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ABSTRACT

This study explored the issues of regeneration and sustainable development, and identified evaluation and impact assessment as an important part of successful project delivery.

It identified sustainable development as a process which considers its environmental, economic and social aspects as elements in equilibrium within a system, and urban regeneration as the process which seeks to reverse urban decline in an area. It defined three main groups of stakeholders within urban regeneration with varying degrees of involvement with an intervention, as well as a variety of interests.

The research went on to examine evaluation and impact assessment within regeneration delivery, and undertook a critical analysis of criteria and techniques used in assessing regeneration and sustainable development as well as delivery in the North West of England.

Based on a pragmatist philosophical stance, the study utilised a unique blend of methodologies in order to investigate current practice as well as identify good practice from other sectors. Working with four case study organisations, it developed improvements to existing methods of evaluating regeneration delivery.

The study identified key challenges within the evaluation of regeneration delivery, and developed improvements to practice based on five critical success factors which are:

- Organisational Culture and Commitment
- Clear Strategy
- Methodological Pluralism
- Communication and Stakeholder Involvement
- Action on Findings

Finally the research outlined the Objectives based EvaluAction framework to inform the evaluation within urban regeneration.
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**UTF**: Urban Task Force

**WHO**: The World Health Organisation

**WWF**: World Wide Fund for Nature
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

“One of the great mistakes is to judge policies and programs by their intentions rather than their results”

- Milton Friedman (1975)
1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 Setting the Context: Regeneration and Sustainable Development

Globalisation and the fast pace of 21st century life have seen an exponential growth of towns and cities around the world. Amidst this high speed advancement however, pockets of social, physical, and economic decline are still found in areas that have for whatever reason fallen victim to the cycle of socio-economic change. This pattern of decline began in the early 20th century, when town and city centre regions witnessed an increase in outward migration on all fronts. Up until the mid-nineteenth century there were sizable residential areas within town and city centre regions, but the development and improvement of transportation systems, as well as the rise in demand for commercial space in the city centre resulted in progressive depopulation over the years (Girouard, 1990).

This migration became a means for wealthier residents to escape the noise, congestion, pollution and other ills of the inner city living. By the early 1980s this decentralisation was further fuelled by a rise in ‘destination shopping’ which saw large retail centres such as leisure complexes and retail parks developed outside the city centre. The same occurred with the manufacturing industry, where factories were taken out of the cramped inner city and edge of town centre locations, beyond the suburbs where cheaper, more spacious, easily developed sites and publicly provided purpose-built industrial estates were available. All this resulted in the siphoning of wealth out of many town and city centre areas, leading to their inevitable decline in some places (Evans, 1997). This reshaping of the city centre is captured in the Burgess concentric zone model of urban structure (See Fig. 1.1) which creates a visual representation of the geo-social urban theory regarding this phenomenon.
The move towards addressing these issues surrounding the decline and breathing new life into these areas of deprivation saw the birth of the ‘Regeneration’ movement. Regeneration seeks to reverse the decline that has taken place in these areas and raise the quality of life of its residents. Regeneration is about “improving an area’s social, physical, and economic environment through programmes and projects which combine physical improvement of the built and natural environment with initiatives designed to boost the local economy” (CLES, 2009, p.9).

Over the years several drives have been initiated by the government in order to regenerate these areas suffering from deprivation and decline creating a changing face of urban regeneration over the decades. In many ways the origin of urban regeneration as we now know it in the UK is derived from the concept of urban renewal, and can be traced back to the Pre-World War II slum clearance programme initiated by the 1930 Housing Act (Planning Help, 2011). The Act (later followed by the 1933 and 1936 Housing Acts) stipulated that councils deal with the existing slums within their boundaries by carrying out large scale clearance within designated improvement areas. The slums were areas of high density which housed the workforce in the wake of the industrial revolution. Most of them consisted of back-to-back Victorian terraces that had undergone severe structural decay adding to the general physical deterioration of the areas which had also become focal points for social deprivation. Prior to the 1930 Act, the 1909 Town Planning Act had outlawed the building of such back to back housing, which had become “symbolic of the poverty of industrial cities” (Planning Help, 2011, p.1).
The Second World War saw widespread devastation due to the bombing of major towns and cities leaving them with extensive damage. By the time it came to an end in 1945 not only did most slums remain as the war prevented the implementation of the clearance programmes, but the destruction of a large number of properties during the war meant that the country was facing a large scale housing shortage (Mullins and Murie, 2006). In many ways the war “provided a stimulus, and intellectual breathing space, for considering radical solutions to long-term problems with the fabric of British cities” (Jones, 2004, p.365). Housing became a government priority in the post war period and the next two decades saw a wave of urban redevelopment interventions including the resumption of the slum clearance programme, the Reith Committee’s New Town Corporations, and large scale construction of new housing (Tallon, 2010).

Up until this point, the focus of urban regeneration had been largely physical, but the 1960s saw a shift towards approaches that demonstrated more consideration for the social aspects of the issues faced by towns and cities. Attention was refocused towards community development around areas that still suffered pockets of deprivation with individuals and groups living in poverty. The period up until the late 70s saw the emergence of such regeneration initiatives as the Community Development Projects, the Urban Programme and the Inner Area studies (Tallon, 2010). The 1970s also saw the first policy-led attempt at an integrated spatial strategy that targeted not only physical decline, but economic decline and social ills in the production of the 1977 Urban White Paper: Policy for the Inner Cities (Department of the Environment, 1977).

Urban regeneration in the 1980s sought to draw the private sector into redevelopment activity, placing greater emphasis on its role in the renewal of the country’s city centres. Rooted in a capitalist neo-liberal ideology, this approach was defined by ‘urban entrepreneurialism’ and the role of competition particularly in the economic revitalisation of an area (Wood, 1998). There was a push towards deregulation and privatisation and new structures such as Urban Development Companies were set up outside of mainstream government agencies in order to drive regeneration form a private sector stand point. The original Enterprise Zones were also introduced during this period in a bid to encourage property led regeneration, with cases like Canary Warf on the Isle of Dogs often cited as a flagship example (Harvey, 1989; Wood, 1998; Evans, 1997).
The 1990s brought about another shift in the direction of urban regeneration policy in the UK harking back to some of the community centred policies of the 1960s. There was an acknowledgement of the importance of community involvement in redevelopment efforts, and a multi sector approach was adopted with the input of public, private as well as third sector organisations. During the latter half of the 1990s, following the ascension of the New Labour government into power, development was geared towards a more comprehensive approach towards tackling regeneration. The focus was on targeting not just the physical and economic aspects of regeneration but also the social aspects simultaneously (Tallon, 2010). This meant the adoption of more people focused regeneration schemes with the emphasis predominantly placed on improving skills and empowering communities. These were schemes such as the Single Regeneration Budget and New Deal for Communities, as well as the utilisation of event-led approaches to regeneration such as hosting the Common Wealth Games or the Olympic Games.

Akinsete (2005) looked at how improvements in areas such as certain districts of Inner London that have been plagued with a number of socio-economic ills (like poverty, crime, poor healthcare and educational facilities, poor/inadequate housing, and unemployment) could be driven by major events like the Olympics. The various issues were examined, as well as the means by which the government sought to provide much needed regeneration in these deprived areas of London; the 2012 Olympic bid was being presented by some as the solution. “The Olympics will bring the single biggest transformation of the city since the Victorian age” (Livingstone, 2003, p.1). The fact that the Olympics would be a great force of change in the city was not in contention; the question was whether this change would actually translate into an improvement in the quality of life of the people of London. The full impact of the Games on the rest on the country outside of London remains to be seen, however leading economists from PricewaterhouseCoopers have projected that the Games will bring a £1.9b boost to the UK economy outside London (ETOA, 2005, p.4).

Regeneration policy under the current coalition government bears elements of a return to the urban entrepreneurialism of the 1980s with a new wave of Enterprise Zones, deregulation and a resurgence of increased emphasis on the role of the private sector in urban development (Department for Communities and Local Government, 2011). It has also seen the introduction of new agencies such as the private sector led Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) that replace development agencies as the main policy mechanism for urban regeneration delivery in the country. The Department for Business Innovation and Skills (BIS) suggest that these LEPs will bring “an integrated approach across real economic geographies” and ensure the right conditions are created in order to support “enterprise, innovation, global trade and inward investment” (BIS, 2011, p.1).
1.1.2 How do we know we are making a difference?

As demonstrated in the previous section history has a habit of repeating itself as policies come full circle (Wilks-Heeg, 1996). However one of the major barriers to learning from the past is the “lack of effective evaluation of previous initiatives”, which means that lessons are “not being learned and applied to future policies to ensure longer and more successful runs” (Wilks-Heeg, 1996, p.1264). This raises questions such as: ‘How is the impact of a project or a scheme assessed within regeneration?’, ‘How are regeneration delivery mechanisms evaluated?’, ‘Who carries out these evaluations?’, ‘Who’s perspective is taken into consideration?’. These questions form the basis of the current study.

This research has found that in most cases, particularly where regeneration projects and programmes are concerned, the evaluation process is often considered as an after-thought. It is viewed as an accounting exercise carried out at the end of a project and the true value of the process often gets lost in the bureaucracy. Aside from the primary role evaluation plays in providing an account on the status of a project (ongoing or otherwise), the Centre for Local Economic Strategies (CLES) (2009) highlights the importance of evaluation in the context of regeneration citing examples of the wider benefits that can be gained from well executed evaluations. They refer to the fact that evaluation plays a vital role in learning for the future (in particular why a project has worked or not), providing evidence for future funding, demonstrating examples of good practice, and above all, informing the development of future policy.

There are several different tools and approaches utilised in the assessment of urban regeneration and sustainable development projects, many of which look at different elements in isolation. These include the use of Local Multipliers eg. LM3 to assess economic impact; Social Return On Investment and other forms of Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) to assess social impact and tools such as Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) to assess
environmental impact (NEF Consulting, 2011; Cabinet Office of the Third Sector, 2009; BRE Global, 2012). There are also a few frameworks geared towards spatial interventions that seek to address multiple issues simultaneously (Brandon and Lombardi, 2005; Curwell et al, 2005; Vreeker R et al, 2009), as well as others which pull together the afore mentioned ‘tools’ to create an ‘assessment toolkit’ with a number of different tools that can be applied to the different aspects of a project or programme (Alexander & Brown, 2006).

The existence of these tools and methods notwithstanding, questions still surround their implementation. Emphasis is required not just on the assessments themselves but on the reflection and analysis of the outcomes of those assessments, which is crucial to the process of evaluation. Despite its importance, the evaluation process is a complicated one and is not an exact science. This is an issue that is further exacerbated by the nature of the evaluand in this case, given that the contexts of regeneration and sustainable development projects and programmes are complex, multi-faceted and involve a wide range of stakeholders. There is also the question of how to capture some of the more intangible aspects of regeneration and sustainable development work such as well-being (Blastland, 2010, p1).

This chapter will introduce the thesis, ‘Approaches to Regeneration and Sustainable Development: A Study of Impact Assessment and Evaluation in the Northwest of England’. It will give a brief overview of the context of regeneration and sustainable development dealt with in the study, as well as the role played by evaluation in this context and its importance. Furthermore the chapter will present the research, reviewing not only its rationale but also the scope of the study. It will cover the aims, objectives and research questions addressed, and provide a brief outline of the methodologies and research methods adopted in undertaking the study. The chapter will also review definitions of originality in a PhD, and outline the means by which this study meets those criteria.
1.2 The Study
Taking into consideration the issues raised in the previous section, the current study picks up on some of the key elements surrounding evaluation and impact assessment within regeneration. It sets out to identify improvements to existing methods of evaluation and impact assessment of regeneration delivery by undertaking a critical analysis of the various means by which the evaluation of different regeneration delivery mechanisms in the Northwest have been carried out. The research seeks to provide recommendations for improvements in the evaluation of regeneration delivery as well as identify best practice from other countries and related industries. For the purpose of the study, the chronological scope will date back to the Urban Renewal movement in England post World War Two.

1.2.1 Research Goals

Aim:
The aim of this study is to undertake a critical examination of evaluation and impact assessment methods of regeneration delivery mechanisms, in order to explore improvements to current practice such as better utilisation of indicators and stakeholder involvement in evaluations

Objectives:
The study seeks to achieve this aim by deconstructing it into five objectives, two of which have been broken down into sub-objectives in aid of further clarification.

The objectives of the study are as follows:

1. Critically examine and analyse the terms ‘Regeneration’ and ‘Sustainable Development’ in the context of the various stakeholders.

   **Sub-Objectives:**
   - Establish and define the various stakeholders involved in the regeneration process
   - Examine the roles of the various stakeholders in the regeneration process

2. Critically examine the different strategic approaches to regeneration delivery in the context of their role in achieving sustainable development
3. Evaluate the methods by which the delivery of regeneration is currently measured

**Sub-Objectives:**
- Identify criteria used in assessing regeneration and sustainable development
- Analyse the evaluation process for regeneration delivery mechanisms

4. Explore best practice in impact assessment and evaluation within other sectors

5. Investigate and recommend improvements to existing evaluation methods

**Research Questions:**
In addressing the different research issues raised in the stated objectives, the study generates a number of research questions. The first three sets of research questions address objectives one, two and three respectively, while the last set of research questions focus on the issues raised in objectives four and five. The research questions are:

What are 'Regeneration' and 'Sustainable Development'?
- How is the term 'Regeneration' defined?
- How is the term ‘Sustainable Development’ defined?
- Who are the various stakeholders involved in the regeneration process?
- What are the roles of the various stakeholders in the regeneration process?
- Why are Regeneration and Sustainable Development necessary?

How is Regeneration and Sustainable Development delivered in England?
- What are the different strategic approaches to delivering regeneration?

How is Regeneration and Sustainable Development delivery assessed in England?
- How is the impact of the different regeneration approaches measured?
- What criteria are used in assessing the different regeneration approaches and sustainable development?
- What is the evaluation process for regeneration programmes?

What improvements/ best practice can be identified from evaluation in other related sectors?
- What methods of impact assessment are used in other related sectors?
- What best practice can be identified in these sectors?
1.2.2 Overview of Methodology

The study adopts a pragmatist stance, which arises more out of “actions, situations and consequences rather than antecedent conditions” (Creswell, 2009, p.11). The focus here lies on ‘what works’, and in the solution to the research problem. Pragmatism seeks to use all available approaches to understand and address the problem rather than focus on the use of a particular methodology. It is not committed to anyone system of philosophy or reality lending itself naturally to the adoption of a mixed method approach, where “the investigator collects and analyses data, integrates the findings, and draws inferences using both qualitative and quantitative approaches or methods in a single study or programme of enquiry” (Tashakkori & Creswell, 2007, p.4). Therefore the adoption of a pragmatic stance within this mixed methods study, opens the door not only to the adoption of multiple methods, different world views, and assumptions, but also the use of multiple forms of data collection and analysis (Creswell, 2009).

It adopts a grounded theory methodological approach where the focus is on generating a theoretical idea as opposed to testing a hypothesis, and utilises a case study research strategy. The study seeks to construct theory emergent from data which is systematically gathered and analysed through the research process (Gibbs, 2007; Strauss and Corbin, 1998). It uses cases as the basis from which to inductively develop theory “that it is situated in and developed by recognizing patterns of relationships among constructs within and across cases as well as their underlying logical arguments” (Eisenhart and Graebner, 2007, p.25).

Based on Kumar’s (2005) classification of different types of research (see Fig. 1.2), this study is an applied study, with some aspects of both explanatory and exploratory research undertaken, using both qualitative and quantitative modes of inquiry.
The research techniques, procedures and methods within the study “are applied to a collection of information about various aspects of a situation, issue, problem or phenomenon” (Kumar, 2005, p.9), with the issue to be addressed in this case being that of evaluation and impact assessment adopted within different approaches to regeneration. The explanatory portion of the study refers to the aspects of descriptive research, which in this context seeks to clarify “the whys and hows” (Kumar, 2005, p.10) of impact assessment within regeneration, and also in defining the key terms ‘regeneration’ and ‘sustainable development’. A further element of explanatory research is present within the case studies, where the study attempts to systematically describe the situational contexts of the case study organisations. The exploratory aspect of the study comes to bear when addressing the final set of research questions, where it seeks to identify best practice and improvements to existing methods, as well as look to other industries to identify transferable practice within impact assessment and evaluation.

The descriptive nature of qualitative research makes it more suitable for the explanatory and descriptive aspects of the study, using tools such as semi-structured interviews and observation. Although the study is predominantly qualitative in nature it incorporates a mix of quantitative as well as qualitative research methods of research and analysis, which Newman and Benz (1998) refer to as being different ends on a continuum. The qualitative aspects of the study are covered by the
background investigation, identification of the different regeneration approaches as well as the descriptive aspects of the case studies, while the quantitative aspects of the study is undertaken when addressing the various indices and measurement methods utilised in the execution of impact assessment and evaluation within regeneration and sustainable development, such as the National Indicator Set and other Local Authority Performance indicators.

Given its basis as a piece of applied research, the study also explores the use of an overarching action research strategy; both within the context of the subject of the research and the meta process that is the actual conduct of the research itself (See Fig. 1.3).

Fig. 1.3: Action Research Framework for Study
Data Collection:

The study seeks to incorporate the use of data obtained from primary, secondary and tertiary sources. Table 1.1 depicts the different levels of data used as well as collection methods. The construction of tools used for interviews are based on a new data collection framework adapted from the Centre for Facilities Management’s (CFM) Framework for Case Study Development. Originally developed by the CFM as a tool for undertaking case studies within various organisations, the use of the framework ensures rich data is sampled from parallel fields within each organisation. CFM developed the framework for use in longitudinal studies however the adapted framework is utilised in conducting a cross case analysis. The case studies involve four different types of urban regeneration delivery mechanisms in operation in the Northwest of England, grouped according to their approach to regeneration delivery. They include a Development Agency, an Urban Regeneration Company, a New Deal for Communities Partnership and an Arms Length Management Organisation.

Data Analysis:

The research utilises a combination of both qualitative and quantitative methods of data analysis. For the interviews and other qualitative forms of data the study uses content analysis with the aid of thematic coding. Once the data has been prepared, codes are developed using a data led grounded theory approach. A qualitative critical discursive analysis is carried out based on the identified themes and with theory built within an axial coding model (Gibbs, 2007; Corbin and Strauss, 1990; Corbin and Strauss, 1998). As this is a mainly qualitative piece of work and there are no overarching dependent/independent variables to be analysed, the use of quantitative methods of analysis is limited and dependent of the nature of the data collected within the individual case studies. Basic statistical analysis methods are used in the review of different indices and measurement methods used during impact assessment and evaluation within regeneration and sustainable development.
### Table 1.1: Levels of Data and Collection Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATURE OF DATA</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>METHOD OF COLLECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY</td>
<td>Case Studies</td>
<td>Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview Transcripts</td>
<td>Informal Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correspondence</td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Journal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Photographs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informal Interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDARY</td>
<td>Journal Papers</td>
<td>Desktop Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scholarly Books</td>
<td>Literature Search</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government Publications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newspaper Articles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earlier Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organisational Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National and International</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERTIARY</td>
<td>Text Books</td>
<td>Desktop Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Articles and Reviews</td>
<td>Literature Search</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reference guides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.2.3 Defining the PhD: Definitions of Originality

In conducting post graduate study, there are certain criteria that distinguish a Master of Philosophy level dissertation and a Doctorate level thesis the key one being the level of originality. The submissions are judged against a ‘significant contribution’ to the existing body of knowledge in the field of study which must be original in its own right. On the concept of originality Cryer (1996) compares the research process to the journey of an explorer and suggests that originality can in fact be considered from three perspectives namely tools, techniques and procedures. Cryer (2006, p.199) goes on to cite various examples of an original contribution to knowledge including:
• A new or improved product
• A new theory or reinterpretation of an existing one
• A new or improved research tool or technique
• An in-depth study
• An exploration of a topic, area or field
• A critical analysis
• A portfolio of work based on research
• A fact or conclusion or a collection of facts or conclusions

Philips and Pugh (2000, p.63) put forward 15 definitions of originality which are:

1. Setting down a major piece of new information in writing for the first time.
2. Continuing a previously original piece of work.
3. Carrying out original work designed by the supervisor.
4. Providing a single original technique, observation or result in an otherwise unoriginal but competent piece of research.
5. Having many original ideas, methods and interpretations all performed by others under the direction of the postgraduate.
6. Showing originality in testing someone else’s idea.
7. Carrying out empirical work that hasn’t been done before.
8. Making a synthesis that hasn’t been made before.
9. Using already known material but with a new interpretation.
10. Trying out something in this country that has previously only been done in other countries.
11. Taking a particular technique and applying it in a new area.
12. Bringing new evidence to bear on an old issue.
13. Being cross-disciplinary and using different methodologies.
14. Looking at areas that people in the discipline haven’t looked at before.
15. Adding to knowledge in a way that hasn’t previously been done before.

- Phillips & Pugh, 2000: p.63
Based on these stipulations, this study meets the following conditions of originality:

- Generating theory on evaluation and impact assessment methods within regeneration and sustainable development
- Providing an in-depth study of evaluation methods within the case study organisations
- An exploration of the field of regeneration and sustainable development as well as evaluation and impact assessment in this context
- Providing a critical analysis of evaluation and impact assessment methods within regeneration and sustainable development
- Providing conclusions against the main issues surrounding evaluation and impact assessment methods within regeneration and sustainable development
- Setting down information on evaluation techniques adopted by the case study organisations for the first time
- Carrying out an original study designed by the researcher and the supervisor
- Making a synthesis that has not been made before in the resultant grounded theory
- Bringing new evidence to bear on the issue of evaluation and impact assessment methods within regeneration and sustainable development
- Utilising different cross-disciplinary methodologies in the research and analysis of the subject
- Adding to knowledge in a way that has not previously been done in the aforementioned ways

**Original Contribution to Knowledge:**

- A critical review of regeneration and sustainable development delivery in the North West of England; with in-depth insights based on case studies which will add to the existing body of knowledge available in the field available to both practitioners and researchers alike.
• Critical evaluation of criteria used in assessing regeneration and sustainable development, which will inform the production of reports and papers generated by the study. These will provide relevant and novel information on the use of criteria in the assessment of regeneration.

• A critical evaluation of the techniques adopted in the assessment of regeneration and sustainable development will also inform the development of reports and papers during the course of the study.

• The identification of good practice in evaluation from other sectors and relating it to the context of urban regeneration in a way that it has not been done previously. The dissemination of which will benefit not only cross disciplinary evaluation research but regeneration practice.

• The development of improvements to existing methods evaluating regeneration delivery, working with case study organisations to improve their own practices. Furthermore, the development of a framework to structure evaluation within the sector.

• The utilisation of a novel blend of research approaches and methods as described in chapter 2, thereby making an original contribution to the body of knowledge within mixed methods research.
1.3 Summary

The issues of regeneration and sustainable development are complex and multi-faceted. Over the years several initiatives in various forms have been adopted in an attempt to address the issues and in recent decades appear to have come full circle. An important aspect to successful delivery of urban regeneration programmes is drawing upon the past however lack of adequate evaluation poses a challenge to accessing that learning.

This research sets out to explore this issue by undertaking a critical examination of evaluation and impact assessment methods of regeneration delivery mechanisms. It utilises a grounded theory approach using case studies to explore emergent issues surrounding evaluation and impact assessment within regeneration delivery. It provides a critical analysis of criteria and techniques used in assessing regeneration and sustainable development as well as delivery of regeneration and sustainable development in the North West of England.

The study develops improvements to existing methods of regeneration delivery and evaluation working with case study organisations, as well as identifies and disseminates good practice from other sectors.

The next chapter examines the research methods and methodologies utilised within this study in more depth. It reviews the philosophical stance as well as the methodological approaches adopted by the research as well as tools and methods of data collection and analysis.
CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGY

“A little less conversation, a little more action please”

- Elvis Presley (1968)
This chapter will review the research methodologies as well as methods adopted by the study. It will introduce the philosophical stance assumed by the research and discuss how this relates to the research methodologies espoused. The chapter will examine the difference between evaluation research and research on evaluation as is constituted by this study. It will go on to discuss research methods utilised within the study including the case study strategy, as well as tools for data collection and analysis. The chapter will also cover the issue of validity and reliability of data in relation to the research.

**2.1 Research Philosophy and Methodology**

**2.1.1 Research Paradigm and Philosophical Stance**

The word paradigm refers to the underlying assumptions and intellectual structure upon which research and development in a field of inquiry is based (Kuhn, 1962). It is derived from the Greek παράδειγμα (paradigma) which means model or pattern. It was first used by Plato (circa 360 BC) in describing the rules or ‘paradigms’ that govern the creation of the cosmos. As in the modern use of the term within research today, Plato goes on to discuss the relationship between the idea and the phenomenon coming together to form a paradigm; “in forming its [the phenomenon’s] shape and quality, [the shaper] keeps his gaze fixed on that which is uniform, using a model [paradigm]of this kind, ... executed in this way” (Plato, circa 360BC, 28a).

The modern definition of the research paradigm comes from Khun (1962) in his seminal work *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. In it he describes a paradigm in the context of research as a lens through which the research is viewed, referring to it as the practices that define a scientific discipline at a particular point in time. The emphasis on ‘a certain time’ highlights the fact that accepted paradigms may shift over time, and are dependent on the perspective of the researcher. He uses the example of the ‘Duck/Rabbit’ [See figure 2.1] optical illusion to illustrate how a
paradigm shift could see the same information viewed in a completely different way (Kuhn, 1962, Vassar College, 2012). Conducting research within an ever evolving field such as urban regeneration and sustainable development (Wilks-Heeg, 1996) requires that the researcher is conscious of the shifting sands on which they are treading. Furthermore the disparate views of various stakeholders means that one issue may be understood from different perspectives (Carmona et al, 2010).

![Fig. 2.1: The Duck/Rabbit Optical Illusion: Which Do You See? (Source: Jastrow, 1899)](image)

Other definitions of a paradigm are proposed by Patton (1990) who suggests that it is a perspective that serves as a means of breaking down the complexities of the world in which we exist; and Guba (1990) who explains a paradigm as an interpretive framework that is structured around a set of feelings and beliefs about the existence of the word, our understanding of it, and how it should be studied.
The main functions of a research paradigm (Dill and Romiszowski, 1997) are to:

- Define how the world works, how knowledge is extracted from this world, and how one is to think, write, and talk about this knowledge
- Define the types of questions to be asked and the methodologies to be used in answering
- Decide what is published and what is not published
- Structure the world of the academic worker
- Provide its meaning and its significance

The main components of a research paradigm (Creswell, 1998, p.74) are its:

- Ontological view of reality
- Epistemological understanding of the nature of knowledge
- Methodological processes of inquiry

Cohen et al (2000, p.396) refer to the means by which the world is studied as “series of peaceful interludes punctuated by intellectually violent revolutions …in which one conceptual world view is replaced by another”, highlighting the fact that not only do accepted paradigms shift, but different paradigms exist in competition. This is to a large extent responsible for the confusion surrounding the understanding of research paradigms and their application. Kuhn (1970, p.187) refers to them as “the most novel, yet least understood” aspect of his book.

This has led to confusion and discrepancies around the definition, classification and description of various research paradigms. Different researchers and theorists propose a number of different ‘research paradigms’ (Quantitative and Qualitative, Positivist and Anti-positivist, Feminist, Interpretism, Constructivism, Critical theory, Praxis, Transformative, Phenomenological, Naturalist) without any consensus on the main categories of these paradigms, a hierarchy to structure them, or which actually represent philosophical stances (Guba and Lincoln, 1981; Denzin and Lincoln, 1998; Patton, 1990; Sale et al, 2002). The waters are further muddied by the fact that even certain terms such as Post-positivism for example are defined differently depending on who is providing the definition. While some authors take it to be synonymous with
an antipositivist or qualitative paradigm, others conceive it as an evolution of positivism which is in opposition to a qualitative paradigm (Niglas, 2001).

This research lends some structure to this area by considering three main ‘clusters’ of research paradigms around the focus of the paradigm; theory, concept or application (Wilcott, 1992; Denzin and Lincoln, 1998). This framework is depicted in Figure 2.2.

![Fig. 2.2: Research Paradigms Clustered by Foci](image-url)
Theory Driven Paradigms:

The first cluster includes theory driven research paradigms which are mainly positivist in origin. This paradigm is "based on the rationalistic, empiricist philosophy that originated with Aristotle, Francis Bacon, John Locke, August Comte, and Emmanuel Kant" (Mertens, 2005, p.8) and is traditionally situated within empirical scientific study utilising quantitative methodologies. The emphasis within the paradigm is placed on observation and reason as a means of understanding human behaviour. It assumes the objectivity of the researcher and an objective reality, knowledge of which is only gained from sense data that can be directly experienced and verified between independent observers (Dash, 2005). This puts such paradigms at odds with a study that deals with urban regeneration which by its very nature considers different perspectives of multiple stakeholders.

Postpositivism reflects a paradigm shift away from positivism. While positivists assume that causality is deterministic of the effects and outcomes (Creswell, 2009), postpositivists assume “that any piece of research is influenced by a number of well-developed theories apart from, and as well as, the one which is being tested” (Cook and Campbell, 1979, p.24). It is generally accepted that post positivism despite its acceptance of subjective epistemology, it is not a form of interpretivism or relativism as it still holds the existence of an objective ontology. In spite of this others align post positivism more closely with constructivism, accepting multiple truths and qualitative findings; suggesting that "what might be the truth for one person or cultural group may not be for another" (O'Leary, 2004 p.6).

Concept Driven Paradigms:

These are generally referred to as Qualitative, Naturalist or Anti-positivist paradigms, and include interpretive and constructivist paradigms. They lie in contrast with positivist paradigms and as a whole reject the constraints imposed by empiricism. The emphasis here is on “the relationship between socially-engendered concept formation and language” (O'Brien, 2001 p.1). The research takes into consideration the impact of the researcher and their background on the research, and generally relies on the "participants' views of the situation being studied". The research
generally does not begin with a theory (as with postpositivism) but "generates or inductively develops [constructs] a theory or pattern of meanings" about a concept (Creswell, 2009, p.8-9). The intention of the research is to interpret “the world of human experience” (Cohen & Manion, 1994, p.36), suggesting that “reality is socially constructed” (Mertens, 2005 p.12), probing “into the various unexplored dimensions of a phenomenon rather than establishing a specific relationship among the components, as in the case of positivism” (Dash, 2005 p.1). The research generally “relies on qualitative data collection methods and analysis or a combination of both …where quantitative data may be utilised in a way, which supports or expands upon qualitative data and effectively deepens the description” (Mackenzie and Knipe, 2006 p.2), thereby making such a stance more applicable in the context of this study.

**Function Driven Paradigms:**

This cluster refers to paradigms that emphasise action and reform via the research process. They include Critical Theory, Praxis and Transformative paradigms. O’Brien (2001) states that the term ‘Praxis’ is referred to by Aristotle as the art of acting upon the conditions one faces in order to change them. He continues by suggesting that such paradigms deal with the investigation into and actions against the disciplines and activities predominant in the ethical and political lives of people. These paradigms seek to “address issues of social justice and suggests that “that inquiry needs to be intertwined with politics and a political agenda… that may change the lives of the participants, the institutions in which individuals work or live, and the researcher’s life” (Creswell, 2009, pp.9-10). Reality is believed to be created and shaped by social, political, cultural, economic, ethnic and gender-based structures and the researcher is understood as having a stake in resolving a problematic situation, being an active participant in that situation, thus rejecting the notion of neutrality (Cohen and Crabtree, 2006).

The different research paradigm clusters and their features are summarised in Table 2.1, along with the blended positioning of this study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARADIGM CLUSTERS</th>
<th>Theory Driven Paradigms</th>
<th>Concept Driven Paradigms</th>
<th>Function Driven Paradigms</th>
<th>Position of the Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ontology</td>
<td>realist ontology:</td>
<td>relativist ontology:</td>
<td>historical ontology:</td>
<td>relativist and historical ontology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>objective reality</td>
<td>reality is constructed</td>
<td>'reality' is apprehendable. It is a reality created and shaped by social, political, cultural, economic, ethnic and gender-based forces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>intersubjectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>through meanings and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>understandings developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>socially and experientially</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemology</td>
<td>representational</td>
<td>transactional or</td>
<td>modified transactional or</td>
<td>modified transactional or subjectivist epistemology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>epistemology:</td>
<td>subjectivist epistemology:</td>
<td>subjectivist epistemology:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>investigator can know this reality and use symbols to accurately describe and explain this objective reality</td>
<td>investigator and the object of investigation are linked such that the individual and how they understand the world is a central part of understanding themselves, others and the world</td>
<td>investigator cannot separate themselves from what they know and this inevitably influences inquiry. What can be known is inextricably tied to the interaction between a particular investigator and a particular object or group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSUMPTIONS</td>
<td>PARADIGM CLUSTERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory Driven Paradigms</td>
<td>Concept Driven Paradigms</td>
<td>Function Driven Paradigms</td>
<td>Position of the Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• experimental and manipulative methods</td>
<td>• naturalistic methods (interviewing and observation and analysis of existing texts)</td>
<td>• dialogic methods</td>
<td>• naturalistic methods (interviewing and observation and analysis of existing texts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• distance between the subjective biases of the researcher and the objective reality studied</td>
<td>• methods ensure an adequate dialog between the researchers and those with whom they interact in order to collaboratively construct a meaningful reality</td>
<td>• methods combining observation and interviewing with approaches that foster conversation and reflection</td>
<td>• dialogic methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• generally involves hypothesis generation and testing</td>
<td>• generally involves challenges guiding assumptions rather than naming and describing</td>
<td>• typically involves challenges guiding assumptions rather than naming and describing</td>
<td>• methods combining observation and interviewing with approaches that foster conversation and reflection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• typically, quantitative methods are used</td>
<td>• typically tries to change the situation rather than just describe it</td>
<td>• typically tries to change the situation rather than just describe it</td>
<td>• generally meanings are emergent from the research process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• typically, qualitative methods are used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• generally involves challenges guiding assumptions rather than naming and describing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• typically tries to change the situation rather than just describe it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another crucial element in the composition of a research paradigm framework is the philosophy of the researcher (Dublin City University, 2012). The paradigm that a piece of research is situated within is heavily influenced by the philosophical assumptions made and ‘world view’ adopted by the researcher. This refers to the various views that the researcher holds about human beings and this world, which informs the researcher’s selection of a ‘theory in practice’ or ‘philosophical stance’ (Morgan and Smircich, 1980). They represent the topography of these basic assumptions on a continuum from a Subjective stance to an Objective stance. Figure 2.4 depicts this topography as well the orientation of the researcher.

The figure shows the alignment of the researcher’s views over the middle ground of the topography making them suited to a “social action theory study” (Morgan and Smircich, 1980 p.494).

Fig. 2.3: Mapping of Study unto Network of Basic Assumptions from Subjective to Objective (Source: Morgan & Smircich, 1980, p.492)
Mills (1959, p.63) reflects on the nature of the researcher situated in work/action oriented context, stating that they are “quickly made impatient and weary by elaborate discussions of method and theory in general”. However this is not to say that theory is rejected completely but rather seen as tool to be used by the researcher as opposed to source of restriction, which is typical of a pragmatist philosophical stance.

The pragmatic approach seeks to unburden itself from the entrapments of the paradigm debate. It acknowledges the ties and themes that connect quantitative and qualitative research, and understands the benefits of blending quantitative and qualitative methods (Morgan, 2007). Though put forward as a research paradigm in its own right by some (Creswell, 2009; Mertens 2005), this study views pragmatism as a philosophical stance that underpins such function driven research paradigms as the transformative or praxis paradigms and their inherent methodological approaches (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 2003; Somekh and Lewin, 2005). Pragmatism places the research problem at the centre of its focus, and seeks to apply data collection and analysis methods that are most likely to provide insights into the question with no philosophical loyalty to any particular research paradigm (Creswel, 2009; Mackenzie and Knipe, 2006).

The adoption of this philosophical stance within this study on evaluation is particularly appropriate as it is a stance championed by leading evaluation researcher Michael Patton. He discusses his concern about “too much research…is based on habit rather than situational responsiveness and methodological appropriateness”, going on to state that “paradigmatic blinders constrain methodological flexibility and stifle creativity by locking researchers into unconscious patterns of perception” (Patton, 1990 p.38). He aligns pragmatism to an alternative paradigm which he refers to as a ‘paradigm of choice’ which values methodological appropriateness over methodological orthodoxy. The issue is less about following the prescriptions of a particular paradigm to the letter, but whether one has made “sensible methods decisions” in the context of the “purpose of the inquiry, research question, and resources available” (Patton, 1990 p.39).
Creswell (2009, p.12) summarises the characteristics of pragmatism below:

- Individual researchers have freedom of choice and are free to choose the methods, techniques and procedures that best meet their needs
- Research occurs in social, historical, and other contexts
- Pragmatists do not see the world as an absolute unity
- Truth is what works at that time; it is not based on a strict dualism between mind and reality completely independent of the mind
- ‘What’ and ‘How’ to research are dependent on intended consequences
- Pragmatism is not committed to any one ‘system of philosophy’ (research paradigm) or reality, in the context of mixed methods research allowing inquirers to draw liberally from both quantitative and qualitative assumptions when they engage in their research

Table 2.2 shows the various paradigm clusters, the research methods and data collection tools associated with them as well as the prevalent terminology used within the different clusters. It also shows the positioning of the study in this context.

Table 2.2: Paradigms, Terminology, Methods and Tools (Adapted from: Creswell, 2009; Mertens 2005; Mackenzie and Knipe, 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARADIGM</th>
<th>Theory Driven</th>
<th>Concept Driven</th>
<th>Function Driven</th>
<th>Position of the Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terminology</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Naturalistic</td>
<td>Critical theory</td>
<td>Comparative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quasi-experimental</td>
<td>Phenomenological</td>
<td>Neo-marxist</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlational</td>
<td>Hermeneutic</td>
<td>Feminist</td>
<td>Participatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reductionism</td>
<td>Interpretivist</td>
<td>Critical Race</td>
<td>Issue oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theory verification</td>
<td>Ethnographic</td>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>Change-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Causal</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Freirean</td>
<td>Interventionist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td>participant meanings</td>
<td>Participatory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparativ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Emancipatory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnographic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theory</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Narrative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>verification</td>
<td></td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Causal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participatory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Issue oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change-oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interventionist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARADIGM</td>
<td>Theory Driven</td>
<td>Concept Driven</td>
<td>Function Driven</td>
<td>Position of the Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminology continued..</td>
<td>Determination Normative</td>
<td>Social and historical construction</td>
<td>Issue oriented Change-oriented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Theory generation Symbolic interaction</td>
<td>Change-oriented Interventionist Queer theory</td>
<td>Race specific Political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Methods</td>
<td>Quantitative. &quot;Although qualitative methods can be used within this paradigm, quantitative methods tend to be predominant.&quot; (Mertens, 2005, p. 12)</td>
<td>Qualitative methods predominate although quantitative methods may also be utilised.</td>
<td>Qualitative methods with quantitative and mixed methods. <em>Contextual and historical factors described, especially as they relate to oppression</em> (Mertens, 2005, p. 9)</td>
<td>Mixed methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Data Collection Tools</td>
<td>Experiments</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Diverse range of tools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quasi-experiments</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tests</td>
<td>Document reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scales</td>
<td>Visual data analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Analysis Tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistical methods</td>
<td>Content analysis Thematic coding</td>
<td>Content analysis Thematic coding Statistical methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Content analysis Thematic coding Statistical methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Terminology continued..**

- **Primary Methods**

- **Primary Data Collection Tools**

- **Data Analysis Tools**
2.1.2 Methodological Approach

As suggested in the previous section, with the study's adoption of a pragmatic philosophical stance and alignment with a function driven research paradigm, this research employs a mixed methods methodology. Vitruvius in his First Book of Architecture (A.D. 15) refers to the multidisciplinary knowledge required by the architect and the plurality that forms a fundamental part of a basic architectural education. Sattup (2011), sites this as an argument for the application of the same plurality within architectural research. The same case can be made for research within urban regeneration and sustainable development. The very nature of the concepts, being both multi-faceted and multi-disciplinary require multiple research methods and even multiple strategies. In addition, the second aspect the study centers around is evaluation, a field which provided the early definitions of mixed methods. Green et al (1989, p.256) defined mixed methods research as that which included “at least one quantitative and one qualitative method where neither type of method is inherently linked to any particular inquiry paradigm”, and like Patton (1990) advocated for the disentanglement of methods and philosophy.

Over the years several authors have presented other definitions of what constitutes mixed methods research laying emphasis on different aspects the concept, from methods to philosophy and purpose. This is captured by Creswell and Plano Clark (2010) in Table 2.3.

Table 2.3: Orientation of Definitions of Mixed Methods Research (Adapted from: Creswell and Plano Clark, 2010 p. 3; Patton, 1990)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>FOCUS OF DEFINITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greene, Caracelli, and Graham (1989)</td>
<td>Methods, Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patton (1990)</td>
<td>Methods, Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tashakkori and Teddlie (1998)</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Onwuegbuzie, and Turner (2007)</td>
<td>Qualitative and quantitative research, Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene (2007)</td>
<td>Multiple ways of seeing, hearing, and making sense of the social world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creswell and Plano Clark (2007)</td>
<td>Methods, Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creswell and Plano Clark (2010)</td>
<td>Methods, Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As mentioned earlier the decision to utilise a mixed methodology within the research was based not only on its alignment with the study’s philosophical stance, but also its appropriateness given the interdisciplinary nature of the research subject. The complexity of the research questions dealt with require equally “complex methodological approaches”, which is “nearly impossible with a mono-method approach” (Mayring et al, 2007 p.1).

In his statement in support of mixed methods research, Mayring et al (2007) goes on to add that there is an increased demand for interdisciplinary (and therefore mixed method) projects and approaches not only from universities, and research commissioners but funders too. Furthermore he cites the use of mixed methodology research as a means to overcome the barriers due to lack of communication created by the traditional silo working of researchers with “scholars describing for specific ‘schools’” (Mayring et al, 2007 p.2). Despite their example being derived from the context of psychological research, this research has found that real life parallels can be draw in the ‘silied’ way in which issues are tackled within urban regeneration and sustainable development practice.

In terms of the typology of the mixed methodology approach as designated by the stage of the research process that the ‘mixing’ occurs, the research can be considered a multi strand study in that there is more than one strand of data; both primary and secondary qualitative data, as well as secondary quantitative data (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 1998; Tashakkori and Teddlie, 2003; Bryman, 2006). Therefore the study while predominantly qualitative utilizes both qualitative as well as quantitative data as well as methods of analysis.

The qualitative aspects of the study are covered by the background investigation, identification of the different regeneration approaches as well as the descriptive aspects of the case studies, while the quantitative aspects of the study is undertaken when addressing the various indices and measurement methods utilised in the execution of impact assessment and evaluation within regeneration and sustainable development, such as the National Indicator Set and other Local Authority Performance indicators. The use of mixed methods highlights the relationship
between qualitative and quantitative research methods, supplementing and complementing each other as different ends on a continuum (Newman and Benz, 1998). Strauss and Corbin (1998, p.31) encourage the exploration of this “interplay between qualitative and quantitative methods”, stating that the “back and forth between the combinations of both types of procedures” can be just as important in shedding light on emergent theory.

2.1.3 Generating Theory from Research

The research is exploratory and inductive in nature, utilising a grounded theory approach in order to construct theory generated form the data. Within a grounded theory study, the theory is emergent from the systematic collection and analysis of data (Gibbs, 2007; Strauss and Corbin, 1998) as opposed to a theory-led study where a hypothesis is tested. The process of generating theory means that not only do the hypothesis and most of the emergent concepts come from the data but they are produced within the context of the research subject. Conducting a grounded theory study requires rigorous adherence to a fixed process which involves data collection, note taking, three levels of data coding (open, axial and selective), sorting and theoretical sampling while extensively using memos throughout the process as a means of facilitating constant comparison (Strauss and Corbin, 1998, Borgatti, 2005). As opposed to the testing of a logico-deductive theory, the research views “theory as a process, and an ever developing entity and not a perfect product” (Glaser and Strauss, 1967 p.32). Grounded theory researchers also embrace the use of mixed methods stating that not only are both forms of data “useful for both the verification and generation of theory”, but in most cases they are necessary and supplementary (Glaser and Strauss, 1967 p.17-18).

While the research does not adhere strictly to the detailed process as set out by traditional grounded theorists and as such may not be considered a pure grounded theory study, it adopts a grounded theory approach as it seeks to generate theory emergent from the data collected. Furthermore it adopts other grounded theory processes within the data analysis as discussed in section 2.3 of this chapter. The research employs a case study strategy, examining selected cases as the basis of
the enquiry from which theory is developed. This ensures that the theory is contextualised and is “developed by recognising patterns of relationships among constructs within and across cases as well as their underlying logical arguments” (Eisenhart and Graebner, 2007, p.25).

Considering the applied nature of the research, the study also explores the use of an overarching action research strategy. The study utilises the reflective cycle of planning, action observation and reflection as depicted in figure 1.3 (Kember, 2000). Despite the fact that the study is not primarily a piece of action research its focus on improvement and concern with social practice (Carr and Kemmis, 1986; Kember, 200) see it embody some of its key elements as a formative strategy (even if it does not constitute its fundamental approach). The study explores improvement not only within the context of the subject of the research, but within the meta process that is the actual conduct of the research thereby seeking the development of my practice as a researcher. This is captured in a reflective piece at the end of the thesis. Figure 2.4 depicts the nature of the research in the context of an action research spiral with the current study forming the first loop of the spiral, with an opportunity for further research based on the findings of the current study.
2.1.4 Using Case Studies to Build Theory

As mentioned earlier, the research adopts a case study strategy, exploring evaluation practices in selected regeneration organisations. This strategy involves the exploration of case or multiple cases (as in the instance of this study), bound by time and place within the social, historical and/or economic setting of the case (Creswell, 1998). The case studies investigate the issues raised by evaluation within regeneration delivery “within their real-life context” utilising “multiple sources of evidence” (Yin, 2003 p.13). The use of this strategy is particularly suited to a pragmatic applied research scenario as is the case here, where there is a “need to understand a particular problem within a unique situation in great depth” (Patton, 1990, p. 54). The focus is on the “circumstances of the research problem rather than an ideological commitment to be followed whatever the circumstances” (Platt, 1992, p.46).

Despite its representation at times as a research methodology (Merriam, 1988) this study does not view it as such, but as a strategy that may employ the use of several research methods in its delivery (Denzin and Lincoln, 1998). Eisenhardt and Graebner (2007) make a case for the use of this strategy in the development of theory within research, stating that it is one of the key methods relied upon by award winning authors particularly in the field of organisational research. They cite studies conducted by Gersick (1988), Eisenhardt (1998) and Bartunek et al (2006) in attesting to the fact that not only do papers which seek to build theory using case studies possess impact ratings disproportionately higher than their numbers, but they also count among the most highly cited references in the Academy of Management Journal as they often produce the most interesting research.

In the context of applied research such as this one, case studies “emphasise the rich real-world context in which the phenomena occur” (Eisenhardt and Graebner 2007, p. 25), providing a means of addressing the lived experience (Travers 2001). Despite the fact that the use of case studies tend to be insufficient in answering
questions such as ‘how often’ and ‘how many’, the strategy is particularly suited to situations where the research seeks to explore the 'hows' and the 'whys' (Edmonson and McManus, 2007). This research investigates the ‘hows’ in terms of evaluation in regeneration delivery, exploring relationships and determining ‘whys’ in order to make recommendations for the improvement of practice in the field.

This strategy is not without its criticisms; practical, involving the amount of energy and time spent collating and preparing data, as well as empirical, relating to the validity and generalisability of the findings (Miles, 1979). Yin (2003) suggests that such practical barriers can be overcome with refinement and standardisation of technique, while Eisenhardt and Graebner (2007, p25-26) propose the findings of “well-done theory building from cases is surprisingly objective due to its close adherence to the data”, making it “likely to produce theory which is more accurate and testable”.

The bottom line however in justifying the use of case studies either as a strategy or as means to generate theory is its fit with the philosophical underpinnings of the study as these tie into all other aspects of the study including the nature of the research questions (Schell, 1992).

The Research Design of the study is illustrated in figure 2.4.
Fig. 2.4: Research Design for Thesis
2.1.5 Evaluation Research vs Research on Evaluation

Evaluation research refers to the branch of social science research which is the foundation of evaluation practice today. Its roots lie in the works of 17th and 18th century philosophers and social theorists Thomas Hobbes, Montesquieu and Jean-Jacques Rousseau, who explored governance, social groups and human traits using systematic social inquiry (Alkin and Christie, 2004). Evaluation research refers to the process of conducting an evaluation, considering it in the context of a socio-scientific study which is investigating the evaluand (the subject of the evaluation). Social scientists such as Rutman (1977, p.16) view evaluation from this perspective, defining it as “first and foremost a process of applying scientific procedures to accumulate reliable and valid evidence in the manner and extent to which specific activities produce particular effects and outcomes”. Evaluation research accepts evaluation as a form of applied research (Pawson and Tilley, 2009), within which the use of scientific research procedures are transferred into practice in order to measure the effectiveness of an evaluand (Rutman, 1980). While parallels can be drawn between evaluation research and other forms of research activity, there are a number of aspects which set it apart (Tones and Tilford, 1994) not least of all its primary focus on the assessment of whether or not specific targets have been achieved.

In contrast, research on evaluation describes the study of evaluation and its practice. It refers to any form of research with evaluation as its core focus, and is in effect research on evaluation research. Evaluations of evaluations (Patton, 1982) constitute a form of research on evaluation, more specifically ‘evaluation research’ on evaluation. Scriven (1969) suggests that evaluators can evaluate their own work with the aid of an evaluation specific checklist; a concept he refers to as meta-evaluation. In this case the evaluation being evaluated is referred to as the primary evaluation.

While this study may possess a number of the characteristics of evaluation described in section 4.1 of this thesis, it crucially does not make judgements on worth and value of the subject of the study, and as such constitutes a piece of research on evaluation rather than evaluation in its own right.


2.2 Data Collection

Data used within the study will be collected from a number of different sources at various levels ranging from primary to tertiary (Hopkins, 2010; Denzin and Lincoln, 1998; Kumar, 2005; University of Pennsylvania, 2007). Primary data sources are largely centred around the case studies and include:

- Audio recordings of interviews
- Interview transcripts
- Correspondence
- Research journal
- Research notes
- Photographs

The secondary data sources used within the study include:

- Journal papers
- Scholarly books
- Government publications
- Newspaper articles
- Earlier research into research methods, sustainability, urban regeneration and evaluation
- Organisational reports
- Archival data
- Survey data
- National and international indicators

The study also incorporated the use of tertiary data sources including:

- Text Books
- Editorials and reviews from research and professional journals
- Reference guides
The data at different levels is collected using a number of different research tools. The primary data is collected using a combination of semi-structured interviews, and informal interviews. Observation was also used as a tool for data collection within the case studies two and four, both passively in observing the activities of others within the organisation as well as actively participating in evaluation activity. Brainstorming session were also used within the same case studies as a data collection tool. The secondary and tertiary data is mainly collected via a desktop study, involving literature searches carried out manually in libraries and via the use of the internet. Further secondary data such as organisational reports, archival data etc. are gathered directly from the case study organisations as well as other organisations relevant to the research, e.g. CLES.

2.2.1 The Case Studies

The case studies involve four of the main types of urban regeneration delivery vehicles in operation in the Northwest of England, grouped according to their approach to regeneration delivery. The first pair is a Development Agency (The Rochdale Development Agency) and an Urban Regeneration Company (New East Manchester), which both adopt a strategic partnership approach to delivering regeneration. The second pair both utilise a neighbourhood management approach in their delivery of regeneration and are a New Deal for Communities Partnership (Charlestown and Lower Kersal NDC) and an Arms Length Management Organisation (Bolton At Home, which during the course of the study has since undergone a stock transfer from the council to become a registered social landlord). The advantage of adopting a case study approach in this study is that it provides the opportunity to explore a “full variety of evidence – documents, artifacts, interview, and observations” making it a preferred strategy of choice when examining “contemporary events when the relevant behaviours’ cannot be manipulated” (Yin, 2003, p. 7-8).

The selection of the cases is non-random and purposeful, based on the type of organisation as well as the approach to regeneration delivery they adopt. Within
each of the cases, the study follows the evaluation of a particular project within the organisation. The research utilises a combination of retrospective as well as real time cases (two of each) which additionally serves to mitigate bias (Leonard-Barton, 1990). Furthermore, “highly knowledgeable” interviewees are sampled from different “hierarchical level, functional areas” within the organisations (project managers, project evaluators, senior management) as well as individuals from “other relevant organisations” (local authority liaison) (Eisenhardt and Graebner, 2007, p.28).

