health condition. They provide training in basic skills: (English, Maths and ICT); life skills and employability skills (e.g., appropriate work attitudes) and sector skills including retail, catering, art, drama, music, soft skills, woodworking, horticulture and functional skills.

The approach to learning develops essential skills through practical learning. A good example is FACET students growing their own vegetables for use in their kitchens and undertaking gardening and landscaping work in the local community, which improves their practical application of skills. There is a lot of emphasis on wellbeing – encompassing various kinds of sporting activities, leading healthy lifestyles, walking for wellbeing, etc. The approach also recognizes the value in skill sharing. Everything is person-centred.

Hanseatic Union

Hanseatic Union provide IAG, ESOL, and employability skills which will support participants to access local services and enter employment. They primarily support recent migrants and

refugees, and people with language barriers in the area of Kings Lynn, but also support local people in the area too.

Headway Cambridgeshire

Headway Cambridgeshire provides specialist support for people with a range of physical, cognitive and social disabilities. This includes life planning, job seeking support, goal setting, wellbeing and communications skills development. They also provide specialist IAG and 1:1 support to help participants re-integrate in the community and to achieve their personal goals.

Kickstart

Kickstart is a charity that offers an alternative mode of transport, training and safety equipment, to individuals who are rurally isolated or need to access work training or education across the GCGP area.

With a fleet of over 300 mopeds, Kickstart helps on average 550 individuals each year to get mobile. As a charity they cover an operational area of over 8,000 sq. km. They cover Norfolk, Suffolk, and Cambridgeshire.

The Ferry Project

The Ferry Project aims to support a large number of homeless people per year, and it supported homeless participants on this project. To tackle barriers resulting from physical health conditions and mental illness, case workers support participants to access available health care where they are not already doing so.

Case workers work with relevant health professionals where the participant has given their consent, so that care can be co-ordinated. Case workers provide support to participants to gain basic skills, including English, Maths and ICT, and arrange for training or voluntary work if paid employment is not available. They help to provide structure to help homeless participants maintain positive behaviours. Throughout the programme they worked with a wide group of participants, not just homeless, but also unemployed people from the local community doing a lot of work with the job centre.

TCHC

TCHC is the Lead Organisation, taking overall responsibility for the delivery of the project. They also provide much of the supporting project systems and processes (CRM, compliance processes, audit, etc.) TCHC also delivers in their own right, providing either the whole customer journey or aspects of it. TCHC has an established delivery infrastructure which includes the Employer Gateway (for identifying suitable work placements or real vacancies for partner and TCHC participants).

TCHC also ran study programmes in Peterborough, courses for ex-offenders and self-employment courses which a number of BBO participants attended. TCHC provided coaching and mentoring to advisors on the programme to ensure that they were equipped to complete the required records (paperwork) and support participants effectively.

Former Partners

The following former partners voluntarily left the programme when the programme was awarded an extension. The reasons for leaving varied by partner. For example, Sharing Parenting left the programme earlier than the others as they wanted to concentrate on the other BBO Programme which TCHC lead -Opportunities Suffolk. However, these partners still contributed to the overall success of the programme.

Keystone

Keystone provided soft and functional skills development support for young people who were at risk of becoming NEET. Additionally, they run schoolwork clubs, ESOL and work opportunities through their enterprises.

Papworth Trust

Papworth Trust provided peer support, work experience, independent living skills, employability skills, job search skills and basic skills support to people with learning disabilities, mental health conditions and Autistic Spectrum Disorders across the GCGP area. They had delivery premises in Peterborough and Wisbech.

Sharing Parenting

Sharing Parenting is a community interest company who primarily worked with parents and carers who are not working. They provided a range of courses for parents including Raising Toddlers, Raising Children, Raising Teenagers, Assertiveness, Building Resilience and True Colours.

The Princes Trust

The Princes Trust provided end-to-end support for young people, including those who are NEET and/or pre-NEET. Support consisted of basic skills training, employability skills training, sector specific training and work experience. Support was delivered across the GCGP area.

The Rosmini Centre

Rosmini delivered ESOL to migrant communities as well as IAG and support to establish local networks and access local services to reduce social exclusion. They also provided Level 1, 2 and 3 training in a variety of sectors in 40 different areas which was dependent on the needs of the individual. The Rosmini Centre supported people from Fenland, and in particular migrants from their support centre in Wisbech.

The SROI Approach

Social Return on Investment (SROI) is an approach that measures a broader concept of value than is usually accounted for in cost benefit calculations. It seeks to “reduce inequality and environmental degradation and improve wellbeing by incorporating social, environmental and economic costs and benefits.”¹ SROI frameworks account for change in an organisation, or to society, by measuring social and economic outcomes, and uses monetary values to represent these outcomes. Once these monetary values have been established, a cost benefit analysis can be conducted, that includes this notion of social value. Finally, a SROI ratio is produced, that shows the social value in pound terms, against money spent on the project or programme.

The SROI approach is based on seven principles:

- Involve stakeholders.
- Understand what changes.
- Value the things that matter.
- Only include what is material.
- Do not over-claim.
- Be transparent.
- Verify the result.²

There are six stages in calculating a SROI, which are as follows:³

Establishing scope and identifying key stakeholders. The scope of the SROI was established in conjunction with TCHC. There have been 1206 participants on the programme, and they were some of the most marginalised in society. There had been 2 previous evaluations undertaken prior to the final evaluation and a number of the participants had been interviewed then. There were systems in place to capture the progress made by the participant which tracked progress both in terms of hard outcomes such as obtaining a job or accessing education and softer outcomes. For this evaluation the evaluator interviewed the partners and specifically asked about the SROI and the information that had been collected.