Seventeen informal interviews are carried out across the four different cases. These are unstructured discussion sessions primarily for the purpose of scoping relevant information and participants. They do not involve any audio recording as permission had not been granted to do so at this stage. They are followed by fifteen semi structured interviews of approximately one hour in length. Semi-structured interviews are recorded, transcribed, summarised and sent to participants for validation. The tools used in the interviews are structured around a data collection framework [See Appendix 1A] adapted from Dr. Margaret Nelson’s Framework for Case Study Development, which is based on one originally created by the Centre for Facilities Management (CFM) in order to undertake longitudinal studies within facilities management organisations. This research utilises the adapted framework within ‘inter’ as well as ‘intra’ case analysis, ensuring that comparable rich data is sampled from parallel fields within the individual cases. The research also provides an information participant sheet as well as an informed consent form in accordance with the University’s ethical procedures [See Appendix 1B]. Reported data obtained is anonymised, making participants more likely to be forthcoming with their responses particularly where sensitive issues are concerned. Clarke (2006, p.4) distinguishes between anonymity and confidentiality stating that the former refers to the non-disclosure of “a research participant’s identity”, while the latter is the non-disclosure to other parties of “the information gathered in the research process”. Following the first round of analysis, seven follow up interviews are carried out with the final case study organisation, feeding forward some of the findings into a pilot exercise evaluating the organisation’s social impact. This stage of the research reflects the participatory and interventionist nature of the study (see table 2.2) with improvements to the social impact assessment exercise as well as the design of
data collection tools jointly developed with the participants from the case study organisation.

Table 2.4 summarises the case studies utilised within the study

Table 2.4: Research Case Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODE OF REGENERATION DELIVERY</th>
<th>STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP</th>
<th>NIEGHBOURHOOD MANAGEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>The Rochdale Development Agency</td>
<td>Charlestown and Lower Kersal NDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE</td>
<td>Development Agency</td>
<td>New Deal for Communities Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT</td>
<td>Kingsway Business Park</td>
<td>One Central Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCURANCE</td>
<td>Retrospective</td>
<td>Real-time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.5 below represents the main components of a research paradigm in relation to elements of the study as discussed above.

Fig. 2.5: Components of a Research Paradigm (Adapted from: Hay, 2002 p.64)
2.3 Data Analysis

Data collected is analysed using a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods. As this is a mainly qualitative piece of work and there are no overarching dependent/independent variables to be analysed, the use of quantitative methods of analysis is limited and dependent of the nature of the data collected within the individual case studies, such as statistical information on indicators. The quantitative aspect of the analysis forms a smaller proportion of the analysis within the study, with the data being analysed using basic statistical techniques such as percentages and means in order to organise it and determine what it means (Kumar, 2005). The use of quantitative analysis software is limited to Microsoft Excel.

The majority of the data analysis is carried out using qualitative methods, focusing on answering the research questions by analysing experiences, interactions, communications and documents collected during the course of the study (Gibbs, 2007). The software of choice for the qualitative analysis is QSR’s Nvivo 9. This is decided upon following a review of other open source software packages available for the analysis of qualitative data including WEFT, Compendium, Transana, Coding Analysis Toolkit (CAT), and RQDA (Akinsete and Nisha, 2011). Table 2.5 presents a summary of the findings of the review, with Nvivo emerging to be the most robust tool available to undertake the analysis required. Data such as interviews are prepared by manual transcription prior to input into the qualitative analysis software in order to make every line of the interview more easily accessible. It is however important to exercise caution when using transcripts within qualitative analysis, so as not to decontextualise data during the coding process, thus losing sight of the bigger picture (Kvale, 1988). In addition to the transcription, interview summaries are also prepared. These serve the dual function of providing a form of data review and ensuring validity of the information collected as informants have the opportunity to review these summaries and provide feedback.
Table 2.5: Comparison of Qualitative Data Analysis Software (Source: Akinsete and Nisha, 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>WEFT</th>
<th>Compendium</th>
<th>Transana</th>
<th>Coding Analysis Toolkit (CAT)</th>
<th>RQDA</th>
<th>NVivo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Import Plain Text Files</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import PDF Files</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Audio Files</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Video Files</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Image Files</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical Coding</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boolean Search</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual mapping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-User Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports Foreign Languages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Advantages**
- WEFT: Free
  - Exports to HTML and CSV formats
- Compendium: Free
  - Plugs into VLEs e.g. Moodle
  - Visual Analysis with Mind maps
  - Drag and drop documents and websites onto a map
- Transana: Free
  - Supports clip manipulation
  - Provides backup on Transana Database
- Coding Analysis Toolkit (CAT): Free
  - Supports Coding of Raw Data
  - Supports export of codes
- RQDA: Free
  - Supports Categorizing of Raw Data
- NVivo: Supports the most Functions
  - Recommended by competition for textual analysis

**Disadvantages**
- WEFT: Does not support audio visual
- Compendium: Requires Quicktime Software
  - “for text-based analysis, N"Vivo can"t be beat” - (Transana, 2011)
- Transana: Requires Programming Knowledge
- Coding Analysis Toolkit (CAT): Requires Programming Knowledge
- RQDA: Boolean Search Requires Programming
- NVivo: Expensive
The case study approach utilised is idiographic focusing on the interplay of factors surrounding the particular case, accepting commonalities but crucially differences as well (Gibbs, 2007). As the nature of the research is inductive and seeks to unpick the nature of evaluation and impact assessment within regeneration, the analysis is centred around generating explanations relating to the focus of the study. The research also utilises thick description as a method of analysis. It is a method described as one which focuses on explaining what is going on within a given situation and answering the question “what is going on here?” (Gibbs, 2007 p.4). It allows the researcher to set the context (social, cultural or otherwise) and examine actions and relationships ‘in-situ’ (Holloway, 1979). Lincoln and Guba (1985) also suggest that the use of this method lends a measure of validity to the study.

Once inputted into the software, the data is analysed using a thematic coding method. The codification process involves the categorisation of sections within the data (Taylor and Gibbs, 2010), using a data led grounded theory approach in keeping with the research design. As data is manually coded, another round of data review takes place within this process, further mitigating error. Charmaz (2006) suggests that it is useful to ask ‘what’ questions in the formulation of descriptive codes, and questions around context issues taken for granted in the formulation of categorical and analytic codes. Taylor and Gibbs (2010), provide an extensive list of various types of phenomena that can be coded as well as examples, ranging from basic descriptive codes relating to specific acts events and activities to more analytical themes like consequences and reflexivity. Table 2.6 represents Taylor and Gibb’s list in the context of the study using examples that reflect the research.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHENOMENA</th>
<th>EXAMPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behaviours, specific acts</td>
<td>Stock taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events – short once in a lifetime events or things people have done that are often told as a story.</td>
<td>Making a case for funding’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities – these are of a longer duration, involve other people within a particular setting</td>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies, practice or tactics</td>
<td>Using procurement to stimulate local economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States – general conditions experienced by people or found in organisations</td>
<td>Pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meanings – A wide range of phenomena at the core of much qualitative analysis. Meanings and interpretations are important part of what directs participants’ actions.</td>
<td>Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. What concepts do participants use to understand their world? What norms, values, and rules guide their actions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. What meaning or significance it has for participants, how do they construe events what are the feelings</td>
<td>Frustration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. What symbols do people use to understand their situation? What names do they use for objects, events, persons, roles, setting and equipment?</td>
<td>Traffic light systems in identifying performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation – adaptation to a new setting or involvement</td>
<td>Change of government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships or interaction</td>
<td>Collaborative partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions or constraints</td>
<td>Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequences</td>
<td>Ownership breeds success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settings – the entire context of the events under study</td>
<td>Regeneration delivery organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexive – researcher’s role in the process, how intervention generated the data</td>
<td>Feedback during the real-time cases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The research once again borrows from grounded theory methods starting by the generation of open codes identifying different relevant phenomena, before refining them into axial codes where categories are developed and relationships explored. Finally the selective codes are identified as core categories which pull the theory together (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). The emergent theory is framed within Strauss and Corbin’s (1998) axial framework which is structured around six elements:

- Causal Conditions
- Phenomenon
- Action strategies
- Context
- Intervening conditions
- Consequences

These Elements are explained in table 2.7, and examples given based on one of the case studies examined within the research.

Table 2.7: Elements of Axial Coding Model (Strauss and Corbin, 1998; Gibbs 2007, Borgatti, 2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELEMENT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>EXAMPLE: OCP EVALUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phenomenon</td>
<td>This is the central idea, event, or incident that actions or interactions are centred around. It is the concept that holds the bits together.</td>
<td>Difficulty engaging participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal conditions</td>
<td>These are the events or variables that lead to the occurrence or development of the phenomenon. It is a set of causes and their properties.</td>
<td>Limited availability of certain members of staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action strategies</td>
<td>The purposeful, goal-oriented activities that agents perform in response to the phenomenon and intervening conditions.</td>
<td>Shorter interviews, Early notification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Locations of Events</td>
<td>OCP building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervening conditions</td>
<td>Conditions that shape, facilitate or constrain the strategies that take place within a specific context</td>
<td>Lack of time, new priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequences</td>
<td>These are the consequences of the action strategies, both intended and unintended.</td>
<td>Interviews secured, evaluation deadlines overrun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The process of codification and theory generation overlap, with memos (also available electronically within the software) serving as a vital tool to put down new ideas for a code, a quick hunch, questions about the data, alternative theories, or simply what is puzzling about the case (Gibbs, 2002). Strauss and Corbin (1998, p.148), recommend their use in the identification of selective codes by “writing a storyline” that integrates concepts. Glaser and Strauss, (1967, p.107) also suggest that the use of memos during the coding process helps to “tap the initial freshness of the analyst’s theoretical notions and to relive the conflict in his thoughts”. [See sections 7.1 and 7.2 for a more detailed discussion on the analytical procedures undertaken by the study].

The findings from the analysis of the data are reviewed in the discussion chapter, contrasting some of the emergent ideas with others within the literature before conclusions are drawn against the different objectives in the final chapter. This process of comparing findings to literature also serves as a measure of supplemental validity (Strauss and Corbin, 1990).

2.3.1 Validity and Reliability

The issues of validity, reliability and generalisability often constitute the source of a majority of the criticism surrounding research involving qualitative methods or methodologies (Denzin and Lincoln, 1998), Wolcott (1992) asserts that validity as a term tends to be over specified within the quantitative domain, creating confusion when relating it to the qualitative domain.

Gibbs (2007, p.152) defines validity in the context of qualitative research as “the extent to which an account accurately represents the social phenomena to which it refers”. This study not only utilises methods mentioned earlier such as the selection of well informed participants from various levels, participant review, thick description and literature comparison to ensure validity of data collected. It also utilises triangulation between the different case studies and respondents by engaging
participants from different organisational levels as well as organisations external but related to the case study organisations (Creswell and Miller, 1997).

Reliability refers to the ability of the study to be repeated, “in different circumstances, and with different investigators” (Gibbs, 2007, p.91). In the case of a study such as this one where the issues are highly contextualised, the reliability rests heavily with the construction of the research tools. Within this study research tools have been subject to internal peer review with the aid of presentations at research group meetings, discussions with supervisors, and discussions within an action learning set. They have also been subject to review via conference presentations and discussions with collaborators from external organisations.

Generalisability refers to the applicability of the findings to a wider range of circumstances. In the context of this study which focuses on specific cases, there is a danger of over-generalising, making it important to limit broad statements to “the groups and settings examined within the project” (Gibbs, 2007 p.100). However Denzin and Lincoln (1998, p.51) argue that “traditional thinking about generalisability falls short”, particularly where case study based research is concerned, as it limits “the ability of the researcher to reconceptualise the role of [their research] in education and human services”. They go on to state that “the value of the case study is in its uniqueness” as a result traditional notions of reliability and generalisability are inadequate, and summarily wish the academic community “can move beyond discussions of this trinity… and on to discussions of powerful statements from carefully done, rigorous studies that uncover the meanings of events in individuals lives”.

The credibility of a study essentially hinges on the quality of its data; how it is collected, how it is treated, and who handles it. Patton (1999) suggests that the issue of credibility deals with three main concerns:

- the rigour of the data collection and analysis
- the credibility of the researcher
- the philosophical underpinnings of the study
In the context of this study, the quality of the data set is ensured first of all by the purposeful sampling of the case study organisations. The selection of the case study organisations is informed by extensive literature review (Loftman and Nevin, 1995; UTF, 1999; Brown, 2002; Roberts and Sykes, 2000; CLG, 2008b, 2010b), with organisations selected to represent the main forms of regeneration delivery in the Northwest of England. They are chosen for their distinctive projects, as well as the combinations of the dimensions of sustainability they characterise within their respective approaches. The first two case studies adopt a partnership approach to delivering regeneration (English Partnerships, 2009); with case study one focusing on local economic stimulation which incorporates economic and physical elements of development, while case study two deals with knowledge and enterprise exchange, which focuses on a combination of socially and economically led regeneration. The next two case studies adopt a neighbourhood management approach (Social Exclusion Unit, 2001). While case study three is socially driven with elements of physical (and economic) regeneration, case study four is primarily environmentally/physically driven with elements of social and economic regeneration. The selected array of case studies creates a rich pool of information for data collection. Furthermore as a combination of both real-time and retrospective case studies are undertaken, this temporal span serves to increase validity by providing perspective and mitigating bias (Leonard-Barton, 1990). As the individual case studies are all unique, the utilisation of a traditional pilot case study (Hall, 2008) proves ineffective due the amount of variation between cases, both in their approaches to evaluation activity as well as the role of the researcher. However, the data collection framework is piloted during the first part of case study 4 (which in chronological order, occurs before any of the other case studies). Interview methods, data preparation methods (transcription and summarising) as well as forms of technology used (transcription pedal, transcription software, and analysis software) are reviewed and refined with learning informing the processes undertaken within the other case studies (van Teijlingen and Hundly, 2001) [see epilogue].

A range of highly knowledgeable participants [see appendix 1C] are sampled for interview, cutting across various stakeholder groups both within and outside the case study organisations. Participants are chosen using a combination of selective
sampling and ‘snowballing’. They are selected based on their experience and roles in relation to the case study project, as well as based on recommendations from other participants. While the experience of these participants lends a certain amount of credibility to the data obtained from them, collecting data not only from different hierarchical levels within the organisations, but also from other relevant organisations adds validity by providing triangulation of data sources (Patton, 1999; Eisenhardt and Graebner 2007). Data is collected using a case study framework based on an existing one developed by Dr. Nelson specifically for use within case studies. Questions are set under fixed headings which guide the data collection process across all the case studies [see appendix 1A]. The fact that the foundations of the framework utilised by the current study have been tried and tested (Kaya and Alexander, 2005) and is currently being used by other PhD students, is a testament to its credibility. Furthermore, as the original framework adapted by Dr. Nelson was developed by the Centre for Facilities Management in order to conduct longitudinal studies, the emphasis is on the collection of similar data along parallel themes of inquiry thus ensuring the reliability of the interview questions.

Summaries of interview transcripts are sent out to interviewees for validation prior to analysis. The primary form of analysis is via qualitative textual analysis, using thematic coding. While the analytic software utilised allows for computerised coding, the data is manually coded to mitigate against the decontextualisation of the data during the coding process (Kvale, 1988). The generated codes are then analysed using an axial coding framework (Straus and Corbin, 1998; Gibbs, 2007). The use of a combination of interview data and archival data (including quantitative data) during the case study analysis, as well as the multiple levels of analysis [see sections 7.1 and 7.2] at case study level and across cases provides both data and methods triangulation (Patton, 1999).

With regards to Patton’s second aspect of credibility, that of the researcher, he acknowledges that while there is no definitive set of criteria to address the credibility of the investigator, the fact the researcher serves as the primary instrument of
investigation means that issues like training, experience and preparation ought to be given some import. In the context of this study, the researcher possesses extensive knowledge of research methods and holds a masters qualification. In addition, the researcher has produced award winning work, conducting a mixed methods enquiry in the field of urban regeneration (Akinsete, 2005). Furthermore, over the course of the study the researcher is involved in the conduct of evaluation activity within the two real-time case studies, thus providing practical hands on experience in the context of the study, as well as an opportunity to validate preliminary findings by feeding forward emergent learning within the final case study [see sections 6.3.3 and 6.3.6.1].

The final element of credibility considers a study’s philosophical underpinnings. The context of this study “in a diverse world” implies that “one aspect of [that] diversity is methodological”. As such, the justification of the research approach adopted within this study is inherently due to the appropriateness of the blended methodologies chosen (Patton 1990; 1999, p.1208). The research design outlined in figure 2.4 is pieced together like parts of a puzzle in which different elements fit together in a form that best addresses the research questions. As an inquiry which is inductive by nature, the study lends itself to a grounded theory approach (Straus and Corbin, 1998; Gibbs, 2007). Its ties to a pragmatist philosophy (Creswell, 2009) [see section 2.1.1] coupled with the multifaceted nature of its foci (regeneration, sustainable development, and evaluation) and the variety of data sources, see the adoption of multiple methods as appropriate (Mayring et al, 2007, Tashakkori and Teddlie, 1998; 2003).

The “social intent” (McNiff, 2003, p.2) of this study situates it under the function/concept driven paradigm clusters [see section 2.1.1], therefore an action oriented and participative style that provides real world access is essential. As such, the case study strategy is adopted seeing that it offers in-depth insights set within live contexts (Platt, 1992; Yin, 2003; Eisenhardt and Graebner, 2007). Furthermore, the participation of the researcher in real-time case studies as an evaluation
practitioner, makes the adoption of elements of an action research framework (such as the reflective cycle depicted in figure 1.3) a useful structure to guide activity (Kember, 2000; Stringer, 2007). Action learning sets made up of other researchers within the faculty, led by Dr. Margaret Nelson and Dr. Donna Vick (formerly of the Raven Institute) helped inform the development of the study. In addition, weekly faculty research group meetings also set up by Dr. Nelson created a space for ongoing presentations and discussions with members of staff as well as other researchers, thereby providing an aspect of peer review over the course of the study. The use of these elements of an action research framework within the study not only ensure that theory generated by the study is embedded within the practical context (McNiff and Whitehead, 2002), but also provides a basis from which to consider issues such as reflexivity (Greenwood and Levin, 1998). In addition, this action research framework serves to inform the development of the researcher’s own practice [see epilogue].
2.4 Summary

This study adopts a pragmatist philosophical stance and utilises mixed methodologies in the examination of the research topic. It uses a grounded theory approach in order to generate emergent ideas and themes form the data. The research is undertaken with the aid of a case study strategy, exploring evaluation within four different regeneration delivery mechanisms in the Northwest of England. It can therefore be described as a piece of research on evaluation.

The study uses both qualitative as well as quantitative data from primary, secondary and tertiary sources. The data is collected using different data collection methods ranging from desktop study to semi structured interviews. The data collected from the interviews is structured around a case study framework adapted from an existing one for the purpose of this research. Data is analysed using both quantitative and qualitative methods, with the aid of software such as Excel and Nvivo. The quantitative analysis involves basic statistical techniques, while the qualitative analysis largely consists of a content analysis using thematic codes.

The next chapter will critically review existing literature on the issue of evaluation in regeneration and sustainable development. It will explore the concepts of regeneration and sustainable development; defining the terms, reviewing stakeholders as well as going over the history of delivery in the UK.
CHAPTER 3

REGENERATION AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

“If there are to be problems, may they come during my life-time so that I can resolve them and give my children the chance of a good life”

- Anon (date unknown)
This chapter will provide a critical review of existing literature on regeneration and sustainable development, as well as provide some key definitions for central concepts in the context of the study. It examines the issue of sustainable development breaking it down into its component dimensions, and provides a timeline for the evolution of the field. It also reviews the implications of sustainable development in the context of a sustainable community. Furthermore, it examines the issue of urban regeneration, and considers the key stakeholders involved in the process. It will go on to explore the development of urban regeneration in the UK, reviewing the different strategic approaches that have been adopted for the purpose of regeneration delivery in the UK.

3.1 Key Definitions

Regeneration:

Regeneration is the “response to the opportunities and challenges which are presented by urban degeneration in a particular place at a particular time” (Roberts and Sykes, 2000 p.9). In the context of this study, regeneration refers to activities associated with redevelopment in towns and cities with areas suffering from decline, in other words ‘urban regeneration’ [See section 3.2.2]. These areas tend to be characterised by poor infrastructure, social deprivation and economic decline, and regeneration refers to the drive to revitalise these areas. The three distinctive features of urban regeneration as highlighted by Turok (2004, p.57) are:

- The intent to change the nature of a place and involve the community and other stakeholders
- The incorporation of multiple objectives and activities cutting across the main functional responsibilities of central government (depending on the challenges and opportunities of an area)
- The utilisation of some form of partnership working by the different stakeholders
Sustainable Development:

There are several definitions offered for the term, but the widely accepted definition is provided by the World Commission on Environment and Development in their 1987 publication ‘Our Common Future’. It refers to sustainable development as "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" (The World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987 p.43). In considering the concept of sustainable development it is necessary to view the world as a system within which space and time are connected. A system where actions in a particular place or area have implications in others, and causes in particular points in time, result in effects further down the line. Sustainable development takes into consideration of environmental (both physical infrastructure and ecology), economic and social aspects of the development process, holding at its core the concept of a good quality of life for all stakeholders within this system (International Institute of Sustainable Development, 2012). [See section 3.2.1]

Stakeholder:

A stakeholder is any individual or group of individuals with a key interest in an evaluand or evaluation. In most cases these tend to overlap and include funders, managers, project workers, target population, other practitioners in the field, policy makers, politicians, and academics (Green and South, 2006). For the purpose of this study, stakeholders will refer to all participants in and beneficiaries of urban regeneration including funders, delivery agencies and professionals, policy makers, developers and community members. [See section 3.2.3]
Delivery Mechanisms:

In the context of this study, mechanisms refer to the means by which urban regeneration is delivered. These include regeneration delivery vehicles such as arms length organisations, urban regeneration companies, urban regeneration partnerships, new deal for communities and all other urban regeneration agencies and organisations. [See section 3.3]

Evaluation:

Evaluation can be defined as the “systematic examination and assessment of the features of an initiative and its effects in order to produce information that can be used by those who have an interest in its improvement or effectiveness” (WHO, 1998 p.3a). In the context of this study it refers to the process of measuring or assessing the success of a project or programme with the aim of learning lessons, (both positive and negative) that can inform future activities (CLES, 2009). There are various forms of ‘evaluation type’ activities such as reviewing, auditing, accounting, performance measurement and monitoring, however evaluation goes a step further taking the results from these various forms of assessment and asking the question ‘What does this mean?’. [See section 4.1]

Evaluand:

The term evaluand refers to the subject of an evaluation. This may be a project, programme, product, policy, proposal, process or person. In the instance of the subject being an individual, they are referred to as an evaluee (Wheeler et al, 1992). In the context of this study the evaluand will generally refer to an urban regeneration project or programme.
3.2 Getting to Grips with Regeneration and Sustainable Development

3.2.1 Deconstructing Sustainable Development

Despite its prevalent citation and common use the Bruntland Commission (1987) [see section 3.1] offers a circular definition of the term sustainable development, defining it in terms of itself and assuming there is a consensus on what constitutes the word development. ‘Sustainable Development’ is a compound term which requires the examination of its component elements in order to determine its essence.

The Oxford Dictionary (2012) defines development as a “specified state of growth or advancement”. The term may be applied to a wide range of activities, from the physical growth of an individual, e.g. the physical development of a child from infancy through adolescence and into adulthood (Kimberly, 2010), to the progress of entire areas or communities. Depending on one’s perspective this large scale view of development may be considered in the physical sense as the process of “converting land to a new purpose by constructing buildings or making use of its resources” (Oxford University Press, 2012, p.1) or an economic one as the process of “increasing the wealth of countries or regions for the well-being of their inhabitants” (Economics for Development, 2012). In the social context, development represents an increase in “freedom and standards of living, including health, sanitation, education and more” (Wagner, 2010, p.1). More recently alternative thinking around what constitutes development have also been put forward, which is based on political resistance and a more people-oriented focus where the local community are given a voice and power regarding their progress (Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement, 2009; Adler, 2012; Moore et al, 2007). Other theories of development are centred on religious value systems that espouse contentment and simplicity (Coordinating Group for Religion in Society, 2012).

Sustainability is a word that has come to be applied to a plethora of terms, “used frequently in many different combinations” (Olsson et al, 2004, p.3). “All of a sudden everything is sustainable… from products and lifestyles to business practices and
reporting requirements” (Hendrickson, 2012, p.1). Terms are used such as sustainable agriculture, sustainable industry, sustainable cities, sustainable medicine, sustainable architecture, sustainable manufacturing, and even sustainable capitalism, but the question of what is actually meant by the word sustainability still remains (Olsson et al, 2004; Thompson, 2010). The origins of the word sustainability lie in the Latin sustinēre, meaning ‘to hold’ (Mariam-Webster, 2007).

Clark et al (1997, p. 17) cite Salwasser’s (1993) definition of sustainability as the “ability to produce and/or maintain a desired set of conditions or things for some time into the future, not necessarily forever”. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) suggest that the central principle of sustainability is based on the idea that all that is needed for survival and well being depends, either directly or indirectly, on the natural environment, therefore creating and maintaining “conditions under which humans and nature can exist in productive harmony, that permits the fulfilment of the social, economic and other requirements of present and future generations” (EPA, 2011, p.1). Moore (2007, p.223) makes a case for the consideration of sustainability as a storyline, as opposed to a scientific condition or concept. He argues that “sustainability is not a fixed condition but a dynamic meta-story line” which charts the plot evolution of a place’s social political, environmental and technological stories. This view of sustainability in terms of an ongoing dialogue between human activity and the evolution of nature highlights the temporal aspect of sustainability in relation to place. It considers the connection between time and space bound within a system with a past, present and future. (International Institute of Sustainable Development, 2012).

Thompson (2010, p.20-22) puts forward two different theoretical constructs for the term sustainability; the first being “resource sufficiency” and the second “functional integrity”. Viewing sustainability in terms of resource efficiency interprets it form a utilitarian perspective whereby “sustainability is a measure of the duration of practices that produce wellbeing”. On the other hand sustainability as functional integrity relates to “the mechanisms that allow whole systems such as societies and ecosystems to maintain their activity over time”. The two theoretical constructs at times lie in opposition to one another, a tension illustrated by Thompson’s “extreme” reflection on the subject of murder. He suggests that from a resource sufficient standpoint, murder can be sustainable within a society so long as there are people
being born, however this jeopardises the sustainability of said society from a functional integrity perspective. He goes on to debate the use of sustainability as a basis for value systems, highlighting the fact that the sustainability of an action in itself does not provide any indication of its moral standing. Sustainability alone does not denote some form of intrinsic good, but reflects a “relative equilibrium among social and natural subsystems”.

The term sustainable development is used for the first time by the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN), in their 1980 report ‘World Conservation Strategy: Living Resources for Sustainable Development’. In a 1991 joint publication with the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the World Wide Fund For Nature (WWF) entitled ‘Caring for the Earth: A Strategy for Sustainable Living’, they build on Bruntland’s 1987 definition of sustainable development, describing it as “improving the quality of human life while living within the carrying capacity of supporting ecosystem” (IUCN, UNEP and WWF, 1991, p.9). Both reports highlight the underlying role played by sustainable development in the improvement of quality of life. ‘Caring for the Earth’ also discusses criticisms following Bruntland (1987) of the definition of sustainable development as being “ambiguous and open to a wide range of interpretations, many of which are contradictory.” The report responds by stating that the confusion has arisen due to the misappropriations of the term and its use interchangeably with terms such as “sustainable growth and sustainable use as though their meanings were the same”. It goes on to elaborate on these terms stating that “sustainable growth is a contradiction in terms since nothing physical can grow indefinitely” while “sustainable use is applicable only to renewable resources as it means using them at rates within their capacity for renewal” (IUCN, WWF and UNEP, 1991 p.9). The report also defines sustainable economy as:

“the product of sustainable development which maintains its natural resource base and can continue to develop by adapting, through improvements in knowledge, organization, technical efficiency, and wisdom”

- IUCN, WWF and UNEP, 1991 p.9
Another important post Brundtland report is ‘Our Common Journey: A Transition toward Sustainability’ published by the Board on Sustainable Development of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences. In light of the criticisms about the ambiguity of the definition of sustainable development the board investigated the “essential strategic connections between scientific research, technological development, and societies’ efforts to achieve environmentally sustainable improvements in human well-being” (National Academy of Sciences, 1999 p.2). The report distinguishes between what sustainable development advocates intend to sustain and what they intend to develop. It then goes on to highlight both how the two aspects are connected as well as the timeframes within which these relationships take place (See Fig. 3.1) (Kates, Parris, and Leiserowitz, 2005).

In seeking to define a concept, pragmatic philosopher William James suggests that “if you follow the pragmatic method, one cannot look on any such word as closing the quest… but set it at work within the stream of experience” (James, 2009, p.43). Taking this into consideration the meaning of a word does not lie in providing it with a definition, but in drawing meaning from its practical application in the context of its use (James, 1904). Therefore in applying this thinking to defining sustainable development, it is important to consider it in its application. The next section reviews the prevailing dimensions of sustainable development, as applied in the context of this study.
3.2.1.1 Dimensions of Sustainable Development

The concept of sustainable development can be distilled into three distinct strands; Environmental, Economic and Social which concern conservation, growth and equity respectively (UNESCO, 2007). There are various models that depict the relationship between these three dimensions. Widely used models include the triangle models, with the three points representing the three different strands of sustainable development (Marco, 2005) as well as the concentric circles model (Williams, 2008).
Computing for Sustainability (2011) discuss the interlocking circles model which depicts each of the pillars of sustainable development within a different circle in the form of a venn diagram as shown in figure 3.2. This particular model acknowledges the intersections of the three different factors and how they all combine to create sustainability. It highlights how one dimension in isolation, or even two dimensions out of the three would not contribute to sustainable development. The interlocking circles model can also be used in the visual representation of sustainability reports, with the size of the circles representing performance in the context of a particular dimension (Newman, 2011).

Fig. 3.2: The Realms of Sustainable Development (Source: Willard, 2010)
Environmental Sustainability:

The environmental dimension of sustainable development can be described as the basis of the concept of sustainability. Kidd (1992, p.5) argues that the term sustainability was founded in ecology “long before it was used in the context of the interdependency between man and nature”. This study identifies two strands of environmental sustainability. The first, which tends to have a higher profile, is ecological sustainability. It relates to the natural environment and the balance therein. The second is physical sustainability, which refers to the built environment and the sustainability of the materials from which it is constructed, as well as the sustainability of the infrastructure and systems of which it is composed.

Ecological Sustainability

Ecological sustainability demands that “humanity must take no more from nature than nature can replenish. This in turn means adopting lifestyles and development paths that respect and work within nature's limits” (IUCN, UNEP and WWF, 1991, p.8). It reflects the ability to maintain natural resources, biodiversity and other ecosystem functions over time. Ecological sustainability recognises that the earth’s resources are finite is concerned with the environmental system’s ability to keep up with the consumption of its natural resources as well as its capacity to withstand the waste material produced by human activity (Harris, 2000; SOGESID, 2012). Ludwig (1997), discusses Pimm’s (1991) views on the balance of nature, and resilience of a system as its potential to maintain its structure or function following disruption. Genetic diversity gives rise to resilience in ecosystems, and in this context “natural resource degradation, pollution and loss of biodiversity are detrimental” as they increase vulnerability, undermine the stability of the environmental system, and reduce resilience. This idea applies to both natural (and wild) and managed (or agricultural) systems, as well as man-made rural and urban areas (Munasinghe, 2007 p.2). Ecological sustainability can therefore be defined as the ability of the environment to support a defined level of environmental quality and natural resource extraction while assuring the protection and the renewal of natural resources (Thwink, 2012; SOGESID, 2012).
Ecological sustainability deals with issues such as climate change, which is one that has gained considerable prominence in recent years (IISD, 2010). This focuses on the relationship between human activity and the environmental system, and takes into consideration issues surrounding greenhouse gas emissions and the effect they have on the environment (EPA, 2012). The issue of climate change is contentious as sceptics challenge the role human activity and its resultant carbon emissions play in the rising global warming phenomenon. They put forward various arguments ranging from the idea that the earth has undergone major climatic changes in the past independent of human activity and that current modelling systems are unreliable (Lindzen, 2009; Dyson, 2007), to the notion that the earth is actually cooling as opposed to warming (Svensmark, 2009). However evidence such as the recovery of the ozone layer (NASA, 2006) which has been linked to global action and lifestyle changes following Rowland and Molina’s report (1974) on the use and effect of chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) has lent some credibility to the case for human activity having a considerable impact on the environment. Following the Kyoto protocol (1997) which outlines targets for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, most governments have adopted environmental sustainability initiatives, with governments across the European Union seeking to reduce their carbon emissions by 20% by the year 2020 (Directorate-General for Climate Action, 2012). That said nations such as the United States and China, two of the largest carbon emitters are yet to sign up to the protocol. This has called the credibility and usefulness of the protocol into question, and in 2011 led to countries such as Canada, Japan and Russia declining to renew their commitments to the protocol (The Guardian, 2011). However, with questions surrounding the future of the Kyoto protocol the United Nations’ Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in Durban saw the creation of a possible successor for the protocol in the new Durban Accord (Singapore Institute of International Affairs, 2011).
Physical Sustainability

This refers to the physical structures that make up the built environment in the context of their impact on the ecosystem and the natural environment. The concept of physical sustainability goes further to include infrastructure such as transportation systems (e.g. roads, railway and metro networks, bridges etc.), and not just their ecological impact but their role in maintaining social-economic balance. The built environment includes all buildings and living spaces that are created, or modified, by people. In addition to the buildings and spaces themselves, it also includes the infrastructural elements such as waste management, transportation and utility transmission systems put in place to serve this building space (Sarkis et al, 2009). Physical sustainability considers the interaction between the built environment and other elements of a given geography including local communities, economies and ecologies. The discourse around the sustainability of the built environment can be grouped under three headings:

- The development of the built environment
- The use and maintenance of the built environment
- The socio economic impact of the built environment.

Physical sustainability in terms of developing the built environment centres primarily on aspects relating to the construction process, and the use of environmentally friendly and socially considerate construction materials and practices. In this sense, physical sustainability regards issues such as the selection of sustainable materials, minimisation of site waste, and noise pollution as a result of activity on site (Langston and Ding, 2001; HM Government, 2008). This heading also considers the transportation of raw materials to the site as well as the removal of waste from the site (Anderson et al, 2009).

The maintenance of the built environment considers the operation, running, refurbishment and upkeep of the man-made physical environment. With the built environment accounting for over 40% of global energy consumption (Clarke et al, 2008; Arup, 2011), usage over the lifespan of constructed facilities is a major factor of physical sustainability. Furthermore, in temperate climates, the impact due to
building maintenance and operations, outweigh those of the actual construction of the structures (Deakin et al, 2007). The maintenance aspect of physical sustainability requires a ‘whole-lifecycle’ approach to the structures (Langston and Lauge-Kristensen, 2002) from sourcing of raw materials, through use, repair and refurbishment to decommissioning and demolition (Anderson, Shires and Steele, 2009). While associated with the earlier stages of the construction process, design and specification play a vital role in the sustainability of a structure in terms of maintenance and use.

The final heading relating to physical sustainability considers the socio economic impact of the built environment, something which tends to be overshadowed by the purely physical elements as discussed above. The built environment and its related processes have a significant impact on quality of life (Shelburne et al, 2006), with research demonstrating that proximity to green space bears a correlation to reduced mortality rates (NHS Cambridgeshire, 2011). Furthermore, the way in which the built environment is shaped has the ability to influence activity levels, while encouraging more sustainable forms of transportation such as walking and cycling (National Centre for Environmental Health, 2011). The accessibility of these same transportation links play a vital role in connecting residents of different communities to employment as well as one another; thereby playing a part in their economic as well as social wellbeing. Built environment’s economic significance is further displayed as the construction industry accounts for 8.5% of the UK’s GDP (UK Contractor’s Group, 2009) and approximately 9% of the global GDP (Confederation of International Contractors' Associations, 2012). It is a major factor to consider in terms of its role in broader view of sustainability, and more specifically the interrelationship between the environmental dimension and the social and economic dimensions of sustainability.
Economic Sustainability:

The Building Research Establishment (BRE) suggests that “being sustainable is as much about efficient profit-orientated practice and value for money as it is about helping the environment” (Brownhill and Rao, 2002, p.2). Economic sustainability seeks to generate the maximum flow of income while maintaining the stock of assets (natural, human and otherwise) which yield this income (Munasinghe, 2007). According to SOGESID, (2012) it reflects in particular the capacity of a system to generate incomes and employment in order to sustain its population.

It is characterised by the relationship between benefits and costs, and is constrained by anything that disrupts this balance. Economic sustainability requires that these gains either meet or surpass the costs; however any drive to ensure costs are kept low should not negatively impact upon the social and environmental aspects of the system. This means that an economically sustainable system must seek to use resources in ways that “do not damage the environment nor impair the capacity of renewable resources to continually replenish their stocks” (Munro, 1995 p.5).

Growth is a core issue concerning economic sustainability, and the concept of sustainable growth has emerged as a source of contention among experts. Despite its common usage, the term is branded an oxymoron as growth cannot be maintained indefinitely (IUCN, WWF and UNEP, 1991). Daly and Townsend (1993, p.267) discuss this contradiction, stating that as an “economic subsystem grows it incorporates an ever greater proportion of the total ecosystem into itself and must reach a limit at 100 percent… therefore its growth is not sustainable”. They go on to discuss the difference between growth and development, defining the former as a natural increase “in size by the addition of material through assimilation or accretion”, and the latter as the expansion or realisation of potential “to bring gradually to a fuller, greater, or better state”. They surmise that “when something grows it gets bigger; when something develops it gets different”, meaning that though the economy must eventually stop growing, it can continue to develop. More importantly it is possible to have "development without growth".
In recent years the global economic crisis has brought the issue of economic sustainability to the fore, calling into question not only the financial models that led to the crash but also the values they were built upon (Brandon and Lombardi, 2005). This has led to discussions around alternative models of economic development such as Sustainomics, a “meta-framework for making development more sustainable, which is transdisciplinary, integrative, comprehensive, balanced, heuristic and practical.” (Munasinghe, 1994 p.2). Its four defining principles are

- Making development more sustainable (MDMS) with empowerment, action and foresight
- Harmonising the sustainable development triangle for balance and integration
- Transcending conventional boundaries with innovation and fresh ideas
- Full cycle application of integrative tools for practical implementation

- Munasinghe, 2012

Other models around resilience have also been put forward by the Centre for Local Economic Strategies (CLES). In the wake of the financial crisis the CLES presents “a new strategic conceptual model for thinking about how local economies operate” which forms part of a broader place-based resilience framework. It argues that “economic development deals badly with adverse change; there is too heavy an emphasis on growth and traditional economic issues opposed to environmental concerns; and that economic development has been too one dimensional” (CLES, 2010 p.7). It makes the case for reduced emphasis on economic growth and greater emphasis on the ability of and economy to withstand major shocks. A view shared by Munasinghe (2007) and the Sustainomics model.
Social Sustainability:

Social sustainability can be defined as the ability to guarantee the welfare of a system, taking into consideration equitable distribution of provision for security, health, and education among social actors (SOGESID, 2012; Harris, 2000). In the past the concept of socially sustainability has received less attention than that of environmental sustainability (Hancock, 2007) but is quickly gaining prominence as the world develops its thinking and practice around sustainable development. It reflects how “individuals, communities and societies live with each other and set out to achieve the objectives of development models, which they have chosen for themselves taking also into account the physical boundaries of their places and planet earth as a whole” (Colantonio, 2009, p.8).

Social sustainability also relates to the relationship between development and current social norms based on religion, tradition, and custom in the context of social and cultural systems. (Munro, 1995 p.4) describes these norms as having to do with:

“ethics, value systems, language, education, family, and other interpersonal relations (including between sex and age groups), hierarchies and class systems, work attitudes, tolerance, and all other aspects of individual or group behaviour that are not primarily motivated by economic considerations”

He goes on to highlight the fact that these norms are changeable, citing the status of women in certain societies as an example of how attitudes considered acceptable in the short term are subject to change in the longer term. This once again brings to bear the concept of resilience, and the importance of the ability of social and cultural systems, to withstand shocks (Munro, 1995; Munasinghe, 2007). Social sustainability also reflects the capacity of the different stakeholders in a system to interact efficiently, towards the same goals, thereby making issues like war, endemic poverty, widespread injustice, and low education rates symptoms of a socially unsustainable system (Thwink, 2012; Harris, 2000).
3.2.1.2 Sustainable Communities

“Urban planning and development has long been fixated on the community's hard infrastructure the sewers, the roads and the electrical, gas and water utilities and other aspects of the physical structure that define the community's form. But a community is much, much more than its physical form. A community is composed of people as well as the places where they live; it is as much a social environment as a physical environment.”

- Hancock, 2007 p.1

As discussed earlier the concept of sustainable development is a dynamic one, and this “malleability allows places from local to global and institutions of government, civil society, business, and industry to each project their interests, hopes, and aspirations onto the banner of sustainable development.” (Kates, Parris, and Leiserowitz, 2005 p.10). The concept of a sustainable community involves the application of all three dimensions of sustainable development within a community. A sustainable community explores the interrelation between the different aspects of sustainable development as stated by the European Economic Area Grants (2006, p.3). It considers:

- the environment as the necessary **basis** for sustainable development
- the economy as the **tool** to achieve sustainable development
- the good life for all (the social dimension) is the **target** of sustainable development
Munasinghe (1992) considers the role of sustainable development within a sustainable community from a largely people-focused perspective; stating that central to the functions of any sustainable community is a process that seeks to improve the range of opportunities available to members, in order for them to reach their full potential over a sustained period of time. The interactions between the key elements of sustainability around a sustainable community which consider the wealth, equity and environment of its members is represented in figure 3.3.

Fig. 3.3: Key elements of sustainable development and interconnections (Source: Munasinghe, 1992)
The term community in itself is one with a variety of different meaning, ranging from residents of an area to members of a particular group. It is linked to locality, similarity of interests, shared cultural and ethnic ideas and values, a way of life and even a sense of belonging (Hird, 2003). The Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DETR/DEFRA) (1997) define the characteristics of a community as based on:

- **Personal attributes:** age, gender, ethnicity, kinship
- **Beliefs:** religious, cultural, political
- **Economic position:** employment status, income, housing tenure
- **Skills:** educational experience, professional qualifications
- **Relationship to local services:** tenants, patients, carers, providers
- **Place:** attachments to neighbourhood village, city or nation

Building on the Hancock’s (2007) notion of community stated at the beginning of this section, one can make a distinction between a local population and a community, considering that the term community “adds connotations of people identifying with the place and each other, interacting with each other, helping each other and making common cause.” (DETR, 2003, p.13).

Beatley and Manning (1997) suggest that a sustainable community is one which strives towards minimising its ecological impact, while providing humane living conditions and a high quality of life for its citizens. Egan (2004, p.18) builds on the definition of sustainable development provided by the Brundtland commission (1987) stating that a sustainable community as one which “meets the diverse needs of existing and future residents, their children and other users, contribute to a high quality of life and provide opportunity and choice”. He goes on to state that it “achieves this in a way that makes effective use of natural resources, enhances the environment, promotes social cohesion and inclusion and strengthens economic
prosperity”. Egan identifies the components that make up a sustainable community, represented on the ‘Egan Wheel’ (see figure 3.4).
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Fig. 3.4: Components of Sustainable Communities (Source: Egan, 2004, p.19)

The Manchester City Council (2002, p.24) also outline five key factors they consider necessary for sustainability within a community:

- **Stable economic foundations**: the amount of money circulating within the locality should be able to support shops, recreational, health and other community facilities
• **Good quality of life:** measured in terms of educational provision, a safe and pleasant environment, good health, the absence of crime

• **Strong local community networks and organisations:** both in terms of the support they give to residents and the extent to which they are valued by residents

• **Good quality public services:** the quality of management of local neighbourhoods

• **Access and choice:** the ability of all residents to access homes suited to their needs and aspirations

They take the idea that people are at the heart of any sustainable community a step further and emphasise the position of the locus of control within the community. They advocate the empowerment of community members, stating that a sustainable community is ultimately built on the exercise of choice. That said, the choices made must be sustainable ones for the equilibrium within the system to be maintained. IUCN, WWF and UNEP (1991, p.7) suggest that the ability for community to exist sustainably hinges on its citizens “accepting a duty to seek harmony with other people and with nature”. They go on to outline nine principles a sustainable society lives by as:

- Respect and care for the community of life
- Improve the quality of human life
- Conserve the Earth's vitality and diversity
- Minimize the depletion of non-renewable resources
- Keep within the Earth's carrying capacity
- Change personal attitudes and practices
- Enable communities to care for their own environments
- Provide a national framework for integrating development and conservation
- Forge a global alliance
3.2.1.3 Sustainable Development Timeline
This section provides a timeline for sustainable development, outlining some of the key milestones in the evolution of the field.

**Pre - ‘Sustainable Development’**

- **1853** Smoke Nuisance Abatement (Metropolis) Act
  - Sought to abate nuisance from the smoke of furnaces in the Metropolis and from steam vessels above London (Birks, 2012)

- **1892** Sierra Club Founded
  - The largest and most influential grassroots environmental organization in the United States. Works to protect communities, wild places, and the planet itself. (Sierra Club, 2012)

- **1955** The Clean Air Act
  - Passed in response to London’s Great Smog of 1952, and introduced ‘smoke control areas’ in some towns and cities in which only smokeless fuels could be burnt

- **1962** Silent Spring (Carlson, 1962) is published
  - The book highlights the damage to health and animal species brought on by the use of pesticides. It brings interrelationship between the environment, economy and social wellbeing to the fore (ISO, 2002)

**Post - ‘Sustainable Development’**

- **1963** British Alkali Act
  - Sought to address severe problems due to emissions from industrial plants manufacturing alkalis such as sodium carbonate and sodium hydroxide which caused extensive damage to vegetation. (Benn, 2012)

- **1955** The Air Pollution Control Act
  - First US federal air pollution legislation. Funded research for scope and sources of air pollution. (EPA, 2012)

- **1961** World Wide Fund For Nature (WWF) established
  - An international fundraising organization to work in collaboration with existing conservation groups and bring substantial financial support to the conservation movement on a worldwide scale (WWF, 2012)

- **1967** Environmental Defence Fund (EDF) Established
  - Seeking to preserve the natural systems on which all life depends (EDF, 2011)
1960
Biosphere Intergovernmental Conference for Rational Use and Conservation of Biosphere is held
Organised by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), it is the first intergovernmental conference examining how to reconcile the conservation and use of natural resources (Fundy Biosphere Reserve, 2012)

Population Bomb (Erlich, 1968) is published
Discusses connection between human population, resource exploitation and the environment (IIISD, 2002)

1970
Report of the Commission on International Development published
First of the international commissions to consider new approach to development, focused on research and knowledge in the South. Led to the formation of the International Development Research Centre (IDRC). (IIISD, 2002)

First Earth Day held
An estimated 20 million people participated in peaceful demonstrations across the U.S. (IIISD, 2002)

1972
UN Conference on Human Environment held
The conference leads to establishing many national environmental protection agencies and the United Nations Environment Programme (IIISD, 2002)

Limits to Growth Published
Environment Programme (IIISD, 2002)

1974
Work on Chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) published (Rowland & Molina, 1974)
Stated that continuous use of CFCs would deplete ozone layer (Rowland, 1997)

1968
Friends of the Earth Established
Not for profit organisation dedicated to achieving a just and healthy world, is by focusing on the economic drivers that are encouraging environmental degradation (Friends of the Earth, 2012)

1969
Founex Report is published
Calls for the integration of environment and development strategies (IIISD, 2002)

International Institute for Environment & Development (IIEDE) established
Mandate to seek ways to make economic progress without destroying the environmental resource base (IIISD, 2002)

Endangered Species Act
Seeks to better safeguard, the benefit of all citizens, the nation's heritage in fish, wildlife and plants

OPEC oil crisis
fuels limits to growth debate

1973
Worldwatch Institute established
Seeks to raise public awareness of global environmental threats and catalyze effective policy responses; begins publishing annual State of the World in 1984. (IIISD, 2002)
1987
Our Common Future Brundtland published
Development Advisory Committee evolve guidelines for environment and development in bilateral aid policies
Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer is adopted

1990
UN Summit for Children
Important recognition of the impact of the environment on future generations
International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) established

1993
First meeting of the UN Commission on Sustainable Development
World Conference on Human Rights
Appointment of the first UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (IISD, 2002)

1996
ISO 14001
Formally adopted as a voluntary international standard for corporate environmental management systems. (IISD, 2012)

1987
Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change established

1988
The Business Council for Sustainable Development publishes Changing Course.
Establishes business interests in promoting SD practices
Rio Earth Summit
Agreements reached on Agenda 21, the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Rio Declaration, and non-binding Forest Principles (UN, 2000)

1992
World Trade Organisation Established
World Summit for Social Development
First time that the international community has expressed a clear commitment to eradicate absolute poverty. (UN, 2009)

1995
Kyoto Protocol signed
This document sets goals for greenhouse gas emission reduction and establishes emissions trading in developed countries and the clean development mechanism for developing countries
UN General Assembly review of Earth Summit
Highlights the fact that progress has been made with implementation of Agenda 21 (IISD, 2012)

1997
**1999**

**First Global sustainability Index launched**
The Dow Jones Sustainability Indexes are the first global indexes tracking the financial performance of the leading sustainability-driven companies worldwide.
(SIAM Indexes, 2011)

**Terrorist Attack on US**
Attack marks marking the end of an era of unhindered economic expansion
(IISD, 2002)

**Conference of the Parties (COP) 7**
Finalisation of workings of Kyoto Protocol
(UNFCCC, 2012)

**2001**

**2004**

**Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent**
Promotes open exchange of information calling for use of proper labelling on exported hazardous materials, including directions on safe handling and inform purchasers of any known restrictions or bans.
(IISD, 2010)

**First environmentalist wins Nobel Prize**
Wangari Muta Maathai Founder of the Green Belt Movement in Kenya
(IISD, 2010)

**Indian Ocean Tsunami**

**2006**

**Stern Report published**
Wedge cost of inaction on climate change will be up to 20 times greater than measures required to address the issue today.
(IISD, 2010)

**Ozone Layer Recovery**
NASA reports that earth’s ozone layer appears to be on the road to recovery.
(NASA, 2011)

**1999**

**Increasing urbanization**
Atlas report shows almost half of the world’s population now lives in cities that occupy less than two per cent of the Earth’s land surface, but use 75 per cent of Earth’s resources.
(IISD, 2002)

**United Nations Millennium Summit**
This largest-ever gathering of world leaders adopted the United Nations World Summit Declaration, which spells out values and principles, as well as goals in key priority areas. World leaders agreed that the UN’s first priority was the eradication of extreme poverty and highlighted the importance of a fairer world economy in an era of globalization.
(UN, 2005)

**United Nations Millennium Goals Unveiled**
Eight goals for international development to be achieved by the year 2015.
(UNDP, 2012)

**2000**

**Global Reporting Initiative**
Guidelines produced for reporting on the economic, environmental and social dimensions of business activities.
(IISD, 2010)

**2002**

**2005**

**Kyoto Protocol effected**
Legally binds developed country parties to goals for CO2 emission reductions, and establishes the Clean Development Mechanism for developing countries.
(IISD, 2010)

**Millennium Ecosystem Assessment**
Highlights the importance of ecosystems to human well-being, and the extent of ecosystem decline.
Provides scientific information concerning the consequences of ecosystem change for human wellbeing.
(UNEP, 2012)

**Hurricane Katrina**
While figure 3.5 charts the evolution of sustainable development, this section highlights some key events which represent vital paradigm shifts in thinking around the issue of sustainability. The 1892 founding of the Sierra Club marks the earliest record of a formalised collective interest, dedicated to the wellbeing of the natural environment, with an emphasis on preservation and conservation in the face of human activity. It is the foremost environmental protection organisation until the World Wildlife Fund for Nature was established over half a century later in 1961 (Sierra Club, 2012; WWF, 2012). The publication of the book ‘Silent Springs’ a year later in 1962, draws attention to the holistic nature the ecosystem as well as wider socio-economic systems. It illustrated this by examining the effects of pesticide use in the US, along the food chain. The success of the book brought early thinking on sustainability into the public consciousness (Radford, 2011; IISD, 2012). By 1968 conservation was a big enough issue for a conference to be held on it; addressing the issue in terms of the consumption of natural resources. This focus on environmental protection in the context of economic activity is the core issue that Friends of the Earth seek to carry forward when they are established in 1969 (Fundy Biosphere Reserve, 2012; Friends of the Earth, 2012).

The estimated 20 million people who participated in the first Earth Day in 1970, demonstrates the increased profile of issues concerning sustainability. Furthermore the increasing interest in exploring different approaches to development in light of the issues raised in relation to economic activity, resource consumption and their wider impacts on the planet, lead to the formation of the International development research centre. Established in 1970, their effort to explore different approaches to development marks another paradigm shift in thinking around the issue of sustainability (IISD, 2002). This is reinforced by the 1972 publication of Limits to Growth (Club of Rome, 2012) which argues that the current levels and approach to global growth are unsustainable, laying the groundwork for current discourse around sustainable development. Another landmark event occurred when the World Conservation Strategy (1980) used the term “sustainable development” for the first time, while analysing the economic, social and environmental factors in relation to habitat destruction. The term is later given its most widely used definition by the Brundtland Commission later that decade in 1987.
By 2012, not only does thinking around sustainable development clearly accept that the environmental, economic and social factors are intertwined, but that core global challenges such as poverty alleviation are the result of multiple points of impact (UN, 2012b).