Mapping outcomes. Through engagement with the stakeholders, an impact map was developed, or theory of change, which shows the relationship between inputs, outputs and outcomes. This impact map considers the social value of changes in the participant’s lifestyles and wellbeing that were provoked by their engagement with the GCGP programme.

Evidencing outcomes and giving them a value. This stage involved data collection to establish what outcomes had taken place, and then assigning monetary value to them. This data collection was based on the information that had been collected by the programme, previous interviews with participants, partners and other stakeholders along with meetings with TCHC using all materials from the initial, interim and final evaluations. Particular financial proxies that were used, along with their source, are outlined later in this report.

¹ Cabinet Office et al *A Guide to Social Return on Investment* (2009) page 8

² Ibid pg 9

³ The six stages are taken from the cabinet office report;

Establishing impact. Having collected evidence on outcomes and monetised those, the aspects of change that would have happened anyway, or are a result of other factors, are eliminated from consideration. This is common economic practice and includes notions of deadweight, attribution, displacement and drop off. These impacts are calculated via a percentage; deadweight considers what would have happened anyway, without the activity under investigation. Displacement considers any activity that the programme under evaluation displaces. Attribution considers any other things that contributed to the changes that are being mapped and drop off considers the outcomes that might lessen over future years.

Calculating the SROI. This stage involved adding up all the monetised outcomes, subtracting any negatives, in this case the cost of the programme, and comparing the result to the investment.

Reporting, using and embedding. This last step involved sharing findings with stakeholders and responding to them, embedding good outcomes processes and verification of the report.

Methodology

Although the evaluation primarily utilised the SROI approach in calculating monetised social value for the programme, the data collected from TCHC and the semi-structured, in-depth interviews with beneficiaries which were undertaken in previous evaluation, additionally the final evaluation undertaken interviewed all partners and these were used to verify some of the results of the analysis of the paperwork which was very comprehensive. The following methodology was employed.

1. Establishing scope and identifying key stakeholders.

- Stakeholder engagement – we established the stakeholder group to properly address the scope of the SROI approach. This was done via a number of meetings between the evaluators and TCHC. The other stakeholders were the partners and the beneficiaries themselves, who were contacted and interviewed. All partners were interviewed. There were too many participants to interview individually so we relied on participant records and on the partners information. There had been some interviewing of participants in previous evaluations (the Initial in 2017 and Interim in 2018) approximately 30 interviews had taken place, and this was supplemented by a number of focus groups.

2. Mapping outcomes.

- A desk review of programme was conducted – this was done via an examination of documentary evidence; including participant numbers, and any other documents associated with the programme including returns made by the programme to the National Lottery Community Fund and ESF and the previous evaluations undertaken by the evaluator. The documentation for the programme was comprehensive and there had been considerable emphasis on some of the soft outcomes. Some partners had been meticulous in recording the results. The evaluator used some of the information

provided by the existing partners to map the outcomes. The number of partners had shrunk from the initial 13 partners so it is probable more outcomes could have been recorded if the former partners had been available to interview. However, many outcomes from former partners were recorded in the paperwork and therefore included in the final evaluation.

3. Evidencing outcomes and giving them a value.

- We conducted semi-structured, in-depth interviews with participants and focus groups for the initial and interim evaluations. At the time of these interviews and focus groups we were not collecting SROI data, however it did give the opportunity to establish a framework for SROI this was supplemented by interviews with providers and interrogation of the participant records. The evaluator interrogated the files to verify the results that the partners were claiming. Thus, a SROI map was produced that could be evidenced.

The indicators that we were particularly interested in were as follows:

- How the programme has helped the participant to meet the defined targets of Jobs, Education and training and Job search.
- To establish whether participants had benefitted from interventions and how it has benefitted society as a whole.
- Calculating value in financial terms. We first established what was material to the programme, based on the interviews, and a desk review of the GCGP programme. We then assigned financial value to the outcomes. A full break down of all the proxies used, including their source and justifications are included later in this report.

4. Establishing impact.

- This involved subtracting benefit values that would have occurred anyway, without the intervention or programme taking place. This was based on the methodology outlined by the HM Treasury in the *Green Book*, which is comparable with the SROI approach.

5. Calculating the SROI.

- This involved the calculations to establish the final financial figures for the SROI, and the SROI ratio of the programme in its entirety. At this stage we undertake a sensitivity analysis a definition of the headings for this is explained below. The actual sensitivity analysis relating to GCGP is described in more detail further on in the report.

6. Recommendations

- This final phase of the evaluation considered the SROI calculations, as well as the other qualitative indicators outlined above, to enable the evaluator to make recommendations about the future of GCGP or similar programmes.

Impact Mapping: Establishing a Theory of Change

Stakeholders

One of the key stages in any evaluation, but particularly for the SROI approach, is to clearly establish the main stakeholders. This better enables you to examine both the costs, and the nature of change brought about by the GCGP programme. Through the evaluation we found the main stakeholders to be:

- Participants of the GCGP programme
- The partners (those organisations both existing and former - listed on page 9 and 10)
- National Government: due to the benefits saved, and increase in taxes earned through increased employment
- The NHS
- Local Authorities
- Carers – both families and support workers

The evaluator interviewed all the partners on the programme - there were a mixture of managers and operational staff (15 in total). The evaluator also looked at 25% of the participant files totalling 301. This gave a picture of the types of proxies that could be developed for this SROI. The evaluator then went back to partners and asked to clarify some of the assumptions made by the evaluator.

Although the documentation on the files was thorough in some instances it needed clarification. This was particularly true of areas around mental health where it was not always clear what was a general “confidence boost” or whether it was a key intervention that significantly aided the mental health of the participants e.g., in some cases prevention of suicide or general prevention of deterioration of mental health.

In some case the participant families were also beneficiaries as greater independence achieved by the participant often meant that they had more time to themselves and in some instances had got jobs as a result. This “snowballing” effect, which is at the heart of the project could have been included in an SROI, with the effect of further increasing the levels of Social Return. However, contacting such a wide pool of “second tier” beneficiaries was largely out of the scope of this project.

Financial Indicators

From the interview data and the desk research, the evaluator mapped the most important changes to the GCGP programme. From the SROI impact map, the financial indicators used in the evaluation were:

Table 3

• Increase in earnings, as participants moved into employment.
• Increased taxation taken, as a result of benefits moving into employment
• Reduction in benefits received as beneficiaries moved into employment
• Volunteering – contributing to society
• CV production and interview practice leading to Job Search
• Costs of supported accommodation as beneficiaries moved out to semi supported living
• Participants feeling less lonely
• Homelessness and its prevention
• Increased confidence and self-esteem ⁴
• Ex-offenders' prevention from re-offending
• Improvement in mental health
• Mental Health – prevention of being sectioned (Facet)
• Independence Skills (Facet)
• Costs of the programme

The details of, and data sources for the above indicators were as follows:

Increase in earnings as participants moved into employment.

This was one of the primary aims of the programme. 303 participants had found employment over the 6 years of the programme. Due to the large number of participants securing employment and the lack of access to specific salaries they were earning and hours they were working we could not produce individual calculations for each person going into employment. So, we took the average to be 35 hour per week job on the minimum wage (called The National Living Wage) which are listed in the table below. (See sensitivity analysis page 34). The years 2016 – 2023, personal allowance have been calculated for under 65, as we have calculated those on minimum wage there was no provision for higher tax payers.

⁴ uk.indeed.com/career-advice/pay-salary/how-much-does-life-coach-make

Table 4 Earning and Tax people aged 23 – 65

	Number gaining self-employment or self-employment Aged 23 – 65	Minimum Wage	Estimated total earning per annum per participants	Estimated total earnings per annum in total	Estimated Tax Paid by each participant who gained employment or self-employment	Estimated total tax paid per annum in total for each year
2016/17	2	£7.20 ⁵	£13,104	£26,208	421 pa ⁶	£842
2017/18	48	£7.50 ph ⁷	£13,650	£655,200	£430 pa ⁸	£20,640
2018/19	91	£7.83 ph ⁹	£14,251	£1,296,805	£480 pa ¹⁰	£43,680
2019/20	51	£8.21 ph ¹¹	£14,942	£762,042	£488 pa ¹²	£24,888
2020/21	20	£8.72 ph ¹³	£15,852	£317,040	£670pa ¹⁴	£13,400
2021/22	21	£8.91 ph ¹⁵	£16,216	£340,536	£729 pa ¹⁶	£15,309
2022/23	29	£9.50 ph ¹⁷	£17,290	£501,141	£944 pa ¹⁸	£27,376
TOTALS				£3,898,972		£146,135

⁵ [Rates and thresholds for employers 2016 to 2017 - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk)

⁶ [Rates and thresholds for employers 2016 to 2017 - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk)

⁷ [National Minimum Wage – April 2017 - OMS](https://www.gov.uk)

⁸ [Rates and thresholds for employers 2016 to 2017 - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk)

⁹ assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/611111/tax-credits-rates-and-thresholds-2017-18.pdf

¹⁰ [Tax and tax credit rates and thresholds for 2017-18 - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk)

¹¹ assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/611111/tax-credits-rates-and-thresholds-2018-19.pdf

¹² [Rates and thresholds for employers 2018 to 2019 - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk)

¹³ [Rates and thresholds for employers 2019 to 2020 - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk)

¹⁴ [Income Tax: Personal Allowance and basic rate limit from 2019-20 - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk)

¹⁵ [National Minimum and Living Wage increases come into effect - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk)

¹⁶ [Rates and thresholds for employers 2020 to 2021 - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk)

¹⁷ [National Living Wage increase to protect workers' living standards - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk)

¹⁸ [Tax rates 2022/23: tax bands explained - MoneySavingExpert](https://www.moneysavingexpert.com/tax-rates-2022-23/)

Table 5 Earning and Tax people aged 20 – 22 years old

Year	Numbers paying tax through self-employment or tax who are 20 – 22 year olds	Minimum wage	Estimated earnings per participant	Estimated total earnings per annum	Estimated Tax Paid per participant per annum	Estimated total tax paid
2016/17	2	£6.70 ¹⁹	£12,194	£24,388	£239	£478
2017/18	10	£7.05 ²⁰	£12,831	£128,310	£266	£2,660
2018/19	8	£7.38 ²¹	£13,432	£107,456	£316	£2,528
2019/20	5	£7.70 ²²	£14,014	£70,070	£303	£1,515
2020/21	4	£8.20 ²³	£14,924	£59,696	£485	£1,940
2021/22	1	£8.36 ²⁴	£15,215	£15,215	£529	£529
2022/23	3	£9.18 ²⁵	£16,707	£50,121	£827	£2,481
TOTALS				£455,256		£12,131

¹⁹ [Rates and thresholds for employers 2016 to 2017 - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/rates-and-thresholds-for-employers-2016-to-2017)

²⁰ [National Minimum Wage – April 2017 - OMS](https://www.gov.uk/government/news/national-minimum-wage-increased-to-7-05-per-hour)

²¹ [National Living Wage and National Minimum Wage: government response to the Low Pay Commission's Autumn 2017 report - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/national-living-wage-and-national-minimum-wage-government-response-to-the-low-pay-commission-s-autumn-2017-report)

²² [National Minimum Wage: previous rates | nibusinessinfo.co.uk](https://www.nibusinessinfo.co.uk/news/national-minimum-wage-previous-rates/)

²³ [The National Minimum Wage in 2020 - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/news/the-national-minimum-wage-in-2020)