### 3.2.2 A New Lease of Life: The Case for Urban Regeneration

This chapter draws on Roberts and Sykes (2000, p.9), defining regeneration as a process by which an area responds to “urban degeneration” in a “particular place” at a “particular time”. This definition highlights two main factors; first, that urban regeneration is a process bound both spatially and temporally, and secondly it aims to reverse decline within that area. Urban areas are characterised by the dynamic interplay between their physical, economic and social components, which are subject to external forces such as globalisation and de-industrialisation (Cheshire and Hay, 1989). The impact of these forces results in change which may be positive or negative. The resultant case of negative change within an urban area can be referred to as urban degeneration or decline (Couch et al, 2003; Roberts and Sykes, 2000; Lang, 2005). This decline is typified by physical decay, economic issues such as increased unemployment, social exclusion and an overall deterioration in standards of living (Medhurst and Lewis, 1969). In some cases the decline is not homogenous with pockets of deprivation within more affluent regions (Andersen, 2002). The effects of urban decline coupled with other ills associated with urban living such as congestion and pollution, render these areas less desirable. As a result areas facing urban degeneration witness the outward migration of more well off residents, further exacerbating the situation and plunging the area into a spiral of decline (Evans, 1997). The means by which this decline is reversed is referred to as urban regeneration. It seeks to raise the standard of living in an area, by improving the built and natural environment as well as the socio-economic conditions in the area (CLES, 2009).

In medical terms regeneration refers to the “renewal, repair, reproduction, or replacement of lost or injured cells, tissues, or organs” (Mosby, 2009, p.1). This
definition is mirrored in the case of urban regeneration where the component parts refer to the different elements of a functioning urban system. Urban regeneration refers to the process by which the degradation within these different elements (environmental degradation, economic decline and social exclusion) is tackled, and the balance redressed. Vilaplana, (1998, p.2) lists the objectives of urban regeneration as:

- Enhancing the physical condition of localities (this involves environmental improvement, development and redevelopment of land and property)
- Stimulating the local economy with activities such as training and enterprise support to business in order to increase the skills of the unemployed
- Tackling social and community issues such as community safety, adult literacy and health promotion
- Securing the longer term future of the locality by strengthening the community's potential for self-government (community capacity building with an emphasis on community based organisations)
- Developing governance structures that involve local stakeholders in decision-making, including resource allocation

With over 50% of the world’s population now living in urban areas (IISD, 2010) the issues posed by urban decline and regeneration are of increasing importance; furthermore there is a need to deliver urban regeneration in a manner consistent with sustainable development. That is to say, sustainable urban regeneration considers how to reverse the cycle of urban decline by adopting integrated programmes that address the issues facing distressed urban areas holistically. Importantly, it recognises the interconnections between problems and opportunities (LUDA, 2005). In addition to addressing the issues within distressed urban areas holistically, sustainable urban regeneration is focused on a long term approach to solving issues as well as the participation of the stakeholders in developing and delivering interventions. Carley and Kirk (1998, p.5) define sustainable urban regeneration as interventions “directed at disadvantaged areas and households, giving long-lasting improvements in the prospects of residents” which are “democratically determined, according with residents’ needs and aspirations”.
3.2.3 Stakeholders

The term stakeholder refers to any individual or group of individuals with a vested interest in an activity. They are key actors who are affected by, or can influence the activity in question. In this context the activity can be anything from a project, to the workings of an organisation (Pearce, 2003; Brandon and Lombardi, 2005). In the context of regeneration, stakeholders refer to all those parties directly or indirectly concerned with a regeneration project. Their interests and stakes in the project differ as do their levels of involvement and influence; however they all play a part in either the development or decline of an area, and therefore constitute a vital part of any regeneration activity (ENSURE, 2009).

Different typologies have been put forward in an attempt to group stakeholders. Smiralova (2006, p.6) discusses the existence of direct and indirect stakeholders, where the former refers to those immediately affected and the latter have/experience a more distant impact, either due to space or time. She also refers to external and internal groups of stakeholders, breaking them down into the:

- **external decisive group**: state, regional and local authorities, city administrators, planning officers, designers, architects, landscape architects and engineers, consultancies and external experts

- **external/internal influencing group**: development agencies of several levels, service providers, infrastructure owners, facilities managers, real estate and property developers, research institutions

- **internal group of local interests**: locally operating and settled businesses, nongovernmental institutions, educational institutions, and citizens
Table 3.1: Typology of Urban Regeneration Stakeholders (Source: Smiralova, 2006, p.9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy makers</th>
<th>Planners</th>
<th>Private investors</th>
<th>Service providers</th>
<th>Citizens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elected officials</td>
<td>Town planners</td>
<td>Property developers</td>
<td>Transport and utility service</td>
<td>People who live in a particular neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City administrators</td>
<td>Designers (i.e., architects,</td>
<td>Building and infrastructure owners</td>
<td>Facilities managers</td>
<td>People who work locally (business owners and staff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authorities</td>
<td>Consultants (e.g., environmental consultants)</td>
<td>Banks and other infrastructure owners</td>
<td>Marketing officers</td>
<td>Community group leaders and members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government agencies</td>
<td>Development control officers</td>
<td>Entrepreneurs</td>
<td>Health and safety officers</td>
<td>Insurers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organisations (NGO's)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Others such as the Exchange Network for Sustainable Urban Revitalisation Experience (ENSURE, 2009 p.3), group stakeholders as:

- **Institutional partners**
  - Policy makers at national and regional levels
  - Local policy makers
  - Revitalisation agency
  - Public services providers

- **The local community**
  - Local residents
  - People working in the neighbourhood but not living there.
  - Individuals such as people living close to the neighbourhood
  - Non-profit organisations

- **Private sector organisations**
  - Businesses
This study draws on the work of Evans (1997) to create a new typology of regeneration stakeholders. The stakeholders are classed as:

- Producers
- Users
- Brokers

The producers refer to those stakeholders responsible for developing, creating funding or providing the regeneration project including the funders, built environment professionals, the local authority and the regeneration delivery mechanisms. Most of the power tends to lie with the producers as they control key assets and have the ability to effect change within the project as well as take strategic decisions (Evans, 1997).

Users refer to stakeholders that are the ‘consumers’ or beneficiaries of urban regeneration. They include local residents, local businesses, and non resident users (e.g. commuters). Also classed as users are the ‘non-user’ users; this refers to members or stakeholders in surrounding communities who despite not using the facilities or services provided as a result of the regeneration, are still affected (either positively or adversely) by the project. Users despite not having a lot of power can exert a considerable amount of influence on producers to sway their decision making. While users may not be professionals they possess an in-depth knowledge of the local area, and their input can be vital in shaping the regeneration process (ENSURE, 2009).

The final group of stakeholders are the brokers, so called because of their role as intermediaries and facilitators. These include community groups, charities, pressure groups, aid organisations and service providers. Some typologies (Evans, 1997) place delivery mechanisms and municipal agencies such as the government within this group; however this study recognises the vital role that these key actors play within regeneration delivery as extending beyond mere facilitation or advocacy to coordination. Table 3.2 below represents a more extensive list of the different types of stakeholders within regeneration delivery. The study has found that while brokers tend to advocate for a particular agenda, they can be invited into the frame by either producers (e.g. debt advice providers) or users (e.g. the Ramblers Association).
Table 3.2: New Typology for Urban Regeneration Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRODUCERS</th>
<th>USERS</th>
<th>BROKERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Developers</td>
<td>• Local Residents</td>
<td>• Local community groups: residents associations, youth groups, sports or interest groups etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local Authority</td>
<td>• Local businesses</td>
<td>• Aid organisations &amp; NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Delivery Mechanisms</td>
<td>• Non local users: Commuters, Shoppers etc.</td>
<td>• Pressure groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Central Government</td>
<td>• ‘Non-User’ users: members of neighbouring communities, relatives of local residents, potential users (e.g. prospective business or tenants), secondary/indirect stakeholders (stakeholders of local stakeholders e.g. suppliers)</td>
<td>• Politicians and Councillors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Charities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Built Environment Professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Faith groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Banks</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Service providers: NHS, Police, transport authority, schools/educational institutions, employment service, fire service etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Private investors and other funding bodies</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Land Owners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


While it is possible to place stakeholders within their primary groups, it is worth noting that this positioning can be fluid depending on circumstances, and it is indeed possible to have stakeholders positioned within more than one group. For example, it is possible to have brokers who are also users if they are located within the regeneration area or use facilities provided. In the same vein it is possible to have producers that double as users too. Furthermore, individuals who are considered stakeholders at a particular point in time, may not be so in future (ENSURE, 2009). The concept of power and influence between stakeholders is also dynamic as relationships are constantly evolving. With the advent of social media and shifting social values, some stakeholders have been able to wield a considerable amount of influence in order to effect real change (Dickins, 2012). An example of this is would be the global ‘Occupy’ movement. Furthermore, changes in policy such as the new planning policy framework will put real power into the hands of local people (Clark, 2012) enabling them to become key decision makers where local development is concerned.

The coordination and management of relationships between stakeholders is key to the delivery of any regeneration project, but also proves to be one of the most problematic (Tallon, 2010). Not least because different stakeholders have different values and vested interests in the project and the area; economic, social, cultural or spiritual (ENSURE, 2009). Most producers such as developers, banks and private sector funders are concerned with making a return on their investment, while public funding providers are concerned with ensuring that the targets attached to the funding provision are met. Brokers such as charities, aid organisations and pressure groups are interested in seeing whatever values they represent considered, and other brokers such as community groups, acting as advocates for their representatives are concerned about ensuring their membership is heard and taken into account. Local businesses are interested in seeing that opportunities are greater for growth within the local economy in the form of better infrastructure of better skilled employee pool, while most of the other users’ interests lie in their quality of life however they might judge that. The local authority and the delivery
vehicle have the unique role of trying to ensure that as many interests as possible (and where suitable) are taken into account, and will be concerned with ensuring that the objectives of the project in terms of environmental, social and economic impacts are being met (Evans, 1997; Brandon & Lombardi, 2010; Dickins, 2012). It is important to note also that stakeholders may be representing the interests of themselves as individuals, and not necessarily other members of the wider community or even the group. Where tensions arise and when levels of power and influence over the situation become more relevant, is in instances that one set of interests lie in opposition to another. For example the council is interested in launching an alleygating scheme to tackle antisocial behaviour and unsanitary conditions within alleyways, but restricting rights of way is in opposition to the interests of the local rambler’s association.

Figure 3.6 maps the relationships between key stakeholders within urban regeneration based on the typology outlined in table 3.2.
Fig. 3.6: Stakeholder Mapping for an Urban Regeneration Project Showing Key Stakeholders and Main Relationships
3.3 Delivery of Urban Regeneration in England: A History

The late 1800s saw many English towns and cities faced with the aftermath of mass industrialisation and urbanisation in the form of urban slums. These slums were areas of high density which housed the workforce in the wake of the industrial revolution but had now become focal points for deprivation on multiple fronts, and were notorious for the poor standard of living associated with them (Dyos, 1967). The slums were confronted with a combination of environmental, economic and social ills stemming largely from the poor quality housing stock which had undergone severe decay over the years. The housing in these areas consisted mainly of Victorian back to back terraces, which would later become symbolic of the poverty within industrialised cities. Aside from the physical problems faced within these areas, there existed other socio-economic issues such as low incomes, and poor health due to widespread disease as a result of the unsanitary conditions in these areas (Rivington, 1880; Planning Help, 2011; Dyos and Wolff, 1999). Early attempts by the government to address the issues created by slums include the introduction of the 1875 Artisans' and Labourers' Dwellings Improvement Act which gave local authorities power to buy up and redevelop slum areas; and the 1885 Housing of the Working Classes Act which not only gave councils access to loans in order to enact the compulsory purchase of land, but also the power to shut down dwellings which did not meet the basic sanitary standards (HMSO, 1885; Rodger, 1989; Living Heritage, 2011). 1930 saw the first issued Housing Act, which was later followed by the 1933 and 1936 Housing Acts. The Acts called for the large scale clearance of slums within designated Improvement areas. They also called for the replacement of demolished dwellings with new and affordable housing stock (Planning Help, 2011; Living Heritage, 2011).

By the end of the Second World War in 1945 most of England’s major towns and cities had suffered severe bombing leaving them with extensive damage and housing in short supply. This coupled with the remaining slums due to the disruption of clearance activities by the war meant that the country was facing a wide spread
housing crisis (Mullins & Murie, 2006). Jones (2004) suggests that the widespread devastation brought on by the war acted as a catalyst in the redevelopment of England’s towns and cities, with housing becoming a legislative priority.

In the decades following the Second World War, key themes and foci can be traced as public consciousness and emphasis in regeneration policy shift over the years. The decades which immediately followed the war saw an emphasis on the physical aspects of regeneration in a move towards urban reconstruction. Legislation such as the New Towns Act of 1946 saw the creation of government funded development corporations driving the largest house building programme of its kind (Alexander, 2009). The Town and Country Planning Act of 1947 gave local authorities the power to designate ‘declaratory areas’ within which they could exercise compulsory purchase powers for reconstruction, marking the origins of modern urban regeneration policy in the country (English Heritage, 2012).

Table 3.3 depicts the evolution of urban regeneration and highlights the shifting emphasis of policy over the years. It shows the overarching strategies as well as the key policy responses and the prevalent issues they seek to address.
Table 3.3: Development and Evolution of Modern Urban Regeneration Policy (Developed from: Roberts and Sykes, 2000; Tallon, 2010; Evans, 1997; BIS, 2011; CLG, 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAIN STRATEGY &amp; FOCUS</strong></td>
<td>Reconstruction of older areas of towns and cities (Physical/Environmental)</td>
<td>Extension of the Reconstruction theme with activity in suburban areas (Physical/Environmental)</td>
<td>Neighbourhood renewal, Environmental improvements with elements of community development (Physical/Environmental &amp; Social)</td>
<td>Deregulation Privatisation Urban entrepreneurialism Flagship projects (Economic &amp; Physical/Environmental)</td>
<td>Holistic approach with emphasis on integrated strategies (Physical/Environmental, Economic &amp; Social)</td>
<td>Retention of holistic approach to regeneration with greater emphasis on economic development (Physical/Environmental, Economic &amp; Social)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KEY CHALLENGES</strong></td>
<td>Housing shortage Urban sprawl Inner city congestion</td>
<td>Economic Decline Physical decay Increased gap between rich and poor Concentrated deprivation Racial discrimination</td>
<td>Rising unemployment Run down social housing Financial recession</td>
<td>Pockets of deprivation Social exclusion</td>
<td>Global recession Rising unemployment Collapse of housing market Public sector cutbacks Pockets of deprivation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENVIRONMENTAL APPROACH</strong></td>
<td>Construction of new housing Selective improvements, Innovative modernist developments</td>
<td>Renewal of social and private sector housing,</td>
<td>Major flagship development schemes, Transfer of ownership of council housing stock to tenants</td>
<td>More modest physical interventions that the 1980s (tied to other socio-economic outcomes)</td>
<td>Deregulation and relaxation of Planning Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMIC APPROACH</strong></td>
<td>Minimal economic aspects to policy, fringe economic benefits from improved standards of living</td>
<td>Increased employment opportunities with employers relocated to more spacious city fringe sites</td>
<td>Local authorities called to take action to tackle economic development in areas</td>
<td>Free market and competition Property led regeneration to increase value of location …</td>
<td>Reinvestment in the towns and cities</td>
<td>Economic growth as key driver for regeneration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL APPROACH</td>
<td>Improvement of living standards</td>
<td>Improvement of living standards, establishment of suburban living</td>
<td>Community based action, increased empowerment</td>
<td>Community self help with limited government support</td>
<td>Emphasis on community participation</td>
<td>Localist approach promoting civic responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY ACTORS</td>
<td>National Government, some private developers</td>
<td>Better balance between public and increased private sector input</td>
<td>Partnerships with private sector, involvement of community, voluntary and educational sector</td>
<td>Increased partnership working, Emphasis on private sector involvement Roll back of public involvement</td>
<td>Partnerships involving public, private and community sectors</td>
<td>Partnerships with emphasis on private sector leadership and community development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL OF ACTIVITY</td>
<td>Local and site level</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Strategic and Regional</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

... leading to gentrification in some cases Incentives promoting inwards investment

Leading to gentrification in some cases Incentives promoting inwards investment...
3.4 Summary

Sustainable development refers to development which meets present needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet theirs. It takes into consideration environmental, economic and social aspects of development as elements in equilibrium within a system. With its origins in the ecological conservation movement, thinking around the sustainable development has evolved over the decades; with issues like climate change bringing it to the fore of public consciousness. Sustainable communities are communities which apply the concept of sustainable development to their function.

Urban regeneration refers to the process that seeks to reverse urban decline within an area. The process involves a diverse group of stakeholders with varying degrees of involvement with the intervention, as well as a variety of interests. Urban regeneration policy dates back to the late 1970s, with planning policy targeted at the redevelopment of urban areas going back a century before that. Tracing the evolution of regeneration delivery over the years, different strategic approaches have shifted emphasis from the physical and environmental aspects of regeneration, through social and economic aspects, to a combination of all three in an attempt to achieve sustainable urban regeneration.

The next chapter examines the evolution of evaluation, reviewing its definition, history, theoretical foundations and also its application in the context of regeneration and sustainable development.
CHAPTER 4

EVALUATION

“True genius resides in the capacity for evaluation of uncertain, hazardous, and conflicting information”

- Winston Churchill (date unknown)
This chapter reviews the existing literature on evaluation, exploring its definition and history. It goes on to examine different classifications of evaluation, as well as various theories that influence the practice; considering them in the context of urban regeneration. Next, the chapter will review evaluation practice in the urban regeneration and sustainable development sectors; exploring various indicators for the measurement of sustainable development, as well as methods used in evaluating urban regeneration. Finally the chapter will reflect on best practice within evaluation in other sectors.

4.1 What is Evaluation: Concepts and Theory

4.1.1 Defining Evaluation

A good starting point would be to ask the question ‘what is evaluation?’. Over the years, several definitions have been ascribed to the term and its related concepts; each coloured by the context from which the definition is proposed, with emphasis lying on different elements within the process. Alkin and Solomon’s (1983 p.14) definition focuses on the evaluation process, defining it as the “process of ascertaining the decision areas of concern, selecting appropriate information, and collecting and analysing information in order to report summary data useful to decision makers in selecting among alternatives”. Given their status as a humanitarian organisation, the World Health Organisation’s (WHO) definition extends to include the stakeholders within the process. In their 1998 Charter for Health Promotion, they define evaluation as the “systematic examination and assessment of the features of an initiative and its effects in order to produce information that can be used by those who have an interest in its improvement or effectiveness” (WHO, 1998a p.3a). Established social scientist and author Leonard Rutman (1977 p.16), defines evaluation in the context of evaluation research, referring to it as “first and foremost a process of applying scientific procedures to accumulate reliable and valid evidence in the manner and extent to which specific activities produce particular effects and outcomes”. He also looks to the transfer of these scientific research procedures into practice in the form of programme evaluation, which he defines as “the use of research methods to measure the
effectiveness of operative programmes” (Rutman, 1980 p.17). Another ‘programme’ related definition that highlights the role of outcomes within evaluation is that of St Leger et al (1992 p.1) which states that evaluation is the “critical assessment, on as objective a basis as possible, of the degree to which entire services or their component parts, fulfil stated goals”. In this context, evaluation is meant to focus on measuring the effectiveness of a programme against the goals it sets out to accomplish, thereby feeding into some form of decision making process within the programme (Weiss, 1972 p.4). Keith Tones (1998 p.52) offers a succinct definition for the term stating that evaluation is “essentially about determining the extent to which certain valued goals have been achieved”. Despite the fact that these different definitions highlight different facets of the term ‘evaluation’, there are certain common themes that run through them, therefore indicating that there are certain characteristics of evaluation that can be teased out from the various practitioners’ perspectives of the phenomenon. A more holistic definition of the term evaluation is put forward by Mark Smith (2006 p.2) of the think tank, the Encyclopaedia of Informal Education, in the form of what he refers to as a more ‘orienting definition’. He refers to evaluation as “the systematic exploration and judgement of working processes, experiences and outcomes. It pays special attention to aims, values, perceptions, needs and resources”. He goes on to highlight the main characteristics of evaluation as:

1. Evaluation is a research process: It is concerned with the careful, systematic and methodological gathering of data in order to draw certain conclusions.

2. Evaluation makes judgements: It goes further than just monitoring or keeping track of a phenomenon, making careful judgements about worth, significance and meaning of said phenomenon.

3. Evaluation is sophisticated: Making careful judgements is not an easy process, and requires criteria and standards embedded in the meaning and values of the work and its stakeholders.
4. Evaluation is multi-levelled: It can take place either as a traditional piece of academic research, or in practice on programme level and on individual project levels

5. Evaluation is participatory: For evaluation to have any meaning it must be concerned not solely with the processes within a programme or project, but also with the people involved within these processes

(Smith 2006, p.2)

The way in which the term evaluation is defined is not only tied into the stakeholders’ aspirations and expectations, but also their understanding of the purpose of evaluation in the first place. Their various definitions therefore contain a statement of purpose for the evaluation itself, and as varied as there are definitions so also are the reasons for evaluating. In its most basic form, evaluation is concerned with the assessment of the effectiveness of interventions (Green and South, 2006 p.4a), as represented by figure 4.1.

Evaluation is outlined as a process of reviewing an intervention in order to come to an informed decision (Kumar, 2005). The process is systematic and bound by rigour; meaning it is thorough, reliable and valid. It assesses the efficiency, effectiveness and appropriateness of the said intervention, before coming to an informed decision. The decision may be about selection between different interventions, effecting changes based on findings or where necessary the termination of the said intervention. This role of evaluation in providing a platform for making informed decisions is a key part of the concept.
Another central reason for carrying out evaluations is to justify the appropriation and renewal of funding as well as to provide an evidence base of the effective use of said funding. This issue of accountability has become increasingly significant given the current global fiscal climate and the atmosphere of economic rationalism. This has meant that more scrutiny than ever is being employed to ensure that public funds are being used judiciously and to maximum effect (Raphael, 2000 p.355). Despite the emphasis being largely financial where accountability is concerned, the concept also extends to the ethical accountability of different interventions, ensuring that they do no harm whether directly or indirectly to all the different stakeholders involved. Furthermore, ethical considerations need to be taken into account at all stages of the evaluation process itself (Green and South, 2006 p.109).
Despite evaluation primarily serving a basic function of indicating the success (or lack thereof) of a particular intervention and its inherent processes, it should go further to highlight why this is so. Our understanding of why a programme’s success or failure is “even more important than simply knowing that it does” (Feuerstein, 1986 p.7). Evaluation thereby equips us with a better basis on which to make future decisions within programme delivery. This highlights the capacity for evaluation, not just as a tool for measurement and collecting evidence but also as a mechanism for organisational learning. The WHO (1998a) expands on the use of evaluation for the purposes of highlighting what can be learned from the experience of implementing a programme. They go further to refer to “the role of evaluation in capacity building and enhancing the ability of individuals, communities, organisations and governments to address important … concerns” (WHO, 1998a p.3). This view is supported by Mertens (1999) who goes as far as to suggest that the definition of evaluation should extend to how it ought to “facilitate positive social change for the least advantaged” (Mertens, 1999 p.6). Green and South (2006 p.4) citing Springett (1998), refer to how the findings from evaluations can therefore be used not only to monitor and review progress, allowing deliverers to make necessary amendments to keep projects on track; but also to demonstrate achievements and celebrate successes providing motivation and empowerment of individuals.

Lewis (2001, p.392) sums up the issue concerning the reasons for evaluation by providing a summary of four primary purposes for evaluation, which reflect the purposes discussed above. These are evaluation for:

- Accountability
- Learning
- Programme Management and Development
- Ethical Obligation

Owen and Rogers (1999, p.61) discuss the different purposes of evaluation, relating them to their underpinning epistemological bases and the resultant form of evaluation. A summary of this discussion is presented in Table 4.1.
Lewis (2001) also highlights the fact that not all activities which appear to be evaluations actually are. He refers to what he terms ‘Pseudo Evaluations’, or evaluation type monitoring or accounting exercises, not particularly deemed ‘worthy’ of being termed evaluations. He draws on Suchman (1967) in listing some of these pseudo evaluations, as well as the reasons behind them. They are:

- Eyewash – focus on surface appearances
- Whitewash – covering up programme failure
- Submarine – political use of evaluation to undermine a programme
- Posture – ritual use of evaluation without any intention to use the findings
- Postponement – a means of avoiding or at least postponing action

- Lewis, 2001 p.391

He goes on to state that ‘posturing and postponement in particular are well known to many as we are increasingly immersed in what he refers to as a performance culture; especially in situations where “one of the performance indicators is that project evaluation is a requirement for project funding” (Lewis, 2001, p.391).
4.1.2 History of Evaluation

The emergence and prominence surrounding the various drivers for different evaluation processes can be traced through the history of evaluation itself. The origins of term itself come from the Middle French word ‘evaluacion’, and was first known to be used in 1842 (Merriam-Webster, 2007). This is approximately 100-200 years after the roots of the earliest forms of evaluation research and theory appear as systematic social inquiry in the works of 17th and 18th century philosophers and social theorists Thomas Hobbes, Montesquieu and Jean-Jacques Rousseau (Alkin and Christie, 2004 p.16). Indeed the roots of the practice of evaluation lie much further back in time with Guba and Lincoln (1981, p1.) citing personnel selection in 2200BC China where the Emperor “instituted proficiency requirements for his public officials to be demonstrated in formal tests” as one of the earliest traceable examples of social evaluation in practice. The more familiar face of systematic evaluation as we have come to know it today has its origins in the pre-World War I assessment exercises carried out by the American government to appraise the effectiveness of their public health, as well as literacy and occupational training programmes (Rossi et al, 2004, p.8). The 1930s saw an increase in the use of social research techniques outside of the strictly academic realm. With the likes of Lewin pioneering action research methods, applied social research was gaining popularity; and on the back of this wave rode the earliest forms of evaluation research. The early evaluators who were mainly social scientists used “rigorous research methods to assess social programmes in a variety of areas” (Freeman, 1977 p.17). Following the Great Depression, President Roosevelt launched a series of socio-economic programmes called the ‘New Deal’ (later re-dubbed the ‘Great Society’) in an attempt to promote the recovery of the US economy (Cornwell, 2008 p.1). Stephan in his 1935 paper ‘Prospects and Possibilities: The New Deal and The New Social Research’, made a case for the place of experimental evaluation in this national programme stating that “mankind in a test tube” was the “hope and aim” of social science, and in so doing established a landmark for the positioning of social research not just in application but in policy (Stephan, 1935 p.1). Freeman (1976 p.2) refers to Stephan’s 1935 “plea for evaluation research” as being relevant to “social and cultural programmes in all countries regardless of differences in ideological outlook.
and the deficits in the human condition that are given priority by different nations”.
He goes on to state that “unless policy makers, social planners and the public know
the consequences of efforts at planned social change and social innovation, broad
scale programmes of social action cannot be judged rationally” (Freeman, 1976 p.2).
This was a springboard from which evaluation research entered the mainstream
consciousness of the US government. As World War II broke out Stouffer and his
associates worked with the US army on the monumental ‘American Soldier’ applied
research programme, which saw the development of procedures to monitor the
morale of the soldiers and the civilian populace, as well as to evaluate personnel
policies and propaganda techniques (Stouffer et al, 1949 p.16). Similar social
science research studies were conducted in Britain and other countries around the
world (Freeman, 1976, p.3).

The efficacy of the programmes conducted in the then emergent field of evaluation
research during World War II led to a boom period following the war where practice
spread to other areas. By the end of the 1950s, programme evaluation was
commonplace, funded not only by the government but also by privately funded
programmes in “urban development and housing, technological and cultural
education, occupational training and preventative health activities” (Rossi et al, 2004,
p.8). The spread could also be seen globally with evaluation research being
implemented within programmes in Europe as well as other less developed nations
in Asia, Latin America and Africa, with studies commissioned by the United Nations
and the World Bank (Freeman, 1976, p.7). Through the 1960s there was a dramatic
rise in the literature on evaluation, reviewing extensively the various evaluation
research methods in use. Furthermore evaluation was being embedded in new
government programmes such as ‘Head Start’ in the US (Mertens, 2006, p.48). By
the 1970s with the launch of the first journal dedicated to evaluation research,
‘Evaluation Review’, the field had emerged as a distinct social science specialism in
its own right (Rossi et al, 2004 p.9). By the 1980s, what had begun as an offshoot of
social research which was targeted at specific policies, educational and health
programmes had evolved into a fully fledged evaluation movement. The growing
appetite for the application of evaluation methods and tools within all forms of activity
is captured by Scriven’s (1980 p.4) declaration that absolutely everything could be
evaluated; taking “every noun common or proper” from the “beginning of the a
dictionary and going through to the end” it was possible to frame it in a context in which evaluation would be appropriate. Using Scriven’s stance as a platform, evaluation practice has since spread across and deep into all strata of our modern day world. Pawson and Tilley (2009, p.1) suggest that evaluation had become a “mantra of modernity”, as we moved into the millennium when “everything needs evaluating”. They related the phenomenon with Kaplan’s ‘Law of the Hammer’, which states that “if a child is given a hammer, he or she will soon discover the universal truth that everything needs a pounding”, therefore evaluating for evaluation’s sake.

Well into the second decade of that ‘new millennium’ this stance still holds true. Thus we find ourselves in an era of ‘hyper-evaluation’ where our every activity is subject to all manner of performance rating, review, appraisal, assessment, quality assurance, performance measurement, stock take and audit, often times to no real avail and in some cases to the detriment of the evaluand. This exponential upsurge in diversity and application within evaluation practice is also reflected within the academic literature on the subject, with evaluation researchers today having to “burrow their way through advice on summative, formative, cost-free, goal-free, functional, tailored, comprehensive, theory driven, stakeholder-based, naturalistic, utilisation-focused, responsive and meta-evaluation” (Pawson and Tilley, 2009 p.2).

4.1.3 Classification of Evaluation

Evaluation is a multifaceted concept that encompasses both types (the ‘whats’) and methods (the ‘hows’) therefore making the breakdown of the concept a complex one. This study adopts a framework which is comparable to viewing evaluation through different filters, resulting in the isolation of different component parts (see figure 4.2). The sub classification is based on viewing evaluation as refracted through four different lenses namely:

- Mode of Inquiry
- Subject
- Approach
- Function
Mode of Inquiry:

Experimental or Responsive evaluations are also referred to as traditional or alternative evaluations. The experimental or traditional approach to evaluation is more quantitative in nature and focuses on the use of standardised procedure to make as objective a judgement as possible on the evaluand. In pursuit of this objectivity, external evaluators are usually co-opted in to undertake the exercise. This form of evaluation has a more positivist outlook and also includes quasi-experimental [see section 4.2.4] evaluation designs (Pawson and Tilley, 2009). It tends to involve assessing the impact of an intervention based on a control group, attributing “observed effects to a specific program by ruling out other possible causative factors”. Selection is either randomised or based on selection controls such as “before and after studies with the same participants” (Hall and Hall, 2004 p.44-45). One of the main criticisms of traditional evaluation is that more qualitative aspects of the intervention tend to be ignored as well as the more hard to measure components along with them (Smith, 2006).
On the other hand, with responsive evaluation as an alternative model of evaluation (Patton, 1990), the emphasis is on dialogue and enquiry for the development and or change of the evaluand and its process, as opposed to purely measurement of its efficacy. Stake (1972, p.1) argues that “the evaluation responds” by orienting directly to programme activities, different perspectives of stakeholders, and audience requirements in terms of reporting. The role of the evaluator is more facilitatory rather than that of an objective neutral outsider. One of the key differences between the two approaches lies in the balance of power and the locus of control within the evaluation process. Whereas in a traditional approach there is a high level of managerial control and measures of success are usually established from the evaluator’s perspective, an alternative approach seeks to democratise the process using dialogue as a tool for empowering those involved with the subject of the evaluation. Negotiation, consensus and reflective-action are all highly valued aspects of a dialogical evaluation approach (Rowlands, 1991 p.17-23; Edelenbos & van Eeten, 2001 p.207.).

**Subject:**

Practice evaluation is “directed at the enhancement of work”, and unlike programme and project evaluation which is outcomes based, practice evaluation is concerned with the working process of particular individuals or groups (Smith, 2001 p.2). Here the evaluation is focused on the situation and making sense of what is going on in order to respond to it. Process evaluation is a type of practice evaluation that focuses on the “activities and operations of a programme” (Rossi et al, 2004, p.56) investigating how well the programme is operating. As a management tool, process evaluations help provide information on the efficiency of operations including whether or not a programme is being delivered to its intended recipients (Scheirer, 1994). However it “does not attempt to assess the effects of a programme on its recipients” (Rossi et al, 2004, p.171) as outcome focused evaluations do. Another type of practice evaluation is a meta-evaluation, or an evaluation of an evaluation (Patton, 1982; Clarke, 1999). Scriven (1969) discusses evaluators conducting
evaluations of their own practice in this process where the primary evaluation is that of the intervention, and the meta evaluation evaluates the process of the primary evaluation. Scriven (2011, p.1) presents six criteria in the form of a checklist for conducting meta evaluations, which attempt to answer the question “What are the criteria of merit for an evaluation in any field, including program evaluation?” (Scriven, 2011 p.1). He suggests these are:

- Validity; covers several aspects mainly if and how an evaluation has met its requirements, and if the results are likely to be true
- Clarity; a combination of comprehensibility to different audiences and brevity, thus reducing the need for interpretation and improving acceptance
- Credibility; apparent bias and expertise
- Propriety; ethicality, legality, and cultural/conventional appropriateness
- Cost-Utility; being economical’ in common sense terms
- Generalisability; which is not a requirement or a defining criterion of merit, but can be bonus-earning

- Scriven, 2011

Outcome focused evaluations address the actual results of a programme and centre on efficiency and formulating judgments thereby making them a useful management tool (Rogers, 2000; Smith, 2001). In this context, the term ‘outcome’ refers to the “observed characteristics of the target population or social conditions, and makes no direct reference to programme actions” (Rossi et al, 2004, p.205). As opposed to an output which refers to a direct action of the intervention, such as the “quantity of a good or service provided” (Smith, 2004, p.1), outcomes reflect the broader impact of activity on society which may be positive or negative. Evaluations that focus on the outcomes of the project alone are referred to as ‘Black Box Evaluations’, so called as a result of the lack of insight into the processes that led to the outcomes being assessed (Rossi et al, 2004). This form of evaluation is useful when the programme being evaluated is standardised and outcomes are likely to be replicated if the programme or project is repeated. On the other hand, where the intervention is not standardised and it is uncertain that repetition will yield the same results, a black box evaluation may prove inadequate (Stufflebeam et al, 2000).
In response to this shortcoming of outcome focused evaluations, process-outcome evaluations consider the process involved in the delivery of the programme as well as its outcomes. It has elements of both outcome and practice focused evaluations, and analyses “the association between various programme activities and intended outcomes” (Rogers, 2000, p.212).

**Approach:**

This considers if an evaluation is summative or formative. The distinction between formative and summative forms of evaluation was first made by Scirven (1967) when during the course of his research into educational curriculum assessment he coined both terms. He made the distinction based on what he considered the two major functions of evaluation; development and outcomes assessment. Summative evaluation is by and large conducted at the end (or at a particular interim point during the process) of an intervention and is intended to judge whether or not a particular evaluand has achieved the objectives and goals it set out to. Whereas formative evaluation is concerned with the development and improvement of an ongoing activity, and usually takes place during the planning stages of an intervention.

Summative evaluation is focused on the product, as it is more concerned with what happens subsequent to delivery of a particular intervention. It can be undertaken in various forms including outcome evaluations, impact assessments, cost-effectiveness analyses, cost-benefit analyses, secondary analyses and meta-analyses. Formative evaluation on the other hand can be linked to the aforementioned practice evaluation, and is more concerned with the delivery of an intervention, and “the quality of its implementation, the assessment of the organizational context, personnel, procedures, inputs, and so on” (Trochim, 2006 p.3). Types of formative evaluations include needs assessments, structured conceptualisation, evaluability assessment, total quality management, continuous quality improvement, and process evaluation. One of the main differences between
these two approaches to evaluation is generalisability, with formative evaluations being very much “unique to the particular project” and thus will have limited generalisability to projects outside the same context (Kemp et al, 1998 p.313).

Scriven (1967 p.42) adds that although all evaluations can be summative, only certain forms of evaluation can serve a formative function. Despite favouring summative evaluation over formative in that it provided what he called “a final evaluation of the project or person”, he recognised the fact that purely summative evaluation lacks the additionality that is brought to bear by the developmental nature of formative evaluation. He goes on to state that projects “must attempt to make best use of evaluation in both these roles” (Scriven, 1967 p.43).

Table 4.2: Basic Types of Evaluations (Adapted from: Clarke, 1999 p.8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FORMATIVE</th>
<th>SUMMATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TARGET AUDIENCE</strong></td>
<td>Programme managers/practitioners</td>
<td>Policy makers, funders, general public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOCUS OF DATA</strong></td>
<td>Clarification of goals, nature of implementation, identification of outcomes</td>
<td>Implementation issues, outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLLECTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROLE OF EVALUATOR</strong></td>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td>Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>METHODOLOGY</strong></td>
<td>Mixed methods</td>
<td>Emphasis on quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FREQUENCY OF DATA</strong></td>
<td>Continuous monitoring</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLLECTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REPORTING PROCEDURES</strong></td>
<td>Formal reports, informal; discussions, meetings etc</td>
<td>Formal reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING</strong></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>On completion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Function:**

This distinction in function is highlighted by Chen (1996, p.123) when he refers to “improvement evaluation” and “assessment evaluation”. He overlays these forms of evaluation onto the outcome/practice classification to develop a matrix of evaluation subject against function. He breaks down improvement evaluation into process-improvement evaluation and outcome-improvement evaluation; where the former reflects the function evaluation serves in determining the strengths and weaknesses with regards to processes and the latter aims to provide information on how to improve the results or impact of an intervention. In both cases improvement evaluation seeks to aid in the “identification of areas where an intervention may benefit from adjustment” (Chen, 1996 p.125). Process and outcome assessment evaluations seek to determine whether or not an intervention has been implemented effectively (the process), and if it has successfully achieved its intended outcomes (Chen, 1996). A clear benefit of Chen’s typology is that it considers both the functions of an evaluation as well as the different stages of a programme it may apply to. In doing so, it “neither limits process evaluation to issues of improvement, nor restricts outcome evaluation to focusing purely on overall merit or effectiveness” (Clark, 1999 p.11).

All the above types of evaluation may be applied to an intervention in conducting a project or programme evaluation. This refers to the use of social research procedures to systematically investigate the effectiveness of social interventions; projects or programmes (Rossi et al, 2004). As highlighted by Rossi and Freeman (1993) this form of evaluation is concerned with the efficiency of a programme as related to the objectives of the said intervention; assessing the design, implementation, improvement as well as outcomes of a programme. Over the years, the vested interests of both the public and private sector in the delivery and therefore evaluation of various programmes and projects has meant that this form of evaluation consequently emerges as one of the foremost drivers of growth within the field of evaluation and evaluation research (Smith, 2001; Rossi et al, 2004).
4.1.4 Evaluation Theory

In recent times, evaluation practice and literature has seen more emphasis placed on methodology, by and large to the detriment of the importance of theory. Shadish et al (1991) highlight this shift away from emphasis on theory in more modern literature within evaluation, and also warn of the danger of the practice of programme evaluation becoming more divorced from its theoretical roots. They compare the field of evaluation to other practice oriented fields such as medicine and engineering, emphasising the fact that despite being mainly practical these fields rely heavily on theories that are not immediately practical; not necessarily to give them the tools for their practice, but to help them understand the “the systems in which their practice occurs, and give them the concepts they need to understand and solve problems in their work”. They go on to state that given the trend within evaluation literature of increasingly “atheoretic listings of methodology” there is a danger of “overlooking important options that a complete theory would contain…failing to tell evaluators why certain practices are worth adopting over others” (Shadish et al, 1991 p.20). They go on to liken the use of theory to that of a good military strategy, and method to weapons, with a good evaluator using theory to choose what methods to employ as a good commander would use strategy and tactics to deploy weapons effectively depending on the situation. The basic function of evaluation theory is to guide practice; therefore learning methodology without the underpinning theory behind it is like learning what to do without knowing why. Evacuation theory “should be an aid to thoughtful judgement and not a dispensation from it” (Mark, 2005 p.3). That said theory is also a means of communicating the lessons of the past to future generations of evaluators in order that they may then learn from otherwise they are “doomed to repeat past mistakes and, equally debilitatingly, will fail to sustain and build on past successes” (Madaus et al, 1983 p.18).
Using Alkin and Christie’s ‘Evaluation Tree’ (2004) as a framework (See figure 4.3), it is easy to trace the emergence and subsequent course of theory, thinking and philosophy around the subject and practice of evaluation. The roots of evaluation theory lie jointly in social research and programme accountability; with the latter presenting a rationale for the practice of evaluation and the former the means. The concept of accountability is dual-dimensional, in the first instance referring to the act of reporting or giving a descriptive ‘account’ of prior or ongoing events, and the second relating to the aspect of ‘answerability’ which sees those in a position of responsibility being held liable for resultant phenomena of said events (Schedler et al., 1999 p.14). It is worth noting that evaluation practice does not comment on this dimension of answerability as it merely “provides the information for being answerable” (Alkin and Christie, 2004, p.14). Within the context of evaluation there are three different aspects reflected by different paradigms. These are; goal accountability which addresses the suitability or fitness of established goals and is reflected in the work of Scriven in examining the role of the evaluator in valuing goals; process accountability which is featured in Stufflebeam’s models of programme evaluation, and refers to the examination of the procedures implemented in order to achieve the established goals and the appropriateness of these procedures; and finally outcome accountability which tends to be the main driver for most evaluation exercises and is reflected across all the main branches of evaluation theory, considering whether or not the established goals have been achieved (Alkin and Christie, 2004, p.14).

The second pillar on which the house of evaluation stands is social research. Social research refers to the “purposeful and systematic acquisition and presentation of information about social issues” (Hall and Hall, 2004 p.5). It asks the question “Why do people in social groups act the way that they do?” (Alkin and Christie, 2004, p.15). Traditionally social inquiry is classified into theory building and theory testing, the latter using quantitative methods such as questionnaires and surveys logically deducing and producing hypotheses from more general data, while the former adopts more qualitative methods such as unstructured interviews and observation to inductively generate theory (Rose, 1982 p.10). Prior to the 1960s, social science inquiry was carried out utilising more positivist experimental methods used within physical science research, however Campbell and Stanley’s 1966 publication on
quasi-experimental methods within the social sciences presented researchers in the field with an alternative approach to undertaking their inquiry (Alkin and Christie, 2004 p.20). That said, not all social research can be neatly classed as either theory testing or building, with some research carried out as purely investigatory, “describing some sociologically interesting area” (Layder, 1993 p.3).
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Even as these two fundamentals of accountability and social inquiry come together to form the basis of evaluation, the debate over methodology remains with social scientists asking questions such as “What is the relationship between theory and observation? Should social scientists have a moral stance toward the individuals and groups that they study? Is this stance appropriate, and would it compromise the researchers’ objectivity?” (Alkin and Christie, 2004, p.17).
With social inquiry providing the methodological basis of evaluation practice, the impact of this dispute over the most appropriate means by which it should be undertaken is evident in the resulting variation observed in the evolution of evaluation practice. Within the ‘evaluation tree’ framework, the trunk and the central branch consist of theories around ‘methods’, while the other main branches are around ‘use’ and ‘value’. This section explores the main ideas discussed along the methods branch, and reviews the use and valuing branches in the context of evaluation within regeneration.

The ‘methods’ branch represents the oldest path on the evolutionary journey of the practice and originated with the works of theorists such as Tyler and Campbell. Tyler’s work in the 1940’s on curriculum evaluation marks a major point in the history of evaluation with several theorists in the field acknowledging his work on ‘The Eight Year Study’, a review of the US Education sector, as the genesis of programme evaluation. Tyler is credited with laying the foundations for “ideas such as the taxonomic classification of learning outcomes, the need to validate indirect measures against direct indicators of the trait of interest … the concept of formative evaluation … decision-oriented evaluation, criterion-referenced and objectives-referenced tests” (Madaeus & Stufflebeam, 1989 p. xiii); ideas which greatly influence the practice of programme evaluation today.

Following the work of Ralph Tyler, Donald Campbell emerged as an objectives-based theorist along the central ‘Methods Oriented’ branch of the evaluation theory tree. Primarily an experimentalist, Campbell’s methods oriented approach produced his ground breaking work on quasi-experimental methods for carrying out social inquiry. He attempted to develop alternative approaches to conducting field research within the social sciences, while still ensuring validity and rigour. This was due to the fact that he recognised it was not always appropriate, possible or even ethical to apply traditional experimental techniques in such scenarios. Campbell’s work is considered seminal in the field of evaluation research with Pawson and Tilley referring to his 1963 and 1979 publications as the ‘Old’ and ‘New’ Testaments that form the Bible of evaluation research (Pawson & Tilley, 2009).
Despite all this, Campbell credits his standing in the field of evaluation to the next theorist up the ‘methods’ branch of the tree, Edward Suchman. It was Suchman who saw the value of the application of Campbell’s work on quasi-experimental methods to the field of evaluation research, and Campbell (1984 p.13) himself states that though not originally an ‘evaluator’, he became overnight “both a senior programme evaluator by fiat, and one committed to an experimental epistemology”, due to the citation of his quasi experimental methods as an appropriate methodological mode by Suchman (1967). Suchman was one of the first theorists to provide an in-depth view of evaluation as a form of research, adopting research methods such as Campbell’s quasi-experimental methods. Though Suchman wanted to improve the experimental designs and quantitative methods in evaluation, he was aware of the politicised social context in which evaluations occurred; with little of the controlled settings that scientific experimental methods were originally designed around. It was his preference for science-impregnated methods that drew him to Campbell’s work, with its emphasis on scientific approach despite the fact that research was being carried out in the messy setting of the field (Shadish et al, 1991 p.124). In his 1967 work to which Campbell refers, Suchman (1967 p.7) makes a distinction between ‘common sense evaluation’, “the social process of making judgements of worth”, and evaluation that adopts the use of research methods which he terms ‘evaluative research’. Suchman identifies five categories of evaluation as:

1. Effort: This refers to the quantity and quality of activity that takes place
2. Performance: This refers to the effect criteria that measure the results of effort
3. Adequacy of Performance: This refers to the degree to which performance is adequate to the total amount of need
4. Efficiency: This refers to the examination of alternative paths or methods in terms of human and monetary costs
5. Process: this refers to how and why a program works or does not work

- Alkin and Christie, 2004 p.22

Despite his position on the ‘methods’ branch of the tree, Suchman (1967 p.21) recognised the importance of ‘use’ within evaluation stating that the “success of an evaluation project will be largely dependent on its usefulness to the administration in improving services”. He goes on to state that “unlike the basic researcher, the applied researcher must be constantly aware of the potential utility of his findings".
Thomas Cook is another theorist on the ‘methods’ branch of the evaluation tree, who recognised that the implementation of scientific methods in field research raises inherent difficulties and therefore was in favour of the use of quasi-experimental methods in evaluation. Cook together with Donald Campbell expanded on the 1966 work of Campbell and Stanley to produce the 1979 seminal text ‘Quasi-Experimentation’.

Though the methodological approach adopted by an evaluation is of importance in the context of all types of programmes; in the context of urban regeneration, evaluations can be used to inform decisions on future policies, “relating findings to key policy priorities” (CLES, 2009). This emphasis on the practical utilisation of evaluation as a decision making tool is highlighted along the use branch of the tree. Theorists along this branch are concerned with the decision oriented application of evaluation and view it as having a critical role in informing decision making and organisational change (Alkin and Christie, 2004). Stufflebeam (1983) suggests that evaluation is a cyclical process that should be viewed as ongoing and should inform decision makers’ choices in order to best serve their clients. He builds on the work of Guba in the 1960s, developing the CIPP evaluation model. The CIPP model emphasises that “evaluation’s most important purpose is not to prove but to improve” (Stufflebeam, 2003 p.4). CIPP is an acronym which represents the core concept of the model which is the evaluation of contexts, inputs, processes and products (see figure 4.4). The context evaluation helps decision makers identify needs, problems, assets and opportunities in order to decide upon programme objectives and activities. This is sometimes referred to as an appraisal or ex-ante evaluation. Input evaluation is concerned with programme strategies and designs, assessing plans for feasibility and cost-effectiveness, while process evaluation as mentioned earlier looks at the implementation of the chosen strategies, providing information on shortcomings. Finally product evaluation reviews the outcomes of the programme, intended and unintended as well as short-term and long-term; informing decisions on the continuation of a programme, its possible refocusing, or discontinuation (Stufflebeam, 2003; Alkin and Christie, 2004; Roberts and Sykes, 2000; Tan et al, 2010).
CIPP focuses on providing an interactive relationship between evaluator and client throughout the evaluation (Tan et al., 2010). Stufflebeam (2007) provides a CIPP evaluation checklist which covers all the different stages of the evaluation process, and including elements of meta-evaluation at the end. The CIPP model continues to develop (Stufflebeam, 2001, 2002, 2007) including stakeholders in the design of evaluation questions, in planning the evaluation and also in drafting reports and disseminating findings. This serves to enhance the usability of the evaluation, a concept key to the theories of Michael Patton who not only emphasised the utilitarian function of evaluations in decision making, but the role of the evaluator in ensuring that this utilisation takes place (Patton, 1997). His utilisation focused evaluation (UFE) model Patton highlights the importance of stakeholder engagement, buy-in and participation; issues that are revisited time and time again within regeneration (Roberts and Sykes, 2000) where stakeholder participation plays a key role in ensuring the sustainability of a project (LUDA, 2005). Patton’s UFE model has gone on to inform the development of other models such as Alkin’s user oriented CSE evaluation model. Alkin’s focus is on the users of the evaluation as ‘value agents’,
as opposed to the evaluator; seeking their input in the establishment of value systems that judgments are based upon (Alkin, 1991).

This issue of values informs the development of theories on the third branch of the evaluation tree, and plays a huge role particularly where regeneration is concerned because it deals with basis on which judgments are made. It debates who’s perspectives are considered in determining what is deemed success or failure, and who is responsible for making that judgement. It is considered the crux of what differentiates evaluation from other forms of research, and therefore evaluators from other researchers (Alkin and Christie, 2004). Scriven (1986, p.19) was one of the first theorists to debate this issue, suggesting that it was “the job of evaluators to decide” what was “good or bad” as they were professionals in the science of valuing that is evaluation. The fact that the issue of values is so complex is one that has led to ongoing debate on the matter with widely disparate views. “Values are subjective, values are objective, values have nothing to do with methodology, values determine methodology” view all derived from different theoretical assumptions (House and Howe, 1999 p.xiv). Scriven (1991) describes an evaluation as the determination of the value of an evaluand, where ‘value’ refers to the worth of thing, and ‘valuation’ refers to the estimation of its worth. There is a view that values and facts are dichotomous, and “while evaluators can legitimately determine facts, they cannot do so with values” (House and Howe, 1999 p.xiv). This strengthens the case for evaluators conducting their evaluations based on the values determined by the stakeholders of the intervention as suggested by Stake (1975, 2000). A pioneer of responsive evaluation traditions, he contends that a consensus in value from the participants should be explored, putting participants in the position to make their own judgments on grounds established by them. Stake’s arguments form the basis of others such as Guba and Lincoln (1981) whose insights into stakeholder involvement in evaluation informed the development of Patton’s UFE model. This view of multiple values and understandings of what is good, depending on the perception and interpretation of individuals involved in the program (Guba and Lincoln, 1981) holds value where regeneration is concerned as it is “increasingly becoming a part of mainstream business practice and central to public policy decision-making and delivery” (Torfaen County Borough, 2007).
Debating values and where the responsibility for determining those values lies, is closely related to the understanding of the role of the evaluator. The role of the evaluator varies greatly from “objective observer, to active participant” (Guenther and Falk, 2007) depending on the form of evaluation. This is particularly determined by both the function and subject of the evaluation. The fact that some theorists (Scriven, 1986) suggest that passing the buck of making the final decision on an evaluation to non professional stakeholders is a major failing, while others (Stake, 2000) state that it is the evaluator’s job to listen to the participants pleas, only serves to illustrate the tensions that concern the role of the evaluator. House and Howe (1999 p.xiv) list a number of conflicting pieces of advice from theory on the role of the evaluator, including the fact that evaluators should:

- be advocates for certain groups
- treat all stakeholders views as equally worthy
- remain aloof from stakeholders
- take the views of the sponsors of the study
- act only as facilitators
- draw conclusions on their studies
- not draw conclusions
- draw partial conclusions

While there are arguments for the different stances, where most social interventions are concerned, including urban regeneration, there has been a marked shift towards evaluators taking up a more facilitatory role in the evaluation process (Hall and Hall, 2004). Although input is sought from a broad range of stakeholders, it is often down to the evaluator to decipher and decide what participants’ interests are, as well as what ultimately goes into the evaluation report (Stake, 2001; House, 2001). All things considered, the role of the evaluator is to deliberate within a particular context, which includes stakeholders and other participants, to produce an evaluation that provides objective, coherent and accurate information from various available sources (CLES, 2009; House and Howe, 1999). This means that the role of the evaluator is often to act as orchestrator of “a negotiation process that aims to culminate in consensus on better informed and more sophisticated” understandings of the issues surrounding an evaluand (Guba and Lincoln, 1981 p.110).
4.2 Evaluating Urban Regeneration and Sustainable Development

The practice of evaluation within urban regeneration is complex, with the uniqueness of each individual intervention meaning there is no agreed consensus on precisely what is required (Roberts and Sykes, 2000). The idea that the theoretical basis of evaluation within urban regeneration embodies elements of theories of use as well as value, suggests that it has a role to play not just in terms of providing information on the success (or lack thereof) of a project, but also promoting best practice. Mark et al discusses the role of evaluation in influencing policy, and go further to suggest that the ultimate goal of evaluation is social betterment (Mark et al, 2000). This is a view shared by Mertens (1999) who states that this social betterment should particularly benefit the least advantaged. The World Health Organisation (1998a) take this view a step further, recommending that evaluation should in fact play a part in capacity building, at individual, community, organisational and governmental levels.

The previous section of this chapter discusses accountability as a foundation for the practice of evaluation. In the wake of the public's increased expectation of accountability from service providers, there has been a noticeable move towards result oriented implementation of said services where managers are required to demonstrate how various activities feed into wider societal outcomes. Callahan and Kolby (2009, p4.) describe this focus on outcomes rather than policy, regulation and process as representing a “fundamental shift in the way the public sector does business—a fundamental shift in the nature of thinking, acting, and managing”. From its beginning in the early 1990s and over the following decade, this shift has swept across a number of sectors gathering considerable momentum and growing from what was initially a new idea within the non profit sector to what is now globally recognised as the outcomes movement (Penna & Phillips, 2005 p.1). The idea has since taken root within a wide cross-section of public sector service delivery from education to health.
Whereas in the past all a public or nonprofit/third sector agency needed to do in order to be considered successful was to “deliver services, carry out activities and spend money in a responsible way”, today’s world demands that they deliver to “outcomes – tangible and meaningful improvements in the condition of clients, neighbourhoods or even the entire community” (Easterling, 2002 p.1). Moreover, despite this shift in paradigm within the public and third sector being a long time coming, the current financial climate has given the movement a second wind with mission-effectiveness becoming “an increasingly urgent issue in the decade ahead” considering the “immense fiscal pressure” most funders are under due to the global recession (Morino, 2011 p.xiii). Morino goes on to suggest that the flipside of this era of scarcity is the fact that it provides an opportunity to explore the fundamentals of the way systems have worked and reassess what constitutes business as usual. In a trend he has dubbed ‘Impact Investing’, investors want to see that their capital is delivering lasting impacts on all fronts and are seeking not just financial returns, but environmental and social ones too.

4.2.1 Measuring Sustainability

The shift towards accounting for impacts across the different dimensions of sustainability and considering the triple bottom line, has raised questions about how those impacts can be measured. An increased amount of research is geared towards determining appropriate indicators for the different aspects of sustainable development. The United Nation’s publication, Agenda 21, urges governments as well as national and international non-governmental organisations to work together to develop appropriate indicators for sustainable development (UN, 2009). In 2007 the United Nations published a comprehensive list of indicators of sustainable development in a bid to provide a basis for decision making on issues relating to the matter (UN, 2007). The publication was geared towards the translation of knowledge from the physical and social sciences to manageable units of that can easily be communicated to the wider community in order to provide crucial guidance for decision making. Since then other countries and organisations (Cooperatives UK, 2012; Department for Sustainable Development, 2009; European Commission,
2012) have also put forward sets of indicators to provide a basis for measuring sustainable development. Tables 4.3 – 4.5 (Developed from: Department for Sustainable Development, 2009; European Commission, 2012; DEFRA, 2011; Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2001; OECD, 2004; Office of Gas and Electricity Markets (OFGEM), 2012; Sustainable Development Commission, 2004; United Nations, 2009) present the different indicators used in measuring sustainable development, according to the respective dimensions the indicators cater to. They also represent the different levels at which the indicators are applied.

4.2.1.1 Environmental Indicators

Work around the development of a set of environmental indicators began with the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) in the 1970s, with the production of a first generation of core indicators for the measurement of environmental sustainability and performance (Moldan et al, 2004; OECD, 2004). The table below shows the main indicators used in determining environmental sustainability.

Table 4.3: List of Indicators for Environmental Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emissions of Greenhouse Gases</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of Ozone Depleting Substances</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality-Ambient Concentration of Air Pollutants in Urban Areas</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arable and Permanent Crop Land Area</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Fertilizers</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Agricultural Pesticides</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDICATOR</td>
<td>LEVEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Area as a Percent of Land Area</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Harvesting Intensity</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Affected by Desertification</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Urban Formal and Informal Settlements</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algae Concentration in Coastal Waters</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Total Population Living in Coastal Areas</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Catch by Major Species</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Withdrawal of Ground and Surface Water as a Percent of Total Available</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentration of Faecal Coliform in Freshwater</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Selected Key Ecosystems</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Area as a % of Total Area</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abundance of Selected Key Species</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity of Material Use</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Energy Consumption per Capita</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of Consumption of Renewable Energy Resources</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity of Energy Use</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation of Industrial and Municipal Solid Waste</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation of Hazardous Waste</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation of Radioactive Waste</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Recycling and Reuse</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Travelled per Capita by Mode of Transport</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy dependence</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity consumption of households</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDICATOR</td>
<td>LEVEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit tax rate on energy (Green tariffs)</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emissions of nitrogen oxides (NOx) from transport</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO2 emissions per inhabitant in the EU and in developing countries</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy consumption of transport, by mode</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of trips per person by mode</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorisation rate</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock density index</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisations and sites with EU Eco-Management and Audit Scheme (EMAS) registration</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecolabel licenses</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area under agri-environmental commitment</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area under organic farming</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregated measurement of support for agriculture</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of certain foodstuffs per inhabitant</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Waste</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban population exposure to air pollution by particulate matter</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban population exposure to air pollution by ozone</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of population living in households considering that they suffer from noise</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity generated, CO2, NOx and SO2 emissions by electricity generators</td>
<td>National (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts of electricity and gas networks</td>
<td>National (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity conservation</td>
<td>National (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Stocks</td>
<td>National (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird Populations</td>
<td>National (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional (UK)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Economic Indicators

Economic sustainability is believed to be more easily measurable than other elements such as social sustainability as it is primarily represented in numeric terms, however it is also difficult to predict as it is affected by several external variables (Munro, 1995). Traditional measures of economic growth such as Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and Income per capita are universally accepted as composite measures for economic viability (Bowler et al, 2002). However not only does viewing these in isolation bear little reflection on issues central to sustainability such as equity, but as mentioned in chapter 3 of this thesis it is possible to have economic development and prosperity in the absence of growth (Sustainable Development Commission, 2004; Jackson, 2009). With scientists and economist alike putting forward the argument for the decoupling of economic growth and the consumption of social and environmental capital (Jackson, 2009) particularly in developing countries (Munasinghe 1999), the broadened range of economic indicators to some extent acknowledges the need to view economic sustainability in its environmental and social context.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GDP per Capita</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Share in GDP</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of Trade in Goods and Services</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt to GNP Ratio</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment by institutional sectors</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net national income</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household saving rate</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real labour productivity growth per hour worked</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total R&amp;D expenditure</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover from innovation</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real effective exchange rate</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy intensity of the economy</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of working age in employment</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Imports from developing countries by income group</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Imports from developing countries by group of products</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU imports from least-developed countries by group of products</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of working age people contributing to a non-state pension in at least three years out of the last four</td>
<td>National (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of people of working age who are economically inactive</td>
<td>National (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional (UK)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.1.3 Social Indicators

Munro (1995) refers to social sustainability as the relationship between development and current social norms which are based on religion, tradition, and custom, thus making them very difficult to define, measure, and evaluate. This complexity is reflected in the broad range of indicators used in measuring social sustainability across the different levels. They consider some elements of the other dimensions comparatively across different societal classes such as gender, income and age groups particularly when dealing with the concept of equality. Furthermore as a dimension undergoing the greatest amount of change and increasing emphasis, new indicators are under development to capture elements such as wellbeing, happiness and social justice (DEFRA, 2012; Sustainable Development Commission, 2006).

Table 4.5: List of Indicators for Social Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Population Living below Poverty Line</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children below the poverty threshold</td>
<td>International, National (UK), Regional (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of pensioners persons aged 65 and over at risk of poverty</td>
<td>International, Regional (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gini Index of Income Inequality</td>
<td>International, European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>International, European, National (UK), Regional (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of 15-19 year olds not in employment, education or training</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of Average Female Wage to Male Wage</td>
<td>International, European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDICATOR</td>
<td>LEVEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortality rates</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortality Rate Under 5 Years and Infants</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average life expectancy at birth</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutritional Status of Children</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immunization Against Infectious Childhood Diseases</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Population with Adequate Sewage Disposal Facilities</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population with Access to Safe Drinking Water</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Population with Access to Primary Health Care Facilities</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary or Primary School Completion Ratio</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Literacy Rate</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of 25-64 year olds with tertiary level qualifications</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area per Person</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household size- Average number of persons per household</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Recorded Crimes per 100,000 Population</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Growth Rate</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population of Urban Formal and Informal Settlements and slums</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of persons aged 15 and over overweight or obese</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular daily smokers aged 15 and over</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people killed per million population</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDICATOR</td>
<td>LEVEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers of car thefts, burglaries and assaults per 100 inhabitants</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road fatalities</td>
<td>International, Regional (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public social expenditure as a percentage of GDP</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demography: Population and population of working age</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment rate, by highest level of education attained</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersion of regional employment rates, by gender</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate, by gender and age</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People at risk of poverty or social exclusion</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistent-at-risk-of-poverty rate by gender, age, level of education attained and household type</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severely materially deprived people</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People at risk of poverty after social transfers</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People living in households with very low work intensity</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In work at-risk-of-poverty rate</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total long-term unemployment rate</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender pay gap in unadjusted form</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with low educational attainment, by age group</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life-long learning</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low reading literacy performance of pupils</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals’ level of computer skills</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals’ level of Internet skills</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public expenditure on education</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy life years and life expectancy at birth, by gender</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy life years and life expectancy at age 65, by gender</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death rate due to chronic diseases</td>
<td>European, Regional (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDICATOR</td>
<td>LEVEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicide death rate, by age group</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self reported unmet need for medical examination or treatment, by income</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious accidents at work</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU financing for developing countries</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign direct investment in developing countries, by income group</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official development assistance, by income group</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untied official development assistance</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilateral official development assistance, by category</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active community participation- informal and formal volunteering at least once a month in the last 12 months</td>
<td>National (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of crime: (a) car theft (b) burglary (c) physical attack</td>
<td>National (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population living in workless households (a) children (b) working age</td>
<td>National (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 year-olds with Level 2 qualifications and above</td>
<td>National (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health inequality - differences between socio-economic groups in mortality rates and differences in average life expectancy between local authority areas</td>
<td>National (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy life expectancy- men &amp; women</td>
<td>National (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of smoking (a) all adults (b) ‘routine and manual’ socio-economic groups</td>
<td>National (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of obesity in 2-10 year-olds</td>
<td>National (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDICATOR</td>
<td>LEVEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of people consuming (a) five or more portions of fruit and</td>
<td>National (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vegetables per day and (b) in low income households</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single person households and dwelling stock</td>
<td>National (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-19 year-olds not in employment, education or training</td>
<td>National (UK) Regional (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensioners in relative low-income households</td>
<td>National (UK) Regional (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How children get to school</td>
<td>National (UK) Regional (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to key services</td>
<td>National (UK) Regional (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sector homes &amp; vulnerable households in the private sector</td>
<td>National (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>below the decent homes standard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households living in fuel poverty</td>
<td>National (UK) Regional (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of rough sleepers &amp; number of households in temporary</td>
<td>National (UK) Regional (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accommodation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households satisfied with the quality of the places in</td>
<td>National (UK) Regional (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>which they live</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Official Development Assistance (a) per cent of Gross National</td>
<td>National (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (b) per capita</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable development education: To be developed to monitor the</td>
<td>National (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impact of formal learning on knowledge and awareness of sustainable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellbeing measures under development</td>
<td>National (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice measures to be developed</td>
<td>National (UK)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Though this study has grouped the different indicators for sustainable development according to the dimensions discussed in chapter three in order to maintain continuity, some organisations (UN, 2007; DEFRA, 2012, European Commission, 2012) have grouped the indicators under themes and sub-themes such as poverty, governance, health, education, demographic, natural hazards, atmosphere, land, oceans, seas and coasts, freshwater, biodiversity, economic development, global economic partnership, consumption and production patterns in order to better address the complex relationships and interconnections between issues and their indicators. One such example is a cross cutting suite of Institutional indicators developed by the UN's Commission on Sustainable Development (Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2001) which signify a country's willingness and commitment to the development of integrated strategies towards sustainable development in accordance with Agenda 21. These strategies should incorporate elements of the environmental, social and economic dimensions reflecting on current national priorities as well as showing consideration for emergent issues. The institutional indicators highlight the extent to which a country has laid down the foundations for sustainable development, by ensuring the right conditions are created in order to facilitate the process. They include:

- National Sustainable Development Strategy
- Implementation of Ratified Global Agreements
- Number of Internet Subscribers per 1000 Inhabitants
- Main Telephone Lines per 1000 Inhabitants
- Expenditure on Research and Development as a Percent of GDP
- Economic and Human Loss Due to Natural Disasters
4.2.1.3 Tools and Methods for Assessing Sustainable Development

There are a variety of tools and methods used in assessing sustainable development drawing on the above mentioned indicators (Kazmierczack et al, 2007), many of which examine individual dimensions of sustainable development. There are however integrated toolkits that approach the assessment of sustainable development in a holistic manner, reflecting on the environmental, economic as well as social impacts and the relationships between them. Integrated Assessment Methods (IAMs) synthesise information from a variety of fields of study in the consideration of the environmental, economic and social indicators that impact on sustainable development. The two key elements of IAMs is that they aim to bring together a broad set of methods from different disciplines, as well as provide useful decision making information (Consortium for International Earth Science Information Network (CIESIN), 1995; Cambridge Centre for Climate Change Mitigation Research, 2012). Like the IAMs, multi-criteria analysis (MCA) refers to a broad range of techniques that adopt a structured approach to the consideration of multiple options, in order to determine a preferred course of action based on multiple indicators. MCA is becoming an increasingly popular tool in the policy decision making process, as it combines a range of option impacts into a single framework for easier understanding and interpretation by decision makers (UNFCCC, 2012 unknown; CLG, 2009). Other frameworks such as the BEQUEST: Assessment Toolkit for Sustainable Urban Development bring together good practice advice on Sustainable Urban Development (SUD) in a logical framework with various assessment methods that will provide the evidence to support better decision making. Developed by the Building Environmental Quality Evaluation for Sustainability through Time (BEQUEST) Networking Project, the toolkit is “designed to demonstrate how practitioners and other decision makers can be helped to tackle sustainability problems in the built environment“ (Curwell and Hamilton, 2000).
The assessment toolkit itself sits on the BEQUEST framework for sustainable urban development which seeks to link the main issues concerning sustainable urban development with the practical socio-economic issues of modern life (Curwell and Hamilton, 2000).
4.2.2 Methods of Evaluation in Regeneration

With the development and evolution of urban policy as well as the shift to a more business minded approach to the delivery of public sector services, evaluation has risen in significance. There is an increased requirement to demonstrate the extent to which programs are reaching their intended clients, producing intended results, and avoiding unwanted side effects (Sesnan, 2006).

However the fact that regeneration is complex and multifaceted raises several issues in its evaluation. HM Treasury (1995,) site the difficulty in the quantification and valuation of regeneration intervention outputs and outcomes as a challenge in conducting evaluations in this context. Within regeneration evaluation is often considered an external exercise to the core activity of an intervention, and viewed as an “additional task to be completed by an already overworked manager” (CLES, 2009, p.11). Furthermore, Langer et al (2003) highlight the long timeframe required in order to determine the sustainability of achieved outcomes as a challenge when implementing evaluations in the context of urban regeneration; thereby making it necessary to distinguish between intermediate and final outcomes (HM Treasury, 1995). In addition the issue of access to information is a barrier when conducting evaluations in the context of urban regeneration.

Green and South (2006, p.11) outline six key questions that shape the design of an evaluation framework. They are:

- Who the evaluation is for
- What is to be found out
- Why it is to be found out
- When findings are required
- Where the information is to be gathered from
- How the results will be used
Chelimsky (1997) reflects on the ‘why’ in the above list, putting forward three main reasons (see table 4.6) for conducting an evaluation namely:

- Accountability: In this case seeking to measure the results of a project or intervention to determine efficiency
- Development: Therefore seeking to use the insights provided by an evaluation to strengthen and improve processes
- Knowledge: Thereby providing a deeper understanding of activities, seeking to delve deeper into the reasons behind different outcomes

Lewis (2001) suggests that the purpose of an evaluation has a bearing on the selection of methods used in conducting the evaluation. Although she suggests the use of experimental and quasi-experimental designs in the conduction of evaluations for the purpose of knowledge, she recognises this view as being largely rooted in health studies. Whereas where social policy is concerned, evaluators tend to employ a more eclectic set of methods, as is the case in urban regeneration.

Table 4.6: Recommended methods for evaluations with different foci (Adapted from: Lewis, 2001 p.392)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PURPOSE OF EVALUATION</th>
<th>METHODS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Independent, external, assessment against agreed objectives, quantitative methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Self-evaluation, descriptive monitoring, feedback from assessment into new action, mainly qualitative methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Combination of above methods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Langer et al (2003) link the reason for conducting an evaluation to the temporal setting of an intervention, referring to three main stages within a programme at which an evaluation can be implemented. These are outlined in table 4.7 along with their varying purposes.
Table 4.7: Timing of Evaluation relative to stage within intervention (Source: Langer et al, 2003, p.14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Process of Regeneration Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>Before Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Ex-Ante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective</td>
<td>Formative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>Formative/Summative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Purpose | Needs Assessment | Program/ process objectives | Program/ process design | Process/System | Interim effectiveness/ efficiency | Effectiveness Efficiency |

Despite the fact that ex-ante evaluations are crucial to the development of a particular intervention, the role ex-post evaluations play in retrospectively highlighting the learning emergent from a given project render them of equal importance (Langer et al, 2003). Ex-post evaluations usually involve a summative element which is focused on highlighting the achievements and outcomes of a particular intervention. The role this plays in proving accountability to funders and wider stakeholders has made this form of evaluation particularly prevalent in the field of urban regeneration. HM Treasury (2003) provides a comparison between ex-ante and ex-post evaluations as shown in table 4.8.
Table 4.8: Ex-Ante Evaluation vs Ex-Post Evaluation (Source: HM Treasury, 2003, p.48)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Appraisal</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim</strong></td>
<td>Ex ante assessment of whether action is worthwhile and impacts</td>
<td>Ex post assessment of whether action was worthwhile and impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of Output</strong></td>
<td>Project procurement, policy and programme design</td>
<td>Feedback for:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(a) future procurement, project management,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) wider policy debate, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(c) future programme management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application</strong></td>
<td>Projects, policies and programmes</td>
<td>Projects, policies and programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timing</strong></td>
<td>Always prior to implementation</td>
<td>☐ During implementation (&quot;formative&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ After implementation (&quot;summative&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data</strong></td>
<td>Forecasted</td>
<td>Historic and current, estimated and actual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimates of counterfactuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Method</strong></td>
<td>Comparison of options against ‘do nothing’ option</td>
<td>Comparison of results against ‘do nothing’ option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated assessment of risk</td>
<td>Comparison of actual outturns against target outturns/ alternative outturns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment of risks that did or did not materialise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analytical Techniques</strong></td>
<td>Cost Benefit/ Effectiveness Analysis</td>
<td>Cost Benefit/ Effectiveness Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discounted cash flow analysis</td>
<td>Discounted cash flow analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-criteria analysis</td>
<td>Multi-criteria analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other statistical analysis</td>
<td>Other statistical analysis -- e.g.: analysis of performance indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision Criteria</strong></td>
<td>Comparison of NPV, NPC for different options</td>
<td>Consideration of whether correct criteria were used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non quantifiable factors may be included if quantification impossible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audit and Enforcement</strong></td>
<td>Public Accounts Committee (PAC),</td>
<td>PAC, NAO, HMT, OGC Gateway 5, Departmental arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAO, HMT, OGC Gateways 0, 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Departmental arrangements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Despite the extensive list of sustainability indicators developed over the years, the extent to which they are reflected within most urban regeneration evaluation frameworks has until recently remained limited (Hemphill et al, 2004; OECD, 2000), with the foremost framework for the evaluation of regeneration based on Value for Money (Roberts and Sykes, 2000; HM Treasury, 1995). More recently frameworks that take into account Gross Value Added (GVA) have gained popularity laying emphasis on the impact (positive or negative) that an intervention has had structured around a list of themes and sub themes. These themes are derived from the objectives of the intervention. Furthermore scope is built in to consider unintended outcomes of activities (BIS, 2009; DTI, 2006; HM Treasury, 1995). In the HM Treasury’s Green Book (2003), they set out a framework for evaluation embedded within the ‘ROAMEF’ cycle (see figure 4.5), where the acronym stands for Rationale, Objectives, Appraisal, Monitoring, Evaluation and Feedback.

![Fig. 4.6: HM Treasury’s ROAMEF cycle](Source: HM Treasury, 2003, p.3)
They break down the evaluation process into five different stages which are:

- Establish exactly what is to be evaluated and how past outcomes can be measured.
- Choose alternative states of the world and/or alternative management decisions as counterfactuals.
- Compare the outturn with the target outturn, and with the effects of the chosen alternative states of the world and/or management decisions.
- Present the results and recommendations.
- Disseminate and use the results and recommendations.

In a bid to reflect the shift in global consciousness towards the incorporation of more social measures of sustainability, HM Treasury include within the 2011 amendment to The Green Book (2003, p.57), a review of the assessment of what they term “non market impacts”. The updated section considers concepts such as value, utility, welfare and wellbeing and looks at things such as life satisfaction.

The project outcomes that form the focus of evaluation activity are tied to the objectives of the project, which in turn are closely linked to objectives of funding providers (National Audit Office, 2011). As such most evaluation criteria based on these objectives are resultantly related to funding criteria and indicators set out by funding bodies such as the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), and statutory organisations that govern the activity of delivery organisations (eg the Tenant Services Authority (TSA)). The ERDF (2009) sets out indicators for monitoring based on project outputs and results such as footpaths or cycle ways created or reconstructed, Individuals assisted to set up a new enterprise and gross jobs created. It also sets out indicators for evaluations derived from project impacts, for example net jobs created, occupancy rates and population with access to infrastructure points. Bodies such as the TSA do not set out indicators as such but rather benchmarks and standards (TSA, 2012) which their members subscribe to, building their core values into project objectives.
The fact that regeneration is multifaceted means that different evaluation methods have been developed in order address different forms of interventions focused on different aspects of regeneration. HM Treasury’s Housing and Urban Policy Team (1995) provide guidance on conducting ex-ante evaluations within regeneration, highlighting four main objectives most forms of regeneration activity seek to meet. These are:

- Promotion of enterprise
- Improvement of physical environment
- Improvement of labour supply
- Improvement of quality of life

The first objective centres mainly on economically driven interventions, while the second involves mostly environmentally driven projects. The third objective is tackled generally by socially focused interventions, and finally the fourth objective is met either by a combination of interventions, or one that seeks to address the different dimensions of sustainable development holistically. Given this context, different evaluation frameworks incorporate a variety of tools and methods depending on the foci of the regeneration intervention (HM Treasury, 2003).

4.2.2.1 Economic Impact Assessment

Some of the foremost tools adopted in assessing the economic impact of regeneration include Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA) and Local Multiplier 3 (LM3).

Cost-Benefit Analysis:
CBA is a widely used assessment tool to measure the financial or economic impacts of an intervention and determine whether to make a change. It compares the costs or disadvantages of an intervention to the benefits or advantages, using the outcomes of this exercise to inform decision making (Mind Tools, 2012).
The main steps involved in CBA are:

- Developing measures or programmes intended to help reduce a certain social problem (e.g. road accidents or environmental pollution).
- Developing alternative policy options for the use of each measure or programme.
- Describing a reference scenario (the do-nothing alternative).
- Identifying relevant impacts of each measure or programme. There will usually be several relevant impacts.
- Estimating the impacts of each measure or programme in physical terms for each policy option.
- Obtaining estimates of the costs of each measure or programme for each policy option.
- Converting estimated impacts to monetary terms, applying available valuations of these impacts.
- Comparing benefits and costs for each policy option for each measure or programme.
- Identifying options in which benefits are greater than costs.
- Conducting a sensitivity analysis or a formal assessment of the uncertainty of estimated benefits and costs.
- Recommending cost-effective policy options for implementation.

- European Road Safety Observatory (ERSO), 2007

Pennisi and Scandizzo (2006) discuss the main differences in practice between the traditional conduct of a CBA from an economist’s perspective and the more “purposed alternative” from the perspective of a social scientist. The tradition view of CBA seeks a standardised and objective process that relies heavily on quantitative measures to the detriment of more qualitative aspects. The process involves a high degree of managerial control with little input from stakeholders. Finally the evaluator maintains the role of an objective professional
whose priorities reflect the values of the CBA process. In contrast, as is the case in regeneration, the social science standpoint recognises the importance of stakeholder input and the subjectivity that goes along with it. The emphasis lies more with dialogue and enquiry as CBA is viewed as an essential part of the process of development and change. The role of management is less controlling and rather seeks to empower stakeholders by giving them a voice. The evaluator’s role is therefore more of a facilitatory one in the context of these negotiations.

HM Treasury (2003) distinguish between cost benefit analysis and cost effective analysis (CEA) stating that while the former deals with comparisons of both financial and non financial values to inform decisions on feasibility, the latter compares the alternative means of delivering the same output in order to determine which the most effective course of action is.

Within urban regeneration, CBA in its most basic form involves the use of purely financial costs and benefits, but it can be extended to take into account more intangible social and environmental costs or benefits of an intervention. This however introduces an element of subjectivity to the process. One of the main issues with the use of cost benefit analyses within urban regeneration is that due to the long term nature of most projects, the break-even or payback point may not come until several years down the line, further increasing the risk and margin of error for calculations (Mind Tools, 2012; ERSO, 2007).

**Local Multiplier 3:**

The Local Multiplier 3 (LM3) is a web-based tool which enables users to measure the economic impact of an intervention or an activity by tracking the flow of money within the local economy, and identifies areas where the impact can be improved. LM3 makes it possible to identify where “money goes, how that money impacts on the local economy, and, most importantly, how to improve the local economy while spending the same or less money” (NEF Consulting, 2011). Developed by the New
Economics Foundation, LM3 tends to be used in public procurement as it provides information on how any organisation can measure its economic contribution by analysing expenditure within a geographic area using current data. It examines a particular local economy (or several), calculating how much of the project spend goes into the local economy and then how much of that is then re-spent and thus retained within the local area (Forth Sector, 2012).

The LM3 process looks at three rounds of expenditure (see figure 4.7) in order to determine a multiplier for every unit of currency originally spent. For example:

- Round 1 involves calculating company X’s turnover
- Round 2 looks at the postcode locations of places where the company spends its turnover such as staff, suppliers, etc.
- Round 3 reviews where there staff members and suppliers have spent that income

  - *NEF Consulting, 2011*

![Fig. 4.7: Rounds 1-3 of the LM3 Process](Source: NEF Consulting, 2011, p.4)
The Centre for Local Economic Strategies (CLES) has extended the LM3 model to consider its application in the context of public sector expenditure and therefore urban regeneration. Their model modifies the 3 step process, where:

- **Round 1**: is total spend
- **Round 2a**: explores spend upon local suppliers
- **Round 2b**: explores spend upon local employees
- **Round 3a**: explores the extent to which suppliers re-spend their incomes in the local economy upon local suppliers and local employees of their own
- **Round 3b**: explores the extent to which employees re-spend their incomes in the local economy in shops and upon services

The final analysis derives an economic multiplier ratio by adding together rounds one to three of spending and dividing the result by round one. The ratio is represented as a percentage of a unit of currency retained in the local area for every unit originally spent. See figure 4.8 below.

![Fig. 4.8: The LM3 Process](Source: Mosely Community Development Trust, 2011)

NEF consulting (2011) highlight one of the main benefits of LM3 stating that it is an effective tool in determine where to ‘plug the leaks’ in the local economy (particularly where regeneration is concerned. Furthermore, it is a vital tool in the demonstration of economic impact in order to justify activity.
4.2.2.2 Environmental Impact Assessment

Two of the leading tools utilised when it comes to assessing the environmental impacts of interventions are Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) and the Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM).

Environmental Impact Assessment:

Basic Environmental Impact Assessments constitute one way in which the environmental aspects of urban regeneration projects are carried out. It refers to a process of “drawing together, in a systematic way, an assessment of a project’s likely significant environmental effects” (Department for Communities and Local Government, 2006, p.1). The EIAs (Strategic Environmental Assessments in Scotland, Wales and NI) are a requirement for planning approval for all major development projects in the UK and are used mainly by local authorities and developers. The Department for Communities and Local Government provides guidance on methods and procedures within the SEA Toolkit and EIA: Guide to Procedures. Department for Communities and Local Government (2006) outlines elements which the process reviews such as:

1. Characteristics of projects

The characteristics of projects must be considered having regard in particular, to:

- the size of the project
- the cumulation with other projects
- the use of natural resources
- the production of waste
- pollution and nuisances
- the risk of accidents, having regard in particular to substances or technologies used
2. Location of projects
The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by projects must be considered, having regard, in particular, to:
• the existing land use
• the relative abundance, quality and regenerative capacity of natural resources in the area
• the absorption capacity of the natural environment

3. Characteristics of the potential impact
The potential significant effects of projects must be considered in relation to criteria set out under 1 and 2 above, and having regard in particular to:
• the extent of the impact (geographical area and size of the affected population)
• the transfrontier nature of the impact
• the magnitude and complexity of the impact
• the probability of the impact
• the duration, frequency and reversibility of the impact

Despite the fact that EIAs are used prospectively, the framework can be applied retrospectively as well, in order to assess the impact a project has had once completed.

BREEAM:
The Building Research Establishment developed assessment framework, BRE Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM), provides a means for Clients, planners, development agencies, funders, and property agents to assess and rate the environmental performance of a building or scheme. Similar to the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) developed by the U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC, 2012) and The Green Building Council of Australia’s ‘Green Star’ assessment method (Green Building Council of Australia, 2012), BREEAM is recognised as the “world's foremost environmental assessment method and rating system for buildings...setting the standard for best practice in sustainable building design, construction and operation” (BRE Global, 2012, p.1).
In addition to toolkits for various types of building design, the BRE has a BREEAM Communities Toolkit which can be applied to large scale developments such as urban regeneration projects, and has been applied to such projects as Media City, Salford. BREEAM Communities currently targets the concept and planning stage of developments, and assesses the eight categories that are linked to planning policy and best practice standards which are already familiar to many local authorities and developers (BRE Global, 2012). These are:

- **Climate Change and Energy** - flooding, heat island, water efficiency, sustainable energy, site infrastructure,
- **Community** - promoting community networks and interaction, involvement in decision making, supporting public services, social economy and community structure, and community management of the development,
- **Place Shaping** - efficient use of land, design process, form of development, open space, adaptability, inclusive communities, crime, noise pollution, street lighting/light pollution security lighting,
- **Buildings** - EcoHomes / BREEAM or Code for Sustainable Homes,
- **Transport and Movement** - general policy, public transport, parking, pedestrians and cyclists, proximity of local amenities, traffic management, car clubs,
- **Ecology** - conservation, enhancement of ecology, planting,
- **Resources** - appropriate use of land resources, environmental impact, locally reclaimed materials, water resource planning, refuse composting, construction waste,
- **Business** - competitive business, business opportunities, employment, business types.

In 2007 the BRE launched their tailor made regional sustainability checklists developed in partnership relevant Local Authorities. The Checklists seek to:

- Directly complement the Government’s new Code for Sustainable Homes and informs the development of the ‘place’ element in Sustainable Communities.
• Incorporate regional planning, sustainable development and other key policies and targets for the individual region into a straightforward tool.

• Enable clients and funders to specify levels of performance in developments.

• Help architects and developers by clearly setting out the standards and targets required to achieve good and best practice performance across a range of sustainability issues.

• Provide planners with a straightforward tool for assessing the sustainability impacts of development proposals and enable different options to be compared.

• Be easily adaptable to local authority sustainability and planning policy, and can be incorporated into Development Plan Documents.

• Be compatible with BREEAM, EcoHomes, Health Impact Assessments and Environmental Impact Assessments.

- World Wildlife Federation, 2006

4.2.2.3 Social Impact Assessment

In recent years impact assessment practice has seen emphasis placed on the embedding of social accountability measures within organisational convention, resulting in a new wave of social impact assessments which build on the foundations laid in the 1970s (Gray, 2001). When assessing the social impact of regeneration projects, two of the more widely used tools include Social Accounting and Auditing (SAA) and Social Return on Investment (SROI).
Social Accounting and Auditing:

Social accounting refers to a process by which it is possible to demonstrate how well an organisation is performing with regards to its community based objectives, and track the social impact it is having (Camron et al, 2010).

One of the foremost methods of social accounting is the AA1000 which is a set of principles that form a framework for the understanding, development, implementation, evaluation and communication of socially sustainable values and activities within an organisation. Geared mainly towards the corporate sector, the AA1000 AccountAbility Principles aim to promote transparency, and the assumption of responsibility for the impact of organisational policies, decisions and actions. Furthermore it obligates organisations to involve stakeholders throughout the process (Accountability, 2008).

More widely used within social enterprise and urban regeneration is the Social Audit Network’s (SAN) Social Accounting and Auditing framework (SAN, 2012). They outline four key steps in the process shown in table 4.9, which also represents the questions posed at each stage.

Table 4.9: Stages of the Social Accounting and Auditing Process (Developed from: SAN, 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE</th>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Identification of the difference the organisation seeks to make | What do you do?  
What difference will you make?  
Who do you work with and for?  
Why do you do it? |
| Identification of how they know they are making a difference | What do you need to know to show you are making that difference?  
How do you make sure you are tracking it? |
| Identification of what difference they are making     | What can you say about your performance?  
How do you report the information?  
What impact are you making? |
| Proving that they have made a difference               | How credible are your claims?  
Who has checked out your draft social accounts and what did they find? |
Social Accounting emphasises the involvement of stakeholders within the process, with a full scale stakeholder mapping activity forming a crucial part of the social accounting process. It is not necessary to conduct a set of social accounts across all sectors of organisational activity, particularly when conducting a pilot, so it is possible to focus the process on segments of the organisation alone. The process is embedded within a cycle (see figure 4.9) that can be repeated and built upon; thereby strengthening the processes over time, and providing results with more meaning. The organisation is able to build a record of their standing with the community, how activity and relationships with stakeholders have changed and progressed, as well as the impacts the organisation has had over time (Camron et al, 2010; SAN, 2012).

![Fig. 4.9: Social Accounting and Audit Cycle (Source: SAN, 2012, p.16)](image)

Social accounting may also be extended to consider elements of environmental impact in an activity that provides a form of environmental accounting (Pearce, 2003), and constitutes a useful means not only to report on activity to funders, but also to keep a historical record of achievement for members of staff. Most importantly it provides a means for organisations to keep track of their activity while identifying areas for improvement (Camron et al, 2010; SAN, 2012).
Social Return on Investment:

Social Return on Investment (SROI) refers to a form of social impact assessment which applies the principles of cost benefit analysis discussed earlier in this section to a social context. Sometimes referred to as Social Cost Benefit Analysis (SCBA), SROI seeks to assess and place a monetary value on the impact of an intervention to society. Values are placed on ‘non market goods’ such as health, educational success, family and community stability, environmental assets etc. by looking at the impact that these parameters have on their consumers. Government economists have also set out to create value sets for other factors such as time, health benefits, prevention of crime and fatalities, injury, and design quality (HM Treasury, 2003).

The CLG (2010c) suggests that with it being possible to translate many of the benefits of urban regeneration (economic, social as well as environmental) into monetary values within the SROI framework, it lends itself well to the reporting of activity in this context particularly to funders. As emphasis within the exercise lies heavily on the valuation process, the development of these monetary proxies is often the focus of critics of this tool. They highlight the generation of monetary values for different factors, particularly in instances where there are no market values as an extensive limitation of the tool, calling into question the accuracy of its results (Third Sector Research Centre, 2011).

The Cabinet Office of the Third Sector (2009, p.7) outline six stages in conducting an SROI exercise:

1. **Establishing scope and identifying key stakeholders:** It is important to have clear boundaries about what the SROI analysis will cover, who will be involved in the process and how. Often service users, funders and other agencies working with the client group are included in an SROI

2. **Mapping outcomes:** Through engagement with the stakeholders, an impact map (also called a theory of change or logic model) will be developed which shows the relationship between inputs, outputs and outcomes.
3. **Evidencing outcomes and giving them a value:** This stage involves finding data to show whether outcomes have happened and then giving them a monetary value.

4. **Establishing impact:** Those aspects of change that would have happened anyway or are a result of other factors are taken out of the analysis.

5. **Calculating the SROI:** This stage involves adding up all the benefits, subtracting any negatives and comparing the result with the investment. This is also where the sensitivity of the results can be tested.

6. **Reporting, using and embedding:** This vital last step involves verification of the report, sharing findings with stakeholders and responding to them, and embedding good outcomes processes.

Like other forms of CBA, SROI may be conducted prospectively at the planning stage of a project as a forecasting tool for appraisal, or retrospectively as a tool for evaluating outcomes of activity (CLG, 2010c).
4.2.3 Best Practice in Evaluation in Other Sectors

The social sector provision cuts across agencies for education, health, justice, works and pensions, as well as housing, and has close links with urban regeneration, as they seek to manage similar areas such as skills and employment, healthcare, housing provision and fairness in society. Furthermore extensive partnerships have been formed between service providers in these areas and organisations responsible for urban regeneration delivery (Carley, et al 2002). This study has identified the focus on outcomes within the sector (Edgington, 2011; Easterling, 2002) as an area of best practice within evaluation. Smith (2004) defines ‘outcome’ as the output or result adjusted for quality.

\[ \text{Outcome} = \text{Output} \times \text{Quality} \]

The focus on outcomes means that it is possible not just to focus on the direct result of an activity but its long term impact and effectiveness (Smith, 2004). It creates a forum to consider socially meaningful changes as a result of the activities conducted, which can serve as a sturdy base for accountability (Easterling, 2002; Morino, 2011); all of which serve to benefit evaluation practice within regeneration. Another area of best practice within the social sector is in its utilisation of methodological pluralism. Schalock (2001) refers to the adoption evaluation practice that combines the use of both performance management and values/impact assessment techniques that use both qualitative and quantitative methods. The utilisation of a combination of formative and summative assessment methods allows service providers focus not just on themselves as an organisation in terms of its activities and processes, but on its clients and users, considering the value of the organisation to them. Once again a key benefit to evaluation practice in regeneration.

Another stakeholder within regeneration that deliverers stand to learn from are voluntary sector providers. Despite criticism levelled against some organisations, especially smaller ones, in the voluntary sector with regards to rigour and attention and resources devoted to evaluation (National Council for Voluntary Organisations, 2012), much stands to be gained by learning from their approach to stakeholder
engagement. A study carried out by the Innovation Network into stakeholder involvement within evaluation practice found that evaluations which encouraged a high level of stakeholder involvement throughout the process produced more comprehensive and accurate reports. Furthermore, organisations which involved stakeholders within their evaluations also found they enjoyed higher levels of stakeholder support; not just for evaluation activities but they also core activities of the organisations themselves. This support is particularly crucial for the long term viability of voluntary sector organisations which experience a high staff turnover, and rely on stakeholders to provide an element of continuity (Pankaj et al, 2011). This is an element that is also key in ensuring the long term sustainability of regeneration activity. Not only does the inclusion of stakeholders in the evaluation process aid in contextualising the evaluation itself but it can provide crucial information on an area such as accepted social norms that can prove vital during appraisal (National Council for Voluntary Organisations, 2012). Another aspect that is considered good practice form the voluntary sector is inter-organisational collaboration between similar agencies providing support for one another in a number of activities. This is an element that goes some way to increase cost effectiveness and is more relevant under the current climate of financial hardship. The idea is already gaining traction with government as we see councils merging to increase efficiency (Resource Centre, 2012; BBC, 2011).

Finally, this study looks to the technology sector as a source of best practice that may inform evaluation within regeneration. Despite the fact that the sector is not closely related to urban regeneration, a study conducted by the US Department of Commerce (2005) highlights several areas of good practice within evaluation in the technology sector. It raises issues mentioned previously around a multifaceted approach to assessment, but crucially highlights the fact that it is essential for evaluation to constitute a core organisational activity. One of the key areas of best practice with regards to evaluation is to establish evaluation as a core activity and sustain it despite budgetary constraints. Whether the evaluations are conducted internally or externally, the report stresses the importance of having staff with appropriate backgrounds, capabilities, and experience, recommending a dedicated budget for evaluation activity (National Institute of Standards and Technology, 2005).
This issue of the organisational buy in with regards to evaluation is key, with it being necessary for organisations to adopt a healthy performance culture (Morino, 2011), and embed the discipline of evaluation into programme lifecycles (Canadian Evaluation Society, undated).

Another area of best practice form the technology sector is in allowing for innovation in evaluation methods, stating that where existing methods and tools appear to be insufficient it is appropriate to develop new tools by combining existing methods in ways they have not been used before; once again linking in to the value of methodological plurality (National Institute of Standards and Technology, 2005). Finally and possibly most importantly is the willingness of the technology sector to evaluate unsuccessful projects along with successful ones. The National Institute of Standards for Technology (2005) state that there is a great deal to learn from projects that have failed to meet their intended objectives.
4.3 Summary
Evaluation can be defined as a process of systematically examining and assessing information on a subject in order to come to a judgment to inform a decision. It may be conducted for a number of reasons including accountability, learning and knowledge generation. Evaluation originated form research practice within the field of social sciences, which consequently influenced the way different theorists have developed the field of evaluation itself, and its evolution along the branches of methods, value and use as well as the varying views on the role of the evaluator. Evaluation can be classified based on the mode of enquiry utilised, the subject of the evaluation, the approach adopted towards the evaluation or the intended function of the evaluation.

In a bid to measure sustainability, governments, international agencies, and non governmental organisations have developed indicators at different levels that address the environmental, social and economic aspects of sustainability. There are also different frameworks and methods that draw on these indicators in a bid to measure and assess sustainable development. Similarly the methods utilised in evaluating urban regeneration tend to focus on a single aspect, social, environmental or economic, although there are some methods and frameworks that attempt to integrate all three.

Finally best practice with regards to evaluation can be drawn from sectors closely related to regeneration such as the social and voluntary sectors, but also unrelated sectors such as the technology sector.

The next chapter goes over the first two case studies undertaken within this research, and reviews the use of public private partnerships in the form of urban regeneration companies within the delivery of regeneration.
CHAPTER 5

CASE STUDIES 1 AND 2: QUASI PRIVATE SECTOR APPROACH

“Government has a legitimate function, but the private sector has one too”

- Cal Thomas (1996)
This chapter presents the first two case studies undertaken within the research. The two case study organisations utilise an approach whereby an independent private sector-type company is set up in order to deliver urban regeneration within an area. The chapter discusses the delivery of urban regeneration through the use of these independent agencies in England, before providing an overview of the case study organisations’ activities. The chapter goes on to present the particular projects and evaluations examined for the purpose of the research. It reviews the research methods adopted in conducting the case studies before presenting preliminary findings arising from the analysis of the individual cases.

5.1 Delivering Regeneration using Urban Regeneration Agencies

This form of delivery refers the use of privately held agencies such as Urban Development Corporations (UDCs) and Urban Regeneration Companies (URCs) as vehicles for delivering primarily physical regeneration in designated areas. The roots of this approach lie in the property-led urban regeneration policies of the 1980s. Under the Thatcherite Conservative government, the shift towards regeneration driven by large scale physical developments coupled with economic stimulation led to the establishment of UDCs to manage and facilitate this process (Loftman and Nevin, 1995). Vested with local authority powers such as the capacity to effect compulsory purchase orders, the UDCs acquired and assembled large amounts of land particularly in deprived inner city areas for development. These developments were characterised by flagship prestige projects such as the London Docklands Development Corporation’s (LDDC) Canary Wharf, and the Albert Docks in Liverpool (LDDC, 2009; Loftman and Nevin, 1995). This large scale redevelopment executed with the use of compulsory purchase orders marked the UDCs’ history in urban regeneration as controversial, with issues raised about gentrification within UDC areas (Kleinman, 1999; Davidson and Lees, 2005; Butler, 2007).
The main objectives of the UDCs were to:

- Bring land and buildings into effective use: acquire, hold, manage, reclaim and dispose of land and other property (including CPO powers)
- Encourage the development of existing and new industry and commerce
- Create an attractive environment: carry out building and other operations
- Ensure that housing and social facilities are available to encourage people to live and work in the area
- Carry on any business or undertaking for the purposes of regenerating its area and generally do anything necessary or expedient for this purpose

- English Partnerships, 2009

With greater emphasis on enhancing the role of the private sector in urban regeneration, the increased responsiveness and flexibility of the UDCs put them in a better position to leverage private sector investment (MacCarthy, 2007). Despite being Quasi-Autonomous Non-Government Organisations (QUANGOs) run under the purview of the state, UDCs being charged with the responsibility of developing the physical environment and securing investment in the area, were the precursors of the more independent URCs (Roberts and Sykes, 2000; LDDC, 2009).

The first URCs were set up in 1999 on the basis of recommendations of a report by the Urban Task Force (UTF)(1999) which set out to examine the causes of urban decline in England and explore solutions to bring people back into cities, towns and urban neighbourhoods. Funded by English Partnerships and the Regional Development Agencies, the URCs were established as private legal entities that were tasked with delivering locally focused physical and economic regeneration objectives, while ensuring their synergy with wider strategic goals (UTF, 1999). Unlike UDCs, URCs do not have compulsory purchase powers, but in the spirit of the urban entrepreneurialism of the 1980s, a large part of the URCs’ role is to liaise with the private sector and work in collaboration with them to deliver “radical physical transformation of their areas” (English Partnerships, 2009, p.1). The approach taken by the URCs lays emphasis on partnership work across both public and private sectors, as well as with local stakeholders such as local voluntary agencies, schools, business owners, and residents.
5.2 Case Study 1: Rochdale Development Agency

5.2.1 Development Agency or Regeneration Company?

The Rochdale Development Agency (RDA; not to be confused with the Regional Development Agencies such as the Northwest Development Agency) is an urban regeneration company, set up at arms length from the council in order to drive development in the borough. Established in 1993, the RDA was ahead of its time as one of the first organisations of its kind, created by Rochdale council well before other urban development companies were set up across the country. The organisation was set up as a not-for-profit organisation at arms length from the council with the ability to bridge the gap between the public and the private sectors; the rationale being that an external body to the council presenting a private sector face will be in a better position to liaise with other private sector organisations in order to attract potential investors to the area (RDA, 2004).

As a former mill town, Rochdale has a transitional economy; moving away from traditional manufacturing such as the textiles industry, and seeking to modernise its economy building on strengths within manufacturing by promoting advanced manufacturing within the technological sector. The main issues facing the borough cover a range of aspects of sustainable development [See Section 3.2.1] including physical decline, low levels of adult skills as well as high levels of unemployment. In order to achieve these goals, the council has a broad economic strategy around attracting new investments, and encouraging existing businesses to expand and move up the value chain. Furthermore it seeks to provide local people the skills, opportunities and support to access employment. The regeneration context in Rochdale is around physical change in terms of the housing market, town centres, and connectivity to the city region. Socio-economic transformation driven by creating better paid jobs and a higher value for businesses within the borough as it suffers from a low wage economy (Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council, 2005). The council recognises that physical regeneration goes hand in hand with economic regeneration, seeing as if regeneration efforts are focused on developing the people without addressing the physical conditions in the borough, there is a risk that the people will move elsewhere.
The RDA was initially set up with a focus on traditional economic development activity such as drawing investment and enterprise to the borough as well as promoting job creation. Over the years, the organisation’s remit has evolved to include an array of different activities, primarily driving major physical development projects such as the Kingsway Business Park, the town centre redevelopment as well as the facilitation of Housing Market Renewal delivery. The council has maintained a focus on broader issues such as resource procurement, policy, strategy, statutory duties and engagement with wider city region. However the more implementation oriented planning and development duties and responsibilities e.g. area based regeneration, town centre redevelopment etc. have been passed over to the RDA in a series of stages. The core strategic aims of the RDA are to:

- regenerate Rochdale’s town centres as the focus of the borough’s economic, social & cultural life
- create the conditions for a growing, more sustainable and diverse local economy
- help build strong, stable and more successful neighbourhoods
- renew and improve the main gateways into and movement corridors within the borough
- help promote new housing development that meets the aspirations of both existing and in-moving residents
- deliver a high quality and value for money service

- RDA, 2011

Though accountable to the council, the RDA is governed by a joint board with both private and public sector representation including the chief executive of the council. The organisation is broken into five specialist teams namely:

- Town Centres Team: responsible for town centre redevelopment
- Sustainable Communities : which helps to deliver the borough wide Sustainable Communities Strategy
- Investment and Marketing: who provide property, recruitment and business support for potential inward investors.
- Kingsway Business Park: which oversees activity on the Kingsway project
- Corporate Services : responsible for aspects such as human resources, health and safety, and business improvement

- RDA, 2009a
The RDA facilitates the delivery of the borough’s strategic regeneration framework, ‘The Renaissance Masterplan’, with the aid of two subsidiary companies; Park Lane Developments and Pennine Land Ltd. The former is a property management company, while the latter is a commercial development company. With the benefit of a multi-skilled team and local knowledge of the Rochdale area, Pennine Land Ltd. works to promote large physical regeneration schemes in the borough, of which all profits are re-invested into the RDA (RDA, 2012a; Pennine Land, 2012).

The RDA is staffed by a range of development oriented professionals; surveyors, planners, designers, project managers, environmentalists, economic development professionals etc. Unlike the council who have specialised departments that deal with these different areas, multi-skilled teams work collaboratively on different projects. Figure 5.1 below outlines the organisational structure of the RDA.

![Fig. 5.1: Rochdale Development Agency Organisational Structure (Source: RDA, 2011 p.3)](image-url)
The RDA receives its core support from the council; with the organisation providing developmental services that the council normally does not provide in-house, they act as a client of the RDA, allocating a proportion of their budget to the RDA in return for consultation, managerial and development services provided by the organisation. In addition, the RDA also received additional funding from the North West Development Agency (NWDA), the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), and the Housing Market Renewal Fund (HMR). Largely reliant on the public sector for its income, recent political changes have had a major impact on the RDA. In the last two years the organisation has suffered major cut backs, leading it to streamline provision focusing on the delivery of its core services (RDA, 2011). The organisation’s 2011 business plan places as priority number one “change management and organisational development”, laying emphasis on the need to “protect the organisation’s project management capacity, retaining high calibre staff that are capable of delivering what is still a major development and regeneration programme.” (RDA, 2012a, p.15).

5.2.2 Kingsway Business Park

The Kingsway business park is a one of the largest mixed use developments in the country, spanning 170 hectares of land including 30 hectares of parkland (see figure 5.2). With the site having been identified in the 1950s, the project predates the establishment of the RDA. Assembling the land took a considerable amount of time as the site was under more than 90 different ownerships. Furthermore remedial works as a result of abnormal ground conditions, planning permissions due to the environmentally sensitive nature of the site, and the construction of necessary infrastructure such as roads and amenities has meant that until recently despite progress being made on the project very little of it was visible on site. However with high profile businesses on site including ASDA and JD sports, the Business Park is gradually taking shape (RDA, 2012b). Recognised as a site of regional strategic importance, Kingsway is served by a new motorway junction as well as a new Metrolink stop, linking the site to the wider city region area and making it easily accessible. The idea behind Kingsway is to drive regeneration in the area, by
utilising a major physical regeneration project intended to act as a catalyst for economic growth; creating jobs and boosting employment which in turn ought to generate wider social improvement in the area. It is estimated that the Kingsway project will bring in £250 - £350 million per annum, as well as 7,250 direct and 1,750 indirect jobs by 2022. The Project also includes a village hub which will have a hotel and some leisure usage such as restaurants, as well as small scale offices and 168 homes (RDA, 2012a).

The project is managed by the Kingsway Partnership which is a legal entity in its own right. The partnership was formalised in 2002 and was originally formed by the RDA, Rochdale Council, the NWDA and the developers Wilson Bowden Developments. With the demise of the NWDA, the HCA has since taken over its assets, the Kingsway business park included (Place Northwest, 2011). In terms of partnership roles, the main contribution of the public sector partners (mainly the NWDA) was investment in the actual infrastructure on site, e.g. the new junction from the...
motorway, the major spine road works, landscaping, lighting, highways, water attenuation, drainage, etc. The RDA has a specific role to help deliver to the borough masterplan, and acting on behalf of the council, facilitate the physical development of the project. They assist in getting proposals through planning, negotiating on the contracts and development agreements. The RDA also works with marketing consultants p3 Property Consultants and Jones Lang LaSalle in order to manage promotion and enquires; linking opportunities on the site to the wider community. With the primary strategy being around economic development and generating jobs for the locality, coupled with the site being of strategic importance to the greater Manchester area, there is a balance to be struck between trying to get jobs for local people and attracting people from the surrounding area. The RDA works in collaboration with Employment Links, a local employment initiative that offers recruitment service to local people. The RDA works to address skills development within the borough through another initiative called Junction 21 by linking the physical development to construction training for young people. Contractors on site are signposted to Junction 21, who work with them to get young people into the workforce.