²⁴ [National Minimum Wage: previous rates | nibusinessinfo.co.uk](https://www.nibusinessinfo.co.uk/news/national-minimum-wage-previous-rates/)

²⁵ [Minimum wage rates for 2022 - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/news/minimum-wage-rates-for-2022)

Table 6 Those, who are on the minimum wage, aged below 20 are not paying tax

Year	Numbers paying tax through self-employment or employment who are 18 – 20	Minimum wage	Estimated earning per annum per participant	Estimated earning in total
2016/17	1	£5.30 ²⁶	£9,646	£9,646
2017/18	4	£5.60 ²⁷	£10,192	£40,768
2018/19	4	£5.90 ²⁸	£10,738	£42,952
2019/20	11	£6.15 ²⁹	£11,193	£123,123
2020/21	0			
2021/22	1	£6.56 ³⁰	£11,939	£11,939
2022/23	1	£6.83 ³¹	£12,431	£12,431
TOTAL				£240,859

²⁶ [Rates and thresholds for employers 2016 to 2017 - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-minimum-wage-rates-and-thresholds-for-employers-2016-to-2017)

²⁷ [National Minimum Wage – April 2017 - OMS](https://www.gov.uk/government/news/national-minimum-wage-in-force-from-1-april-2017)

²⁸ [Rates and thresholds for employers 2018 to 2019 - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-minimum-wage-rates-and-thresholds-for-employers-2018-to-2019)

²⁹ [The National Minimum Wage in 2020 - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/news/national-minimum-wage-in-force-from-1-april-2020)

³⁰ [The National Minimum Wage in 2021 - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/news/national-minimum-wage-in-force-from-1-april-2021)

³¹ [The National Minimum Wage in 2022 - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/news/national-minimum-wage-in-force-from-1-april-2022)

Table 7 Earning and Tax for people who 16 – 18 year old

Year	Numbers paying tax through self-employment or employment who are 16 – 18	Minimum wage	Total estimated earning per participant	Total Estimated earning per annum
2016/17	0			
2017/18	4	£4.05 ³²	£7,371	£29,484
2018/19	0			
2019/20	4	£4.35 ³³	£7,917	£31,668
2020/21	0			
2021/22	1	£4.62 ³⁴	£8,408	£8,408
2022/23	1	£4.81 ³⁵	£8,754	£8,754
TOTAL				£49,814

TOTAL of Earning and Taxation throughout life of the programme and totalling all the age groups.

Table 8

All estimated tax as a result of the programme	£158,266
All estimated earnings as part of the programme	£4,644,901

Increased taxation taken as a result of participants moving into employment

Due to the participants moving into employment, the state benefited from increased taxation revenue. We have assumed that all are paying NIC at the A band rate, of the appropriate rate for which was for most years 12% for employees and 13.8% for employers – although it did change for 7 months, and the figures have taken this into account. The earnings thresholds have been applied for the years – 2016 – 2023 As we are unaware of any working tax credits, maternity pay, statutory sick pay etc, these have been left out of the calculations.

³² [National Minimum Wage – April 2017 - OMS](#)

³³ [Rates and thresholds for employers 2019 to 2020 - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](#)

³⁴ [PowerPoint Presentation \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](#)

³⁵ [National Minimum Wage and National Living Wage rates - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](#)

Table 9: Estimated yearly Earning less income tax and NIC as a result of the programme for those aged 23 – 65.

	Number of participants who attained a job	Yearly wage on minimum wage	Nic employees	Total NIC Contribution employees multiplied by participants	NIC Employers	NIC employers Multiplied by participants
2016/17	2	£13,104	£874	£1,748	£1,005	£2,010
2017 /18	48	£13,650	£933	£44,784	£1,073	£51,504
2018 /19	91	£14,251	£938	£85,358	£1,134	£103,194
2019 /20	51	14,942	£1,057	£53,907	£1,215	£61,965
2020 /21	20	£15,852	£1,153	£23,060	£1,326	£26,520
2021/22	21	16,216	£1,197	£25,137	£1,377	£28,917
2022/23	29	£17,290	£1386	£41,238	£1,582	£45,878
TOTAL				£274,188		£315,957

Table 10 National insurance paid by those that went into employment 20 – 22 year old.

Year	Numbers Going into employment who are 20 – 22 year old	Estimated earnings per participant	NIC employees	Total Nic Employees Multiplied by the number of participants
2016/17	2	£12,194	£764	£1,528
2017/18	10	£12,831	£835	£8,350
2018/19	8	£13,432	£888	£7,104
2019/20	5	£14,014	£945	£4,725
2020/21	4	£14,924	£1,042	£4,168
2021/22	1	£15,215	£1,077	£1,077
2022/23	3	£16,707	£1,313	£3939
TOTALS				£30,891

Table 11 National insurance paid by those that went into employment 18 - 20 year old.

Year	Numbers Going into employment who are 18 – 20 year olds	Estimated earnings per participant	NIC employees	Total Nic Employees Multiplied by the number of participants
2016/17	1	£9,646	£459	£459
2017/18	4	£10,192	£518	£2,072
2018/19	4	£10,738	£565	£2,260
2019/20	11	£11,193	£607	£6,677
2020/21	0			
2021/22	1	£11,939	£684	£684
2022/23	1	£12,431	£768	£768
TOTALS				£12,920

Table 12 National insurance paid by those that went into employment 16 - 18 year olds.

Year	Numbers Going into employment who are 18 – 20 year olds	Estimated earnings per participant	Total Amount of earning multiplied by the number of participants	Total Nic Employees Multiplied by the number of participants
2016/17	0			
2017/18	4	£7,371	£29,484	716
2018/19	0			
2019/20	4	£7,917	£31,668	856
2020/21	0			
2021/22	1	£8,408	£8,408	260

2022/23	1	£8,754	£8,754	300
TOTALS				£2132

TOTAL National insurance contributions

Employer National Insurance Contributions	£315,957
Employee National Insurance contributions	£320,131
TOTAL NIC	£636,088

Reduction in benefits received as participants moved into employment

As well as the increase in earnings, as participants moved into employment, there was a corresponding reduction in their benefits.³⁶ We do not know exactly what benefits were paid to all participants, so we have erred on the side of caution and used the minimum ESA benefit as the minimum – it is very likely that more was paid.