When an enquiry comes in, the RDA meets the prospective tenant, and determines what their requirements are. The developer’s designers then produce a scheme to meet the client brief; and offer a design and build package along with cost estimates. This sort of negotiation is carried out on a plot by plot basis; and while it goes a long way to mitigate the risk on the developer’s side, there are a number of businesses that are seeking completed premises they can simply move into. However due to the recession the risk averse nature of lenders has resulted in a shift away from speculative development. This has made it more difficult to attract small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) to the site as they are not usually interested in (or in a position to commission) large units. This is seen as a challenge since supporting SMEs is key to fostering local enterprise which is one of the goals the RDA seeks to achieve (OECD, 2010; RDA, 2011).

The financial crisis has had a major impact on the rate of progress on Kingsway, with large prospective tenants pulling out. However the project was in the fortunate position of having ‘done the hard yards’ before the recession struck. Major works
such as the land assembly as well as construction of new infrastructure on the site had already been completed by the time the recession set in. With the continuing recession attracting new investment has been difficult. However there continues to be interest in the site, which has received a steady stream of enquires over the past few years. Recently the Kingsway Partnership received the Public Sector Team of the Year award, at the 2012 Insider Property Awards North West in recognition of the high profile private sector investment deals the partnership has managed to secure on the project (Rochdale Online, 2012).
5.2.3 Methodology

The case study investigation focused on evaluation practice within the Rochdale Development Agency, with particular emphasis on the evaluation of the Kingsway project. The case utilised both primary and secondary data; with primary data obtained from five informal interviews and three semi-structured interviews of approximately one hour in length [See Chapter 2; Section 2.3.1]. Informal interviews were conducted with three council staff members, and two senior members of staff at the Rochdale Development Agency (RDA). Formal semi-structured interviews were conducted with:

- Respondent CS1PM: Senior management within the RDA also project manager on the Kingsway project
- Respondent CS1PE: Senior management within the council and Kingsway partnership board member
- Respondent CS1SM: Senior management within the RDA
- Respondent CS1CL: Council liaison

Interviews were recorded, transcribed and summarised, before summaries were sent out to respondents for validation [see e-appendix 4]. Other sources of primary data included photographs and notes taken during field visits. Secondary data was collected in the form of literature such as government publications, articles, archival data and organisational reports which underwent a document review.

A thematic content analysis was conducted on the qualitative data, with main themes coded and reviewed [see section 7.1, e-appendices 2A and 5A]. Statistical methods were used to determine the main themes emergent from the data coding process. A list of prevalent codes, which were utilised within the cross case analysis [see section 7.2], was compiled by cross referencing the codes with the highest occurrence (by total number of references) and total codes with the highest occurrence (by percentage coverage) [See Appendix 2B].

Further analysis of the data within an axial coding framework (Strauss and Corbin, 1998; Gibbs, 2007; Borgatti, 2005) [See Section 2.3] was utilised for the comparative analysis of the primary as well as secondary data against the emergent axial codes.
[See Appendix 2C and e-appendix 1A]. These axial codes formed the basis of the core themes that provided the structure for the preliminary findings set out in section 5.2.4.

QSL NVivo9 was used for the qualitative elements of the analysis such as code generation, while MS Office Excel was used for quantitative methods such as statistical analysis applied to generated codes and some secondary data. Details of the analysis and results can be found in section 7.1, appendix 2 and e-appendix 1A.

5.2.4 Preliminary Findings

The preliminary findings are presented under the following core themes (listed in rank order of emergence within axial coding framework; Appendix 2C):

- Evaluation: General information on evaluation within the organisation as well as the basic forms of evaluation conducted.
- Methods: The processes, procedures and tools adopted in conducting evaluation activity. This includes research questions, participants, criteria and indicators.
- Strategy: Strategic approach to evaluation, including dissemination of findings.
- Motivations: Incentives, and reasons that drive evaluations
- Dissemination: Means by which evaluation findings are reported
- Learning: The organisation’s formative evaluations and actions taken on evaluation findings
- Organisation: The context within which the evaluation occurs; organisational priorities and objectives
- Timeframes: Life cycles and chronological constraints of evaluation activity
- National: The national structures and influences on evaluation practice
- Challenges: The main barriers to evaluation highlighted by the data
- Future: Future plans for the organisation

Findings under individual themes may contain some elements of repetition as the data is being viewed via different lenses each time, and should be considered in the context of the specific heading being addressed. These preliminary findings form the basis of the key learning points listed in Section 5.2.5.
Evaluation

This refers to general information on evaluation within the organisation as well as the basic forms of evaluation conducted.

Council Evaluation

The primary data found that a suite of indicators are monitored at borough level (Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council, 2011a), which reflect worklessness, an aggregate of job seekers allowance, disability benefit, skill level attainment which come in annually. Reports go to the council’s economic partnership, which has sub-groups that suggest corrective action when appropriate. Evaluation varies depending on the nature of the project or initiative, so some things are bound by nationally prescribed evaluation processes, for example SRB funding projects are subject to evaluation.

There are other activities that the council does at the other end of the spectrum on a micro scale. Eg. employment projects collect feedback from customers every day, every time they interact with a customer. Where big formal evaluations are not carried out feedback still informs the council’s learning as they go along; reflecting on the learning, and changing the way things are done. Where there are big programmes, there is a summative evaluation at the end, and usually but not always, formative evaluation going through the process. Pilot activities which are by very definition about learning will have evaluation built in as part of the project.

There are corporate processes in place that inform timeframes. The Rochdale sustainable community strategy and borough masterplan (Rochdale Pride Partnership, 2011; Rochdale MBC 2005) have a fifteen year timeline, and are subject to a three year re-examination and annual review. Individual services are required to produce annual service plans (Rochdale MBC 2011a), which are normally on a three year cycle with an annual refresh. Annual reports are produced, but quarterly performance reports go to the elected members. Balance scorecards for each service are reviewed by the senior management team on a quarterly basis as well. The scorecard is based on performance indicators, so it does not necessarily state that the project is up to X point, but it will state that X people have got into work over the last three months [See ‘Methods’ theme]. The same goes for
the community strategy, and additionally there are processes built in for reporting to local residents and businesses about performance.

Evaluation across the borough on a day to day basis is more to do with ongoing feedback rather than formal evaluations. There is a tendency to be consumed with hitting targets rather than standing back and reflecting; asking if they are the right targets.

RDA Evaluation

Most of the assessment criteria used by the RDA is selected by the council, who generate the indicators mapped onto the Greater Manchester strategic indicators (Rochdale MBC, 2011a; 2011b; Rochdale Pride Partnership, 2011) [See ‘Methods’ theme]. They are built into the council performance management structure which the RDA is a part of. The RDA feeds information on their performance into the council’s system which comes out as a spreadsheet.

Most of the RDA’s evaluation involves measurement of achievement against targets set out for the year in its business plan (RDA, 2011). Every quarter a progress report is produced that goes to the board which assesses performance against those targets.

The RDA has had two main pieces of evaluation work carried out on it; one being a retrospective on the organisation, and the other a benchmarking study looking at the organisation compared to others, which reviewed how different partners and stakeholders viewed the organisation.

Kingsway Evaluation

The primary research revealed that the Kingsway Project has not undergone any extensive form of evaluation in recent years. The Kingsway partnership delivers to a project plan which is less detailed than the RDA business plan, but has objectives and targets around number of businesses attracted, jobs created, enquiries generated, marketing initiatives run with in the year etc., which are measured on a
quarterly basis through the council via its performance management system, and also by the RDA board.

The Kingsway Partnership undertakes more monitoring than evaluation, constantly tracking unemployment, skills, health etc. The partnership monitors:

- progress on physical development
- issues about roads
- project management as a whole.
- levels of enquiries: breaking them down into expressions of interest, and monitoring their progress, tracking how many convert to actual tenancies
- jobs created on the site.

At the moment evaluation activity is quite quantitative, and it is still very project orientated. There hasn’t been an opportunity to sit back and reflect on what the project means for the borough as a whole.

Furthermore, current financial constraints mean that there has not been much work done other than the crude tracking of:

- What kind of businesses are coming on?
- How many jobs are being created?
- How many of those are going to local people?

An annual Kingsway Partnership [See section 5.2.2]meeting takes place as well as regular monthly meetings reviewing sustainability, planning, transport, employment and marketing (which is every two weeks). The meetings control the relationships between the parties quite well, and the relationships between the parties are very good. The RDA reports to the council’s Policy and Scrutiny committee, quarterly or half yearly.

The project has a strategic plan set within a specific framework it can be measured against, but again it has not succeeded as quickly as it should have for various reasons, such as difficulty in assembling the land as well the economic downturn.
The Kingsway project is constantly monitored, using various mechanisms built into the partnership such as:

- The five year strategic review
- Annual review by the board of the key partners
- Quarterly executive steering group chaired by the organisation’s chief exec

The process has always been a Partnership effort. With the demise of the regional development agency, the transition is seeing Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) take over. This will create a forum for a more structured review of where the project is and where it’s going next.

The primary research revealed that the Kingsway Project has not undergone any extensive form of evaluation in recent years. Something which is supported by the lack of literature and documentation on evaluation found within the secondary data.

**Monitoring /Performance Management/Benchmarking**

The primary data found that a suite of indicators are monitored and reported on annually at borough level (Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council, 2011a) [see ‘Methods’ section]. They reflect worklessness, an aggregate of job seekers allowance, disability benefit, and skill level attainment. Most of the RDA’s evaluation involves measurement of achievement against targets set out for the year in its business plan (RDA, 2011). Every quarter a progress report is produced that goes to the board which assesses performance against those targets.

The Kingsway Partnership monitors:

- progress on physical development
- issues about roads
- project management as a whole.
- Levels of enquiries: breaking them down into expressions of interest, and monitoring their progress, tracking how many convert to actual tenancies
- Jobs created on the site.
- What kind of businesses are coming on site?
- How many jobs are being created?
- How many of those are going to local people?
Most of the assessment criteria used by the RDA is selected by the council, who generate the indicators mapped onto the Greater Manchester strategic indicators (Rochdale MBC, 2011a; 2011b; Rochdale Pride Partnership, 2011). They are built into the council performance management structure which the RDA is a part of. The RDA feeds information on their performance into the council’s system which comes out as a spreadsheet.

Programme/Project Evaluation

Evaluation varies depending on the nature of the project or initiative, so some things are bound by nationally prescribed evaluation processes, for example Single Regeneration Budget (SRB) funding projects are subject to mid term and end of project evaluations.

There are other activities that the council does at the other end of the spectrum on a micro scale E.g. employment projects collect feedback from customers every day, every time they interact with a customer. Where big formal evaluations are not carried out feedback still informs the council’s learning as they go along; reflecting on the learning, and changing the way things are done. Where there are big programmes, there is an evaluation at the end, and usually but not always, formative evaluation going through the process.

It was found that each major project has its own arrangements in terms of project and performance management etc. For example for the Municipal Offices Project, there is a dedicated board which oversees that process, and reports to the transformation board within the council which looks overall at the major transformational projects; so they get performance reports on a regular basis. Each programme or project will inevitably have a different kind of timeline attached to it.

Where there are big programmes, there’s a summative evaluation at the end, and usually formative evaluation as going through the process. Again this is dependent on the nature of the project, so the SRB and the NDC programmes, (which were very much about the benefit of the community), had processes to feedback to the
communities they were embedded within. The same goes for the community strategy which is there for the borough and therefore there is a process built in which is about reporting to local residents and businesses about performance. Findings of the document review (Department of Land Economy, 2002; New Heart for Heywood NDC, 2009; Rochdale MBC, 2011a; 2012; Rochdale Vision Partnership, 2011) supported those of the primary data evidencing some of the consultations.

Methods
This refers to the processes, procedures and tools adopted in conducting evaluation activity. This includes research questions, participants, criteria and indicators.

Evaluation across the borough is mainly quantitative, and is still very project orientated. There has not been an opportunity to reflect on what the project means for the borough as a whole. The council operates a balanced scorecard for each service based on performance indicators. The score cards reflect four perspectives namely:

- Customer Focus
- Our People
- Financial
- Services Corporate and Strategic Targets

- Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council, 2010

The score card may not necessarily state that the project is up to X point, but it will state that X people have got into work over the last 3 months. In addition to surveys, qualitative narratives are provided within reports to supplement quantitative results.

The evaluation on the Kingsway project is undertaken by the Kingsway partnership, which monitors progress on the project on an ongoing basis, based on a number of performance related targets. The Kingsway partnership operates a traffic light system [see glossary of terms] for reporting progress on targets. Incorporated into the reports is a confidence guide developed by the organisation with smiley faces or frowning faces depending on how the organisation is doing. Different outcomes have different timelines, and it might take a year to achieve certain outcomes, so the
confidence guide provides an indication of how well progress is being made and can go up or down depending on how the project progresses.

In the past, external consultants have carried out a review of the RDA’s services, as well as a customer satisfaction survey which involved stakeholders and partners of the organisation.

**Indicators/Criteria/Targets**

The primary data revealed that there are a suite of indicators tracked at borough level. [See Appendix 2E]

The primary research found that targets are set based on the strategy (RDA, 2011) set by the Kingsway partnership and reviewed annually. These include:

- Progress on physical development
- Issues about roads
- Project management as a whole.
- Levels of enquiries: breaking them down into expressions of interest, and monitoring their progress, tracking how many convert to actual tenancies
- Jobs created on the site.
- What kind of businesses are coming on site?
- How many jobs are being created?
- How many of those are going to local people?
- The amount of floor space targets for development,
- Hectares of land developed,
- Numbers of housing units

Milestones like signing an agreement for major a development on site (e.g. funding for a dedicated metrolink stop) are also monitored in a bid to track progress made on projects.
This is supported the review of archival documentation which found targets to include:

- publish Design Guide
- renew outline planning permission
- review Master Plan
- progress Metrolink station and access
- progress Rochdale Investment Centre as a catalyst for the office market
- secure funding for and reinvigorate marketing campaign

-RDA, 2009b

- Review current marketing plans, including the Kingsway Target Marketing Strategy.
- Improved knowledge and understanding of those segments of the overall market where Rochdale borough has a distinctive and competitive offer.
- Raise the profile of the Borough with outside investors and their intermediaries through a series of targeted campaigns, emphasising the capacity of Rochdale to enable existing and new businesses to grow.
- Identify those key local businesses with capacity to grow and directly assisting these with their plans to expand or relocate, whether at Kingsway Business Park or other locations across the borough.
- Attract more enquiries from the identified target sectors to Kingsway Business Park, reflecting its position as a strategic priority site within the Greater Manchester.
- Secure an increased level of enquiries from prospective occupiers and convert a high percentage of these active enquiries into successful investment projects.
- Work with local partners to optimise the benefits of the borough exists portfolio of managed workspace facilities and other initiatives designed to encourage the growth of micro enterprises and small-to-medium sized businesses.
- Support the Kingsway Partnership in revising and updating the Kingsway Masterplan to better accord with current and anticipated market demand
- Secure funding to provide a dedicated Metrolink Stop to serve Kingsway Business Park, subject to the outcome of a bid for funding under the Government’s Regional Growth Fund initiative.
- Support plans for the developer at Kingsway Business Park (Wilson Bowden Developments) to construct part of the northern loop road to connect to the proposed Kingsway Stop.
- Support the Kingsway Partnership in bringing forward the development of the large Plot J at Kingsway to meet current demand for large buildings to accommodate occupiers.
- Support the Kingsway Partnership in securing the progressive development of a mixed-use residential, office, retail and leisure scheme at Kingsway Village.
- Support the Kingsway Partnership in securing the development of a Village Hotel on the prominent gateway site into Kingsway Business Park from the M62 motorway.
- Complete a travel and relocation plan for JD Sports in relation to their major new distribution facility at Kingsway Business Park.

-RDA, 2011

Table 5.1: RDA Overall Outputs and Targets (Source: RDA, 2008, p.38)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE MEASURES</th>
<th>V1 09/10</th>
<th>V2 10/11</th>
<th>V3 11/12</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◊ Amount of Land acquired (ha)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◊ No. of Buildings acquired (m²)</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◊ Amount of Brownfield land redeveloped (ha)</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◊ No. of New housing developed (no. units)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◊ Amount of Serviced employment land brought forward (ha)</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>74.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◊ Amount of Employment floorspace created (m²)</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>26,500</td>
<td>108,000</td>
<td>151,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◊ No. of Commercial properties improved</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◊ No. of environmental improvement schemes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◊ No. of jobs created by new investment</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◊ No. of referrals to employment support agencies</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◊ No. of companies assisted with relocation from outside the borough (inward investors)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◊ No. of local companies assisted with relocation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◊ No. of local companies given general business/property assistance</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◊ Amount of Public Sector investment (£M)</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>142.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◊ Amount of Private Sector investment (£M)</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>109.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The secondary data revealed that the Kingsway Partnership monitors key milestones such as:

- Issue design Guide                June 2009
- Renew outline planning permission  Dec 2009
- Review Masterplan                  Dec 2009
- Securing occupiers for the three vacant Plot E units and larger bespoke buildings March 2010
- Further improve sustainable transport and examine the potential for renewable energy on-site i.e. reduction of water use, waste and carbon emissions to establish Sustainability as a unique selling point March 2010
- Working with GMPTE to deliver the Metrolink stop, ensuring ERDF funds are in place and Phase 3 infrastructure is ready
- Deed of Variation and Collaboration Agreement for Phase 2 works
- Relocate marketing suite to facilitate disposal of Unit E1.

-RDA, 2008

The primary data revealed that some of the criteria are required by the council and the wider partnership [See Appendix 10E]. This is supported by the indicators shown in Table 5.2.
Table 5.2: Greater Manchester Strategic Indicators (Source: Rochdale MBC, 2011b)

### Prosperity

#### Assist with transition from unemployment into work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Measured as</th>
<th>2011/2012</th>
<th>2012/2013</th>
<th>2013/2014</th>
<th>Lead Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NI 151</td>
<td>Overall employment rate</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>66.50%</td>
<td>66.50%</td>
<td>67.50%</td>
<td>Rochdale Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI 153(a)</td>
<td>Working age people claiming out of work benefits in the worst performing neighbourhoods DWP DSO</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP3012(a)</td>
<td>Increase the number of apprenticeship starts in the borough - aged 16-18 Starts</td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>836</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP3012(b)</td>
<td>Increase the number of apprenticeship starts in the borough - aged 19-24 Starts</td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>824</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP3012(c)</td>
<td>Increase the number of apprenticeship starts in the borough - aged 25+ Starts</td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>303</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Keep and attract skilled and high income families to the borough by improving skills to access jobs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Measured as</th>
<th>2011/2012</th>
<th>2012/2013</th>
<th>2013/2014</th>
<th>Lead Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NI 163</td>
<td>Proportion of population aged 16-64 qualified to at least Level 2 or higher</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Rochdale Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI 79</td>
<td>Achievement of a Level 2 qualification by the age of 19</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI 80</td>
<td>Achievement of a Level 3 qualification by the age of 19</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP3008</td>
<td>Reduce the percentage of working population (aged 16-64) with no qualifications</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP3009a</td>
<td>Net additional homes provided</td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>Rochdale Boroughwide Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP3009b</td>
<td>Number of affordable homes delivered</td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP3009c</td>
<td>Provision of high value homes</td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attract new businesses and promote the economy**

**Reference** | **Indicator**                                                                 | **Measured as**          | **2011/2012** | **2012/2013** | **2013/2014** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NI 171</td>
<td>New business registration rate BERR DSO per 10,000 population</td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP3014</td>
<td>Increase the number of high growth businesses in Rochdale borough</td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP3015</td>
<td>Increase the number of local companies assisted to stay or relocate in the borough by the RDA</td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP3016</td>
<td>Increase the number of business ambassadors doubling the number year on year</td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP3017</td>
<td>Increase the Gross Value Added of the Rochdale Borough economy</td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>Awaiting data</td>
<td>Awaiting data</td>
<td>Awaiting data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP3018</td>
<td>Increase the number of jobs safeguarded/created by companies relocating within the borough through RDA</td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Maximise the potential of Kingsway**

**Reference** | **Indicator**                                                                 | **Measured as**          | **2011/2012** | **2012/2013** | **2013/2014** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POP3010</td>
<td>Increase the number of new property developed (sq metre) at Kingsway</td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60000</td>
<td>43000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP3011</td>
<td>Increase the number of new jobs (to the borough) created by businesses relocating to Kingsway</td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

185
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximise the relationship with Manchester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP3013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support local businesses with advice and promotion of local supply chain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP3019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP3020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The research found that there is an attempt to move towards outcomes measures rather than outputs [See Chapter 4, Section4.2]. e.g. Trying to move towards the number of people that get a job rather than the number of people that go into job training programmes. This has proven challenging as outcomes are difficult to measure, and some of them are more long term. Therefore the output measures are needed as well to track progress.
Strategy
This refers to the strategic approach to evaluation, including dissemination of findings.

The primary data found that the RDA’s evaluation strategy revolves around the measurement of achievement against targets set out for the year in its business plan (RDA, 2011). Every quarter a progress report is produced that goes to the board which assesses performance against those targets. The same goes for evaluation on the Kingsway project, which is assessed based on its performance against set targets and milestones outlined in the business plan.

A review of the latest version of its business plan revealed that the RDA has sought to address evaluation and monitoring as a priority (RDA, 2011). As part of its strategy it outlines the following points:

- Participate in a review of current performance indicators and targets.
- Continue to contribute to the performance monitoring system established by the Local Strategic Partnership, ensuring that all staff providing information is fully trained.
- Establish an agreed set of RDA performance outcomes, targets & milestones as part of the RMBC/RDA Service Level Agreement and as a framework for regular reporting.
- Provide regular reports on performance to the RDA Board, RMBC Regeneration Committee & other bodies as agreed. The special reporting & monitoring arrangements for the Kingsway Business Park project will be maintained.

-RDA, 2011

The business plan also revealed that the RDA’s strategy which already focuses largely on partnership working across the Kingsway partnership as well as with the council, will in future see more engagement with stakeholders and customers using surveys (RDA, 2011).
Motivations
This refers to the incentives, and reasons that drive evaluations

The research found that the main incentive for carrying out evaluation activity was accountability to funding bodies. With the NWDA as investors in Kingsway, progress was monitored on Kingsway with the assistance of the RDA and the rest of the Kingsway partnership. This fed into regional reports on the NWDA’s activity. This is supported by a review of the NWDA’s annual reports (NWDA, 2009; 2012).

Dissemination
This refers to the means by which evaluation findings are reported

The research found that results of evaluation activity within the RDA are disseminated via different channels including reports to the RDA’s board, relevant steering groups, the Local Strategic Partnership, as well as to the Council’s Policy and Scrutiny committee, on a quarterly basis. On specific projects such as the HMR project annual delivery plans were submitted for approval by the HMR board.

Progress and achievement against key targets are reported in the RDA’s business plan as well as their website.

Learning
This refers to the organisation’s formative evaluations and actions taken on evaluation

With both the primary and secondary data revealing an emphasis on monitoring as opposed to robust evaluation activity within the RDA, the data has also revealed a lack of evidence of learning based on reflection on the findings of evaluation activity. Despite the new business plan (2011) stating that the RDA has a commitment to continuous improvement, with the exception of the improvements to mechanisms for dealing with enquiries (which was a recommendation of the Regeneris study carried out in 2010) a lot of the organisational improvement is centred around project management and professional development, and not necessarily as a result of evaluation findings.
Organisation

This refers to the context within which the evaluation occurs; organisational priorities and objectives

The primary research found that the RDA delivers against aims and objectives set out in the organisation’s business plan. These are:

Vision

To make Rochdale Borough a more prosperous and vibrant place by encouraging new economic investment and physical development

Strategic Aims

- To regenerate our town centres as the focus of the borough’s economic, social & cultural life;
- To create the conditions for a growing, more sustainable & diverse local economy;
- To help build strong, stable and more successful neighbourhoods;
- To renew & improve the main gateways into & movement corridors within the borough;
- To help promote new housing development that meets the aspirations of both existing and in-moving residents;
- To deliver a high quality and value for money service.

Values

- Performance: we are committed to delivering results and take pride in our achievements;
- Respect: we treat people with courtesy & respect and listen to other people’s points of view;
- Integrity: we take personal responsibility for our actions and are open, honest & fair in our dealings with others;
- Development: we are committed to continuous development & improvement;
- Excellence: we strive for excellence and seek to create an environment in which people can give their best and achieve their potential.

- RDA, 2011
Timeframes

*This refers to the life cycles and chronological constraints of evaluation activity*

Within the council, individual services are required to produce annual service plans, which are normally on a 3 year cycle with an annual refresh. They are subject to an annual report, but quarterly performance reports go to the elected members. Balanced scorecards for each service are reviewed by the senior management team on a quarterly basis as well.

When the RDA was working on the HMR project they prepared an annual delivery plan to be approved by the HMR board which included the council. Targets and spend to achieve were monitored quarterly through the year with an end of year evaluation on performance in terms of the targets, objectives etc.

Performance on the Kingsway partnership is measured on a quarterly basis through the council via their performance management system and also by the URC board.

The RDA reports to the councils Policy and Scrutiny committee, quarterly or half yearly.
National
This refers to the national structures and influences on evaluation practice

There are a number of different factors that impact on the organisation from a national level including:

- Major shifts in Government policy and the disappearance of previous public sector regeneration programmes, notably the Housing Market Renewal Programme as well as policies such as:
  - Local Growth White Paper
  - Localism Bill
  - Skills White Paper
  - Welfare Reform & DWP Work Programme
  - comprehensive Spending Review & LA Settlements
  - Abolition of Regional Development Agencies & introduction of new Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs)
  - Cessation of Housing Market Renewal funding programme
  - Abolition of previous Business Link business support structure
  - Substantial reorganisation of Homes & Communities Agency & budgets
  - Introduction of new funding programmes e.g. Regional Growth Fund.

- Radical changes to the previous organisational structures for delivering regeneration at national and especially regional level, notably the abolition of the Regional Development Agencies and the creation of sub-regional Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEP’s)

- A general strengthening of the sub-regional structures, a process already underway in Greater Manchester but which will be consolidated under new City-Region governance arrangements

With the demise of the Audit commission, the RDA also notes in its new business plan (2011) that Central Government has reduced the demands on local areas in terms of nationally directed targets, providing the opportunity to establish more meaningful local objectives for the Rochdale borough.

Challenges
This refers to the main barriers to evaluation highlighted by the data

Lack of evaluation

Evaluation activity has been mainly qualitative and in the form of monitoring. With no real evaluation having been carried out on the Kingsway project, interviewees revealed that there was a belief within the organisation that more could be done in terms of evaluation as it should be more than just ticking boxes, and there is a need to stand back and ask if the right indicators are being tracked. There is a need to reflect on whether or not the project has made a difference.
**Hard to measure/Attribution Long term/ Follow up**

From the council perspective, the availability of data is a major issue because some of the things that the council would really like to measure such as wellbeing are very difficult to get data for at a level that is meaningful.

Furthermore, attribution has proven to be an issue, with difficulty linking actions on the part of the council and the RDA (e.g. training) to eventual outcomes (e.g. employment).

Monitoring progression on an individual level has proven difficult, with some outcomes only materialising several years down the line.

**Perception**

Previous evaluation activity under the audit commission which involved a large number of indicators was perceived as oppressive with too many targets, and in the long run counter-productive as they turned evaluation activity into a series of box ticking exercises.

**Resourcing/ Reflection**

Funding and resourcing evaluation remains an issue, with it being necessary not only to undertake an amount of reflection, but also to engage in longitudinal analysis where more long term outcomes are involved.

**Future**

*This refers to the future plans for the organisation*

The primary data revealed that there needs to be a review of the RDA’s evaluation processes; furthermore with the demise of the NWDA, a more structured review of the Kingsway project is due as the HCA steps in to take their place.

This is reflected within the secondary data (RDA, 2011; 2012b) with priority being placed on change management as well as improvement of the performance management processes.
5.2.5 Key Learning Points

Monitoring and Evaluation

- Majority of evaluation activity is summative.
- While some qualitative methods such as interviews have been used, majority of the evaluation activity is quantitative with information obtained from surveys and questionnaires and archival data.
- Despite the fact that a number of indicators are tracked and monitored there is little evidence of reflection to suggest indepth evaluation activity.
- The main motivation for evaluation activity is tied to accounting for funding. This coupled with the limited evidence of reflection and learning presents evaluation activity within the organisation as ‘posturing’ (Lewis, 2001) [see section 4.1.1]; thereby lacking in actual utility.
- There is an attempt to move towards outcomes measures rather than outputs. [See ‘Evaluation’ and ‘Learning’]

Evaluation Strategy, Organisational Objectives and Performance Indicators

- While the organisation’s approach to evaluation is based on measuring achievement against organisational objectives and targets as set out within the business plan, it lacks a cohesive evaluation strategy. [See ‘Strategy’ and ‘Organisation’]
- The fact that the business plan sets out a vision and aims but not clearly structured objectives makes the link between specific performance indicators and the organisational strategy unclear.
- Stated targets are inconsistent with some referring to individual milestones (e.g. securing funding for a Metrolink stop) and others referring to the ongoing tracking of indicators (e.g. numbers of business enquiries). Furthermore other ‘targets’ are ambiguous such as ‘support plans for the developer’ [see ‘Methods-Indicators’]. These provide an ineffective basis of for well structured evaluation activity.
• There is no clear indication or record of specifically how some of these more ambiguous targets are assessed.

• While indicators monitored by the organisation reflect physical development and economic activity, there is no indication of measures which reflect the social or environmental aspects of the organisations regeneration activity (despite the fact that contribution to the borough’s social and cultural life is a stated strategic aim). This is more relevant now that the ‘Village’ development on Kingsway is underway. [See ‘Methods-Indicators’ and ‘Organisation’; see appendix 10E]

• Engagement with the community is not reflected as a priority where evaluation activity is concerned (from development through to dissemination). Community involvement will aid in the development of more rounded criteria around the social impacts of the organisations activities.

• The demise of the Audit Commission provides the organisation the opportunity to establish more meaningful local objectives for the Rochdale borough.

Gaps and Challenges

• Evaluation strategy: The organisation recognises that there needs to be a review of their current performance indicators, however this needs to be extended to address the entirety of their evaluation processes; creating a clear link between organisational objectives, indicators and methods. These ought to be set out within a comprehensive evaluation strategy.

• Objectives and Targets: Evaluation activity is not guided by aims and objectives in their own right, which is something that a clear evaluation strategy would address. The organisation’s stated targets are unclear and should also be subject to review and restructuring.

• Indicators fail to reflect the social and ecological aspirations of the organisation’s activities.
• More needs to be done to involve the Rochdale community not only in the organisation’s regeneration activities, but in its evaluation processes.

• Negative perceptions of staff: Despite the fact that the organisation accepts that it needs to do more in terms of evaluation activity, negative perceptions exist based on past exercises which have involved a raft of box ticking and paperwork. This is something that can be addressed by involving staff in the development of an evaluation strategy, ensuring they are well informed about the rationale behind evaluation activity.

• Difficulty attributing cause and effect to actions of specific parties: This may be mitigated by developing a more collaborative approach to evaluation (rather than simply reporting results), therefore encouraging acknowledgement of achievements as a group effort.

• A more collaborative approach to evaluation will also address issues surrounding the availability of data, not only in terms of access by pooling data, but also in terms of developing more meaningful indicators for some softer outcomes around areas such as ‘wellbeing’.

• Some issues such as long term engagement with individual respondents continue to pose a challenge and must be acknowledged as a limitation in the field

**Good Practice**

• The use of a visual confidence guide, based on quarterly progress means that it is possible to determine whether the organisation is on track to achieving its targets. This is particularly useful with back loaded targets where achievement may not be evident until later in the year. With this system, a smiley face will signify that all is well, and the target will be met by Q4, even if its indicators are low it the end of Q1.

• The organisation has demonstrated an attempt to move towards outcomes focused measures.
5.3 Case Study 2: New East Manchester

5.3.1 Introduction

Created in 1999 as a partnership between the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA), the North West Development Agency (NWDA), and Manchester City Council, (MCC) New East Manchester Ltd. (NEM) became the second UDC established in England. Following the de-industrialisation of the 1970s, cities such as Manchester which relied heavily upon industry for sustenance suffered disproportionately in the wake of the decline (Tallon, 2010). The east of the city which was at one point the heart of the industrial revolution was left in a state of severe physical decay, accompanied by extensive socio-economic issues [See Section 5.3.4 – ‘Motivation’ and ‘Organisation’]. The main challenges faced by East Manchester were:

- High unemployment due to loss of industry such as textiles steel and engineering, coupled with 60% employment loss between 1975 and 1985 due to the recession of the 1970s/80s
- 13% population loss in 1990’s due to the persistent socio-economic issues
- Failure of the housing market due to mismatched supply and demand leading to 20% vacant properties and negative equity
- A resultant low skills base, high crime/poor health/poor community and retail facilities as well as a fragile economic base - 52% households receive benefit

- NEM, 2010a; MCC, 2003; Manchester Living Lab, 2006

NEM was thus set up outside of the council in order to draw down funding as an independent organisation and alongside the local NDC (Beacons for a Brighter Future, which was also set up in 1999) sought to promote regeneration in the area. Governed by a mainly private sector board, and managed by a chief executive, the organisation set out to drive regeneration in the area led largely by physical development as a catalyst for increased enterprise; in turn generating economic as well as social improvements in the East Manchester area. Its core objectives were to revitalise the economy, increase local employment, improve retail provision, improve housing provision, as well as facilitate movement and encourage use of public transport. Operating outside the council under its own chief executive afforded the
organisation a level of autonomy which allowed it to be more responsive than its public sector counterparts where decision making was concerned (European Institute for Urban Affairs, 2006; Manchester City Council, 2006).

Following extensive consultation with the community, NEM developed a Strategic Regeneration Framework which outlined the strategic priorities to be addressed by the organisation. They were to:

- Lead the physical regeneration of East Manchester
- Market and promote the area
- Co-ordinate and integrate social/community and economic programmes and initiatives
- Work in collaboration with other initiatives such as the New Deal for Communities partnership, the Single Regeneration Budget (SRB) and the Housing Market Renewal fund (HMR)
- Establish Action Zones (Education, Health and Sports)
- Facilitate key priority projects (Ancoats Urban Village, Medlock Valley and Beswick, North Manchester Business Park, the Commonwealth Games)
- Focus mainstream public funding effectively (Approximate value £150m per annum)
- Secure public and private sector resources to deliver the comprehensive programme

- URCs-Online, 2009; NEM, 2000

The strategic framework was reviewed in 2008 setting out three core objectives for the sustainable delivery of regeneration of East Manchester. These were:

- Raising incomes: increasing the number, quality and uptake of local employment opportunities by promoting investment, working with those seeking to enter or return to the labour market and helping those in employment to secure better paid employment.
• Raising aspirations: working with young people, residents and people in employment to increase their expectations of what they can achieve as individuals, what they should expect as citizens (in terms of key services and facilities) and how they can contribute to their communities.

• Raising families: encouraging neighbourhood-focused growth through the provision of high-quality housing and services, which give existing and new residents the confidence to raise their families in the neighbourhoods in East Manchester.

- NEM, 2008b

Following the 2010 accent of the Conservative-Liberal Democrat coalition government into power and the dissolution of the regional development agencies, the NWDA included, New East Manchester has entered into a tripartite agreement with the City council and the Manchester City football club. In terms of its staffing and operation, the organisation though retaining its corporate independence has been re-absorbed into the council and is a “wholly-owned subsidiary company of and controlled by Manchester City Council” (NEM, 2010b, p.1). The research revealed a shift in the role of NEM in the emerging landscape, as primarily that of being a ‘custodian of place’, facilitating development within the area; ensuring that new projects and infrastructure fit in with the strategic vision for the East Manchester area, and seeing that these opportunities are linked to the community.

5.3.2 One Central Park

One Central Park Ltd. (OCP Ltd.) is presented as a unique blend of education and enterprise packaged in a purposed built community facility (see figure 5.4). It was set up in 2005 as a joint venture between Manchester College, The University of Manchester, Manchester Metropolitan University (MMU), the University of Salford, University of Manchester Innovation Centre (UMIC) and Manchester Science Parks (MSP); with funding provided by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and the North West Development Agency (NWDA) via New East Manchester (NEM)
as the local urban regeneration company. The purpose of OCP is to drive regeneration in the North and East Manchester areas using knowledge and enterprise as a catalyst. “It’s a place where industry and academia meet to develop tomorrow’s products and services whilst also acting as a training hub for the skills sought by 21st century business.” (OCP, 2012, p.1). The strategy is centred on creating a progression from academia through to business within an environment that encourages cross-fertilization between the two (UMIC, 2008; OCP, 2012). Located two miles outside the Manchester city centre, OCP is set within the wider Central Park development which is a mixed used technology oriented urban business park. Central Park is centred on ICT and innovation in a bid to create high value employment within the heart of the North and East Manchester area (UMIC, 2008). With purpose built facilities featuring high capability networks in order to support activity in the high-tech industry, Central Park boasts tenants such as the Sharp Project, Fujitsu and the Greater Manchester Police. Central Park is also home to Madison Place which is a hub of high specification office buildings, designed to achieve a BREEAM rating of ‘very good’. The offices provide the perfect location for businesses to expand into once they have outgrown their incubation units within OCP (Ask Goodam Developments, 2012; MSP, 2012).

Fig. 5.4: One Central Park (Source: UMIC, 2008)
OCP Ltd. is run by a chief executive officer and governed by a board with representatives from each of the founding organisations. OCP Ltd is unique in its make up and is described as a ‘simple company, but a complex organisation’. The actual company does not employ any staff directly, and under a set up agreed by shareholders to create as much cost flexibility as possible; all staff are either seconded from other organisations or retained under a management contract (see figure 5.5).

The CEO is seconded from another company, as are the meetings and events manager and the commercial support manager. The facilities management group is retained under a management contract, and is then responsible for employing the facilities management (FM) team, as well as the security management team who are seconded full time to the company. The facilities management group is also responsible for procuring contracts for maintenance, heating and ventilation, lifts etc. Legally and financially, all contractors report directly to the CEO as the contracts are
between the company OCP Ltd and the contractor, however the FM management team manage the contracts on the company's behalf. They vet contractors and the paperwork that goes with them, before the information is passed to the company for payment, dispute, discussion etc. They therefore act as the company’s FM team despite the fact that they are in essence a contractor as well. However at the end of the day all FM contracts are with the company, including the one for the FM team.

The main occupants of the OCP building are Manchester College (53% floor space), Manchester Science Parks (18% floor space), UMIC (20% floor space), and One Central Park Ltd. itself (3 rooms). Together they seek to provide a flow of opportunities at all levels from basic skills and training, through postgraduate studies to research and development, business creation and incubation. The College provides a learning environment providing a range of courses from vocational training through to foundation degree level with emphasis on IT based courses such as computing and creative technologies. UMIC provides business incubator services with access to business development training, financial and investment advice networks, as well as university assistance. In addition to office space for fledgling entrepreneurs, Manchester Science Parks (MSP) offers value added services such as business and marketing support, as well as access to mentorship and a of business and technology network (Manchester College, 2012; MSP, 2012; UMIC, 2012) (see figure 5.6). In terms of organisational function within OCP the building, the OCP Ltd. FM team deals with all issues relating to clients such as moving, maintaining infrastructure like phone ports etc. In the event of a new company moving into the business incubator, the data ports and the phone system would have to be changed. The sub contractors brought in to do the work charge OCP Ltd. for the work, who in turn charge the UMIC or MSP, who in turn charge their clients. OCP Ltd. seeks to use its procurement processes as a means to support the local economy, hiring local labour where possible. The organisation also worked with the college on two pilot schemes which involved students working collaboratively with companies within the building to create a visualisation of the companies’ business. Such projects encourage interaction between the different elements in the building, with the organisation acting as a conduit to generate interest and benefits on both parts.
The college plays a key role in delivering to the organisation's wider regeneration outcomes around raising the level of skills within the area. The organisation seeks not just to promote the creation of new businesses but also to offer training in a bid to ‘upskill’ the community and contribute to economic regeneration and social inclusion (UMIC, 2008). By providing a range of courses within the ICT field, the college creates a ready pool of labour with an ideal skill set to feed into companies within central park. Furthermore, the organisation works in collaboration with NEM and Job Centre Plus hosting pre-recruitment and pre-interview workshops for companies which are relocating to the area, thus providing an opportunity for the local community to benefit from the development in the area.

One of the problems that OCP has faced is the external perception of what the organisation is. Despite the fact that OCP is meant to serve as a community facility,
engaging with said community has proved challenging for two main reasons. Firstly, the building’s location within a business park means that the ‘community’ it is meant to serve is not readily identifiable. Secondly, the corporate image of the building makes it appear less approachable, and it is more often perceived to be just an office block or a college when in fact it is much more, being a community facility (CFM, 2011b).

Improved transportation infrastructure as well as the new dedicated metro stop has gone some way to improve physical access to the site. The new CEO has made improving the relationship between the organisation and the community a priority. The organisation has taken steps towards this by improving signage and renovating the reception to create a more welcoming atmosphere, as well as launching a new website to people informed about the latest news and events. Furthermore the organisation is promoting a more ‘open door’ image by staging events such as a Christmas market within its quadrangle which encourages interaction not only between the organisation and the community but among its occupants as well. This shift in approach will also see the organisation move towards working more as a unified entity rather than individual stakeholders.
5.3.3 Methodology

The case study examined evaluation practices within NEM, as well as OCP. In conducting the case, both primary and secondary data were utilised [See Chapter 2; Section 2.3.1]. Primary data was obtained from three informal interviews with one occupant, the project evaluator, and a member of OCP staff; as well as four formal interviews with the respondents listed below. In addition, as this was one of two live case studies, further primary data was collected using tools such as brainstorming as well as both passive observation of the evaluation activity and active observation while taking part in the evaluation process. A copy of the final OCP evaluation presentation can be found in Appendix 4. Formal semi structured interviews were conducted with:

- Respondent CS2PM: Senior management within OCP
- Respondent CS2PE1: Member of evaluation framework development team (who is also an end user of the facility as a tenant within OCP)
- Respondent CS2PE2: Project evaluator
- Respondent CS2CL: Council liaison and senior management within NEM

Interviews were recorded, transcribed and summarised, before summaries were sent out to respondents for validation [see e-appendix 4]. Secondary data was collected in the form of literature such as archival data, government publications, articles and organisational reports which underwent a document review.

A thematic content analysis was conducted on the qualitative data, with main themes coded and reviewed [see section 7.1, e-appendices 2B and 5B]. Statistical methods were used to determine the main themes emergent from the data coding process. A list of prevalent codes (utilised within the cross case analysis [see section 7.2]) was compiled by cross referencing the codes with the highest occurrence (by total number of references) and total codes with the highest occurrence (by percentage coverage) [See Appendix 3B].

Further analysis of the data within an axial coding framework (Strauss and Corbin, 1998; Gibbs, 2007; Borgatti, 2005) [See Section 2.3] was utilised for the comparative analysis of the primary as well as secondary data against the emergent axial codes
These axial codes formed the basis of the core themes that provided the structure for the preliminary findings set out in section 5.3.4. QSL NVivo9 was used for the qualitative elements of the analysis such as code generation, while MS Office Excel was used for quantitative methods such as statistical analysis applied to generated codes and some secondary data. Details of the analysis and results can be found in section 7.1, appendix 3 and e-appendix 1B.

### 5.3.4 Preliminary Findings

The preliminary findings are presented under the following core themes (listed in rank order of emergence within axial coding framework; Appendix 3C):

- **Evaluation**: General information on evaluation within the organisation as well as the basic forms of evaluation conducted.
- **Strategy**: Strategic approach to evaluation, including dissemination of findings.
- **Methods**: The processes, procedures and tools adopted in conducting evaluation activity. This includes research questions, participants, criteria and indicators.
- **Motivations**: Incentives, and reasons that drive evaluations
- **Learning**: The organisation’s formative evaluations and actions taken on evaluation findings
- **Engagement**: The organisation’s efforts to engage with stakeholders including the council, partners and the wider community.
- **Dissemination**: Means by which evaluation findings are reported
- **Innovation**: This refers to innovative features of the evaluation process
- **Organisation**: The context within which the evaluation occurs; organisational priorities and objectives
- **Timeframes**: Life cycles and chronological constraints of evaluation activity
- **Challenges**: The main barriers to evaluation highlighted by the data
- **Future**: Future plans for the organisation

Findings under individual themes may contain some elements of repetition as the data is being viewed via different lenses each time, and should be considered in the context of the specific heading being addressed. These preliminary findings form the basis of the key learning points listed in Section 5.3.5.
**Evaluation**

*This refers to general information on evaluation within the organisation as well as the basic forms of evaluation conducted*

The research found that at council level, the main pieces of evaluation which have been carried out in the East Manchester area have reviewed the NDC partnership [See Section 5.3.1] as well as the New East Manchester (NEM). This was supported by the secondary data which revealed that the evaluations were carried out based on objectives set within the East Manchester Regeneration Framework (NEM, 2000; 2008b).

The interviews as well as a review of archival documents revealed that NEM has had one major piece of evaluation work carried out on it, with several sub strands of evaluation activity carried out on individual projects (EKOSGEN, 2010a; 2010b). The document review found that NEM monitors a set of key performance indicators (NEM, 2006) [See appendix 3E] based on the East Manchester Regeneration Framework (NEM, 2000; 2008b) which are presented to the board on a bi-annual basis. A baseline survey of the area was carried out in 1999 when NEM was set up, furthermore an interim evaluation was carried out in 2007 by the European Institute of Urban Affairs. This is supported by the findings of the primary data, which goes on to highlight a key question going forward being who funds evaluation activity, NEM or the council.

The primary data found that the One Central Park (OCP) monitors its performance against certain targets which the organisation is trying to achieve [See ‘Methods-Criteria’ and ‘Organisation’]. The organisation is also looking at setting out new targets for assistance in regeneration and community engagement; as it seeks to foster closer links between OCP and the local community. The organisation carries out an internal survey which feeds back positives and negatives as observed by tenants of the building, with allowance for the suggestion of improvements. This is supported by the documents reviewed which list these indicators [See ‘Methods-Criteria/KPIs/Targets’ below] (UMIC, 2008; Dabrowska, 2011).

The current evaluation was a proposal by Centre for Facilities Management to OCP, which sought to place emphasis on the organisation’s regeneration and community outcomes. It sought to evaluate from a user/community/broad stakeholder
perspective, and the extent to which the organisation was meeting its objectives. It examined the fairly unusual remit that the organisation has; on the one hand as an education centre, which involves the FE provider, and on the other hand as a business incubator centre. The idea was to think about whether the building does what it set out to, and assess its links with the community. It reviewed the organisation using the evaluation methodology that CFM had developed [See ‘Methods – Methods/Tools’].

Without suggesting that the environmental aspects of sustainability were less important, the CbFM framework placed more emphasis on understanding the other dimensions that were considered equally important e.g. user perceptions which affect psychological as well as physical accessibility to the local population. In addition to environmental sustainability, the framework considered social sustainability and the contribution of the organisation to the community. It also addressed the extent to which the facilities are available for community use and to what extent a sense of ownership was fostered within the community.

There were several criteria for each dimension, all of which could be utilised individually as the basis of an evaluation (as CFM has done in the past). The framework was developed with enough flexibility to allow the evaluator to explore what methods would work best in that situation. It is an inclusive framework that incorporates qualitative as well as quantitative techniques, and acts as a toolkit which allows for the utilisation of other methods such as BREEAM, LM3 etc.

**Strategy**

*This refers to the strategic approaches to evaluation activity such as frameworks*

The different regeneration initiatives within the East Manchester area deliver to outcomes as detailed within the strategic regeneration framework (NEM, 2008b) however there is a lack of a cohesive strategic evaluation framework that brings together performance across the remit of NEM. This gap is noted within the strategic framework document (NEM, 2008b).
The research found that OCP’s strategy with regards to evaluation activity centres primarily on monitoring performance against performance indicators; as well as feedback from customer satisfaction.

The strategy for the evaluation conducted as part of this case study flowed from the Community based Facilities Management (CbFM) methodology developed by CFM, which focused on the six dimensions of a facility listed below. This was supported by the secondary data (CFM, 2011b) which went on to expand on each of the dimensions of the framework:

- **Experience**: The user journey – arrival, reception, way-finding, working environment, departure
- **Accessibility**: Social inclusion policy and strategy. Physical, psychological and social accessibility
- **Effectiveness**: Usability - efficiency, effectiveness and satisfaction
- **Engagement**: Local economic and social impact
- **Resilience**: Ecological performance, Carbon footprint
- **Viability**: Utilisation and management of the physical asset, use value

All the dimensions revolve around the community which is at the heart of the strategy (see figure 5.7). The framework was developed as part of an ongoing project that the CFM had been running for five years, which sought to understand how community facilities could be used for regeneration. The evaluation examined OCP as a key demonstrator of how wherever an organisation puts down its footprint it presents an opportunity to engage local people in its activities; particularly in helping to manage the facilities and to ensure that they are effectively used by community groups.

The evaluation examined OCP as a combination of enterprise, education and community facilities, in the context of its contribution to regeneration objectives (CFM, 2011b). The evaluation considered:

- OCP as learning environment
- OCP as innovation space
- OCP as workplace
- OCP as community resource
Methods

This refers to the processes, procedures and tools adopted in conducting evaluation activity. This includes participants, criteria and indicators.

Criteria/KPIs/Targets

The key performance indicators that are utilised by NEM are based on the strategic regeneration framework (2008b). The document details targets and objectives which form the basis the headline indicators detailed within internal documentation (NEM, 2009b). [See Appendix 3E]
Within OCP the main KPIs focus on the operation of the building as business park. The college has a set of indicators that it assesses itself against (Manchester College, 2010; Manchester City Council, 2011) based on the Ofsted key performance indicators (2009) which look at:

- Being healthy
- Staying Safe
- Enjoying and Achieving
- Making a positive contribution
- Achieving economic wellbeing
- Service management

While the college’s indicators reflect some of NEM’s wider regeneration outcomes and key performance indicators (NEM, 2009b), OCP’s corporate indicators are more in line with the Manchester Science Park performance indicators, which focus on the operation of the building as a business part of business park rather than as an avenue for delivering holistic regeneration outcomes. These include measures such as:

- Total income and expenditure
- Number of qualified enquiries
- Area let/unlet, number of lettings in period
- No of firms on science park
- No of firms being incubated
- No of events and participants in period
- No of firms assisted
- No of collaborators with knowledge base
- Floor Space occupied
- Jobs Created
- Sales Generated plus Investment
- Length of Occupancy/Jobs

- UMIC, 2008; Dabrowska, 2011
The primary data revealed the OCP indicators were in the process of being reviewed, with selection based on a joint decision between the CEO and the various departments of the organisation.

The case study evaluation adopted the CbFM framework, and reviewed the organisation in the context of its wider regeneration outcomes. The criteria were set around the six individual dimensions of the framework, using established benchmarking systems in each of the respective areas of enquiry such as:

- Use of signage, information provision, security access, location (Experience)
- Website access, use of signage, DDA compliance, transport plans (Accessibility)
- Use of signage, traffic flow management, parking provision, (Effectiveness)
- Contribution to local economy, local spend, provision and use of community facilities, local groups engaged (Engagement)
- Carbon Emissions, energy efficiency, waste management (Resilience)
- Occupancy, income, (Viability)

Within the CbFM framework, criteria is negotiated on a case by case basis, according to existing provisions form benchmarking structures that are most appropriate for the given project.

Methods/Tools

A review of the secondary data found that the NEM evaluation utilised methods such as document review, surveys as well as both quantitative and qualitative analysis of baseline data.

Traditionally evaluation activity by OCP has involved the use of questionnaires in the form of a customer survey.

The CbFM framework adopts a range of qualitative and quantitative methods of data collection depending on the tools being utilised on the particular project being evaluated. On the OCP evaluation, the main forms for data collection were semi-structured and informal interviews based on a schedule built into the framework, observational tools like walk-throughs, as well as document reviews, and questionnaires.
Participants

Evaluation at East Manchester level has been carried out by external consultants such as Ekosgen and the European Institute of Urban affairs who obtained primary data from surveys with stakeholders such as residents and business owners in the area, partners of NEM such as Urban Splash, the Greater Manchester Police, Jobcentre Plus etc. (See Appendix 4 for full list of Ekosgen consultees).

Evaluation activity in the form of monitoring is an internal process and is conducted by OCP staff, who collect primary data [see ‘Methods – Criteria/KPIs/Targets’] from tenants, the college, as well as partner organisations on the OCP board.

The CbFM evaluation of OCP involved external consultants evaluators (freelance researcher and University of Bolton) as well as additional support provided by international interns of CFM who trialling the CbFM methodology. Participants included OCP staff, business tenants, staff and students of Manchester College, UMIC, MSP, suppliers and visitors to OCP.