Table 13

Year	Number of participants who got a job/self-employment who were unemployed when starting the programme	Minimum ESA Benefit per week	Total for the year	Total for the year multiplied by the number of participants
2016/17	2	£73.10 ³⁷	£3,801	7602
2017/2018	44	£73.10 ³⁸	£3,801	167,244
2018/2019	87	£73.10 ³⁹	£3,801	330,687
2019/2020	48	£73.10	£3,801	182,448
2020/2021	19	£74.35 ⁴⁰	£3866	73454
2021/2022	20	£74.70 ⁴¹	£3884	77,680
2022/2023	28	£77.00 ⁴²	£4004	£112,112
TOTAL	248			£951,227

³⁶http://www.direct.gov.uk/en/MoneyTaxAndBenefits/BenefitsTaxCreditsAndOtherSupport/Employedorlookingforwork/DG_10018757

³⁷ [Benefit and pension rates from 6 April 2016 \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](http://publishing.service.gov.uk)

³⁸ [Proposed benefit and pension rates 2018/2019 \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](http://publishing.service.gov.uk)

³⁹ [Benefit and pension rates 2020 to 2021 - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](http://www.gov.uk)

⁴⁰ [Benefit and pension rates 2020 to 2021 - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](http://www.gov.uk)

⁴¹ [Benefit and pension rates 2021 to 2022 - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](http://www.gov.uk)

⁴² [Employment and Support Allowance \(ESA\): What you'll get - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](http://www.gov.uk)

Table 14 Under 25 who were unemployed before starting the programme

Year	Number of participants who got a job/self-employment who were unemployed when starting the programme	Minimum ESA Benefit per week	Total for the year	Total for the year multiplied by the number of participants
2016/17	3	£57.90 ⁴³	£3,011	£9,033
2017/2018	22	£57.90 ⁴⁴	£3,011	£66,242
2018/2019	12	£57.90 ⁴⁵	£3,011	£36,132
2019/2020	23	£57.90 ⁴⁶	£3,011	£69,253
2020/2021	5	£58.20 ⁴⁷	£3,026	£15,130
2021/2022	4	£59.20 ⁴⁸	£3,078	£12,312
2022/2023	6	£61.05 ⁴⁹	£3,175	£19,050
TOTAL	75			£227,152

TOTAL Amount of estimated benefits saved:- £1,178,379

Volunteering activity as a result of the programme

A number of the participants who were not job-ready chose to volunteer as a means to eventually getting a job or in cases where they would be happier to continue volunteering as a way of making a contribution due to not feeling able to manage the demands of paid employment. In consultation with the delivery partners, it was agreed that 1 day a week would be an average for a participant to volunteer and we used The National Living Wage minimum hourly rate as a proxy.

The proxy used to calculate the figures, was the national living minimum wage. Although there is more sophisticated accounting techniques to establish the value of volunteering hours – namely VIVA (Volunteer Investment and Value Audit), due to the lack of information regarding the outside organisations the beneficiaries volunteered at, this could not be done for this particular evaluation, and thus a more simplistic proxy the National Living Wage minimum hourly rate was used. This, however, is not overly problematic for the SROI, as it is likely to be a slight under-estimation, rather than an overestimation of the value of these hours. Thus, we have erred on the side of caution to produce a robust figure for the final SROI ratio.

⁴³ [Proposed benefit and pension rates 2017-2018 \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](https://publishing.service.gov.uk)

⁴⁴ [Proposed benefit and pension rates 2017-2018 \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](https://publishing.service.gov.uk)

⁴⁵ [Benefit and pension rates 2019 to 2020 - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk)

⁴⁶ [Benefit and pension rates 2019 to 2020 - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk)

⁴⁷ [Benefit and pension rates 2020 to 2021 - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk)

⁴⁸ [Benefit and pension rates 2021 to 2022 - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk)

⁴⁹ [Benefit and pension rates 2022 to 2023 - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk)

Table 15: Volunteering hours with proxies

Volunteering	Proxy	Number of volunteers	Hours per week	Per annum total
2017/18 Financial year hourly rate	£7.50 ⁵⁰	38	7	£1,995
2018/19 Financial year hourly rate ⁵¹	£7.83	52	7	£2,850
2019/20 Financial year hourly rate ⁵²	£8.21	130	7	£7,471
2020/21 Financial year hourly rate ⁵³	£8.71	28	7	£1,609
2021/2022 ⁵⁴ Financial year hourly rate	£8.91	28	7	£1,746
2022/23 Financial year hourly rate ⁵⁵	£9.50	32	7	£2,128
TOTAL		308		£17,799

Participants who will have created a CV to access Job Search

One of the main points of exiting of the programme was job search. Each participant will have been helped to update or write a CV and will have also undergone interview practice. We have therefore put in a proxy for work with a private employment agency. We have applied a proxy £100 for this element of the programme.⁵⁶

⁵⁰ [National Minimum Wage – April 2017 - OMS](#)

⁵¹ [The minimum wage in 2018 - LPC analysis - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](#)

⁵² [LPC welcomes acceptance of its 2019 minimum wage rate recommendations - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](#)

⁵³ [The National Minimum Wage in 2020 - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](#)

⁵⁴ [The National Minimum Wage in 2021 - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](#)

⁵⁵ [Minimum wage rates for 2022 - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](#)

⁵⁶ www.cvpilots.co.uk/blogs/career-advice/how-much-do-professional-cv-writers-charge

Table 16 Participants who have CV produced

Number of Participants who had CV produced	775	Cost of a CV £100	Total £77,500
--	-----	-------------------	---------------

Participants prevented from being evicted and remained in their accommodation.

A couple of the partners specialised in preventing homelessness and were asked to provide information on how many they had helped and that they knew had been helped to stay in their accommodation as a result of the programme. There were 74 and the cost is estimated to be £9,266 if a person is homeless.⁵⁷

Table 17 Participants who are prevented from being homeless or evicted.

Number of participants who have been prevented from becoming homeless	74	Cost of homelessness on average – including street homelessness and sofa surfing.	Total
		£9,266 per person.	£684,684

Health well-being and mental health as a result of the programme

Across the programme mental health was a big issue. Providers recognised that they were dealing with often very complex cases and people who were not accessing mental health services. Although they could not provide the medicalised intervention of the NHS they could often help prevent the need for accessing mental health services. We have therefore put in a proxy of 4 mental health interventions at £342⁵⁸ per participant who stated that they had improved mental health and wellbeing. We have been cautious with this figure as a number of providers said that the numbers with mental health conditions who they worked with was more like 40% of the participants that they helped. So as not to over-claim we have limited to those that stated that they had improved mental health and well-being – 362 as a result of the programme. Although the programme did not provide professional mental health support it was equivalent to an intervention in that it provided hope and support in turning lives around and increasing participants mental well-being.

Table 18 Increased Health and Well-being

Number of participants who had improved mental health as a result of the programme.		Cost of a mental health intervention £342 X 4	Total
362		£1,368	£495,216

⁵⁷ www.crisis.org.uk/ending-homelessness/homelessness-knowledge-hub/cos

⁵⁸ [NHS England » National Cost Collection for the NHS](#)

Gains in self-esteem and confidence

This was a very important component of the programme. To obtain a proxy, we used a session with a life coach @ £100 a session. For 10 sessions this meant £1,000 per participant, making a total value of £1,418,00.⁵⁹ This was a particularly strong part of the project and good records were kept on this aspect. Good records were kept on gains in confidence with some participants that had been on the programme for a number of months reporting successive quarter on quarter confidence boosts as shown in the quarterly confidence reports. So, if one participant noted that they had improved confidence it would equate to 10 sessions with a professional life coach and if they noted it twice it would be equated to 20 sessions etc.

Table 19

Number of recorded boosts in confidence	1418	Cost of Boost in Confidence	£1,000	Total £1,418,000
---	------	-----------------------------	--------	---------------------

Increased social networks and feeling less lonely.

597 participants said that they felt less lonely, as a direct result of the programme. We equated this to being a member of a social club, with a cost of £25per annum, making a total of £14,925 in social value.⁶⁰

Table 20

Number of participants who reported to be less lonely	597	Cost of social club	£25	TOTAL £14,925
---	-----	---------------------	-----	------------------

Cost of re-offending

Table 21: Participants who are ex-offenders who now have jobs.

Some of the delivery partners had high numbers of ex-offenders. As a result, the number of ex-offenders who were helped by the programme was quite high. 60 ex-offenders managed to get a positive outcome by securing a job. This is not counting any that may have gone onto a training course and there would have been a higher likelihood of those not re-offending. So we have just taken those that have paid employment and estimated the savings to the State on this figure.

Care worker salary in United Kingdom (indeed.com)⁵⁹
<http://research.mla.gov.uk/evidence/documents/Community%20Engagement%20Appendix%207%20-%20SROI%20Impact%20Maps.pdf>

⁶⁰ <http://www.londonivc.com/>

Number of participants who were ex-offenders who have jobs	60	The cost of an average prison placement ⁶¹	Total
		£46,696 per person.	£2,801,760

FACET

One partner - Facet – the majority of their participants had a learning disability, physical disability and/or mental health conditions and usually with high support needs. They worked very closely with their participants and in a number of cases worked with them for a number of years. As it was a small organisation and could track their participants accurately, they were able to keep extremely good records on their progress. As a result, we have a separate section for their participants.

Aspects like confidence and mental health have already been included in the figures above. The information below is an example of some of the changes that have resulted from their particular work. The gains that their participants made meant that less support was needed either by their carers or their family. In one instance the mother was the carer, and she went back to work as a result of increased independence skills of the two brothers who both could do more to help her in the house.

Table 22

Improved IT Skills	13 participants had improved IT skills with 12 equating to 2 hours carers time and 1 hour carers time	25 hours of carers time a week Cost of a carer £11.49 per hour ⁶²	Total: - £287 per week
Improved independence skills, helping with the housework, cooking themselves, managing money and generally looking after themselves	15 participants had improved independence skills this ranged from 1 – 15 hours a week in carers time – however the average was 3.5 hours per participant	52.5 hours of carers time Cost of a carer £11.49	Total:- £603 per week
Travel independently	11 participants could now travel independently this could be either by walking to their destinations or travelling by public transport. This averaged 6 hours per participant	Total carers time 66 hours a week Cost of Carer £11.49	Total £758 per week
Access to the community activities alone, this included shopping and visiting friends etc.	6 participants had improved skills and could access the community The hours for this varied by participant, but it averaged at 4 hours a week	Total 24 hours carers time a week Cost of carers £11.49	Total £576 per week

⁶¹ [Cost per prisoner England and Wales 2022 | Statista](#)

⁶² [Care worker salary in United Kingdom \(indeed.com\)](#)

Supported living to semi-supported	2 participants went from fully supported living to semi – supported living needing 10 hours of carers time per week	The average care home costs are £704 a week ⁶³ To employ a carer, it would be on average £17 ⁶⁴ an hour for 10 hours £170. Savings for each participant on moving from supported to semi-supported housing £534	Total amount of savings per week £1,068
Prevented from being sectioned	1 participant stated that if it had not been for the programme they would have been sectioned (they had a long history of mental illness) We therefore calculated a figure for a 6 month detention in a mental hospital	The average cost in 2017 was £78,078 which is the period of the programme. ⁶⁵	£78,078

Yearly Saving from some of Facets participants.