Motivations

This refers to the incentives, and reasons that drive evaluations

The primary data revealed that the main motivation for carrying out evaluation activity was due to requirements of funding bodies, as well as evidencing delivery with respect to outcomes. Monitoring activity on various projects OCP included, was carried out in order to manage performance and ensure the project is delivering to its set objectives. However this also serves to meet requirements of funding bodies such as the ERDF. At East Manchester level the drive to prove value for money and justifying public spend is a major motivation.
Learning
This refers to the organisation’s formative evaluations and actions taken on evaluation

The research found that with regards to OCP, despite the fact that some customer feedback was implemented where building management was concerned, there was a lack of evidence to suggest built in mechanisms for organisational learning from robust evaluation activity. However the organisation has reflected some learning from the CbFM evaluation (CFM, 2011a; 2011b) e.g. addressing conclusions on usability which suggest there is work to be done around perceptions of accessibility. OCP have since made changes to their website making it more user friendly and communicating more effectively the purpose of OCP as well as the facilities available.

Engagement
This refers to the organisation’s efforts to engage with stakeholders including the council, partners and the wider community.

Both the primary and secondary data found little engagement of wider stakeholders during the development of evaluation strategy. Engagement during the evaluation process was limited to immediate stakeholders such as residents and partner organisations, and during the data collection process. Further engagement takes place at the end of the process as finding are disseminated via reports, and online websites.

Dissemination
This refers to the means by which evaluation findings are reported

Dissemination of evaluation activity takes the form of reports feedback to the board, partner organisations, and the wider public via the local newsletter ‘East Magazine’ and organisational websites. This makes it possible for the public to review the results and outcomes of evaluation, providing an avenue for engagement, and a level of accountability.

For the CbFM evaluation a presentation of the findings was made to senior management of OCP Ltd.
Innovation

This refers to innovative features of the evaluation process

As a newly developed framework the CbFM evaluation process is an innovative approach; particularly as it not only seeks to take a holistic view of organisational performance but it focuses on the user perspective as well as that of the wider community – something that organisations (e.g. Bury Police and OCP) have stated provides them with a fresh perspective.

Organisation

This refers to the context within which evaluation activity occurs; organisational priorities and objectives

Both the primary and secondary data found that NEM has a core set of well structured objectives which provide a good basis for the development of assessment criteria and performance indicators. NEM delivers to its core objectives as set out within the Strategic regeneration framework:

1. Raising incomes: increasing the number, quality and take-up of local employment opportunities by promoting investment, working with those seeking to enter or return to the labour market and helping those in employment to secure better paid employment.

2. Raising aspirations: working with young people, residents and people in employment to increase their expectations of what they can achieve as individuals, what they should expect as citizens, in terms of key services and facilities, and how they can contribute to their communities.

3. Raising families: encouraging neighbourhood-focused growth through the provision of high-quality housing and services, which give existing and new residents the confidence to raise their families in the neighbourhoods in East Manchester. - NEM, 2008b
The core objectives represent broader aims, as the document specific targets and objects around the themes of Economy and Employment, People and Communities, Neighbourhoods and Places. These tie into key performance indicators utilised by the organisation. The targets are presented in table 5.3, showing which of the stated objectives they seek to address.

Table 5.3: NEM Targets against Core Objectives (Developed from: NEM, 2008b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEM TARGETS</th>
<th>Obj. 1</th>
<th>Obj. 2</th>
<th>Obj. 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By 2013 a total of 9,200 new homes will have been completed or will be on site and this will increase to 15,000 by 2018 and to 24,000 completed new homes by 2025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A further 7,000 properties will be improved by 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The population of East Manchester will have increased from the current level of 62,616 to between 90,000 and 100,000 by 2018</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An additional 700,000 sq m of new business development will be created by 2018</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000 residents will be supported into employment by 2013 and 3,500 more by 2018</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In doing so the rate of economic inactivity in East Manchester as evidenced by the proportion claiming working age benefits will reduce by 20% by 2013 and by 50% to the Manchester average by 2018</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment measured by the proportion of pupils securing 5 A*-C GCSEs will remain above the City average and will surpass the Greater Manchester average by 2011 and the national average by 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proportion securing 5 A*-C GCSEs which include English and Maths will reach the Manchester average (currently 29%) by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A reduction in the current Directly Standardised Mortality Ratio to within 5% of the Manchester average by 2013 and to the Manchester average by 2018</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The rate of conception for under 18’s will reduce by 20% by 2011, by 40% by 2013 and to the Manchester average by 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To reduce the rate of volume crime as well as criminal damage to below that of Manchester as a whole by 2011, significantly closing the gap with the national rate. This will be the equivalent of 670 fewer crimes per year in East Manchester in 2011 than in 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The significant improvements to the environmental quality of the area will continue with 50,000 trees planted by 2018 and continuing improvements to parks and open spaces evidenced by all East Manchester parks securing green flag status by 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, the organisation is guided by a code of conduct (NEM, 2008a) which sets out seven principles to which the NEM seeks to adhere. These are:

- Selflessness
- Integrity
- Objectivity
Furthermore the document review found that the organisation considers evaluation activity a priority and is actively taking steps to develop a cohesive evaluation framework. Part of this process has involved mapping the operational context of the organisation, which is represented graphically in figure 5.8 below.

The document review found key priorities and targets for OCP to include:

- Agree a strategy for inward investment with MIDAS based on east Manchester’s strengths and opportunities;
• Secure maximum local benefit through all new developments utilising available mainstream funding to deliver sector-specific pre-employment training programmes to ensure that local residents are equipped to compete for the jobs that will become available;

• Continue the refurbishment of the former Sharp factory to develop it as a Digital and Animation business cluster, creating a UK centre for the digital animation and visualisation industry;

• Finalise the remediation of key sites together with infrastructure works across Central Park South to facilitate the development of available land in association with partners.

• Review the disposal strategy of the Homes & Communities Agency owned sites on Central Park South;

• Complete studies on junction improvements around Hulme Hall Lane and Ten Acres Lane to facilitate enhanced access to Central Park South;

- NEM, 2009a

The primary data found that within OCP there was a perceived disconnect between the organisational strategy and operational function, as while the strategy incorporates wider regeneration outcomes relating to local skills and growth of the individuals and companies within OCP, the functional aspects relate more strongly to the process of running the building as a business incubator.

Timeframes

This refers to the life cycles and chronological constraints of evaluation activity

The primary data found that at NEM level, while different projects carry out evaluations to various timeframes, organisation wide monitoring ties into wider structures (see figure 5.8). The document review found that since 2003, reports on the NEM key performance indicators are presented to the board bi-annually. Furthermore performance reports are produced annually which bring together feedback on activity across different projects OCP included. The CbFM evaluation was carried out on a fairly flexible 3 month timeframe, which overran by 1 month.

Challenges

This refers to the main barriers to evaluation highlighted by the data
Resources

The primary data found that the source of funding for evaluation activity poses a challenge going forward, which may impact upon the extent of evaluation activity that may be carried out. Furthermore there was a perception that there was a lack of expertise within OCP Ltd. to carry out robust evaluation activity themselves. There may therefore be a need to draw on external consultants.

Access to Consultees

The primary data also revealed that access to consultees during the CbFM evaluation, particularly those at senior level proved difficult, leading to delays in execution of the evaluation activity.

Coherence

The document review found that a lack of coherence in terms of a structured framework for evaluation activity (NEM, 2009a). This is supported by the lack of primary data indicative of a structured evaluation framework within OCP Ltd.

Future

This refers to the future plans for the organisation

At NEM level, both the primary and secondary data have revealed that establishing what agency funds evaluation activity would be a major consideration going forward. Furthermore going forward steps are being taken to develop an integrated framework that captures evaluation activity across the organisation (NEM, 2008a; NEM, 2009b).

The primary data found that within OCP upcoming surveys intend to include questions about the external community to gain insight from their perspective and gain feedback on organisational activity.
5.3.5 Key Learning Points

Evaluation Strategy

- While New East Manchester’s evaluation activity adopts a holist approach (environmental, economic and social) to their regeneration activity, OCP’s evaluation activity focuses on the organisation’s function as a science park. [See ‘Methods-Criteria’]

- Furthermore, OCP primarily undertakes monitoring activity, tracking performance against KPIs, without further reflection or view to implement findings in a meaningful way.

- The CbFM evaluation of OCP sought to broaden the organisation’s view of their impact assessment by considering their activity from a more holistic standpoint, centred around the community. It marks the first time OCP has been evaluated in the wider context of sustainability.

- While NEM adopts both qualitative and quantitative means of evaluation; prior to the CbFM evaluation, OCP’s approach has been more limited, using surveys as its main form of data collection.

- The lack of a cohesive evaluation framework is an issue for both NEM and OCP. While this is acknowledged by NEM in their strategic framework document (NEM, 2009b), there is no evidence that OCP seeks to address is this issue in the near future. [See ‘Strategy’]

- The main motivation for evaluation in both NEM and OCP is in order to evidence delivery against objectives and satisfy the requirements of funding bodies such as the ERDF. As NEM is also supported by public funds, there is a need to prove value for money. Learning does not emerge as a main driver for evaluation activity.

- While OCP solicits and acts on customer feedback in the context of building management, evidence of learning from evaluation findings is limited. This is largely due the observed lack of robust evaluation activity.
• With NEM’s new role as a wholly owned and financed by the Manchester City Council, funding is a major concern given the current financial climate. Not only is there uncertainty about who’s remit (NEM or the council) funding future evaluation of NEM’s activity will fall under, but without adequate funding for the core organisational functions, funding for evaluation activity runs the risk of being considered as an afterthought (CLES, 2009).

• The lack of in house expertise within OCP to carry out robust evaluation suggests that steps should be taken to develop staff skills around this area as opposed to simply commissioning external consultants; particularly in a climate of increased financial constraints.

**Linking Organisational Objectives and Indicators**

• Although NEM’s stated objectives are not fully formed ‘SMART’ objectives, considered in combination with the set targets, they provide a basis for the development of clearly associated performance indicators. [See ‘Organisation’]

• While OCP does not have stated objectives as such, it has a number of key priorities and targets. The lack of structure to these makes developing an assessment framework around them challenging.

• The perceived disconnect between OCP’s strategic direction and operational function is evident when comparing the stated priorities [see ‘Organisation’] and the sort of indicators utilised by the organisation [see ‘Methods-Criteria’]. While the OCP’s priorities reflect more closely the strategic direction of NEM (albeit, with a more employment oriented focus), the indicators performance indicators utilised relate to OCP’s function as a building manager of a science park.

• This disconnect is made more apparent when comparing the indicators used by NEM [See appendix 3E], and those used by OCP which only relate to two of the NEM indicators under the ‘Economy and Employment’. [see appendix 10E]
• OCP states that it seeks to ‘secure maximum local benefit’ (e.g. leveraging procurement processes) (NEM, 2009a) [See ‘Organisation’], however this is not reflected within the organisation’s evaluation processes.

• Furthermore, while data is collected by collaborative partners like Job Centre Plus delivering workshops (e.g. attendance), it is unclear how this is fed back into OCPs monitoring systems, and what learning is gleaned from the data.

• While a desire to address these issues has been reflected by OCP’s management by developing new targets around the organisation’s wider regeneration activity, there has been no specific indication that the performance indicators will be reviewed.

• The college appears to operate its own evaluation processes outside the remit of OCP, using an Ofsted framework (2009) whose indicators are more closely aligned to those of NEM. There is a need to share this practice with the rest of OCP. [See ‘Methods-Criteria’]

**Engagement**

• Improvements can be made with regards to engaging the community during evaluation activity. During data collection, NEM consults residents and partner organisations, while OCP consults partners and tenants; however, there is no indication of wider engagement during the development of evaluation activity. Engaging with the community should be considered as part of the development process for an evaluation strategy.

• Efforts are made by NEM to disseminate evaluation findings to a wider audience using avenues such as their website, which is a practice that it would be helpful for OCP to adopt. This wider dissemination promotes transparency and accountability.
• While the college plays a key role engaging the community, and tracks Ofsted based socio-economic indicators, there is no evidence that these are fed back to or utilised by OCP.

• New management at OCP seeks to prioritise engagement; developing closer links between OCP and the local community, as well as encouraging closer working relationships with occupants and collaborative partners. This is move is well aligned to emerging coalition strategies around localism which present a community focused approach to service delivery.

• It is therefore important that consideration is given to the means by which these activities will be measured and evaluated.

Gaps and Challenges

• Evaluation Strategy: Developing a cohesive evaluation strategy that brings together the work carried out across all strands of the organisation’s activities. This will also inform the development of a more robust evaluation strategy for OCP. While there is an indication that between OCP Ltd, Manchester College, and collaborative partners (eg job centre plus), data is being collected that covers the breadth of regeneration activity represented by the NEM objectives and targets, as things stand there is no cohesive framework at OCP level pulling all these elements together in the form of comprehensive evaluation activity.

• Learning: More needs to be done in order to ensure that learning from evaluation findings is implemented. This is an issue developing a clear evaluation strategy will help to address; building in mechanisms to encourage the utilisation of emergent findings. Promoting the attachment of specific actions to recommendations is one way of doing this.

• Engagement: Improvements made to engagement with both internal and external stakeholders will not only address evaluation of wider regeneration outcomes, but having partners closely involved will mitigate issues like difficulty accessing senior members of staff for consultation.
• Indicators: there is a need for more inclusive overarching OCP indicators to reflect social impacts of the organisation. Furthermore, there would appear to be a gap in terms of indicators to measure the organisation’s performance in terms of environmental sustainability. This is something the organisation may want to consider as part of its performance management review.

• Resourcing: Concerns about funding and staff capacity to support robust evaluation activity would suggest a view be taken to develop in-house competency in the area of evaluation practice.

Good Practice

• The CbFM framework’s blend of structure and flexibility allow for adaptable use of the framework as the basis of an evaluation strategy

• NEM’s objectives and targets are clear, representing a good foundation for the development of a comprehensive evaluation strategy.
5.4 Summary

Urban Regeneration Companies are agencies which seek to deliver improvement within designated areas, primarily deprived inner city neighbourhoods. The agencies focus on emphasising the role of the private sector, facilitating partnership working with the public sector in the delivery of urban regeneration. The first case study organisation was the Rochdale Development Agency which was established in 1993 and became one of the first of a new generation of UDC. It sought to liaise with the private sector and act as a catalyst for large scale physical transformation within the borough. The case study focused on the Kingsway Business Park which is a flagship project of the RDA’s. It is a 170 hectare business park that provides high quality locations for businesses including JD sports and ASDA. Furthermore, the project includes housing provision as well as 30 hectares of parkland. The case study methodology involved the use of both primary and secondary data collected via interviews and document reviews. Analysis was carried out using qualitative methods as well as basic statistical methods. This revealed preliminary finding under the themes of:

- Evaluation
- Methods
- Strategy
- Motivations
- Dissemination
- Learning
- Organisation
- Timeframes
- National
- Challenges
- Future

Key learning points were outlined around:

- Monitoring and Evaluation
- Evaluation Strategy, Organisational Objectives and Performance Indicators
- Gaps and Challenges
- Good Practice
The second case study involved New East Manchester, an urban regeneration company set up in 1999 to tackle issues of physical decay and socio economic deprivation in the East Manchester area. The case study examined the One Central Park project, which is a unique blend of educational institution, business incubation unit and community facility. The project was established in 2005 as a partnership between Manchester College, The University of Manchester, Manchester Metropolitan University, the University of Salford, University of Manchester Innovation Centre (UMIC) and Manchester Science Parks; with funding provided by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and the North West Development Agency (NWDA) via New East Manchester (NEM) as the local urban regeneration company. The case study was real-time and saw the researcher involved in the conduct of the ongoing evaluation. The study utilised primary and secondary data collected via interviews, brainstorming, observation and document review. The analysis involved both qualitative and quantitative methods and produced preliminary findings under the following themes:

- Evaluation
- Strategy
- Methods
- Motivations
- Learning
- Engagement
- Dissemination
- Innovation
- Organisation
- Timeframes
- Challenges
- Future

Key learning points were outlined around:

- Evaluation Strategy
- Linking Organisational Objectives and Indicators
- Engagement
- Gaps and Challenges
- Good Practice

Chapter 6 of this study examines the neighbourhood management approach to regeneration delivery and reviews the next two case studies undertaken as part of this research.
CHAPTER 6

CASE STUDIES 3 AND 4: NEIGHBOURHOOD MANAGEMENT APPROACH

“Never underestimate the power of local knowledge.”

- HSBC (2012)
This chapter presents the second set of case studies examined by the research. Both case studies focus on organisations that deliver urban regeneration using a neighbourhood management approach. The chapter provides an overview of the neighbourhood management approach, and reviews the backgrounds of the respective organisations as well as the individual project evaluations considered with respect to the research. The methods adopted within each of the case studies are presented including participants and data collection tools used within the studies. The chapter also presents the findings generated from the analysis of each case study.

6.1 Delivering Urban Regeneration via Neighbourhood Management

Neighbourhood management aims to deliver renewal at local level with the focus on a holistic view of an area as opposed to along various strands. This place-based approach is geared towards narrowing the gap between more deprived communities and neighbourhoods within an area and the surrounding locale (CLG, 2008b). At its heart, neighbourhood management seeks to utilise a grassroots method of regeneration delivery whereby the local services are pooled together and brought into alignment with the local community’s needs; thus making them more responsive.

The objective of neighbourhood management is to create efficient service delivery within a particular geographic boundary that is tailored to address the unique issues faced by its local community; thereby improving the quality of life of the populace. The process is overseen by a neighbourhood manager whose focus is on the ‘totality of place’ and works in partnership with both the community and service providers in order to tackle local problems from the local residents’ perspective. The Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG) describes the process as bringing together “an alliance of three forces – representatives of the local community (including councillors), representatives of local service providers and a small professional team led by the Neighbourhood Manager to facilitate change” (CLG, 2008b, p.18). In their fourth Policy Action Team report, the Social Exclusion Unit (SEU) outlines a basic model (see Table 6.1) for neighbourhood management which
sets out five key features of neighbourhood management as well as four main tools for its successful delivery. This model has formed the basis of the development of different neighbourhood management-based initiatives such as the Pathfinder Programme and New Deal for Communities.

Table 6.1: Delivering Neighbourhood Management (Source: Social Exclusion Unit, 2001; CLG, 2010a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEATURES</th>
<th>TOOLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Someone with overall responsibility at the neighbourhood level for managing the renewal process</td>
<td>• Agreements with service providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community involvement and leadership</td>
<td>• Devolved service delivery and purchasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The tools to get things done</td>
<td>• Pressure on agencies and Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A systematic, planned approach to tackling local problems</td>
<td>• Special resources on enabling and cross-cutting Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Effective delivery mechanisms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By its very nature, neighbourhood management covers a wide scope of activities; from the work of estate wardens, caretakers and housing managers, to broader approaches such as service decentralisation and improved means of local governance (Brown, 2002). This means that where evaluation is concerned, an equally wide net needs to be cast. In most cases success is measured based on improved conditions in the area such as less damage and crime, better community relations, better educational attainment, improved employment opportunities and so on. Further measures such as “resident satisfaction and involvement, support from schools, doctors, police, reduced empty property, vandalism and nuisance, high staff morale” (Power and Bergin, 1999, p.22) etc are also taken into account when considering the impact of neighbourhood management on a community.
6.2 Case Study 3: Charlestown and Lower Kersal NDC

6.2.1 The New Deal for Communities

Launched in 1998, the New Deal for Communities (NDC) programme was a neighbourhood-level area based regeneration initiative that aimed to put the community at the centre of redevelopment and renewal. The programme saw 39 NDC partnerships (See Appendix 5) set up in the most deprived neighbourhoods across England, each with approximately £50m of funding over a 10 year period. There was a recognition of the fact that the problems facing these deprived areas were not just physical or environmental but socio economic too. Furthermore, these complex issues were intertwined and could not be addressed in isolation. The NDC partnerships were intended to be a community led attempt to address these multiple issues faced in the neighbourhoods simultaneously in order to achieve holistic change and close the gap between the NDC areas and the rest of the country (Beider et al, 2012; Centre for Regional, Economic and Social Research, 2012). All partnerships were developed around six key objectives:

- To achieve change in the areas of crime, community, housing and the physical environment, education, health, and worklessness
- To close the gaps between the 39 areas and the rest of the country
- To work with other delivery agencies such as the police, Primary Care Trusts (PCTs), schools, Jobcentre Plus (JCP), and their parent local authority
- To place the community at the heart of the initiative
- To achieve value for money
- To sustain a local impact after NDC Programme funding ceased

CLG, 2010a

The NDC partnerships adopted a neighbourhood management approach to delivering regeneration within the designated areas. They partnered with service providers within the local area such as the local council, the NHS, the Police, education and training providers, employment services, housing associations, transport services and voluntary organisations. The NDCs sought to engage with the local community in order to address neighbourhood specific issues, such as poor
job prospects, high levels of crime, educational under-achievement, poor health, and problems with housing and the physical environment. The focus at local level meant that each NDC delivered a range of projects unique to the particular partnership, depending on the strategic priorities identified in the individual neighbourhood. Where NDCs identified low aspiration, low confidence and self esteem as a priority, the majority of the projects were based around the empowerment of the community and improvement of skills; targeting in particular young people in an attempt to break the cycle of deprivation. In other areas the environment and physical conditions emerged as a priority, leading the NDCs to utilise projects particularly around housing as a driver for change (Centre for Regional, Economic and Social Research, 2002).

Ensuring the long term sustainability of improvements made within the NDC partnership areas meant that developing community capacity was a priority. As a result, active involvement in the NDC’s activities was encouraged with an average of 49% resident representation at board level (Centre for Regional, Economic and Social Research, 2002). The fact that NDCs sought to empower the local community and enable them to take ownership of projects in the area played a key role in ensuring the legacies of the various NDCs once the programme came to an end (The Neighbourhood Renewal Unit, 2005).
6.2.2 The Charlestown and Lower Kersal NDC

Overall the Salford borough has a number of areas that suffer from high levels of deprivation, with nine out of twenty wards including Charlestown and Lower Kersal (CHALK) area among the top 10% of the most deprived in the country. Salford city council seeks to approach regeneration in a holistic manner, addressing not just physical issues but social and economic issues as well. With more emphasis on economic growth at the moment given the current context of the financial climate, and the publicity of such flagship projects as The Media City, the council seeks to ensure that its residents are equipped to take advantage of these opportunities. It is concerned with making sure they are healthy, have the proper skills, and have a place to live that they are proud of; something that is reflected in both Strategic Regeneration Frameworks that guide development in the east and west of the city.

The city is broken into eight neighbourhoods (one of which is the CHALK area) and each neighbourhood has had its own neighbourhood manager since the early 1990s. The introduction of the NDC in the CHALK area lent the existing neighbourhood management structures an increased community focus and involvement, as well as the crucial financial backing required to effect lasting change in the area.

Established in 2001, the NDC was set up in the Charlestown and Lower Kersal (CHALK) area of East Salford. The NDC received £53m of funding to improve an area of 3,687 households and an estimated 10,000 people located two miles outside the Manchester city centre. Despite the fact that the CHALK area had a well defined community, it historically suffered from complex issues such as low educational attainment, high unemployment and crime, as well as poor environmental conditions. Furthermore, its close proximity to the University of Salford meant that the area housed a large student population, which created a transient community and friction with the long term residents. In the late 1990s some parts of the neighbourhood adjacent to the CHALK area suffered from serious issues due to housing market failure which saw property prices drop to about £5000 for a terraced property. In certain cases, residents walked away from properties, and handed their keys back to the mortgage companies. Although this was not the case in the CHALK area, things
were heading in that direction; thus a desire to stabilise and reverse the decline before the situation reached similar levels drove the selection of that particular area for the NDC.

The NDC had a 10 year lifespan and came to an end in 2011, during which time it set out to tackle local issues around six themes:

- Building Communities
- Crime and Community Safety
- Children, Young People and Education
- Physical Environment
- Health
- Business, Employment and Skills

- CHALK NDC, 2001

From the very beginning the council worked with the community to develop a bid for the NDC, with emphasis placed on listening to the community and taking on board their views. The NDC board was established very early on to take it through the bid process, and then later govern and implement the whole programme. The NDC partnership board was comprised of local community representatives (approximately 50%), and representatives from agencies such as the city council, the university, the PCT, the police, local businesses, local schools, and some voluntary sector agencies. The board was always chaired by a member of the community, and always had locally elected members, as well as the leader of the council. Therefore it was a collaborative effort from of both the community and the council from the beginning. Over time the relationship developed as the community’s capacity for involvement improved. The NDC took on staff to actually work with the community (some of which were community members themselves) and increase their engagement with the NDC’s operation, which saw the relationship with the community progress from consultation, through participation, to involvement.

The fact that the NDC sought to work together with the council and encouraged their involvement was one of the key drivers of the success of the CHALK NDC resulting in the reduction of deprivation within the area (CHALK NDC, 2011c). The level of collaboration between the NDC and the council emerged as one of its distinguishing features as some other NDCs had pitted themselves against their councils which
created particularly troubled relationships (Marrs, 2010). On the housing front for example where the NDC put in £7m, the council provided access to another £11m of housing market renewal funding. This was facilitated by the close working relationship between the two organisations, which was something that would not have been possible had the NDC set itself up as an island or in opposition to the council. Figure 6.2 below illustrates the context within which the NDC operated.

Fig. 6.2: CHALK NDC Organisational Context (Source: CHALK NDC, 2001 p9)
Strategically the NDC did not set out to create job opportunities but rather set up the people to take advantage of other existing and emerging opportunities nearby. The NDC set up programmes to make people feel more confident, improve skills, provide job application support, and facilitate the process of transferring from benefits to employment, as some residents could not see how they would be better off. The NDC supported people’s lives, which helped more than building a supermarket and creating several part-time short term jobs would have. Furthermore a lot of investment was put in business areas, particularly in terms of reducing crime, business support, and helping improve skills levels amongst employees in local businesses. Though there are still a number of people who are unemployed, they are better skilled, with better job prospects, and despite the borough’s problems, the last index of multiple deprivation showed an improvement, so progress has been made in some areas.

With the end of the NDC programme, focus shifted to succession. The CHALK NDC’s succession strategy did not involve one big successor body taking over the assets of the NDC as there was no business case for it; neither was there a gap in the market for it nor people who would want to run it. Instead the NDC succession involves the development of a more strategic structure (see figure 6.3) in the form of a development framework group onto which local residents may be elected. They will continue in a more influencing capacity, particularly in terms of physical development and housing. They will act as the community’s link with regeneration and safeguard some of the legacy of the NDC; acting act as a scrutiny body, making sure that local residents’ wishes are still heard in managing community facilities and buildings such as the youth and sports centres.

The council as an accountable body were more comfortable with this approach as it was about mainstreaming the NDC’s activities and absorbing them into existing structures for coordinating service delivery at a neighbourhood or sub-district level as shown in table 6.2 (CHALK NDC, 2011a; CLG, 2008a).
Fig. 6.3: CHALK NDC Succession Strategy (Source: CHALK NDC, 2011a, p21)
6.2.2.1 The Alley-gating Project: More than just two metal gates

Initially the alley-gating project was linked to block-improvements on private sector housing. It started out as a crime prevention initiative driven by high levels of burglaries in these properties due to break-ins from the backyards. It was therefore decided to formally close the alleyways, and then have gates erected at the ends. The project was spearheaded by Salix Homes; the council’s housing Arms Length Management Organisation (ALMO). As well as alley-gating, the NDC funded the ALMO to deliver other environmental schemes such as alleyway resurfacing, estate remodelling schemes, creating driveways to keep cars off the road etc. The ALMO led neighbourhood teams that were made up of officers from different agencies, the NDC being one of them. The ALMO’s physical environment team applied for the funding through the NDC, and also got additional joint funding through the ERDF.
The project lasted a little over one and a half years mainly due to the amount of consultation involved. As a result of the legal process of closing the alleyways, there was a high level of consultation and involvement with local residents because an objection from a single resident could halt a closure order being processed. Initially there was strong opposition to the alley-gates within the community as owners of the properties would have to re-adopt the alleyways from the council. Other opposition came from the Ramblers’ Society. The utilisation of gating orders which are fixed period closure orders usually used for country footpaths (as opposed to traditional right of way closures) meant that the council still had responsibility for the alleyways and the maintenance of the gates; therefore property boundaries remained the same and owners’ insurance premiums were not affected. The use of gating orders for alley closures is now adopted by the council across the city.

Residents were also presented with examples of where alley-gating had worked to demonstrate community ownership such a project could bring. The fact that the project was tied to a wider block improvement scheme meant that it was easier to engage with the residents as they knew further regeneration would be underway. The ALMO took the lead on the design of the gates, and acting as the client took the initiative to draw on designs from more affluent areas, incorporating aesthetic details as shown in figure 6.4. The designs were sent out and meetings were held where residents got to select the design that was used. There was also a police liaison architect on board too as the gates had to look nice but essentially aid safety by design. Statistics showed that a large percentage of the population in the older terraces were elderly or infirm, so a ‘slam-to’ gate was designed with a very simple key. This is now the gate that is used throughout the city. They also incorporated features like hidden bolts in the bottom so that when one gate shuts, it stopped the bar from being lifted up (which is another standard that was introduced citywide).

Another innovation of the project was in its distribution of the keys, by attempting to seize the opportunity to engage the community. Rather than deliver keys to each house with a letter, the project was keen to give them to those who were willing to engage and so wrote letters informing them that their keys were at the NDC office, and if it was not suitable to have them collected in person, residents could request to
have them delivered. Having residents come into the office created another opportunity to talk about the project and allowed residents voice their concerns about particular issues.

![Fig. 6.4: Rising ironwork detailing linking low walls to gate columns](image)

The project aimed to make the alleyways a used space, and not a forgotten one. It sought to get people used to the idea that the alleyways could be spaces that were used for recreation, rather than just putting bins out or anti-social behaviour. What the NDC found was residents who had lived for years on the same street but never engaged with each other were speaking to one another for the first time. Community groups were set up and once the alley was closed off, it was a safe enclosed area that was utilised by residents. There was an expansion of people planting flowers, creating gardens and putting picnic benches out in the alleyways [see figure 6.5]. The NDC provided a leaflet about greening the alleyways, and there were grants.
available, for up to £5000 for any constituted group to support alleyway beautification. This encouraged residents to come together and take ownership of the spaces. This meant the resident liaison officers at the NDC were deeply engaged with key people, encouraging them to form a residents group specifically for their alleyways. Once the group was established then they could source funding to green their alleyways. This worked to establish new structured community groups (with a chair, treasurer, and a constitution in place), some of which were really strong and vocal. There were larger neighbourhood groups, and within those smaller alleyway neighbourhood groups. Individual alleyways bid for money through their groups, and entered national awards such as ‘In Bloom’.

Fig. 6.5: Greening in gated alleys (Image B source: CHALK NDC, 2010b)
The project was something that started out with a very limited scope but grew into something more. It happened that it contributed a lot more particularly around community engagement and empowerment, as residents actually wanted to do something for themselves. The fact that they had something they could see, that was tangible, meant they started working together. As well as a recorded reduction in burglaries, environmental crime was addressed because people were more likely to dump rubbish in a disused, blighted spot than in a garden. There were also associated health benefits as there was an increase in physical activity and a reduction in social isolation; furthermore residents began growing fruits and vegetables in some alleyways (Lythgoe, 2008). The project contributed to skills development and employment in the area, ensuring that contractors used local labour and engaged with young people in the community. It was recognised that although there were apprenticeships available for local young people, they were generally geared towards those who were doing well and would have had access to opportunities elsewhere. One of the companies carrying out the block improvements engaged with a youth group in the area that dealt with young people classed as needy, and provided four of them with work experience (CHALK NDC, 2011b, 2011c).

The project was as one of the largest of its kind in the country and one of the most successful in no small part due to the level of engagement with the community and the fact that the community took ownership of it. The project was commended by the police, who wrote to say that they use it as an example of best practice. It tied into the wider work of the NDC considering regeneration holistically, and the alley-gates themselves were in actuality a small part of that. What seemed to be a very simple and relatively inexpensive project touched on far more than just crime or the physical environment; creating social and economic benefits from an activity that was effectively just erecting gates across alleyways.
6.2.3 Methodology

The main focus of the investigation within the case study was evaluation practice within the CHALK NDC. The research utilised both primary and secondary data in the examination of the evaluation carried out on the alley-gating project presented above, as well as broader aspects of evaluation within the NDC. Results of the alley-gating evaluation report can be found in Lythgoe (2008) and CHALK NDC (2011b, 2011c).

Primary data was collected via four informal interviews and three semi structured interviews of approximately one hour in length [See Chapter 2; Section 2.3.1]. Informal interviews were conducted with two senior management level staff members of the NDC, the project manager on the alley-gating project, as well as a senior manager at the council who worked closely with the NDC. Formal semi structured interviews were conducted with:

- Respondent CS3PE: Senior management within the NDC also responsible for Evaluation
- Respondent CS3PM: Project manager on the alley-gating project
- Respondent CS3CL: Council liaison

Interviews were recorded, transcribed and summarised, before summaries were sent out to respondents for validation [see e-appendix 4]. Other sources of primary data included photographs and notes taken during field visits. Secondary data was collected in the form of literature such as government publications, articles, archival data and organisational reports which underwent a document review.

A thematic content analysis was conducted on the qualitative data, with main themes coded and reviewed [see section 7.1, e-appendices 2C and 5C]. Statistical methods were used to determine the main themes emergent from the data coding process, generating a list of prevalent codes by cross referencing the codes with the highest occurrence (by total number of references) and total codes with the highest occurrence (by percentage coverage) [See Appendix 7B]. These were utilised within the cross case analysis [See Section 7.2].
An axial coding framework (Strauss and Corbin, 1998; Gibbs, 2007; Borgatti, 2005) [See Section 2.3] was utilised for the comparative analysis of the primary as well as secondary data against the emergent axial codes [See Appendix 7C and e-appendix 1C]. QSL NVivo9 was used for the qualitative elements of the analysis such as code generation, while MS Office Excel was used for quantitative methods such as statistical analysis applied to generated codes and some secondary data. These axial codes formed the basis of the core themes that provided the structure for the preliminary findings set out in section 6.2.4.

Details of the analysis and results can be found in section 7.1, appendix 7 and e-appendix 1C.

6.2.4 Preliminary Findings

The preliminary findings are presented under the following core themes (listed in rank order of emergence within axial coding framework; Appendix 7C):

- Evaluation: General information on evaluation within the organisation as well as the basic forms of evaluation conducted.
- Strategy: Strategic approach to evaluation, including dissemination of findings.
- Methods: The processes, procedures and tools adopted in conducting evaluation activity. This includes research questions, participants, criteria and indicators.
- Motivations: Incentives, and reasons that drive evaluations
- Learning: The organisation’s formative evaluations and actions taken on evaluation findings
- Engagement: The organisation’s efforts to engage with stakeholders including the council, partners and the wider community.
- Organisation: The context within which the evaluation occurs; organisational priorities and objectives
- Culture: The organisational culture, perceptions, and commitment to evaluation
• National: The national structures and influences on evaluation practice
• Timeframes: Life cycles and chronological constraints of evaluation activity
• Challenges: The main barriers to evaluation highlighted by the data
• Funding: Impact of funding on evaluation activity
• Unique Features: Distinguishing features of the organisation’s evaluation activity
• Future: Future plans for the organisation

Findings under individual themes may contain some elements of repetition as the data is being viewed via different lenses each time, and should be considered in the context of the specific heading being addressed. These preliminary findings form the basis of the key learning points listed in Section 6.2.5.

Evaluation
This refers to general information on evaluation within the organisation as well as the basic forms of evaluation conducted.

Council evaluation
The primary data found that historically the council carried out evaluation activity at the end of a given project or programme, however there was a move towards evaluating while the project was ongoing rather than at the end. This way it was possible to pick up earlier on what was not working so amendments could be made to bring the project back on track, or to terminate the project if necessary. The research found that evaluation had become a bigger part of the council’s activity, with continuous monitoring seeking to establish if outcomes are being met and if not why. This was supported by the secondary data, as the document review found that the council undertakes annual customer satisfaction surveys as well as a structured performance management framework which covers the council’s services (Salford Council, 2012a; 2012b).

The primary data found that evaluation criteria is selected by the directorate, and may differ on individual projects. The document review found that the council
indicators (Salford Council, 2010; 2012c) [See ‘Methods-Criteria/Indicators’ below and Appendix 10E] were based on the borough’s seven key pledges. Feedback is provided through the governance structures of the respective projects as well as through the directorate structures and the wider public via the council website.

NDC evaluation/Cross cutting/National framework

Both the primary and secondary data revealed that all CHALK NDC projects had an appraisal framework established when they were set up and had funding approval. They were required to fill a form (CHALK NDC, 2009b) which stated:

- What the project intended to achieve (outcomes)
- How the outcomes will be achieved (processes)
- How achievement will be measured (evaluation)
- Any succession strategies

The NDC programme had a national evaluation team which examined the cross cutting issues across all NDCs using case studies (CHALK NDC, 2011b). They examined how the NDC programme had performed around the six key themes of:

- Building Communities
- Crime & Community Safety
- Children, Young People and Education
- Physical Environment
- Health
- Business, Employment and Skills

The cross-cutting evaluations were carried out later on in the life of the different NDC partnerships as they were assessing the impact of the programmes as a whole across its different areas of activity.

The CHALK NDC had three strands of evaluation:

- About learning and development
- Using and sharing the information
- Evaluation in terms of performance

[See ‘Methods’ and ‘Organisation’ sections below for further findings]
Programme and Project Evaluation

The research found that programme level evaluation, which looked at the cross-cutting programme outcomes, was generally carried out by external consultants. Programme level evaluations took place on an annual basis as the government required an annual review of performance up until 2007 however the CHALK NDC continued to carry on their annual programme evaluations.

The research found that at project level the evaluation conducted depended on the individual project. Where possible formative ex-ante evaluation is carried out in the form of a baseline survey, and then evaluation activity is carried out continuously in the form of monitoring. This allows for corrective measures to be taken based on findings of the evaluation activity. Finally ex-post evaluation is carried out at the end of the project in order to provide summative feedback on the performance of the individual project as well as inform learning on other projects. On smaller projects it is not always possible or feasible (due to resourcing or time) to carry out on-going evaluation activity. In these cases, evaluations are only carried out at the end of the project.

Furthermore it was found that the project level evaluations were the most difficult to implement as despite the fact that the NDC evaluation manager provided support, the evaluation activities were mainly down to the individual project managers. Some projects took it very seriously, and carried out copious amounts of research, while others were lost. One thing that the NDC did in order to mitigate this was to focus on the narrative of the project. Furthermore the NDC provided a local evaluation framework as a form (CHALK NDC, 2007a) which facilitated the evaluation process by guiding the project manager through a structured process of narrating the project’s activity and achievements. Furthermore the form helped link project activity or outcomes to the wider NDC outcomes where applicable. The research found that although different projects had their own life cycles, they were all reviewed at least once by the NDC’s monitoring and evaluation sub-committee.
Strategy

This refers to the strategic approach to evaluation, including dissemination of findings.

Evaluation within the NDC took a comprehensive approach which attempted to look at the higher level cross cutting issues while taking in the detail at project level. Using the appraisal framework, project level evolutions were encouraged to take in the bigger picture based on the NDC’s overarching themes (CHALK NDC, 2004) [See ‘Organisation’ below].

The NDC’s evaluation strategy stems from three main questions:

- What has the project set out to achieve?
- What has the project actually achieved?
- What else has the project achieved?

Following the appointment of an evaluation manager, a review was carried out on the NDC’s evaluation systems, and a local evaluation framework was developed (CHALK NDC, 2007a). The framework (see figure 6.6) set out the main aims of the NDC’s evaluation activity namely:

- About learning and development,
- Using and sharing the information,
- Evaluation in terms of performance.

The framework also sets out the following cross cutting values:

- The work must be positive, active and constructive
- The results must be honestly stated
- Learning should be a primary consideration at all times
- The process must be accessible and inclusive - whatever we do, people should be able to get value from it
- The work must cover social, economic and physical change
- Adding value to statutory evaluation requirements
The strategy centred on stories of how things happened and what the wider benefits were. Evaluation sought to highlight how things worked together to improve the area and close the gap with other parts of the city, as opposed to simply evaluating individual projects in isolation.

![Fig. 6.6: Local Evaluation Framework (Source: Lythgoe, 2008 p.5)](image)

Earlier in the NDC’s life, evaluation focused heavily on evidencing and accounting for funding, however as time went on the emphasis shifted to relating the journey travelled and reporting the lessons learned (Lythgoe, 2008). As the NDC came to an end, evaluation strategy began to focus on the legacy of the NDC and its succession strategy, laying emphasis on what others could gain from the learning that came out of evaluation activity within the NDC.
Figures 6.7 and 6.8 illustrate the evaluation strategies before and after the review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NDC Year 1</th>
<th>Evaluation of projects</th>
<th>Performance Management Assessment</th>
<th>Programme Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NDC Year 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MORTI SURVEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDC Year 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDC Year 4</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation sub-</td>
<td></td>
<td>MORTI SURVEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>ctee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDC Year 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Programme Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MORTI SURVEY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 6.7: CHALK NDC Evaluation Strategy- Pre 2007 (Source: Lythgoe, 2008 p.3)
Aside from developing the local evaluation framework, the CHALK NDC went beyond national requirements of their funding by examining the impact of the NDC beyond its boundaries. Furthermore the NDC carried on conducting cross-cutting programme level evaluations even after they were no longer required by the government. This aided the NDC in monitoring performance activity in order to keep the programme on track – reviewing process, and refocusing objectives based on feedback where needed, as well as terminating projects if necessary. Another thing the NDC did was focus on process evaluation; assessing not just on the impact projects had, but finding out how they achieved these impacts.
Alley-gating Evaluation

Evaluation on the alley-gating project attempted to look not just at the physical outcomes of the project, but also a lot of the softer aspects, and was used as a pilot of the newly developed local evaluation framework. It started out investigating what the project set out to achieve, and then explored what other unintended outcomes the project delivered. Furthermore, as part of the framework the evaluation sought to capture how these outcomes were achieved (see figure 6.9).

Given the considerable scale of the project, evaluation was continuous, with formative evaluation being carried out as soon as the first gates went up. In addition, ex-ante evaluation was carried out in the form of a baseline survey before the project began.

Fig. 6.9: Alley-Gating Evaluation - Wider Themes (Source: Lythgoe, 2008 p.7)
Dissemination

The primary data found that at council level findings of evaluation activity are feedback through the governance structures of the respective projects eg. steering groups, as well as through the directorate structures to the director, senior management team, and the lead member for that service. Reports are also passed on to the Regeneration Initiatives Cabinet Working Group, and so things would get reported to RICWG and may not go to cabinet unless it was very significant. Cabinet is very much about key decisions that have to be taken, but RICWG might review it, so again it depends on the project. The document review found that reports are also published on the council website and are subject to public scrutiny.

Both the primary and secondary data revealed that within the NDC, focusing on using and sharing information was one of the strands of its evaluation strategy. Emphasis was placed on ensuring that information was disseminated in order for others to learn from findings of the evaluation. As such the NDC adopted a number of different means in order to disseminate evaluation findings. Reports were feedback through various channels as shown in figure 6.7, with copies going to the NDC board, the council, as well as stakeholders. Furthermore findings were published in organisational literature in summary format in order to make it more accessible to the general public. Other forums adopted by the NDCs in order to disseminate findings include sub-group and task group meetings, organised community events or activity days, and the NDC website.

Methods

This refers to the processes, procedures and tools adopted in conducting evaluation activity. This includes research questions, participants, criteria and indicators.

The research found that the evaluation methods used by the NDC include:

- Surveys
- Interviews
- Questionnaires
- Document and Statistical review
Furthermore MORI poll surveys were utilised by the NDC in conducting resident satisfaction surveys which asked questions such as:

- Do you consider the area a nice place to live?
- Do you want to move?
- Do you plan on moving?

On the whole evaluation activity sought to illicit information asking:

- What did the project set out to do?
- What did it actually do?
- How did it do this?
- What were the Key successes?
- What could have been improved?
- What could be learnt?

On the alley-gating project the methods used were:

- Interviews
- Document and Statistical review
- Questionnaires and Surveys (MORI poll, customer care cards)

The evaluation asked question about what else the project achieved outside its original outcomes. The evaluation adopted the use of narrative in order to tell the story of how outcomes were achieved and what the wider benefits were.

The document review revealed that the NDC utilised tools such as the Practical Quality Assurance System for Small Organisations (PQASSO), Social Accounting and Audit (SAA), and Social Return on Investment (SROI) (CHALK NDC, 2009c).
Criteria/Indicators

The research found that the NDC assessment criteria were set around the original NDC outcomes (CHALK NDC, 2001; 2004; 2012). At project level, the assessment criteria was determined by project outcomes as set out within the project appraisal form completed at the beginning of the project. These outcomes are linked to those of the Local Area Agreement (LAA) as well as the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP). The indicators are detailed under each of the NDC priority outcomes:

- **Building Communities** - For Example:
  - Residents able to influence decisions that affect their area
  - % residents who think that NDC has improved the area a great deal / fair amount as a place to live
  - % residents involved in activities organised by NDC in last 2 years

- **Crime and Community Safety** – For Example:
  - % residents very / fairly worried about being physically attacked by strangers
  - % residents feeling very / fairly safe in the area
  - % residents feeling that the area is more safe than 2 years ago

- **Education, Children and Young People** – For Example:
  - % local residents very/fairly satisfied with local childcare provision
  - Number of registered childcare places
  - % local residents satisfied with pre-school nursery provision

- **Physical Environment** – For Example:
  - % of residents who want to move
  - % new residents (in area less than 1 year) attracted by recent improvements
  - Number of void public housing properties

- **Health** – For Example:
  - % local residents very/fairly satisfied with local health facilities
  - Number of people benefitting from new or improved health facilities
  - % households having someone with a limiting, long term illness

- **Business, Employment and Skills** – For Example:
  - % households in paid work
  - % households having someone registered unemployed
  - Employment rate

- CHALK NDC, 2012
See Appendix 6A for a full list of indicators and outcome measures of the NDC.

The NDC indicators are based on the council’s key performance indicators (Salford Council, 2012c) (see Appendix 6B for a full list of council indicators) which tie into the single data set of indicators at national level (CLG, 2012). The indicators reflect the borough’s seven key pledges, and include measures such as:

- Improving health in Salford
  - Adult participation in sport and active recreation
  - Obesity among primary school age children
  - All-age all cause mortality rate

- Reducing crime in Salford
  - Serious violent crime rate
  - Perceptions of anti-social behaviour
  - Number of drug users recorded as being in effective treatment

- Encouraging learning, leisure and creativity in Salford
  - Achievement of 5 or more A*- C grades at GCSE or equivalent including English and Maths
  - Secondary school persistent absence rate
  - Narrowing the gap between the lowest achieving 20% in the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile and the rest

- Investing in young people in Salford
  - Perceptions of parents taking responsibility for the behaviour of their children in the area
  - Emotional health of children
  - Children who have run away from home/ care

- Promoting inclusion in Salford
  - % of people who believe people from different backgrounds get on well together in their local area
  - % of people who feel they can influence decisions in their locality
  - Participation in regular volunteering

- Creating prosperity in Salford
  - Overall Employment rate
  - New business registration rate
  - 16 to 18 year olds who are not in education, employment or training

- Enhancing life IN Salford
  - Overall/ general satisfaction with local area
  - Improved street and environmental cleanliness
  - Access to services and facilities by public transport, walking and cycling
Participants

The alley-gating evaluation was carried out chiefly by the NDC evaluation manager, with support from the project manager, liaison officers, Groundworks staff and local estate agent. Information was collected from:

- Local residents
- Businesses
- Project staff
- Partner organisation staff
- Council staff

The findings were reviewed by the NDC’s monitoring and evaluation committee, as well as the various task groups (CHALK NDC, 2007b).

The document review found different stakeholders were involved within NDC evaluation processes in a variety of capacities. They are listed in table 6.3 below along with their contributions.

Table 6.3: Participation in NDC evaluation processes (Source: CHALK NDC, 2011c p.12)

| The communities of Charlestown and Lower Kersal | MORI Household survey, feedback to individual projects and events, People’s Voice Media (PVM) research |
| Partnership Board members | MORI household survey (as appropriate), Monitoring and Evaluation sub-committee, feedback at Board meetings, feedback to individual projects and events, PVM research |
| Project delivery staff | MORI household survey (as appropriate), Feedback to individual projects and events, project evaluation reports, outcomes report, PVM research |
| NDC staff | Staff interviews, possibly MORI household survey, Team meeting report, individual project evaluation reports, PVM research |
| Key agencies and partners | Individual project evaluation reports, feedback at Board meetings, PVM research |
Figure 6.10 shows participants and their levels of involvement within evaluation activity across the NDC.

Motivation

This refers to the incentives, and reasons that drive evaluations

The research found that the main incentive for carrying out evaluation at project level was in order to satisfy funding requirements, as the completion of a project appraisal form is a pre-requisite for initial funding. In addition each project only gained funding approval for approximately 3 years, and was required to submit an evaluation report to the monitoring and evaluation sub-committee in order to have their funding reapproved.

At programme level in addition to funding, sharing and learning provided another incentive for carrying out evaluation
Learning
This refers to the organisation’s formative evaluations and actions taken on evaluation

Interviews found that where pilot projects were involved, learning formed a primary function of the evaluation activity. Furthermore formative evaluations were utilised to inform the delivery of ongoing projects, making decisions about refocusing objectives or termination if necessary. Findings of evaluations were also fed into the NDC business plan, informing the operation and development of the NDC itself.

Following the appointment of the evaluation manager, the review of evaluation systems informed an overhaul of evaluation process within the NDC.

Towards the end of the NDC’s life emphasis of evaluation activity lay not just on learning within the organisation but externally as the focus shifted to the legacy of the NDC and what findings could mean for other organisations and stakeholders.

This was supported by the findings of the document review which reinforced learning as a key function of evaluation activity within the NDC, with “learning and improvement” listed as one of the three core aims of evaluation. Furthermore the fact that “learning should be a primary consideration at all times” is a stated value within the NDC’s local evaluation strategy (CHALK NDC, 2007a; 2009c).

Engagement
This refers to the organisation’s efforts to engage with stakeholders including the council, partners and the wider community.

The research found that when it came to the final stage of evaluation activity, dissemination and feeding back of findings, the NDC engaged with a broad range of stakeholders using a variety of forums (see ‘Dissemination’, table 6.3 and figure 6.10 above).
Stakeholders engaged during evaluation activity included:

- Residents
- NDC staff
- Council staff
- Partners
- Funders
- Project staff (including external staff)

During the development and planning stage of evaluation activity, the NDC engaged with a narrower group of primarily internal stakeholders (NDC staff and project staff) as well as key external stakeholders in the delivery of evaluation (council staff, residents and external consultants).

The NDC utilised the task groups and the partnership board in the development of evaluation strategy, as well as the review of its finds. In so doing, residents and members of the community were engaged in different aspects of the evaluation process.

Organisation
This refers to the context within which evaluation activity occurs; organisational priorities and objectives

The research found the CHALK NDC had a set Long term vision along with listed aims stated below:

“to make Lower Kersal and Charlestown a place where people want to live, by building a community and future that engages everyone.”

This means that in ten years, Charlestown/Lower Kersal will be a vibrant and successful community with:

- an attractive and safe environment;
- quality homes to meet existing and future needs;
- a mix of improved and new housing to buy or rent;
- improved and expanded local facilities;
• low unemployment and a strengthened business community offering new job opportunities;
• opportunities for all, through the development of the area’s unique combination of schools, college and university;
• the river as a central feature, uniting the community, providing recreation opportunities and attracting investment

- CHALK NDC, 2001

Under each of its six key themes, the NDC listed a number of chosen outcomes each with specific milestones (objectives). Table 6.4 outlines these outcomes and objectives.

Individual projects each had a set of goals that varied depending on the individual nature of the project. They were developed to feed into the overarching NDC outcomes (CHALK NDC, 2012). The project originally aimed to:

‘Implement a series of alley gating and community led environmental improvements, to reduce crime, improve community safety, reduce housing turnover, improve local area image and foster community spirit.’

A full list of project objectives can be found in Appendix 8A (Alley-gating evaluation report). The alley gating project was carried out as part of a wider Block Improvement programme of over 1000 homes which listed the following as objectives: To provide certainty regarding the future of the properties and encourage owner investment in their own homes

• To stabilise and revive the local housing market;
• To improve the fabric of property that may have been neglected;
• To reduce maintenance obligations in the short-medium term until owner confidence and the housing market improves;
• To create attractive neighbourhoods where people, both existing residents and newcomers, would choose to live.