Table 23

Improved IT Skills	£14,924
Improved independence skills, helping with the housework, cooking themselves, managing money and generally looking after themselves	£31,256
Travel independently	£39,416
Access to the community activities alone, this included shopping and visiting friends etc.	£29,952
Supported living to semi-supported	£55,536
Prevention of sectioning	£78,078
TOTAL	£217,906

Costs of the programme

The cost of the programme was £3,189,932.7 which was administered by TCHC.

This information was provided by TCHC.

⁶³ [Care Home Fees And Costs: How Much Do You Pay In 2022/23?](#)

⁶⁴ www.trustontap.com/carers/how-much-does-it-cost-to-have-a-carer/

⁶⁵ [How much does it cost to be detained on a psychiatric ward and 'treated'? \(cchr.org.uk\)](#)

Non-Monetised Benefits

Training

A number of the participants had taken up training sessions, but these had been paid for by the programme and therefore could not be monetised for this reason.

Educational outcomes as a result of participation in the programme

A number of participants gained qualifications; however, this information has not been included because the return from gaining a qualification is normally seen over a longer period of time⁶⁶ and thus we could not give a social return on it. In addition, some of the lower level 1/2 qualifications do not always deliver a significant *financial* return over three or five years, however these qualifications do move people towards the labour market.

Sustainability Benefits

This programme had taken sustainability very seriously and there were obvious social returns. However, these had not been documented in a way that could be easily monetised. When this programme started the concept of recording benefits of sustainability was relatively new and gains were recorded in a qualitative fashion. Future programmes should endeavour to use more quantitative measures for recording sustainability outcomes rather such heavy reliance on qualitative measures.

Generalised reporting of Soft Outcomes

Some of the soft outcomes recorded were too vague to be included in the SROI. For instance, questions like “participants completing group activities?” – to put a value on this you would need to know what the group activity was and what value it would ultimately have. Also, with a question like “is the participant more connected to local services?” – you would need to know what local services and then determine if it had a social return or not. Although these types of soft outcomes cannot be monetised, they are still valid and have a strong contribution to the overall success of the programme.

Soft outcome results as reported to the National Lottery Community Fund:

Action Plans and Job Search

This was an outcome, but it cannot be monetised instead, as set out above, we used the creation of a CV when a participant exited on job search as an outcome that could be monetized.

Health Returns

In programmes such as these there are often health benefits⁶⁷ as people move into employment - however there was not enough data captured to monetise these benefits. These could have included less visits to the doctor/ health care professionals, less medication etc.

⁶⁶ CEE DP 110 Measuring the Returns to Lifelong Learning Jo Blanden ,Franz Buscha ,Patrick Sturgis and Peter Urwin

⁶⁷ Slam Sroi Reprt Justine Cawley and Karina Bezins

However, through the evaluation of the programme it was anecdotally reported that these benefits were arising – they could not be quantified accurately. However, and as set out above, there was enough evidence to monetise less recourse to mental health services.

Impact Measures

Impact measures provide a way of estimating how much of the outcome would have happened anyway and what proportion of the outcome can be isolated as being added by service activities. We are interested in the ultimate impact of the Community Connections programme, and this has been determined with reference to the effects of attribution, displacement, deadweight and drop-off. We use these impact measures to assess whether and to what extent the outcomes we have analysed result directly from the programme.

Establishing impact is important as it reduces the risk of over-claiming and means that the story will be more credible. It is only by measuring and accounting for all these factors that a sense of the impact that the activity is having can be gained.

There are four aspects of establishing impact:

- Attribution – how much of the outcome was caused by the contribution of other organisations or people
- Displacement – what activities or services are displaced
- Deadweight – how much of the activity would have happened anyway
- Drop-off – the decline in the outcome over time (only calculated for outcomes that last for more than one year).

Each of these aspects is normally expressed as a percentage and our impact map spreadsheet allows us to input these percentages and calculates the monetary values to be deducted. For every decision taken we have kept supporting information that explains the assumptions that we have made in the study.

Sensitivity Analysis: Deadweight, Displacement, Attribution and Drop Off

The following section examines the deadweight (what would have happened anyway), displacement (anything that the programme displaced), attribution (if any factors outside the programme prompted change) and drop off (a consideration that the changes in activity might fall away over future years).

This was a new investment funded by the National Lottery Community Fund and ESF. Although TCHC had run similar programmes, this was a new programme for them by them and thus did not displace any existing programmes and was unique in that it valued both hard and soft outcomes. It supported the hardest to reach participants and measured who were exited the programme having secured a job, embarked upon education/training and achieved the job search outcome.

As the focus was on the hardest to reach and took a less time and target driven approach (although there were targets) - the soft outcomes of working towards the employment market were as important as the job outcomes themselves. The figures below, which are associated with attribution, come from information taken from the interviews and information kept by the programme.

Increase in earnings as participants moved into employment and associated financial figures such as taxation, National Insurance contributions and decrease in benefits.

Deadweight: 267 had found employment. We have assumed a 10% deadweight, this is comparatively low, this was a unique programme in that it helped the hardest to reach in as far as employment was concerned and it had no time limits.

Displacement: We have assumed 0%, because the individuals have benefitted financially from the programme, and nothing has been displaced.

Attribution: We set a figure of 10% as all had been unemployed, however some may have had previous interventions and this programme set out to help these individuals to find work. It was a unique programme in that it had no time constraints and looked at the barriers to employment in a holistic way so there was minimal referral to other agencies outside the programme.

Drop Off: This was estimated at 25%. We consulted similar programmes, who gave us a likely 75% retention rate. (TCHC and Tower Hamlets PCT Work it Out programme).

Increase in taxation as a result of beneficiaries moving into employment.

This is clearly linked to the percentages explained above, and the same rationale was used to calculate deadweight, displacement, attribution and drop-off.

The decrease in benefits payments

This is clearly linked to the percentages explained above, and the same rationale was used to calculate deadweight, displacement, attribution and drop-off.

Volunteering

Deadweight: 200 had found volunteering opportunities. We have assumed a 10% for the reasons outlined in the sections above.

Displacement: We have assumed 0%, because nothing has been displaced.

Attribution: We set a figure of 10% for reasons outlined above.

Drop Off: This was estimated at 25%, for reasons outlined above.

Production of CV

Deadweight: 867 had CV produced. We have assumed a 10% as there are employment programmes offering this sort of support.

Displacement: We have assumed 0%, because nothing has been displaced.

Attribution: We set a figure of 10% for reasons outlined above.

Drop Off: This was estimated at 25%, for reasons outlined above.

Preventing Homelessness

Similar to the work done on employment

Deadweight: 18 were prevented from being homeless. We have assumed a 10% deadweight, this is comparatively low, this was a unique programme in that it helped the hardest to reach facing very high barriers to getting employment. We have assumed 10% for this as we only calculated return on those that had gone into employment. Having interviewed the partners we knew that this was a group that had been significantly helped by the delivery partners.

Displacement: We have assumed 0%, because nothing has been displaced.

Attribution: We set a figure of 10% for reasons outlined above.

Drop Off: This was estimated at 25%, which is in line with other areas of the programme.

Confidence

Deadweight: 331 boosts of confidence were recorded. We have assumed a 10% deadweight, as this was a major part of the programme. The participants were monitored closely, and regular states were recorded. The number of boosts in confidence was a direct result of participants being asked if they were more confident due to their participation on the programme.

Displacement: We have assumed 0%, because nothing has been displaced.

Attribution: We set a figure of 10% for reasons outlined above.

Drop Off: This was estimated at 25%, which is in line with other areas of the programme.

Improved social networks – feeling less lonely

Deadweight: 225 participants felt less lonely – this was an element of the programme that had been monitored very closely and they were specifically asked if they felt less lonely as a result of the programme. The deadweight figure is therefore low at 10%.

Displacement: We have assumed 0%, because nothing has been displaced.

Attribution: We set a figure of 10% for reasons outlined above.

Drop Off: This was estimated at 25%, which is in line with other areas of the programme.

Ex-offenders

Deadweight: We had specialist organisations working with ex-offenders and have suggested 37 will not re-offend which is likely to be an underestimation. We have therefore calculated a deadweight percentage of 10%.

Displacement: We have assumed 0%, because nothing has been displaced.

Attribution: We set a figure of 10% for reasons outlined above as the relatively high figure of ex-offenders is due to the specialist partners working with this group.

Drop Off: This was estimated at 25%, which is in line with other areas of the programme.

Mental Health and Wellbeing

Deadweight: We had specialist mental health organisations working within the programme. We have been realistic on the figure being helped with this aspect of their lives. So we have calculated a deadweight of 10% which is quite low. However, all partners stated that this was a significant part of the programme, and this was backed up by statements from the participants.

Displacement: We have assumed 0%, because nothing has been displaced.

Attribution: We set a figure of 10% for reasons outlined above as the relatively high figure of mental health specialist agencies working with this group.

Drop Off: This was estimated at 25%, which is in line with other areas of the programme.

Facet Interventions – independence skills and other inputs.

Deadweight: Facet had very good records and could pinpoint each change in the individual and attribute to the programme. We have nevertheless put in some deadweight to err on the side of caution. So, we have calculated a deadweight of 10% which is quite low.

Displacement: We have assumed 0%, because nothing has been displaced.

Attribution: We set a figure of 10% for reasons outlined above as the relatively high figure of mental health specialist agencies working with this group.

Drop Off: This was estimated at 25%, which is in line with other areas of the programme.

Conclusion

The SROI analysis has found a very high social return on this programme – **£10.11**. The programme was unique in that it valued soft outcomes and asked for these to be recorded. It was also unique in that it did not have a limit of time that a person could be on the programme. This meant that there was a holistic approach in which participants could work on all the barriers to employment. This worked extremely well and changed many lives for the better. The social return could have been even better if more accurate recording had taken place.

However, it should be noted that this programme did record soft outcomes more rigorously than the other similar programmes but with more attention to this area they could have been even more social return. However, Facet really did rise to this challenge and changes were documented that had not been asked for. They had the advantage in that their programme was classroom based and they could record changes on a more regular basis – but this shows what a difference a rigorous recording system could have particularly on SROI impact if this sort of detail could have been applied to the whole programme.

There were a couple of recommendations that arose from the findings of the evaluation, which don't detract from the successes of the programme but are intended to improve it, if it were to run again. These recommendations solely deal with the SROI part of the evaluation as other learning points have already been covered.

Recommendations

- If a SROI is anticipated to be part of the final evaluation, then more specific outcome measures need to be measured throughout the programme. This would undoubtedly increase the social return. These should be reviewed throughout the life of the programme to ensure it captures all the emerging themes e.g., Mental Health was a theme that emerged during the life of the programme and other similar themes could emerge throughout the life of the programme.
- Similarly, if follow-ups had taken place once the programme had finished there may well have been further progress made – those on job-search for instance a substantial number may well have got jobs and it is likely that there would be other beneficial outcomes.
- If a SROI evaluation is to take place, then delivery partners should have a short training course on this so that they are aware of the importance of recording outcomes and the benefits that this brings.