- CHALK NDC, 2009a
Table 6.4: CHALK NDC Organisational Goals (Source: CHALK NDC, 2001 p. 29)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEME</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING COMMUNITIES</td>
<td>Secure the success of the New Deal for Communities programme by ensuring that as many local people as possible are aware of and empowered to participate fully in the programme, supported by an effective communications network</td>
<td>Build on the strengths of the Participatory Appraisal Team and ensure the creation and implementation of the Charlestown/Lower Kersal Participation and Communications Strategies within the first twelve months of the programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>建兴 nore of the Community programme to 70% of all residents by year 3, to 80% by year 6 and sustain this to the end of the programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximise the role of the community (including all hard to reach groups) within the NDC area, by increasing the level of community support, activities, services and facilities available</td>
<td>Increase the proportion of residents feeling involved in the community to 30% in year 3, 40% in year 6 and 50% in year 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undertake an audit of community activities and facilities within the first twelve months of the programme (establish the milestones in year 1 following this assessment).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEME</td>
<td>OUTCOME</td>
<td>OBJECTIVES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIME AND COMMUNITY SAFETY</td>
<td>Decrease the proportion of residents feeling unsafe to the average for the city.</td>
<td>Reduce the proportion of residents feeling unsafe to the average for the city within twelve percentage points of the city average by year 3, to within seven percentage points in year 6 and to the city average by the end of the programme. Additional police time targeted on specific crime ‘hotspots’ in year 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of recorded crimes reduced to the city average.</td>
<td>An initial increase in the number of recorded crimes (by 15%) by year 3 as residents feel more confident/supported in reporting crimes, followed by a reduction to the current level in Charlestown/Lower Kersal by year 6 and the city average by the end of the programme,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of recorded incidences of criminal damage and juvenile nuisance reduced to the city average.</td>
<td>An initial increase in the number of recorded crimes of criminal damage and juvenile nuisance (by 15%) by year 3 as residents feel more confident/supported in reporting crimes, followed by a reduction to the current level in Charlestown/Lower Kersal by year 6 and, to the city average by the end of the programme,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce the number of recorded incidences of domestic burglary by 15%.</td>
<td>An initial increase in the number of recorded crimes of domestic burglary (by 15%) by year 3 as residents feel more confident/supported in reporting crimes, followed by a reduction to the current level in Charlestown/Lower Kersal by year 6 (following a programme of target hardening and the introduction of affordable house contents insurance). A reduction to 25.4 per 1000 population by the end of the programme,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decrease the proportion of businesses stating crime and security as the biggest issue facing the business community by 50%.</td>
<td>Reduce the proportion of businesses stating crime and security as their biggest business issue to 66% by year 3, 55% by year 6 and 44% by year 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE</td>
<td>Improve the provision of affordable, locally available childcare.</td>
<td>Reduce the proportion of residents rating local childcare facilities as poor to 80% by year 3, 70% by year 6 and 50% by year 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve the quality and provision of children’s</td>
<td>Improve the proportion of residents who rate play facilities as good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve the appearance and image of the area.</td>
<td>Increase the proportion of residents who are satisfied with their</td>
<td>Increase the proportion of residents who are satisfied with their neighbourhood to 40% by year 3, to 50% by year 6 and 60% by year 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neighbourhood to 40% by year 3, to 50% by year 6 and 60% by year 10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve access throughout the area to all sectors of the</td>
<td>Improve and provide a range of sport and leisure</td>
<td>Increase the proportion of residents rating sport and leisure facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT**

- **Objective:** Improve access throughout the area to all sectors of the community.

**Outcome:** Increase the proportion of residents who rate the quality of public transport as good to 30% by year 3, 35% by year 6 and 40% by the end of the programme.

---

**PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT**

- **Objective:** Improve the quality and provision of children’s play facilities within the area.

**Outcome:** Detailed youth engagement/consultation to be undertaken in year 1 (the milestones for youth involvement to be set in year 1 following this work).

---

**PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT**

- **Objective:** Improve and provide a range of sport and leisure facilities within the area.

**Outcome:** Increase the proportion of residents rating sport and leisure facilities.

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEME</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH</td>
<td>a) Provide a comprehensive and consistent approach to health care facilities, advice and services in the area.</td>
<td>a) Provide a broad range of health services and facilities in the area and increase satisfaction with local health care to 40% in year 3, 50% by year 6 and 60% by the end of the programme. Brief for Health Action Centre produced in year 1 and at least one Centre fully operational by year 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Increase community involvement in planned health provision in the area</td>
<td>b) Community Health Partnership Board fully established in year 1 addressing issues of community satisfaction and ensuring best value in the provision of local health services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhance existing amenity open spaces in to safe and functional areas.</td>
<td>Increase the proportion of residents rating parks and green spaces as good to 20% by year 3, to 35% by year 6 and to 50% by the end of the programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fully engage all sectors of the community in creating a sustainable environment.</td>
<td>Reduce the proportion of residents who feel the area is deteriorating to 60% by year 3, to 50% by year 6 and 40% by year 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEME</td>
<td>OUTCOME</td>
<td>OBJECTIVES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH</td>
<td>Reduce the proportion of households that have a member suffering from depression by a fifth and a member being treated for stress by a fifth by the end of the programme, in line with national targets for improving mental health.</td>
<td>Reduce the proportion of households that have a member suffering from depression to 14% by year 3, to 13% by 6 and to 12% by the end of the programme. Reduce the proportion of households that have a member suffering from depression to 14% by year 3, to 13% by 6 and sustain this to the end of the programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce the standard mortality rate by 20% by the end of the programme, in line with national targets, and set in place the framework for continuing to narrow the gap to the city average beyond the life of the programme.</td>
<td>Reduce the standard mortality rate by 10% by 6 and by a total of 20% by the end of the programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEME</td>
<td>OUTCOME</td>
<td>OBJECTIVES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND SKILLS</td>
<td>Establish a holistic prevention, detection and treatment programme suitable for local implementation</td>
<td>Establish a holistic prevention, detection and treatment programme suitable for local implementation by year 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase the percentage of pupils achieving level 4 or above at key stage 2 English, Maths and Science to the national Average</td>
<td>Increase the proportion of pupils achieving level 4 or above at key stage 2 to within six percentage points of the city average by year 3, six percentage points by year 6 and to the national average by year 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase support for lone parents by putting in place an integrated package of services</td>
<td>Provide more support to parents via a range of facilities and activities linking education (child care/parenting) health (stress clinics, relaxation, complimentary therapies) and social support (via groups) and activities e.g. Home Start by year 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase GCSE rates to the average for the city.</td>
<td>Increase the percentage of pupils achieving 5 or more GCSEs at grades A* - C to within eight percentage points of the City average by year 3, four percentage points by year 6 and to the city average by year 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEME</td>
<td>OUTCOME</td>
<td>OBJECTIVES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND SKILLS</strong></td>
<td>Increase the percentage of residents rating secondary schools as good to 60% by year 10</td>
<td>Opening of the new Albion High school in year 3 (September 2003) Increase the percentage of residents rating secondary schools as good to 30% in year 3, 50% by year 6 and 60% by year 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase the proportion of pupils going on to further education to the average for the city.</td>
<td>Increase the percentage of pupils going on to further education to within eight percentage points of the City average by year 3, four percentage points by year 6 and to the city average by year 10.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEME</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND SKILLS</strong></td>
<td>Reduce the proportion of households that have someone who is registered unemployed to the city average.</td>
<td>Reduce the proportion of households that have someone who is registered unemployed to within four percentage points of the city average by year 3, two percentage points by year 6 and to the city average by year 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce the proportion of households receiving income support to the average for the city</td>
<td>Reduce the proportion of households receiving income support to within nine percentage points of the city average by year 3, five percentage points by year 6, and to the average for the city by the end of programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create a skilled and productive workforce, by supporting people to gain the necessary skills, qualifications or experience necessary in order to access employment opportunities</td>
<td>Increase the proportion of residents taking steps to gain the necessary skills, qualifications or experience to access employment to 25% by year 3, 35% by year 6 and 45% by the end of programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce the proportion of households containing one or more residents with no qualifications to the average for the city by year 10.</td>
<td>Undertake a detailed skills audit in the area within the first 12 months of the programme (detailed milestones for skills levels to be established in year 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce the proportion of local companies experiencing difficulties recruiting staff to no more</td>
<td>Reduce the proportion of local companies experiencing difficulties recruiting staff to no more than 30% by year 3, 25% by year 6 and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than 20% by year 10.</td>
<td>20% by year 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the proportion of local businesses who believe the local image is poor to no more than 25% by year 10.</td>
<td>Reduce the proportion of local businesses who believe the local image is poor to no more than 65% by year 3, no more than 50% by year 6 and no more than 25% by year 10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 20 new businesses trading in the area by year 10</td>
<td>Increase the number of businesses trading in the area by 5 in year 3, by 10 in year 6 and by 20 overall in Year 10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 15% of existing businesses supported to recruit additional local people by year 10</td>
<td>At least 5% of existing businesses supported to recruit additional local people by year 3, 10% supported by year 6, and 15% supported by year 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Culture

This refers to the organisational culture, perceptions, and commitment to evaluation

The research found that at organisational level there is a real commitment to evaluation activity as demonstrated by the NDCs provision of resources not only to support evaluation activity but to employ a dedicated evaluation manager. Furthermore, NDC continued to carry out cross-cutting programme level evaluation even when they were no longer required by the government. The strategic importance of evaluation within the NDC was reflected in its practices, with the provision of detailed guidance as well as clear processes and structures such as the monitoring and evaluation committee. Furthermore the organisation demonstrated a willingness to take on board learning from evaluation and make the appropriate adjustments.

Across the organisation the there was a clear understanding of the rationale behind evaluation activities as with the aid of the clear guidance and strategic direction provided staff are well informed. Despite the perception of evaluation as a technical complicated process by managers on some projects, the evaluation framework with clear steps in simple language meant that some level of evaluation was carried out on every project the NDC undertook.

At borough level, there is an increasing understanding of the rationale for evaluation with it playing a bigger part in the council’s decision making and improvement process. This is supported by findings of the document review as evidenced by the council’s improvement framework (Salford Council, 2012b).

National

This refers to the national structures and influences on evaluation practice

The primary data revealed that at AGMA level, while more emphasis is being placed on evaluation activity, the focus is on methods such as cost benefit analysis without enough guidance being provided, e.g. training. Information on the detailed workings and assumptions made in terms of its sensitivity analysis is not readily provided.
This reflects the national trend of a less prescriptive attitude towards evaluation activity. This is supported by the document review as since the assent of the coalition government into power, several national assessment frameworks have been abolished including the comprehensive area assessment, the Place Survey, the national indicator set and local area agreements. An updated ‘single data list’ (CLG, 2012b) sets out all the data sets required from local authorities and other arms length organisations operating at local level. The list includes indicators for various outcomes based on:

- Stronger and Safer Communities
- Children and Young People
- Adult Health and Wellbeing
- Local Economy and Environmental Sustainability

Not only does the new data set maintain a reduced number of indicators (CLG, 2007) but at council level, the indicators in use, have been cut by 118 (Salford, 2012c).

### Timeframes

*This refers to the life cycles and chronological constraints of evaluation activity*

At project level, timeframes were varied and dependent on the individual projects. Projects underwent appraisal prior to funding approval, as well as some form of summative evaluation at the end. Further ongoing formative and interim evaluation took place on longer projects which were subject to re-approval every 3 years.

Programme level evaluation was carried out on an annual basis with the involvement of the six task groups. The cross cutting theme reviews took place over the last 18 months of the NDC’s life. MORI polls were conducted bi-annually. This was supported by the findings of the document review, which further revealed that quarterly project monitoring returns were required by the monitoring and evaluation sub committee (CHALK NDC, 2010a).
Challenges
This refers to the main barriers to evaluation highlighted by the data

The primary data found that a major limitation was the capacity of individual members of staff responsible for evaluation activity on the various projects. While the programme level evaluations were conducted with a certain level of rigour, despite the guidance provided by evaluation framework, the standards of project level evaluations varied. One thing the evaluation framework did mitigate to an extent was the lack of confidence experienced by some of the project workers in conducting evaluation activity. Furthermore stakeholder engagement, as well as the availability of funding to carry out evaluation activity were highlighted as challenges.

The document review supported these findings, and further highlighted the following additional challenges:

- Access to data (difficult to measure cost of MORI survey information)
- Capacity - staff time, staff continuity, ability, staff commitment (length of contracts)
- Diverting attention from project delivery - needs to be embedded into the programme and job roles, project appraisals, etc
- Concern about negative findings
- Avoiding ‘spin’ and production of biased findings

- CHALK NDC, 2007a

Funding
This refers to the impact of funding on evaluation activity

Within both the primary and secondary data, funding was found to be a recurring theme. Funding is found to be both an incentive for carrying out evaluation activity, as well as a barrier. At programme level the NDC was required to provide an evaluation framework as a prerequisite for funding, and earlier on in the programme, emphasis was placed on accounting for funding as a major reason for conducting
evaluations. At project level the NDC required that appraisals were carried out prior to funding approval (Lythgoe, 2008; CHALK NDC, 2007a; 2009c). Both the interviews and a review of the NDC’s evaluation framework guidance, highlighted the availability of funding to support evaluation activity is also seen as a potential challenge (CHALK NDC, 2009c). [See ‘Evaluation-NDC Evaluation’, ‘Strategy’ and ‘Motivation’ above].

Unique Features

This refers to distinguishing features of the organisation’s evaluation activity

The interviews found that the CHALK NDC had a more comprehensive approach evaluation than other NDCs and went beyond what was required, conducting non mandatory evaluation activities, such as the post 2007 programme evaluations as well as an assessment of the NDC’s impact outside of the partnership’s borders. This finding was supported by the document review which found that a majority of the NDCs had underdeveloped evaluation strategies (Centre for Regional, Economic and Social Research, 2002).

The research also found that of the 30 projects carried out by the NDC (CHALK NDC, 2011c), the alley-gating project was one of the few where the evaluation started off as a focused project evaluation with a limited scope but eventually resulted in what was effectively a broad cross-cutting evaluation across 5 of the 6 NDC priority themes.

Future

This refers to future plans for the organisation

The primary data found that as the NDC’s focus began shifting to the future and its legacy, the evaluation activity began to lay greater emphasis on learning; particularly learning for the NDC’s external stakeholders. The role of evaluation is one that is being promoted within the NDC’s succession strategy (See section 6.2.2, figure 6.3
and table 6.2), particularly the relevant knowledge that could inform work going forward such as neighbourhood planning and other localism oriented activities. Going forward it is unlikely that regeneration will exist in the form that it does at the moment, but become part of mainstream delivery, in the form of intensive neighbourhood management work that carried out by a Local Authority or Housing provider. This is supported by the findings of the document review with the NDC’s succession strategy representing the future of regeneration work in the area along these lines. Furthermore it found that the priorities and development of the strategy was informed by the NDC’s evaluation activity (CHALK NDC, 2011a; CLG, 2008a).

6.2.5 Key Learning Points

Evaluation Strategy and Methods

- The NDC reflects a healthy evaluation culture, with organisational commitment to evaluation activity. This is demonstrated not only by the appointment of a dedicated evaluation manager, but the development of a comprehensive evaluation strategy bolstered by guidance to support staff. [See ‘Culture’]

- It is evident that the appointment of the evaluation manager is crucial to the robustness of the NDC’s evaluation practice. Furthermore the appointment marked a shift in the organisation’s approach to evaluation, leading to a review of the evaluation mechanisms in use and the development the evaluation strategy [see ‘Strategy’ and ‘Learning’]

- In an emerging theme, funding plays a major role as a driver for evaluation activity both as incentive and as a resource, within the CHALK NDC however, learning features as a core motivation for conducting evaluation activity. [see ‘Evaluation’, ‘Strategy’ and ‘section 4.1.3’]

- As part of this learning, the evaluations focussed not just on outcomes, but process as it reviewed how outcomes were achieved. see ‘Evaluation’, ‘Strategy’ and ‘section 4.1.3’
• The evaluation strategy brings together the wider programme objectives and more specific project objectives, linking them to corresponding indicators and evaluation processes. This makes for effective evaluations at different levels. [see ‘Strategy’]

• In assessing the diverse range of activities undertaken by the NDC, it adopts a multiplicity of methods [See ‘methods’] something which has been highlighted by the literature review [see ‘section 4.2.3’] as good practice.

• The evaluation strategy evolved along with the different stages of the NDC’s lifecycle, and while at the beginning there was a lot of emphasis on accountability to funding bodies, this emphasis shifted to relating lessons learned that could be fed into the succession strategy. [see ‘Strategy’]

Organisational Objectives and Performance Indicators

• The NDC has a clearly presented set of organisational aspirations, ranging from a vision statement and aims structured around core themes, to a well structured ‘SMART’ objectives linked to specific programme outcomes (which are based on the strategic direction of the LAA and LSP). [See ‘Organisation’]

• At project level the stated objectives are not as rigorously developed, which corroborates issues raised in ‘capacity’ under ‘Gaps and Challenges’ below. However they still have a clear link with the organisation’s outcomes [See ‘organisation’ and appendix 6A]

• The fact that the NDC’s objectives are well structured means that they provide a good basis for developing specific criteria and indicators.

• The indicators in use by the organisation are structured under each of key outcomes which the objectives are tied to. This not only means that they cover the breadth of the organisation’s activities but a traceable link from outcomes through objectives to indicators is established. [See ‘Methods’ and appendix 6A]
The fact that the indicators are based on those utilised by the council make evaluation results readily comparable across the borough. [See ‘Methods’ and appendices 6A, 6B and 10E]

Gaps and Challenges

- **Resourcing:** Availability of funding to carry out evaluation activity, as well as staff time, staff continuity, ability, staff commitment (length of contracts)
- **Stakeholder engagement:** involving ‘difficult to reach’ members of the community
- **Access to data (difficult to measure cost of MORI survey information)**
- **Diverting attention from project delivery - needs to be embedded into the programme and job roles, project appraisals, etc [see ‘postponement’ (Lewis, 2001) ‘section 4.1.1’]**
- **Concern about negative findings**
- **Avoiding ‘spin’ and production of biased findings**
- **Capacity:** Staff capacity particularly at project level is a major challenge, thereby reducing the level of rigour applied to evaluation activity on some projects. The provision of extensive detailed guidance as well as encouraging the use of narrative helps to address this issue (CHALK NDC, 2007a).
- **National Trends:** Although there is an increasingly accountability oriented climate [see ‘section 4.1.1’], there is a less prescriptive attitude towards evaluation and assessment criteria [See ‘National’]. While this raises concerns around lack of knowledge and guidance to support evaluation, this new found flexibility provides an opportunity to develop fit for purpose evaluation systems with appropriate assessment indicators.
- **Engagement and involvement of a wider group of stakeholders in the early stages (as well as analysis) of evaluation activity is an area where evaluation practice could be further developed.**
• Furthermore, while the indicators in use represent the breadth of the organisations activities, there is a notable gap around indicators addressing ecological sustainability such as CO2 emissions. While the NDC has some transportation related indicators [See appendices 6A and 10E], there are non specific to elements of environmentally friendly practices despite the fact that the borough level indicators reflect this [see appendix 6B].

• Finally, with evaluation having played a major role in the development of the NDC succession strategy, it is important that the emphasis placed on the role of evaluation carried through in the operation of the succession body.

Good Practice

• Clear evaluation strategy with supporting guidance
• Clearly linking outcomes and objectives directly to assessment criteria and indicators
• Tying outcomes and indicators to wider borough/national level regeneration outcomes
• Flexibility and methodological pluralism of evaluation activity (eg use of narrative)
• Effective attempt to capture softer outcomes using alternative methodologies (e.g. Social Return on Investment [see section 4.2.2.3])
• Creation of healthy evaluation activity with organisational commitment to evaluation activity at senior level coupled with understanding and buy-in from team and other staff members
• Well aligned organisational and evaluation strategy with shared approaches and philosophies.
• Frequent review of evaluation processes; development and adaptation
• Focus on learning from evaluation with findings informing project and programme development
• Focus on evaluation informing learning outside the organisation; use of information sharing events
6.3 Case Study 4: Bolton At Home

6.3.1 Part A: What is Bolton At Home?

In 2002 what was originally the housing department within the Bolton Metropolitan Borough council broke away to form the Arms Length Management Organisation (ALMO), Bolton At Home. It was one of the first ALMO’s in the country, and the first to have an explicit regeneration directive set out within its objectives. In addition to having regeneration at the heart of the organisation, it also continued to deliver private sector housing renewal benefiting thousands of residents in targeted regeneration areas (Housingnet, 2011), which is unique for a housing ALMO and another first where ALMOs in the country are concerned (Respondent CS1SM, 2011). In 2011, following the passing of a ballot vote by residents, Bolton at Home became a Registered Social Landlord (RSL) and underwent a stock transfer, taking ownership of over 18,000 homes form the council. At present Bolton at Home owns approximately 18,500 properties split between 14,500 general lets and 3000 sheltered or communal properties, with 22,000 tenants across the Bolton borough. As an RSL, Bolton at Home is a registered charity and is run by “a board and associated sub committees made up of councillors, independent members and tenants” (Bolton At Home, 2011a) who the chief executive reports to. Under the chief executive are five directorates:

- Housing Services
- Technical Services
- Housing Regeneration
- Organisational Development
- Business and Financial Services

Each directorate head is responsible for various areas of the organisation’s operation from asset management to anti-social Behaviour Management [See figure 6.11]. With a mandate that extends beyond the sole provision of housing services, Bolton At Home works in partnership with the council and several other agencies such as the Credit Unions, National Health Service and the
Fig. 6.11: Bolton At Home Organisational Chart (Source: Bolton At Home, 2011a)
police in order to improve the wellbeing of residents on their estates as well as other disadvantaged areas of the Bolton borough, tackling not just the physical conditions, but also the social and economic. Together with their tenants, Bolton at Home has produced an organisational aim of creating homes and neighbourhoods to be proud of, and set out to achieve this by:

- Delivering on promises
- Being open, honest and fair
- Listening to customers and learning from feedback
- Working with customers to get it right first time
- Delivering service that are flexible and adaptable
- Welcoming change to improve services

-Bolton At Home, 2011b

Bolton at Home forms part of Bolton Community Homes Ltd (BCH), an independent strategic housing regeneration and service provider company established by the council in 1992, and one of the 14 strategic partnerships that make up the Bolton Vision Partnerships, which is the local strategic partnership (LSP) for Bolton. BCH links with the Development and Regeneration Directorate within the council with which they have a management and operational relationship through the Chief Housing and Regeneration Officer. Some of BCH’s key areas of activity include:

- New Housing Provision
- Affordable Housing Provision
- Development of Specialist Housing Schemes
- Sustainable Communities
- Contributes to the production and implementation of strategies

- BCH, 2010

In September 2005, Bolton at Home became the first organisation in the North West to receive 3 stars (the maximum rating) from the Audit Commission for the delivery of its housing and regeneration services. (Housingnet, 2011)
While Bolton has some very affluent wards it is also home to some of the most deprived wards in the country with life expectancy between thirteen and fifteen years lower than the national average in some areas. The main challenges faced by these areas have been identified as unemployment, poor educational attainment, poor housing and poor health. This disparity between the wealthy and the deprived wards of the borough formed the impetus behind the council’s ‘Narrowing the Gap’ agenda, which seeks to redress the balance by bringing some of its poorer neighbourhoods up to a better standard of living. In a bid to achieve this, the council has adopted a neighbourhood management approach which focuses on smaller geographic areas and looks at a multi-thematic strategy in tackling the issues to do with that area.

Working collaboratively to the same vision as the council, Bolton at Home also delivers regeneration using a neighbourhood management approach, and have sought to embed this within the organisation’s functions by undergoing a restructure of their directorates. Following the restructure the regeneration department became a directorate in its own right, and was configured to deliver neighbourhood management with four neighbourhood managers responsible for a quarter of the borough. With its commitment to neighbourhood management, the organisation sought to break away from the traditional set up of a housing association and in addition to the basic functions around property maintenance attempted to provide a community development service. The organisation rebalanced its focus lending less weight to housing repairs, and more to the empowerment and development of individuals to take control of their neighbourhoods and their lives.

The organisation works with the council to a joint strategy called Transforming Estates. The strategy outlines a three pronged approach around environmental improvements, provision of new housing, and a socio-economic offer.

Despite the fact that Bolton at Home had decent homes investment, most of the money was spent on kitchens, heating, bathrooms etc. as opposed to the environment. The old neighbourhood panels had invested a lot of money but it was piecemeal, and it was often replacing a low quality element with elements of equally low quality. There wasn’t an intelligent, design-led approach to it, so this was an attempt to alter that. With environmental improvements, architects and designers were invited to tender to see if they could work with the organisation and its
customers to come up with some real innovation around physical and environmental renewal. The residents got involved with the whole process making it a robust way of carrying out environmental improvement and at the same time getting residents to feel a real sense of ownership which in turn should make the project more sustainable. An initial pilot project was carried out, and lessons learnt from this informed the other projects across the borough. The organisation’s technical services department learned a lot from working alongside first-rate surveyors and designers.

With construction, the organisation is getting more involved in new build, trying to rebalance tenure with its estates. Bolton at Home is working in collaboration with its other housing partners, (the other Housing Associations, and the Council’s Housing partnership as the umbrella organisation for all the Housing Associations), looking at what the vision is in terms of new build across the borough.

With the change in government, funding has been impacted but the organisation intends to continue with a new build programme and so have identified pockets of land across the borough in order to carry out negotiations with the council in terms of capital receipts, land ownership etc and how that ties into the work around the Transforming Estates strategy (Bolton at Home, 2011a).

As part of the Construction strand, the organisation has been looking at what impact projects have on the other communities, eg resentment. Neighbourhood managers have to oversee the transformational process, managing the impact of new build projects in their areas. A new build has a massive impact in an estate, so in their role Neighbourhood Managers have to look at every element of it. They ask questions such as ‘What will happen to those living next door to the estate? How will they feel about the new people coming in? Where will the new residents have come from?’. Neighbourhood managers may also bring in arts officers or community development officers to look at issues around skills, training and other economic issues in the communities. When new builds are carried out, as part of the construction programme, the organisation looks at what environmental works could be implemented on the edges of the new build to make the transition from the existing structures to the new ones more seamless.
The socio-economic element is something Bolton at Home as an organisation is very strong on. The focus is on narrowing the gap, with emphasis on deprivation and worklessness. As part of the restructure the organisation introduced two economic and worklessness coordinators who work with the neighbourhood management teams to embed employment initiatives, volunteering opportunities etc. The socio-economic element, lies heavily with the neighbourhood managers as one of their main roles within the organisation. Neighbourhood managers have teams underneath them, which incorporate services that were separate in the past. The neighbourhood management approach extends to the Urban Care And Neighbourhood (UCAN) Centres [see section 6.3.2], where on a small geographical area neighbourhood managers adopt a thematic approach to tackle the issues eg, unemployment, health etc.

Bolton at Home has continued to take an approach that incorporates physical regeneration (housing renewal) and the more social (people based) regeneration. The organisation deals with both the public and private sector, leading on regeneration in private sector renewal areas in the borough as well as working in partnership with the local Housing Associations that are allocated to different areas. This is why some of the organisation’s UCAN Centres are owned and managed by other Housing Associations. The UCAN Centres have become a legacy that was left as part of the physical regeneration carried out in that area, and the other Housing Associations have taken on a watching brief over that community once Bolton at Home has moved out. There are currently two UCAN Centres being run by other housing associations within the borough (in Private Sector Renewal Areas that the organisation has managed).

The fact that Bolton at Home still delivers private sector renewal on behalf of the council is quite unique, as many housing sector ALMOs and RSLs would not undertake private sector renewal since most organisations of the kind consider the private rented sector outside their remit. The organisation was one of the first to do so in the country and remains part of a small minority.
In the context of the current restrictive funding regime faced by most organisations in this sector, Bolton at Home has had to explore more innovative ideas and ways of working with the private sector. The organisation is looking at new ways to bring in the private sector, getting them to invest in some of the organisation’s activities.

Another unique service Bolton at Home runs is the Percent for Arts Service which sees the organisation donate part of their capital budget to the arts. Bolton at Home has run this service for over 10 years and is the only RLS in the country to do so. Bolton at Home is committed as an organisation to using the arts in terms of regeneration, and has used the arts in terms of getting involved with the customers, e.g. some of our elderly residents.

As part of the percent for art service Bolton at Home is now commissioned by the council to deliver the Section 106 public art allocation. When new builds are constructed on the estates, under Section 106 the private developers expected to contribute something back to the council. When the Section 106 money is brought back into the council, the Bolton at Home Percent for Art service manages the fund. This is something that does not cost the organisation much but means that they can offer additionality to projects that take place on the estates. Schemes have ranged from garden projects to film projects about addressing things like anti-social behaviour, and involve the whole community which brings people together, and encourages community cohesion.

Bolton at Home are seen as being an innovator, and the organisation is committed to creating the right climate from the top for people to feel free to be innovative, and supporting them in doing so. The organisation does not have a blame culture and supports people in trying new things out; a culture carried on under the new Chief Executive. As a 3 star organisation, outsiders ask to come in and talk to staff in order to develop good practice. A housing group that visited recently to find out what the organisation did in terms of involving communities and their people spent a day with the organisation and went around the UCAN centres.
6.3.2 How Can? UCAN

The Urban Care And Neighbourhood (UCAN) centres are nuclei for services across the Bolton borough, pulling together a wide range of facilities including IT access, free phones, tenancy management, information provision, debt advice, health advice, training and employment support, environmental services, antisocial behaviour management, and even crèche facilities in some cases. The UCAN centres also work closely with external partners including the Police, the Primary Care Trust (PCT), the local credit union and training providers. The UCANs represent a physical embodiment of the organisation’s neighbourhood management strategy by focusing energy on a particular area and pulling together various services and partners in order to tackle multiple issues simultaneously.

The first UCAN centre was set up in a Private Sector Renewal area using European Regional Development Funding (ERDF) and was a legacy of the work that had been carried out in the area, with the view to providing continuity and sustainability. When the initial ERDF funding ran out a bid for Area Based Grant funding was put in to the council with some qualitative statements form partners about the benefits to the council and how the centres fitted in with strategies around access points in delivery of the council’s services. The neighbourhood centres were recognised as being an important part of delivering Neighbourhood Renewal both by the organisation and the council. Following the success of this first centre other UCAN centres were established not only on the organisation’s estates, but also those of some other private sector renewal areas and estates belonging to other housing associations. In those cases the centres are managed either by council staff or staff of the other housing associations. The idea was to see the UCAN centres embedded within the communities that they served so they were located right at the heart of the community and easily within walking distance of the residents they served.

The centres were generally set up in vacant terraced houses, shops, and community facility buildings such as libraries. The fact that the UCANs were located in unoccupied properties meant they served a secondary purpose of reducing the number of empty and boarded up structures in the area. There was demand for UCAN centres in areas where services such as housing offices, libraries and community centres had been withdrawn leaving a void that needed to be filled. This
led to an organic development of the centres as and when the need arose in an opportunistic manner as and when locations became available.

The UCAN centres act as a focal point for the community, serving as a hub for community development in the area. The laid back and informal atmosphere is purpose designed to make the centres approachable and encourage their use as drop in centres where residents can stop by, have a conversation, a cup of tea and some biscuits. Unlike traditional housing offices or job centres where the staff is in uniforms and behind counters, the UCANs are open plan and counter free. Furthermore facilities such as the kitchen and the restrooms are shared by both staff and residents, fostering a greater sense of ownership of the actual centres within the community. The centres provide a one-stop shop facility to the community by bringing together a variety of services under one roof [See figure 6.12].

Fig. 6.12: The Urban Care And Neighbourhood Centre
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The UCAN centres offer a range of training courses, services and facilities to residents that cover different areas. In terms of employment and economic support, the centres partner with Job Centre Plus to offer employment support and run job shops where staff can provide assistance with filling application forms and writing CVs. Residents also have free access to facilities such as the telephone, computers, and the internet in order to carry out job searches and pay their bills. Finance and debt management advice is also offered in centres as well as money skills workshops run in conjunction with HOOT, the local credit union. On most of the estates, skills and literacy are an issue so centres run basic Literacy and Numeracy courses in conjunction Learn Direct. There are also IT courses as well as a sound and media course that has seen residents progress on to work with the local radio station. Centres provide volunteering opportunities to residents for those who feel they have something to offer or in order to help get back into employment.

In terms of healthcare, the centres work with the NHS to provide a range of services including weight management support that incorporates advice on getting fit and healthy eating. The centres also run a variety of social activities such as Yoga and Keep Fit classes. One of the Neighbourhood Centres is next to a playing field so there are now raised beds in place for growing vegetables, which then leads into discussions around healthy cooking, eating etc. Furthermore, the UCANs have visiting health workers, counsellors and midwives who the residents have access to during drop in sessions.

The centres provide a meeting space for community groups and clubs organised both by UCAN staff and residents such as walking clubs, and arts and craft clubs. At Christmas there are also themed activities like decoration making. In a lot of cases residents have young children and require childcare in order to take advantage of some of the services on offer. This led to one of the centres extending their Homework club to include a crèche for parents in attendance at the centre.

Some of the issues that residents are most concerned with are related to the physical conditions of the estates, so centres offer housing and tenancy services where tenants are able not only to report issues such as litter or housing repair, but also to pay rent. In addition, UCANs partner with the Greater Manchester Police, who run sessions with Community Police Officers in the centres.
The Neighbourhood Centres are staffed by a team of people that range from experienced managers who are familiar with all of the services, down to junior members of staff. They also take on future jobs fund employees. In addition, the Neighbourhood Centres are used as the basis for the Community Researchers initiative which sees residents involved in conducting elements of consultation and research within their own communities. The initiative provides another means by which the organisation is able to engage the community utilising residents who live within it.

Despite the organisation being a housing provider, it aims to offer a community development service. With its remit in regeneration, its neighbourhood management service focuses less on housing and more on what it is like to live in a particular neighbourhood, and how the organisation could help to make that better. In order to address this issue, the organisation seeks to engage its residents by a variety of means. The traditional methods of tenant engagement work for those who prefer to attend meetings and are willing to come forward, but in addition the organisation seeks to reach those who are not likely to be present at meetings. The UCAN centres are a vehicle the organisation utilises in order to carry out alternative means of engagement, with the focus on harnessing the energy and enthusiasm of people who walk through the doors. The approach is centred on asking individuals what they want and how the organisation can assist them and their neighbours in working towards those goals. This rebalances the focus, with the object being less about housing repairs, and more about empowering individuals to try and take control of their own neighbourhoods and their own lives.

This approach is more flexible and capable of adapting to the ebbs and flows of the communities, as opposed to dictating that people are required to join a particular group with a constitution. The structures reflect the reality of how communities go through changes at different times. In the past where residents have been concerned with environmental issues, the organisation with the aid of the staff at the UCAN centres set up a number of initiatives around maintaining the physical environment including green patrols and litter picking walks which also provides health additional health benefits.
The locations of the UCAN centres are a source of contention as there was no original strategic thinking behind where they were situated. Centres were opened as and when the need or opportunity arose. Eg one centre was set up on a particular estate after the council housing office withdrew its services following the council’s review of their tenancy management delivery. As the estate had some of the highest indices of deprivation the UCAN centre stepped in as a proxy. However there were questions asked due to the low numbers of Bolton at Home properties in the area, as well as the fact that there was another UCAN centre with a housing office nearby. The other UCAN itself came about because the housing office was located in a library and the library was moving out leaving vacant a good usable space, which the organisation decided might be suitable for a UCAN centre. Also the fact that the organisation deals with both public sector and private sector housing, and works in partnership with other local housing associations means that not only are some centres located in largely private sector areas, but some are owned and managed by the other housing associations. As a result of all the issues that the locations of the centres posed, it was hoped that the review would shed more light on that area.

6.3.3 Methodology I

The case study was carried out in two parts, forming different stages of the action research cycle. Part A reviewed evaluation practice with regards to the organisation’s regeneration activities, focusing in particular on the review of the UCAN centres. Part B saw the organisation revisited, and key learning from the research including the literature review as well as the other case studies was fed forward into a social accounting pilot conducted on neighbourhood management activity [See section 6.3.6.1].

In Part A, primary data was collected from six informal interviews (the four respondents below as well as two neighbourhood managers) and four formal semi-
structured interviews [See Chapter 2; Section 2.3.1]. Interviews were of approximately one hour in length and conducted with:

- Respondent CS4SM: Senior management within the Bolton at Home Regeneration directorate
- Respondent CS4PM: Senior management on the UCAN project
- Respondent CS4PE: A member of the organisation’s Knowledge and Information Management team
- Respondent CS4CL: Council liaison

Interviews were recorded, transcribed and summarised, before summaries were sent out to respondents for validation [see e-appendix 4]. Furthermore as this was a real time case study, observation was also used as a tool for primary data collection, with notes taken on the activities of others and actively participating in the evaluation process. Secondary data was collected in the form of literature such as government publications, articles, archival data and organisational reports which underwent a document review.

A thematic content analysis was conducted on the qualitative data, with main themes coded and reviewed [see section 7.1, e-appendices 2D and 5D]. Statistical methods were used to determine the main themes emergent from the data coding process. A list of prevalent codes (used for the cross case analysis [See Section 7.2]) was compiled by cross referencing the codes with the highest occurrence (by total number of references) and total codes with the highest occurrence (by percentage coverage) [See appendix 8B].

An axial coding framework (Strauss and Corbin, 1998; Gibbs, 2007; Borgatti, 2005) [See Section 2.3] was utilised for the comparative analysis of the primary as well as secondary data against the emergent axial codes [See appendix 8C and e-appendix 1D]. These axial codes formed the basis of the core themes that provided the structure for the preliminary findings set out in section 6.3.4.

QSL NVivo9 was used for the qualitative elements of the analysis such as code generation, while MS Office Excel was used for quantitative methods such as statistical analysis applied to generated codes and some secondary data. Details of the analysis and results can be found in section 7.1, appendix 8 and e-appendix 1D.
6.3.4 Preliminary Findings

The preliminary findings are presented under the following core themes (listed in rank order of emergence within axial coding framework; Appendix 8C):

- Evaluation: General information on evaluation within the organisation as well as the basic forms of evaluation conducted.
- Strategy: Strategic approach to evaluation, including dissemination of findings.
- Methods: The processes, procedures and tools adopted in conducting evaluation activity. This includes research questions, participants, criteria and indicators.
- Motivations: Incentives, and reasons that drive evaluations
- Engagement: The organisation’s efforts to engage with stakeholders including the council, partners and customers.
- Collaboration: How the organisation works together with other organisations or stakeholders in undertaking evaluation activity
- Learning: The organisation’s formative evaluations and actions taken on evaluation findings
- Organisation and UCAN Centres: The context within which the evaluation occurs; organisational priorities and objectives, UCAN Centres, and partners’ objectives
- Culture: The organisational culture, perceptions, and commitment to evaluation
- Timeframes: Life cycles and chronological constraints of evaluation activity
- National: The national structures and influences on evaluation practice
- Challenges: The main barriers to evaluation highlighted by the data
- Future: Future plans for the organisation

Findings under individual themes may contain some elements of repetition as the data is being viewed via different lenses each time, and should be considered in the context of the specific heading being addressed. These preliminary findings form the basis of the key learning points listed in Section 6.3.5.
Evaluation
This refers to general information on evaluation within the organisation as well as the basic forms of evaluation conducted. It also includes the participants involved in regeneration activity.

The research found that evaluation is carried out on different levels, from strategic level based on the neighbourhood renewal strategy (NRS) (which is linked to the Local Area Agreement and the Local Strategic Partnership delivery plan). There are also local level activities carried out by resident volunteers on estates. Bolton at Home also utilises customer inspectors to obtain feedback on UCAN performance.

Bolton at Home undertakes various forms of evaluation on an ongoing basis, with different directorates carrying out assessments of their activities.

A review of the Neighbourhood performance reports reveals (Bolton at Home, 2011b) a focus on housing service provision as opposed to the wider aspects of regeneration. [See 'Organisation' below]

There is a characteristic lack of evaluation particularly where the UCAN Centres are concerned. Despite reports (both internal and external) (ODPM, 2005; Audit Commission, 2005; SQW Consulting, 2007) having been conducted on the activities of the UCAN centres, and partner and customer feedback being collected; the evaluation activity within the centres has taken the form of monitoring with emphasis placed on number of residents accessing services, number of positive outcomes (eg volunteering, job placement etc) numbers.

Other evaluation activity is conducted in the form of reports against performance indicators primarily in fulfilment of funding requirements. Eg ERDF

The UCAN review marked the first official evaluation of the centres.

Bolton at Home’s Knowledge and Information Management (KIM) team works closely with the council where evaluation is concerned, sharing information where appropriate and using similar software packages.

Both organisations work on a closely linked objectives and therefore indicators as strategy stems from the Local Area Agreement, Bolton Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy, & Bolton Community Homes Delivery Plan. [See ‘Collaboration’]
Evaluation generally carried out internally by KIM team and community researchers; however external participants are brought in when needed.

The UCAN review involved various participants as part evaluation activity namely:

- Resident volunteers (data collection)
- Community researchers (data collection)
- UCAN centre staff - junior staff, neighbourhood managers, housing managers, partners (data collection, respondents)
- Neighbourhood managers, project managers (business & finance) KIM team, directors, CE (strategy, data collection and review, respondents)
- External researchers – University researchers (data collection and review)
[see ‘Methods’]

**Strategy**

*This refers to the strategic approach to evaluation, including dissemination of findings.*

The research found that the strategic approach to the delivery of regeneration within the organisation is informed by its business plan (Bolton at Home, 2010). This is based on priorities as stated in the Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy (Bolton Vision, 2006), the Local Area Agreement (Bolton Vision, 2006), the Sustainable Community Strategy (Bolton Vision, 2007), as well as the strategic priorities as stated within the Bolton Community Homes Delivery Plan (BCH, 2007). These various documents set out priorities for regeneration delivery which also form the strategic basis for the organisation’s evaluation activity. [See ‘Organisation’]

As stated earlier, the research has found that prior to the UCAN review there had not been any robust evaluation of the centres. With the main performance indicators utilised by the centres being numbers of people accessing services, number of positive outcomes, and customer satisfaction, the assessment strategy focuses more on monitoring than evaluation. [See ‘Methods’]
For the UCANs the research team sat down with the Neighbourhood Centre staff and built a series data collection tools, not just for measuring footfall but also staff informally talking to them and getting some basic details from them; such as name, address, contact details etc so if they did disappear in the future, the centre could provide an outreach service to them. Customer satisfaction is assessed using data gathered from a questionnaire and is carried out annually. Feedback is also obtained from customer inspectors who inspect the UCANs. A preliminary session is carried out with the customer inspectors to explain to them what the neighbourhood centre is, and what their expectations would be of it, in order that they understand what the offer is.

The research has found that the UCAN Review was a formative exercise to provide information on different aspects of the UCANs including financing, staffing requirements, locations, in order to inform the strategic development of the model. [see ‘Learning’]

In terms of dissemination, a quarterly report on the performance of the UCAN centres is fed-back to the relevant organisational sub-groups and the board. Findings from the UCAN Review were feedback to the council, the senior management team and the regeneration sub group within the organisation. Findings from the review were intended to inform strategic development of the UCAN centre service. [ see ‘Learning’]

At an organisational level, the business performance team produce a set of quarterly reports are fed back to the management team, the board, the council and a wider group of stake holders (partners, customers etc. ). Furthermore reports are published on the organisation’s website. A review of the secondary data also found that key findings of the reports in terms of performance are disseminated via the organisation’s website and other publications such as its newsletter and annual customer feedback booklet (Bolton at Home, 2011).

At council level, the chief executive’s department report annually on what has been achieved in the context of the Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy, stating activities,
outcomes and outputs that have been delivered. This is a public document on the council’s website providing external scrutiny, and wider dissemination.

The council have set up a programme around neighbourhood management cum neighbourhoods insight which is on the shared intranet, that graphically represents the data for each of the targeted neighbourhood renewal areas and performance against each of the indicators, making it clear to see if targets are being met in certain areas or not across various indicators, giving neighbourhood managers an insight into where they needed to be putting their efforts. [See ‘Collaboration’]

Methods

This refers to the processes, procedures and tools adopted in conducting evaluation activity. This includes research questions, data collection, technology, criteria and indicators.

Data Collection

At an organisational level, Bolton at Home utilises a Balanced Score Card approach, linking organisational objectives to indicators based on key priorities shared with the strategic partners via the LSP (Bolton at Home, 2010). Bolton at Home carries out evaluation on its estates using volunteer tenants to provide feedback on the state of the environment based on a pro-forma.

Customer inspectors provide feedback on UCAN centres.

Community researchers door knock and input data.

Customer satisfaction survey using 5 Score scale, levels of satisfaction; from very satisfied, through to don’t really care, to very dissatisfied.

The annual customer satisfaction survey has been reviewed to include multiple comments boxes to encourage more qualitative feedback.
Within the UCAN Review, the organisation adopted a number of different methods:

- Questionnaires
- Focus groups
- Interviews

A series of questionnaires as well, so people visiting the Neighbourhood Centres would put down the reason for visiting, quality of information received, and if they visited other centres. Visitors were also asked if they accessed other UCAN-type facilities, in order to find out if there are other services the UCANs could be providing.

Focus groups were undertaken with the staff (managers and junior staff) and also the organisation’s partners and residents.

- The junior officers were asked questions such as:
  - ‘Do you think the Neighbourhood Centres work?’
  - ‘Do you like the working environment?’
  - ‘Do you like that you have very close contact with customers?’

The managers’ questions were around the vision for the Neighbourhood Centres; questions such as:

- ‘Where do you think the Neighbourhood Centres should be located?’
- ‘What’s the strategic direction?’
- ‘Should they provide job opportunities or is it about Yoga and Healthy eating?’
- ‘Are you happy to have community support police in your office or does that affect residents?’
Partners were split into different sets as there was a varied audience from individuals running classes to large organisations like the Greater Manchester Police. Partners were asked questions such as:

- ‘Do the UCAN Centres work?’
- ‘Do you go out to other places to provide your services?’
- ‘What sort of challenges do you find?’
- ‘Is the organisation effective?’ (this is because some of the partners are charged eg the yoga and keep fit classes will pay a fee)
- ‘Are the other providers cheaper than the UCANs?’
- ‘Do they provide better facilities?’

Bolton at Home is part of a network of four housing associations (the NW Housing Network) which is working as an action learning set reviewing a number of tools and techniques like LM3, social return on investment, and social accounting. The group is rolling some of these techniques out across their organisations, and are working with a social entrepreneurship consultancy to progress some of that work. The organisation has adopted the Sustainable Homes Index For Tomorrow (SHIFT) method for environmental assessment and strategic development which a number of large housing associations such as Riverside and St Vincent’s have signed up to (Sustainable Homes, 2012).

All surveys across the organisation are developed using ‘Snap’ and can be carried out online. Analysis is carried out using software like SPSS.

The use of IT has enabled surveys to be carried out via mobile phones, providing access to different groups of people based on the idea that people interact in different ways.

The council also utilises a web-enabled tool (Performance Improvement for the Community Strategy – PICS), allowing all partners to track progress against the Local Strategic Partnership Targets (Bolton Vision, 2006).
Criteria and Indicators

Evaluation criteria used within the organisation is developed by management based on the organisation’s business plan (Bolton at Home, 2010), as well key strategic documents such as the Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy (Bolton Vision, 2006), the Local Area Agreement (Bolton Vision, 2006), the Sustainable Community Strategy (Bolton Vision, 2007), and the Bolton Community Homes Delivery Plan (BCH, 2007).

The NRS sets out key indicators around:

- Income
- Employment
- Health Deprivation and Disability
- Education, Skills and Training
- Barriers to Housing and Services
- Crime and Disorder
- Living Environment

Performance indicators as set out by organisations such as the Tenants Service Authority (2008) are drawn upon in developing Organisational Performance Measures for the Regeneration Directorate (See Appendix 9A).

- % of customers satisfied with physical improvements
- % of customers satisfied with open spaces
- % customers satisfied with their local area as a place to live
- % of people who think that their local area has got better over the last 12 months
- % of respondents who assess their health as either very good or good
- % of people who think that there is a problem with people not treating each other with respect and consideration in their local area
- % of people who agree that parents take enough responsibility for the behaviour of children in their local area
- % of customers claiming out of work benefits
- % of people who believe people from different backgrounds get on well together in their local area
- % of people who agree that they can influence decision making in their area
- % of tenants satisfied that their views are being taken into account
- % of overall staff satisfaction with working for Bolton at Home (Regen Directorate)
- % of tenants involved in community engagement activity
Evaluation criteria for the UCAN centres (as with most project level evaluations) are largely determined by outcomes set by funding streams such as ERDF (2008). These consider aspects such as:

- Jobs
- Business Creation
- Business Support
- Physical Regeneration
- Employment Support
- Skills
- Finance

The elements are considered in the form of output indicators (e.g. number of individuals assisted to access jobs) as well as outcome indicators (e.g. number of individuals progressed into employment).

With the UCAN Review, senior management along with neighbourhood managers and members of the KIM team developed the criteria for the review, considering what need to be taken into account as part of the review. Considering the formative nature of the review, the evaluation strategy was developed to address key questions around:

- What the UCANs deliver
- Who the customer base is
- Where they are from
- If the level of resourcing is adequate
- If the UCANs are appropriately located
Motivation

This refers to the incentives, and reasons that drive evaluations

Accountability - Need to account for funding from council and other sources (ABG and ERDF); also wider stakeholders. Previous evaluation of the UCAN mainly to account for ABG funding received.

Learning – Evaluation such as the UCAN review is formative, providing information to feed into strategic development of the service

Stock taking – Need to ‘stop and take a look around’, in order to determine a baseline state of affair, as was the case with the organisation wide review prior to the Stock Transfer ballot vote

Engagement

This refers to the organisation’s efforts to engage with stakeholders including the council, partners and customers.

The organisation takes the ongoing dialogue with its customers seriously and as such explores different means of engagement at different levels as set out within the Community Engagement Strategy (Bolton at Home, 2010).

The use of technology has opened up new avenues (as well as new audiences) of collecting data such as online and via mobile phones.

With accounts on Facebook and Twitter, the organisation is engaging stakeholders via more informal channels.

The organisation is also exploring the use of micro sites, which can be dedicated to different areas, either by geography or by audience/interest groups. Furthermore micros sites can be targeted at specific ethnic groups run in different languages providing audience specific information eg. Where is the nearest polish food store? Where can I learn English? The organisation is then able to incorporate other features to get vital information such as who signs on to it.
The organisation involves customers in the conduction of evaluations using volunteer customer inspectors who provide feedback on the environmental conditions on estates, as well as service provision within the UCANs. The organisation also uses a dedicated group of community researchers to support evaluation activity such as data collection and inputting.

Members of the customer committee also provide feedback and assist in monitoring performance particularly where the tenancy aspect of the organisation’s activities is concerned.

In terms of evaluation of UCAN centres, feedback in terms of performance has been collected from partners on an ad-hoc basis. The UCAN centres provide a useful avenue for engagement, the challenge there is engaging with the customers that don’t come into the centres. The organisation employs door knocking as a means of proactively reaching out to its community.

Within the UCAN review, stakeholders in the form of residents and partners were consulted during focus group sessions.

**Collaboration**
*This refers to how the organisation works together with other organisations or stakeholders in undertaking evaluation activity*

The organisation works closely with council on evaluation as they are delivering to the same strategic priorities. The KIM team work closely with their council counterparts, sharing information and pooling data where appropriate. The KIM team consult the council’s team particularly in areas where they have more experience, eg dealing with health outcomes.

Bolton at Home is part of a network of four housing associations (the NW Housing Network) which is working as an action learning set reviewing a number of tools and techniques like LM3, social return on investment, and social accounting.
Learning

*This refers to the organisation’s formative evaluations and actions taken on evaluation*

Feedback from customer inspections is used to develop an improvement action plan based on the review of the feedback at a tenant-lead service quality management meeting.

The UCAN review was intended to be formative, in order to present a means to develop the structure of the UCAN model in future. i.e. ‘this is where the centre needs to go, this is how much money it will need, and this is how much staffing it will need’. Findings from the UCAN review were utilised by senior management in the formation of strategy around the development of the UCANs.

Organisation, UCAN Centres

*This refers to the context within which the evaluation occurs; organisational priorities and objectives, UCAN Centres, and partners’ objectives*

The organisational priorities are based on the wider priorities set out in the key strategic documents mentioned earlier.

The business plan (2010) states the organisational priorities as:

**Vision:** “Great Homes in Great Communities”

**Aim:** “work in partnership to create desirable homes, neighbourhoods and services that customers choose and shape”

**Objectives**

- To give current and future customers in all our communities the homes, neighbourhoods and housing services they want.
- To involve, and where possible, give customers and partners the lead in making sure our services are excellent, represent value for money, offer choice and are environmentally responsible.
- To ensure Bolton at Home is a dynamic innovator, a leader in its field and a great place to work and develop.
- To maximise our people and financial resources to deliver Bolton at Home and related council objectives, and to grow our business.
UCAN priorities:

Though the UCAN centres had been difficult to finance because of their very nature as being revenue heavy, there had been a commitment as an organisation to support them as they had been recognised them as integral to delivering regeneration, community development, customer involvement and engagement.

The UCANs have set out to assist at neighbourhood level in:

- tackling crime
- improving the environment
- promoting employment and learning
- helping sustain the area

- Beacon Authority, 2007

The organisation’s priorities are tied to those of their partners via the wider strategic priorities of the LAA, and the NRS. These priorities inform those of the Bolton Local Strategic Partnership (Bolton Vision) as set out in the Sustainable Community Strategy. Members of the Bolton Vision Partnership are:

- Bolton Council
- Greater Manchester Police
- Bolton Primary Care Trust
- Greater Manchester Probation
- Bolton Community and Voluntary Services
- Bolton Community Homes
- Bolton Children’s Trust
- Bolton Hospitals NHS Trust
- University of Bolton
- Greater Manchester Chamber
- Bolton Community College
- Job Centre Plus
- Learning and Skills Council
- Private Sector
- Voluntary and Community Sector
- Faith Sector
- Local Schools
LAA priority outcomes:

- Healthier communities
- Older people
- Children and young people
- Economic development and enterprise
- Safer communities
- Cleaner, greener communities
- Stronger communities

Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy & Sustainable Community Strategy priorities:

- Healthy
- Achieving
- Prosperous
- Safe
- Cleaner and greener
- Strong and confident.

Culture

*This refers to the organisational culture, perceptions, and commitment to evaluation*

Evaluating regeneration activity has proven more difficult than other technical and financial aspects of the organisation’s activity. There is a commitment to regeneration delivery at corporate level, giving the staff within that department flexibility required to keep investigating different methods of carrying out evaluation activity.

The organisation strives to continually improve its performance management practice (Bolton at Home, 2010). The development of a socially and environmentally responsible approach to organisational activity has driven the exploration of alternative forms of impact assessment, as demonstrated by the North West Housing Network’s activities.

There is a perceived apathy from the current government in terms of monitoring and evaluation practice.
Timeframes
This refers to life cycles and chronological constraints of evaluation activity

The Sustainable community strategy runs till 2017 and as such is a long term view, but it is reviewed annually.

Bolton at Home reports to the council on a quarterly basis on its performance against the offer document.

Evaluation is carried out on a rolling programme with performance reports produced on a quarterly basis.

Customer satisfaction survey is carried out annually, as well as a door knocking activity.

The UCAN evaluation took approximately 6 weeks.

Individual projects evaluations have varying timelines
[See ‘Evaluation’, ‘Methods’ and ‘Organisation’]

National
This refers to the national structures and influences on evaluation practice

In the past national structures such as the TSA and the Audit Commission, and now Housemark and the HCA, have provided some form of benchmarking/ national framework where evaluation has been concerned; however there is a perceived apathy from the current government in terms of monitoring and evaluation practice.

Funding streams in the form of the ERDF, and now the Regional Growth fund will also impact outcome measures and in turn evaluation criteria.

New policy and legislation introduced by the new government has created a perception of being in limbo, with stakeholders trying to get to grips with the new structures and funding streams. [See ‘Methods’ and ‘Organisation’]
**Challenges**

This refers to the main barriers to evaluation highlighted by the data

**Formal Strategy:**

Working with the Northwest Housing Network has revealed that the organisation is informally involved in some of the methods being reviewed by the group, with methods like the SHIFT method being more about bringing together monitoring activity that is already being carried out across the different departments. However one concern is the bureaucracy that is attached to some of these techniques.

**Evaluation v Performance Management:**

There is a tension between evaluation and managing performance.

There is a tension between focused indicators and outcomes and wider strategic priorities

**Attribution:**

The complex nature of the issues being tackled in regeneration means that attribution is a challenge. With multi disciplinary areas such as children’s services, questions are raised such as:

If an indicator reflects decline to what extent are Bolton at Home responsible for that?

To what extent can they contribute to that indicator?

**Hard to Measure:**

This is one area where it has been a lot more difficult for the regeneration directorate than for some other parts of the organisation.

The organisation has found the LAA outcomes inadequate when it comes to measuring aspects such as community development.

**Measuring Success:**

A key issue is how success is defined

In terms of narrowing the gap of deprivation, success is achieved everyday with individuals who build up their skills, confidence and move on to better things; the question is how this is captured.
Expectations:

Linked to defining success are expectations of what can be achieved.

Expectations need to be realistic.

They are relative and reflect current context; e.g. in the current of financial climate emphasis has shifted from purely ‘narrowing the gap’ to mitigating the impact.

Due to the long term nature of regeneration, challenges have arisen where funders have had expectations of outcomes being visible in the short term.

Engagement:

The main challenges around engagement have been involving the difficult to reach stakeholders; e.g. feedback from customers who do not use the UCAN centres.

Another challenge has been obtaining long term data of customers in order to track long term outcomes.

Funding:

Source of funding still largely dictate evaluation activity.

Change of governments and reshaping of these funding structures has a knock on effect on the focus of evaluation activity; thing is a particular challenge at the moment with the end of the Area Based Grant.

Diminishing public funds means that although more emphasis is being placed on demonstrating value for money, there are fewer resources to support both the delivery and its assessment.

Future

This refers to the future plans for the organisation

Long term the organisation has plans to explore forms of impact assessment that capture ‘softer aspects’ of regeneration, e.g. how a person or place changes. One of the things that was started about 12 months ago was identifying a group of people on one of the estates who were all on the workless programme and tracking them every three months to assess their progress.

The organisation also recognises that there is a need to explore the means by which they can engage with more difficult to reach stakeholders.
6.3.5 Key Learning Points A

Monitoring and Evaluation

- Evaluation activity tends to focus on performance management consisting mainly of customer satisfaction surveys and monitoring Key Performance Indicators.

- While various elements of evaluation activity take place within different directorates across the organisation, it is unclear whether they are brought together to create a representative picture of its activities.

- While the organisation asserts a commitment to regeneration activity, capturing performance in this area of delivery has proven difficult. As a result evaluation activity tends to focus on the organisation’s activities as a housing provider and other more technical functions [See ‘Evaluation’ and ‘Organisation’]

- At UCAN Centre (neighbourhood management) level, there is a distinct lack of robust evaluation activity with the monitoring of footfall constituting the main form of performance management. The UCAN review marks the first evaluation of the centres.

- The UCAN review also represents an attempt to take a more formative approach to evaluation activity; with the intention of feeding findings forward into strategic development.

- While accountability (mainly for funding received) was historically the main motivation for evaluation/monitoring activity, the ‘Stock Transfer’ process provided an incentive for the organisation to re-examine their current position, and thereby undertake some form of formative evaluation as opposed to simply monitoring performance.

- Even though the organisation adopts a wide range of data collection methods [See ‘Methods’], and makes an attempt to involve its stakeholders during consultations, the process lacks reflection on data collected to evolve into a comprehensive evaluation, thereby remaining a performance monitoring and reporting exercise.
Evaluation Strategy, Organisational Objectives and Performance Indicators

- The lack of cohesion and rigour in reflected in the approach to evaluation activity is symptomatic of the absence of a robust evaluation strategy.

- While the organisational strategy is driven by its business plan (which is informed by various borough-wide strategic documents, see ‘Strategy’), there is no strategic counterpart to inform evaluation within the organisation.

- This results in several different strands of monitoring activities being carried out without a strategic underpinning, to serve as a thread tying these activities back to stated organisational objectives.

- While the stated organisational objective relate to the borough-wide strategic priorities, there is an apparent disconnect with the organisation’s wider regeneration strategy. Therefore while the UCAN priorities are regeneration focused and also tie into the borough –wide strategic priorities, they do not appear to sit well under the stated organisational objectives. [See ‘Organisation’]

- This disconnect exacerbates the perceived tension between short term and long term goals as well as, monitoring and evaluation; with KPIs being monitored against organisational strategy, but evaluation of longer term regeneration goals slipping through the cracks. [See ‘Evaluation’]

- Furthermore, the organisational objectives are not well structured, and fail to form a good yardstick against which performance can be measured. For a thorough evaluation strategy to be developed, the organisational objectives will need to be reviewed.

- The lack of cohesion between the organisational ‘objectives’ and its regeneration activity is evident within the indicators in use by the regeneration department; as while links can be traced between some indicators and a corresponding organisational priority, others appear to be floating. [See ‘Methods-Criteria’, ‘organisation’ appendices 11A, 11B and 12E]
• Collaborative working and engagement is an organisational strong point in the
delivery of their services [see sections 6.3.1 and 6.3.2], and where evaluation
is concerned the organisation has a close working relationship with the
council. However the future of this relationship needs to be considered in light
of the landscape after the stock transfer, with Bolton at Home operating as
completely independent organisation. This will have implications for aspects
such as access to data on both sides of the relationship.

• While the organisation engages well with its stakeholders from a consultation
stand point , more can be done to encourage more strategic stakeholder
involvement in the evaluation process (eg. developing the strategy and
indicators) [See ‘Engagement’ and ‘Methods - Data collection’]

Gaps and Challenges

• Lack of Cohesive Evaluation Strategy: Addressing this will in turn address
other challenges raised such as, defining success and establishing indicators
for measuring softer outcomes.

• Engagement of stakeholders (staff, partners and customers alike) during the
development of the strategy will aid in education around evaluation practice,
and the communication of the rationale behind it; thereby addressing some
challenges around staff concerns (e.g. bureaucracy). This may also
encourage participants to stay engaged with the process and help to mitigate
some issues to do with long term contact with participants. [See,
‘Challenges‘ and section 4.2.3]

• The process of developing the strategy will also provide a forum to review the
indicators in use, allowing the organisation to address underrepresented
aspects such as economic and ecological indicators [See appendix 10E]. In
addition the process is also an opportunity to review the organisational
objectives.

• Capturing hard to measure outcomes requires the adoption of more varied
approaches to evaluation such as social and environmental impact
assessment methods in a bid to cover the breadth of regeneration activity. [See, ‘Challenges’ and section 4.2.3]

- Challenges such as attribution are intrinsic to the nature of regeneration and require a transparent approach to evaluation, and an acknowledgement of the collaborative and multidisciplinary nature of the sector.

- The reduction in funding available to support regeneration activity means that not only is there less funding available to support evaluation activity, but more scrutiny is being paced on the funding which is made available. With funding having played a major role in dictating evaluation activity in the past, the introduction of new funding structures have created a feeling of uncertainty as stakeholders try to understand the new modus operandi. see ‘Challenges’, and ‘Funding’]

- This coupled with a perceived apathy and lack of direction from government where evaluation is concerned makes for even more uncertainty [see ‘Challenges’ and ‘National’]. This period of change should be seized as an opportunity to revisit evaluation practice; with a less prescriptive government providing a chance or organisations to think creatively about their impact assessment, making it work for their specific contexts. Activities such as those of the NW Housing Network, exploring new evaluation methodologies ought to be encouraged. [See ‘Future’ and ‘Collaboration’]

**Good Practice**

- Inclusion of community members as participants in the evaluation process (community researchers) [See ‘Methods- Data Collection’]

- Adoption of a wide range of data collection methods

- Extensive and creative use of technology [see ‘Engagement’]
6.3.6 Part B: Developing Better Practice

This second phase of the case study saw the implementation of the preliminary findings emergent from phase one of this case study, as well as the rest of the research which includes three other case studies and a review of relevant literature.

Preliminary findings in the form of a set of critical success factors were fed forward into this second part of the case study in a bid to develop evaluation practice within the case study organisation.

6.3.6.1 Methodology II

Engaging with the social accounting pilot as an external researcher, the process involved liaising with the organisation in the development of and conduction of the evaluation exercise.

The aim of the exercise was to focus on the core issue of neighbourhood management but be flexible enough to cater to a broad range of stakeholders and allow them to express their opinions as a narrative. To this end semi-structured interviews were conducted with representatives of seven of the stakeholders identified during the mapping process.

The stakeholders represented were:

- Bolton At Home Staff (Senior Management – Regeneration Directorate)
- Bolton At Home Board
- Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council
- Health Partners (NHS)
- Environmental Partners (Bolton Metropolitan Borough Neighbourhood and Regulatory Services)
- Bolton At Home Customers
- External Training Consultants (Community Development)
The interviews lasted approximately 40 minutes and were based on an interview schedule (Appendix 9B) developed by Ebun Akinsete (University of Bolton), Stuart Dagg (Bolton at Home), Mark Turnbull (Bolton at Home) and Dr Margaret Nelson (University of Bolton). Participants were provided with a briefing note and an informed consent form (Appendix 9C). Interviews were transcribed by an external provider (with confidentiality agreed), and summaries of the interviews were sent to participants for approval before analysis. Secondary data was obtained from organisational reports, archival data, government publications and articles. Analysis of the data was conducted using qualitative thematic methods with responses reviewed in the context of their relevance to evaluation practice. Findings were presented under the emergent themes of:

- Organisational Objectives
- Neighbourhood Management
- Evaluation Practice and Measuring the Impact

Key learning points were drawn from the emergent findings and recommendations for improvement of evaluation practice were developed based on the key learning points as well as prior research (Akinsete & Nelson, 2012b).

6.3.6.2 Key Learning Points B

- The stated ‘objectives’ are more akin to aspirational statements (aims and goals) rather than targeted, action oriented statements. They are referred to as ‘principles’ by one respondent.

- Bolton at Home’s stated priorities are perceived as representative of the organisation’s activities. As priorities are based the borough’s key strategic themes, they complement those of their partners, who are working to the same strategy.
• Having a core understanding of not only what the key issues facing Bolton at Home’s neighbourhoods are, but also their underlying causes, is essential in developing any meaningful solutions to tackle them.

• Following the stock transfer the organisation’s core business is housing provision therefore triple bottom line accounting will be essential in evidencing and monitoring the organisation’s balance in terms of delivering its core business as well as wider regeneration responsibilities.

• Neighbourhood management is of strategic importance to regeneration delivery across the borough. It not only plays a key role in supporting Bolton at Home to achieve its wider regeneration priorities but also provides an avenue for community development.

• There is a general consensus between Bolton at Home and their stakeholders on the core principles of neighbourhood management being about a coordinated approach to service delivery at local level which is inclusive of residents in order to achieve maximum benefits for communities. That said partners perceive a difference in philosophies between Bolton at Home and the Council in their approach to delivering neighbourhood management.

• There is a distinction made between customers of Bolton at Home, who are more concerned with the organisation’s functions as a land lord, and communities who are more concerned with the organisation’s neighbourhood management efforts.

• The local focus of neighbourhood management means that customers are able to benefit from specifically tailored services that reflect their needs.
• Neighbourhood management provides an avenue for the Bolton at Home to develop not just closer, but mutually beneficial relationships with their partners.

• The UCAN centres are considered an essential tool for Bolton at Home’s delivery of neighbourhood management, as well as its delivery of broader organisational objectives. They also provide the organisation with a means to engage the community on different levels, and play a vital role in supporting community development activity.

• Questions were raised about the applicability of the objectives to the organisation’s neighbourhood management efforts, with a perceived disconnect between the stated goals and neighbourhood management specific targets.

• Neighbourhood management is not reflected in the remit of the Customer Committee.

• There is a need to raise awareness of neighbourhood management activity both internally within the organisation and externally among its stakeholders.

• The broad scope of neighbourhood management creates a tension between long term and short term priorities, as well as measuring against outputs and outcomes.

• Despite the importance placed on neighbourhood management, it is still met with scepticism by some both within Bolton at Home and the council. This is mainly down to the amount of resources required to deliver neighbourhood management activities, coupled with the intangibility of some outcomes.
• There is a need to consider alternative means of evaluation in order to capture some of the more difficult to measure outcomes of regeneration. Exploring triple bottom line accounting will be essential in evidencing and monitoring the organisation’s balance in terms of delivering its core business as well as wider regeneration responsibilities.

• Defining success in the context of regeneration continues to prove challenging.

• There is a need for a holistic and cohesive approach to neighbourhood management, both strategically and operationally, linking it to other aspects of the organisation’s activities. This integration also needs to be reflected in the organisation’s approach to evaluation.
6.4 Summary

Neighbourhood management is a method of delivering regeneration that seeks to tackle multiple issues at local level. The approach places emphasis on the community, putting them at the heart of the strategy and aligning local service provision to meet local needs. Neighbourhood management generally aims to narrow the gap of deprivation between specific areas within a borough and the surrounding locale. The third case study focuses on the Charlestown and Lower Kersal New Deal for Communities (CHALK NDC) partnership in Salford. The New Deal for Communities (NDC) programme was launched in 1998 as a local level area based initiative which aimed to put the community at the centre of redevelopment and renewal. Utilising a neighbourhood management approach meant that each NDC partnership was developed to address area-specific issues. As such, the respective partnerships delivered a unique range of projects tailored to address the needs of the specific area. The CHALK NDC was set up in 2001, with £53m worth of funding for a period of 10 years. The case study focused on evaluation practice within the NDC, examining the evaluation of an alley-gating project undertaken by the NDC. The case study methodology utilised both primary and secondary data collected via interviews and document reviews. The analysis which involved the qualitative methods as well as basic statistical methods produced preliminary findings under the following headings:

- Evaluation
- Strategy
- Methods
- Motivation
- Learning
- Engagement
- Organisation
- Culture
- National
- Timeframes
- Challenges
- Funding
- Unique Features
- Future
- Positive Practice
Key learning points were subsequently outlined around:

- Evaluation Strategy and Methods
- Organisational Objectives and Performance Indicators
- Gaps and Challenges
- Good Practice

The second case study investigated evaluation practice within Bolton at Home, an Arms Length Management Organisation which became a Registered Social Landlord during the course of the research. The case study was carried out in two phases, with the first involving the examination of organisation’s evaluation practice with regards to regeneration (focusing in particular on a review of the organisation’s Urban Care and Neighbourhood (UCAN) Centres). As a real-time case study, the researcher actively took part in the conduct of both rounds of evaluation activity. As a real-time study, the researcher participated in the ongoing evaluation activity. The case study saw primary and secondary data collected via interviews, brainstorming, observation and document review. The analysis which involved the qualitative methods as well as basic statistical methods produced preliminary findings under the following themes:

- Evaluation
- Strategy
- Methods
- Motivation
- Engagement
- Collaboration
- Learning
- Organisation
- UCAN Centres
- Culture
- Timeframes
- National
- Challenges
- Future

Key learning points derived from the findings were present under:

- Monitoring and Evaluation
- Evaluation Strategy, Organisational Objectives and Performance Indicators
- Gaps and Challenges
- Good Practice
The second phase of the case study involved a return to the organisation in order to develop evaluation practice with regards to their regeneration activity. This phase involved feeding forward learning from the first phase of the case study, the literature review as well as the other three case studies. It focused on the organisation’s pilot of a social accounting exercise in the context of their neighbourhood management delivery. The methodology involved a series of interviews with stakeholders as well as a document review, and a qualitative thematic analysis was carried out on the data obtained. The emergent findings informed a list of key learning points which served as the basis of a set of recommendations put to the organisation within a report.

The next chapter presents a cross case analysis carried out on the data collected from all four case studies.
CHAPTER 7

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

“Although we often hear that data speak for themselves, their voices can be soft and sly”

- Frederick Mosteller (1983)
This chapter presents an overview of the analytic process undertaken within the study. It also presents the cross case analysis, reviewing the significant codes as generated from each case study, and filtering them within a matrix to determine which are of the most significance. The analysis is conducted using both qualitative and quantitative methods, with the different codes analysed across all four cases using a comparative thematic content analysis. While the majority of the analysis is qualitative, the indicators in use are analysed quantitatively using statistical methods. Finally the chapter presents the results of this analytical exercise.

7.1 Analytic Process

Several rounds of data analysis took place at different levels within the study. Once the primary data collected from interviews was transcribed, summarised and validated by participants [see e-appendix 4], it was inputted into the qualitative analysis software package (NVivo) to be coded. A single NVivo file was created per case study, which contained all the data collected from interviews in relation to the particular study [see e-appendix 5]. Within the individual files, open codes (referred to as ‘Nodes’ within NVivo) were generated based on emergent themes from the text [see appendices 2A, 3A, 7A, 8A and e-appendix 2]. Codes were generated manually, and in keeping with the grounded theory approach adopted by the study, they were developed asking questions structured around a range of descriptive and categorical phenomena (Charmaz, 2006; Taylor and Gibbs, 2010) as discussed in section 2.3 [see table 2.6].

Still within NVivo, these open codes were categorised based on an axial framework (Strauss and Corbin, 1998; Gibbs, 2007; Borgatti, 2005) in order to form a grouped hierarchy of axial codes and subcodes within each case study [see appendices 10A-D]. In order to develop this hierarchy, statistical methods were used to deduce the most prevalent codes within each of the case studies. This involved cross referencing the codes with the highest occurrence by total number of references within NVivo against those with the greatest percentage coverage within NVivo [see appendices 2B, 3B, 7B and 8B].
The codes at the top of these hierarchies effectively formed the axial codes, with relevant sub-codes beneath them. The axial codes along with their sub-codes were situated within a tabular axial framework model for analysis [see e-appendix 1]. These tables were populated with data from the corresponding codes within NVivo. During analysis, the data was cross-referenced against respondents and the relevant archival data was also reviewed at individual codes. The findings from this round of analysis were presented within each of the case study chapters [see sections 5.2.4, 5.3.4, 6.2.4 & 6.3.4] as preliminary findings of the study. The axial codes developed at case study level, as well as the preliminary findings from their analysis form the basis of the next level of analysis (the cross case analysis) presented in the next section of this chapter.

Figure 7.1 depicts the overall process of data analysis within the study, illustrating how the data is refined, deconstructed, distilled and reconstructed to produce the overall findings of the study.
Fig. 7.1: Overview of analytical process of the study
7.2 Cross Case Analysis

In order to structure the cross case analysis and determine which themes were of the most significance across all four case studies, the axial codes developed at case study level were analysed within a matrix. The matrix was populated with the prevalent codes identified by prior analysis at the case study stage [see sections 5.2.3, 5.3.3, 6.2.3, 6.3.3 and 7.1], and the most significant codes (and consequently themes) were deduced by cross referencing the frequency of occurrence of the codes within individual case studies against the commonality of their occurrence across the four case studies (as depicted in table 7.1).

Table 7.1: Cross Case Coding Matrix
Based on this analysis, codes were grouped as being:

- of Key Significance (Higher frequency/ High commonality)
- of Considerable Significance (Lower frequency/ High commonality)
- Fairly significant (Lower frequency/ Low commonality)

**Evaluation**, being the core theme of the inquiry emerged as a code of key significance. Other codes of *key significance* included *Strategy, Methods* and *Motivations*. All codes of key significance featured in all four case studies with a high level of frequency in each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Motivations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The next set of codes was those of *considerable significance*. These were codes that featured in all four case studies but did not feature as frequently in each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Timeframes</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The final set of codes was those that featured in more than one case study, thereby making them *fairly significant*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissemination</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

These codes formed the main themes that the comparative cross case analysis was structured around. Individual codes were broken down into subject areas, and in some cases, subject areas were further broken down into topics [see table 7.2 and e-appendix 3A Table.1]. A thematic analysis was carried out on each of the axial codes; comparatively examining the case studies based on preliminary findings produced earlier [see e-appendix 3ATable.2]. Analysis was primarily qualitative, however statistical methods were used in analysing the indicators utilised by the different organisations [see e-appendix 3C]. Furthermore graphic representations of the results were produced using Microsoft Excel [see figures 7.2-7.32 and e-appendix 3B].
The results of this analysis are presented in sections 7.2.1-7.2.3, and form the basis of the findings presented and discussed in chapter 8 of the study [see figure 7.1].

Table 7.2: Excerpt of ‘Axial Code Breakdown’ Table (see e-appendix 3A, Table 1 for full version)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AXIAL CODE</th>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRATEGY</td>
<td>Framework/ Basis</td>
<td>Strategic Evaluation Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organisational Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Borough wide Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Strategic Partnership/ Partner Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Area Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nationally Prescribed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject (of Evaluation)</td>
<td>Outcome (What)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Practice (How)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>Formative (Ex-Ante)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summative (Ex-Post)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.1 Codes of Key Significance

7.2.1.1 Evaluation

This code refers to the core theme of the inquiry. It denotes references to evaluation practices in general both within and outside the case study organisations. Further deconstruction of evaluation as an axial code is not carried out within this chapter as analysis [see sections 5.2.4, 5.3.4, 6.2.4 and 6.3.4; Appendices 2, 3, 7 and 8] revealed a considerable amount of duplication between this code and all others.

Given the grounded theory based coding framework (Strauss and Corbin, 1998; Gibbs, 2007; Borgatti, 2005), ‘Evaluation’ may be considered a ‘core/selective’ code which is inclusive of all the other codes analysed in this chapter.
### 7.2.1.2 Strategy

This denotes the overarching approach and design of the evaluation activity.

#### Table 7.3: Table of Results: Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework/Basis</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 1</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 2</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 3</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 4</th>
<th>FURTHER COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation strategy revolves around the measurement of achievement against targets set out within the organisation’s business plan.</td>
<td>Evaluation strategy delivers to outcomes detailed within strategic regeneration framework however there is a lack of a cohesive strategic evaluation framework that brings together performance across the remit of NEM. Gap is noted within the strategic framework document</td>
<td>Evaluations based on projects appraisal framework and local evaluation framework. The frameworks are linked to NDC delivery plan. General emphasis on simplicity and ‘telling the story’</td>
<td>Lack of over arching evaluation strategy, with different directorates carrying out various forms of evaluation on an ongoing basis. Evaluation activity carried out based on business plan, which draws on priorities set out in the Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy, the Local Area Agreement and Bolton Community Homes Delivery Plan</td>
<td>Evaluation strategy based on outcomes, targets set out within organisational strategy. This is generally linked to borough-wide strategies, agreements and partner organisations. In other cases evaluation is required by central government as part of national programme, with strategic framework provided. General lack of strategic evaluation framework at organisational level with NDC the only case study organisation with robust framework in place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priorities within organisational plan tie into sustainable community strategy and borough masterplan</td>
<td>Regeneration initiatives based on individual partner organisation strategies (UMIC and Manchester College).</td>
<td></td>
<td>The performance management system operates using a balanced scorecard approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certain projects are tied to nationally prescribed evaluation frameworks Eg. HMR and SRB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The performance management system operates using a balanced scorecard approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Strategic Evaluation Framework | X | | | 1 |
| Organisational Strategy | X | X | X | 4 |
| Borough wide Strategy | X | X | | 3 |
Fig. 7.2: Topic-based breakdown of 'Framework/Basis' subject-area by total number of case studies
### Focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE STUDY 1</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 2</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 3</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 4</th>
<th>FURTHER COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project evaluation carried out on individual basis</td>
<td>At programme level baseline survey was carried out in 1999 when NEM was set up, interim evaluation was carried out in 2007 by the European Institute of Urban Affairs, further evaluation carried out in 2010 by Ekosgen which included the East Manchester NDC programme. Project evaluation varies depending on project</td>
<td>Programme level evaluation reviewed cross-cutting outcomes, project level evaluation took place on an individual basis depended on the individual project</td>
<td>Project evaluation carried out on an individual basis</td>
<td>Project evaluation generally flexible and dependent on the individual project Programme level evaluation carried out externally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Programme | X | X | 2 |
| Project   | X | X | X | 4 |

**Fig. 7.3:** Topic-based breakdown of 'Focus' subject-area by total number of case studies
### Subject of Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CASE STUDY 1</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 2</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 3</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 4</th>
<th>FURTHER COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome (What)</td>
<td>Subjects are programmes and individual projects (performance against set outcomes)</td>
<td>Subjects are programmes and individual projects (performance against set outcomes)</td>
<td>Subjects are programmes and individual projects (performance against set outcomes)</td>
<td>Subject is strands of delivery within organisation (performance against set aim and objectives)</td>
<td>Majority of evaluation activity focuses on outcomes of the project or programme with less attention paid to evaluating the process of how it is achieved NDC only case study to place emphasis on process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice (How)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Case Studies: 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 7.4:** Topic-based breakdown of ‘Subject of Evaluation’ subject-area by total number of case studies
### Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE STUDY 1</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 2</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 3</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 4</th>
<th>FURTHER COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation activity is mainly monitoring and evidencing activity</td>
<td>Evaluation mainly summative Formative evaluation in form of baseline survey, customer satisfaction/feedback, interim programme evaluation</td>
<td>Programme and projects all undertake some form of summative evaluation Formative evaluation in the form of baseline survey and interim evaluations, ongoing consultations. Some summative evaluation informs learning on other projects.</td>
<td>Evaluation activity mainly monitoring, (summative but informs development) summative evaluation carried out on individual projects. UCAN review was formative.</td>
<td>Main form of evaluation is Summative. All serve some formative function however this is particularly weak within the RDA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formative (Ex-Ante)</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summative (Ex-Post)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 7.5:** Topic-based breakdown of ‘Approach’ subject-area by total number of case studies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 1</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 2</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 3</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 4</th>
<th>FURTHER COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majority evaluation activity is monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Most emphasis is placed on monitoring and performance management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited assessment activity, with reflection on evaluation activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Even though monitoring informs development lack of evidence to suggest indepth reflection on results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of evidence to suggest evaluation explicitly for improvement purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NDC strongest on range of evaluation activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of activity carried out at programme level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim programme evaluation carried to evidence performance and inform development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring carried out on ongoing basis within OCP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring activity carried out on ongoing basis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project and programme assessed at least once in life-cycle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis placed on learning, utilising evaluation for improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate activity monitored in accordance with wider organisational performance management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of evidence to suggest reflection in the form of assessment evaluation for improvement such as UCAN review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fig. 7.6: Topic-based breakdown of ‘Function’ subject-area by total number of case studies
7.2.1.3 Methods

This denotes the specific techniques, tools, participants and indicators.

Table 7.4: Table of Results: Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of Inquiry</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 1</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 2</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 3</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 4</th>
<th>FURTHER COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Mainly quantitative questionnaires, Supported by some qualitative feedback and comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Most evaluation places emphasis on quantitative elements, but supported with some qualitative NDC placed emphasis on use of narrative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 7.7: Topic-based breakdown of 'Mode of Inquiry' subject-area by total number of case studies
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 1</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 2</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 3</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 4</th>
<th>FURTHER COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are goals?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was achieved?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who benefitted?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How was it achieved?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What unintended outcomes?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were key successes?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What could be improved?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDA evaluation activity involves customer surveys and document reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEM evaluation involves interviews, review of key documents, resident surveys, focus groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDC evaluations involve surveys (MORI poll, customer care cards), interviews, questionnaires, document and statistical review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation - customer inspectors, door knocking, customer satisfaction survey, questionnaires, focus groups, interviews, document review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document review</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus groups</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 7.8: Topic-based breakdown of ‘Research Questions’ subject-area by total number of case studies.

- What are goals?
- What was achieved?
- Who benefitted?
- How was it achieved?
- What unintended outcomes?
- What could be improved?
- What were key successes?

Fig. 7.9: Topic-based breakdown of ‘Data Collection’ subject-area by total number of case studies.

- Questionnaires
- Interviews
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- Document review
- Observation
- Focus groups
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 1</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 2</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 3</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 4</th>
<th>FURTHER COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost Benefit Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Accounting and Auditing</td>
<td>Despite being focused on delivering economic regeneration, RDA is not using any tools to measure its economic impact on the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Accounting and Auditing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Practical Quality Assurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>System for Small Organisations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Analysis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tops and pants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mind maps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Storyboards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storyboards</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 7.10: Topic-based breakdown of ‘Tools’ subject-area by total number of case studies**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 1</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 2</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 3</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 4</th>
<th>FURTHER COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation Staff</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Staff</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner organisations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Consultants</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology/ Innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>used in RDA evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website used to collect feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web based tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(logbooks, blogs and webchats)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media Centre’s services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(people’s voice media)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>used to engage stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Snap’ online surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mobile phone surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>web-enabled tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Performance Improvement for the Community Strategy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for monitoring targets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website and social media used to collect data/feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online surveys</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile phone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web-based tools</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 7.11: Topic-based breakdown of ‘Participants’ subject-area by total number of case studies

Fig. 7.12: Topic-based breakdown of ‘Technology/Innovation’ subject-area by total number of case studies
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 1</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 2</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 3</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 4</th>
<th>FURTHER COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No social regeneration indicators within the RDA</td>
<td></td>
<td>NEM seeks to develop their ‘environmental impact’ indicators, particularly in relation to energy efficiency and climate change. Indicators such as CO2 emission, biodiversity, recycling, green technology and the green rating of buildings are unavailable at required levels. Project specific indicators vary. OCP’s corporate indicators are more in line with the Manchester Science Park performance indicators.</td>
<td>CHALK NDC Indicators linked directly to outputs Comprehensive list, large number, Duplication</td>
<td>Limited consideration of indicators to reflect economic regeneration</td>
<td>Economic indicators and monitoring well established (See Appendix 10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Links to Organisational Strategy | X | X | X | X | 4 |
| Links to borough wide Strategy | X | | X | | 2 |
| Links to Local Strategic Partnership/ Other Partner Organisations | X | X | X | X | 4 |
| Local Area Agreement | X | | X | | 2 |
| Nationally Prescribed | X | | X | | 2 |
| Stakeholder Input | X | | | | 1 |
Fig. 7.13: Topic-based breakdown of ‘Indicators’ subject-area by total number of case studies
RDA Indicators

64% Economic
36% Environmental

Fig. 7.14: Percentage Distribution of Indicators within RDA

NEM Indicators

32.35% Social
29.41% Economic
38.24% Environmental

Fig. 7.15: Percentage Distribution of Indicators within NEM

CHALK NDC indicators

60% Economic
21% Environmental
19% Social

Fig. 7.16: Percentage Distribution of Indicators within CHALK NDC

Bolton at Home Regeneration indicators

64% Economic
29% Social
7% Environmental

Fig. 7.17: Percentage Distribution of Indicators within Bolton at Home
Fig. 7.18: Regeneration Indicators in use across case studies

Distribution of Regenration Indicators

- Social: 39.16%
- Economic: 32.59%
- Environmental: 28.25%

Total number of indicators in array: 14, 25, 34, 267
Median: 29.5 (30)
Mean: 85
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### 7.2.1.4 Motivations

This refers to the incentives, and reasons that drive evaluations.

#### Table 7.5: Table of Results: Motivations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accountability/Evidence</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 1</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 2</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 3</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 4</th>
<th>FURTHER COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Main incentive for carrying out evaluation activity was accountability to funding bodies (NWDA)</td>
<td>evidencing delivery with respect to outcomes accountability to funding bodies (NWDA, ERDF)</td>
<td>evidencing delivery with respect to outcomes</td>
<td>Need to account for funding from council, other sources (ABG, ERDF and Bank) and wider stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funders</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement</td>
<td>Data on certain indicators are required by the council and the wider partnership</td>
<td>requirement of funding provision</td>
<td>Project appraisal form prerequisite of project funding required to submit an evaluation report to the monitoring and evaluation sub-committee once in project life cycle</td>
<td>Requirement if internal performance management systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funders</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council/ Government</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning/Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEM interim evaluation was carried out in order to inform development of the programme</td>
<td>Learning a key strand of evaluation strategy</td>
<td>Formative evaluation such as UCAN review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 7.19: Topic-based breakdown of ‘Accountability/ Evidence’ subject-area by total number of case studies

Fig. 7.20: Topic-based breakdown of ‘Requirement’ subject-area by total number of case studies
7.2.2 Codes of Considerable Significance

7.2.2.1 Learning

This refers to the organisation’s formative evaluations and actions taken on evaluation

Table 7.6: Table of Results: Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CASE STUDY 1</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 2</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 3</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 4</th>
<th>FURTHER COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisational</td>
<td>Lack of evidence of learning as a result of reflection on the findings of evaluation activity</td>
<td>feedback was implemented where building management was concerned NEM evaluation informs learning across all URCs</td>
<td>Emphasis on evaluations informing both ongoing project within the NDC as well as external organisations/stakeholders</td>
<td>Feedback from customer used to develop an improvement Findings from the UCAN review informed development strategy</td>
<td>Learning mainly aimed at improvement within the organisation Except in the case of national programmes like the NDC or evaluations carried out externally at an national scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Fig. 7.21: Subject-areas for ‘Learning’ Axial Code

- External
- Organisational

Number of Case Studies
### 7.2.2.2 Organisation

This considers organisational priorities, goals, and objectives.

Table 7.7: Table of Results: Organisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CASE STUDY 1</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 2</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 3</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 4</th>
<th>FURTHER COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council Priorities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>All organisational goals reflect borough-wide priorities as environmental, economic, and social priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough wide Strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Strategic Partnership</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Area Agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Partner Organisations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental/Physical</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘SMART’ Objectives</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider stakeholder input</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4

All case study organisations reflect some level of wider stakeholder input apart from RDA.
Fig. 7.22: Subject -areas for 'Organisation' Axial Code
### 7.2.2.3 Timeframes

Table 7.8: Table of Results: Timeframes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CASE STUDY 1</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 2</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 3</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 4</th>
<th>FURTHER COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External evaluation of RDA was interim</td>
<td>NEM baseline survey</td>
<td>Projects appraisal prior to funding approval</td>
<td>Monitoring carried out on a rolling programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring is ongoing</td>
<td>NEM interim evaluation</td>
<td>ongoing and interim evaluation took place on longer projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End of project evaluation</td>
<td>Monitoring ongoing</td>
<td>interim evaluation at programme level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex- Ante</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex- Post</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reporting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quarterly report to senior management</td>
<td>Biannual NEM KPI report</td>
<td>project level timeframes were varied and dependent on the individual projects</td>
<td>Individual projects evaluations have varying timelines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End of year evaluation</td>
<td>Annual OCP performance report</td>
<td>Annual programme level evaluation</td>
<td>Annual customer satisfaction survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Biannual MORI polls</td>
<td>Annual ‘door knock’ performance reports produced on a quarterly basis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quarterly project monitoring returns to M&amp;E sub-committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biannually</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on project lifecycle</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Fig. 7.23: Topic-based breakdown of ‘Timing’ subject-area by total number of case studies

Fig. 7.24: Topic-based breakdown of ‘Reporting’ subject-area by total number of case studies
### 7.2.2.4 Challenges

Table 7.9: Table of Results: Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lack of evaluation</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 1</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 2</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 3</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 4</th>
<th>FURTHER COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no real evaluation having been carried out on the Kingsway project, the primary data revealed that there was a belief within the organisation that more could be done in terms of evaluation</td>
<td>More emphasis on monitoring than evaluation</td>
<td>Tension between evaluation ad monitoring/ managing performance</td>
<td>Need for critical reflection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Data</td>
<td>availability of data is a major issue for softer outcomes, eg wellbeing</td>
<td>difficult to measure</td>
<td>Regeneration outcomes are more intangible such as community development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard to measure</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution</td>
<td>difficulty linking actions to eventual outcomes</td>
<td>Causality</td>
<td>With multi disciplinary neighbourhood management teams Attribution/ contribution to indicators is a challenge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term/ Follow up</td>
<td>some outcomes only materialise several years down the line</td>
<td>Long term tracking of beneficiaries</td>
<td>obtaining long term data of customers in order to track long term outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Perception</td>
<td>Too many targets oppressive counter-productive (nationally prescribed)</td>
<td>Diverting attention from project delivery</td>
<td>bureaucracy that is attached to some techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resourcing</td>
<td>Funding and resourcing evaluation remains difficult</td>
<td>the source of funding for evaluation activity poses a challenge going forward a lack of expertise within OCP Ltd. to carry out robust evaluation activity</td>
<td>ability of individual members of staff responsible for evaluation activity was limited on some projects availability of funding staff time, staff continuity &amp; commitment (length of contracts) Funding source still largely dictates evaluation activity although more emphasis is being placed on demonstrating value for money, there are less resources to support both the delivery and its assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff (expertise)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement/ Access to consultees</td>
<td>Engaging senior level staff proved difficult, leading to delays</td>
<td>Difficulty engaging stakeholders</td>
<td>difficult to reach stakeholders; e.g. feedback form customers who do not use the UCAN centres.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherence</td>
<td>lack of coherence in the in terms of structured framework for evaluation activity needs to be embedded into the programme and job roles Lack of cohesive evaluation strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigour</td>
<td>the standards of project level evaluations varied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Image</td>
<td>Concern about negative findings</td>
<td>Avoiding ‘spin’ and production of biased findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavourable findings</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measuring Success</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defining success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capturing day to day change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change of government:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reshaping of funding structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Fig. 7.25: Subject-areas for ‘Challenges’ Axial Code: Main Challenges Identified by Occurrence
### 7.2.2.5 Future

This considers evaluation in the context of the future of the different case study organisations.

**Table 7.10: Table of Results: Future**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE STUDY 1</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 2</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 3</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 4</th>
<th>FURTHER COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review of Evaluation Strategy</strong></td>
<td>there needs to be an overview of the RDA’s evaluation processes</td>
<td>steps are being taken to develop an integrated evaluation framework</td>
<td>explore forms of impact assessment that capture ‘softer aspects’ of regeneration, e.g. how a person or place changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>priority being placed on improvement of performance management processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholder Engagement</strong></td>
<td>upcoming surveys intend to include external community to gain insight and feedback from their perspective</td>
<td></td>
<td>The organisation also recognises that there is a need to explore the means by which they can engage with more difficult to reach stakeholders.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Succession and Legacy</strong></td>
<td>role of evaluation is one that is being promoted within the NDC’s succession strategy development of the strategy was informed by the NDC’s evaluation activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Fig. 7.26: Subject-areas for ‘Future’ Axial Code
7.2.3 Fairly Significant Codes

7.2.3.1 Engagement and Dissemination

This refers to the involvement and levels of participation of different stakeholders (including dissemination of findings) as well as the means by which the engagement takes place.

Table 7.11: Table of Results: Engagement and Dissemination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Development and Design</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 1</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 2</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 3</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 4</th>
<th>FURTHER COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation Staff</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Staff</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner organisations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Consultants</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During Evaluation - Researchers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation Staff</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Staff</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner organisations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Consultants</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 7.27: Topic-based breakdown of ‘Evaluation Development and Design’ subject-area by total number of case studies

Fig. 7.28: Topic-based breakdown of ‘During Evaluation’ subject-area by total number of case studies (contrasting researchers and consultees)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CASE STUDY 1</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 2</th>
<th>CS 3</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 4</th>
<th>FURTHER COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>During Evaluation - Consultees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation Staff</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Staff</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner organisations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>After Evaluation – Reporting /Dissemination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation Staff</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner organisations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Consultants</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider public</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avenues for Engagement/ Dissemination</strong></td>
<td>-reports to the RDA’s board, steering groups, the Local Strategic Partnership, -council’s Policy and Scrutiny committee</td>
<td>Reports /presentation feedback to the board, partner organisations, and the wider public via the local newsletter organisational website</td>
<td>The use of technology has opened up new avenues (as well as new audiences) of collecting data such as online and via mobile phones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence guide and Traffic Light Systems</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities and Events</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Phones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Centres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering/Task Groups; Committees</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door Knocking</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 7.29: Topic-based breakdown of ‘After Evaluation’ subject-area by total number of case studies.

Fig. 7.30: Topic-based breakdown of ‘Avenues for Engagement’ subject-area by total number of case studies.
7.2.3.2 Culture

This refers to the evaluation culture within the organisation.

Table 7.12: Table of Results: Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key organisational Activity</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 1</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 2</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 3</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 4</th>
<th>FURTHER COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Evaluation built into project processes</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>well informed staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>clear understanding of the rationale behind evaluation activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support and Guidance for staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>provision of detailed guidance as well as clear processes and structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appointment of evaluation manager</td>
<td>investigating different methods of carrying out evaluation activity</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>provision of detailed guidance as well as clear processes and structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action on Findings</td>
<td>Implementation of customer feedback</td>
<td>willingness to take on board learning from evaluation and make the appropriate adjustments</td>
<td>Findings inform development of service provision</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Fig. 7.31: Subject-areas for ‘Culture’ Axial Code
### 7.2.3.3 National

This denotes national structures and influences on evaluation practice.

Table 7.13: Table of Results: National

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CASE STUDY 1</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 2</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 3</th>
<th>CASE STUDY 4</th>
<th>FURTHER COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government policy</strong></td>
<td>reduced demands on local areas in terms of nationally directed targets, providing opportunity to establish more meaningful local objectives</td>
<td>Changes under new government</td>
<td>less prescriptive attitude towards evaluation activity</td>
<td>perceived apathy from the current government in terms of monitoring and evaluation practice</td>
<td>Both threat and opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uncertainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>reduced the demands on local areas in terms of nationally directed targets, providing the opportunity to establish more meaningful local objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Structures</strong></td>
<td>Changes under new government</td>
<td>Changes under new government</td>
<td>Influence on outcomes and indicators</td>
<td>Changes under new government</td>
<td>Influence on outcomes and indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGMA (LEP &amp; Joint Authority)</strong></td>
<td>Reporting to new structures</td>
<td>Reporting to new structures</td>
<td>more emphasis is being placed on evaluation activity, but focus is on methods such as cost benefit analysis without enough guidance being provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Bodies</td>
<td>Demise of TSA and the Audit Commission Adherence to Housemark and the HCA</td>
<td>demise of the Audit commission abolishment of national assessment frameworks comprehensive area assessment Place Survey, national indicator set local area agreements reduced the demands on local areas in terms of nationally directed targets, providing the opportunity to establish more meaningful local objectives new 'single data list'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>national assessment frameworks have been abolished including the comprehensive area assessment, the Place Survey, the national indicator set and local area agreements new 'single data list' with reduced number of indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 7.32: Subject-areas for 'National' Axial Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject-area</th>
<th>Number of Case Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Bodies</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGMA (LEP &amp; Joint Authority)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Structures</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government policy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 7.32: Subject-areas for ‘National’ Axial Code
7.3 Summary

Open codes generated from earlier stages of the analysis were refined into axial codes, following which codes of significance were determined using a frequency matrix. These were:

- Codes of high significance:
  - Evaluation
  - Strategy
  - Methods
  - Motivations

- Codes of considerable significance:
  - Learning
  - Organisation
  - Timeframes
  - Challenges
  - Future

- Fairly significant codes:
  - Dissemination
  - Engagement
  - Culture
  - National

Based on the grounded theory approach adopted by the study, ‘Evaluation’ is identified as a ‘core code’ which ties all the other axial codes identified together. A comparative thematic analysis carried out across all four case studies generated results which were presented under the headings of the respective axial codes.

The next level of analysis producing findings based on the above results is presented in the next chapter. The chapter also conducts a discussion around the findings.
CHAPTER 8

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

“A scientist's aim in a discussion with his colleagues is not to persuade, but to clarify”

- Leo Szilard (1961)
This chapter presents the findings from the literature review portion of this study under the objectives outlined in chapter 1. It also presents the findings produced from an analysis of the results outlined in the previous chapter. The findings are presented under the key themes emergent from the research, which are identified as: Strategy, Organisation, Methods, Engagement and Funding. The chapter critically discusses the themes; further exploring them in the context of the literature, and synthesising the findings from both the literature review and the case study portions of the research. Finally, in light of the discussion, the chapter presents the emergent theory from the study in the form of a conceptual framework for the evaluation of urban regeneration projects.

8.1 Findings from the Literature Review

8.1.1 Objective 1

On defining sustainable development, the literature review reveals that the widely accepted working definition of the term sustainable development is offered by The World Commission on Environment and Development, (1987, p.43) as “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs”. However this definition is found to be recursive and self referencing of the ‘development’ element of the term. As a compound term, the literature examines the component parts of ‘sustainable development’ and finds that development is a “specified state of growth” (Oxford University Press, 2012, p.1) which may take place in a variety of different contexts; biological, physical, economic and social. In examining sustainability, the literature finds that sustainability is a dynamic phenomenon bound by time (International Institute of Sustainable Development, 2012; Moore, 2007), and is applied to a wide variety of activities (Olsson et al, 2004). While the concept may be considered in terms of resource or function, the fundamental principles on which it is predicated are longevity, balance and equilibrium (EPA, 2011; Thompson, 2010).
The literature review finds that sustainable development operates within three dimensions; environmental, social and economic (see figure 3.2). These different strands address conservation, growth and equity respectively (UNESCO, 2007), and must operate in tandem with one another to achieve sustainability (Newman, 2011) while fulfilling the role of sustainable development in improving quality of life (IUCN, UNEP and WWF, 1991). With its origins in the ecological conservation movement, thinking around sustainable development has evolved over the decades, with issues like climate change bringing it to the fore of public consciousness. Applying the concept of sustainable development at community level, Egan (2004) outlines seven components of a sustainable community (see figure 3.4). This has informed thinking around the modern public sector approach to urban regeneration (Manchester City Council, 2002).

The literature review finds that urban regeneration refers to the process that seeks to reverse urban decline within an area. This decline is typically brought on by external forces acting on an area such as changes in economic practice, deindustrialisation, or unfavourable socio-demographic trends (Roberts and Sykes, 2000). Urban decline manifests in the form of physical decay, economic issues such as increased unemployment, social exclusion and an overall deterioration in standards of living (Medhurst and Lewis, 1969). Urban regeneration seeks to reverse this decline, raising the standard of living in an area, by improving the built and natural environment as well as the socio-economic conditions in the area (CLES, 2009).

The literature reveals that the process of urban regeneration involves a diverse group of stakeholders with varying degrees of involvement with the intervention, as well as a variety of interests (ENSURE, 2009). Stakeholders refer to any individual or group of individuals who are affected by, or can influence an activity (Pearce, 2003; Brandon and Lombardi, 2005). The literature reviews different typologies for classifying stakeholders within urban regeneration (see section 3.3.4), and finds that stakeholders can be grouped as users, producers and brokers.
The producers refer to stakeholders responsible for developing, creating, funding or providing the regeneration. They include funders, built environment professionals, the local authority and other regeneration delivery organisations. Users refer to the ‘consumers’ or beneficiaries of urban regeneration and include local residents, local businesses, and non resident users (e.g. commuters). This group also includes members or stakeholders in surrounding communities who despite not using the facilities or services provided as a result of the regeneration, are still affected by it. The brokers are intermediaries and facilitators such as community groups, charities, pressure groups, aid organisations and service providers (Evans, 1997; ENSURE, 2009; Smiralova, 2006).

8.1.2 Objective 2

In examining strategic approaches to urban regeneration, the literature finds that urban regeneration policy dates back to the late 1970s, with planning policy targeted at the redevelopment of run down urban areas going back a century before that (Dyos, 1967). The strategic approaches to tackling urban regeneration have evolved over the decades with emphasis shifting from the physical and environmental aspects of regeneration, through social and economic aspects, to a combination of all three in an attempt to achieve sustainable urban regeneration (see table 3.3).

Early urban regeneration strategies (reconstruction and revitalisation) stemmed from housing and focused on two strands of physical regeneration around slum clearance and housing provision (Rodger, 1989; Planning Help, 2011; Living Heritage, 2011). By the 1970s, urban regeneration had begun to consider the social aspects of sustainable development, with the renewal strategy including community based initiatives that sought to empower citizens (Tallon, 2010). The period from the late 1970s into the 1980s saw strategic focus shift once again, with greater emphasis placed on the economy. The redevelopment strategy promoted urban entrepreneurialism and the role of the private sector and the market in urban regeneration (Department of the Environment, 1977; Wood, 1998; Evans, 1997). The strategy focused on the development of flagship physical projects and stimulating economic activity (Harvey, 1989).
By the 1990s, the regeneration strategy encouraged a holistic approach to tackling the issues of urban decline. The strategy adopted an integrated approach towards the different dimensions of sustainability and focused on multi-agency and multi-sectoral collaborations; working in partnership with the community in order to achieve not just physical but economic and social improvements simultaneously (Roberts and Sykes, 2000; Tallon, 2010). The literature review finds that the current strategy of regrowth while maintaining a comprehensive approach to regeneration, places greater emphasis on economic development, and bears elements of the redevelopment strategy of the 1980s. Regrowth encourages the private sector to take a more active role in urban regeneration and has seen the introduction of new agencies such as the private sector led Local Enterprise Partnerships to lead on facilitating urban regeneration delivery in the country (CLG, 2011; BIS, 2011).

8.1.3 Objective 3

On the assessment of sustainable development and urban regeneration, the literature review examines evaluation theory and finds that evaluation is a process of systematically examining and assessing information on a subject in order to come to a judgment that informs a decision. There are various definitions for the term with more descriptive definitions emphasising the actual process of evaluation (Alkin and Solomon’s, 1983), while others consider its function either as a management tool or in the context of its stakeholders (St Leger et al, 1992; Weiss, 1972; WHO, 1998).

The literature review finds that evaluation practice originated from the application of social science research methods in public sectors such as education in order to assess the effectiveness of socio-economic interventions (Freeman, 1977). Its roots in academia and the field of social sciences consequently influenced the way different theorists have developed the field of evaluation itself. Based on fundamentals of accountability and social inquiry, evaluation practice has evolved along the lines of methods, value and use; with theorists asserting varying views on the role of the evaluator (Alkin and Christie, 2004) (see section 4.2.4).
The literature review finds that evaluation may be conducted for a number of reasons including accountability, learning, programme management or as an ethical obligation (Lewis, 2001). Furthermore evaluation can be classified based on the mode of enquiry utilised (experimental or responsive), the subject of the evaluation (practice or outcome), the approach adopted towards the evaluation (summative or formative) or the intended function of the evaluation (improvement or assessment) (see section 4.2.3).

In terms of assessing sustainable development, the literature review finds that the approach is structured around the dimensions of sustainability. Furthermore the development of indicators that adequately capture performance with regards to each of these indicators is a main concern (UN, 2009). There are several sets of indicators developed by various organisations (Department for Sustainable Development, 2009; European Commission, 2012; DEFRA, 2011; Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2001; OECD, 2004; Office of Gas and Electricity Markets (OFGEM), 2012; Sustainable Development Commission, 2004; United Nations, 2009), which are in use at different levels of operation, from regional level within the UK to an international scale (see section 4.3.1). Another finding of the literature reveals that while the majority of indicator sets are structured around the dimensions of sustainability, some organisations (UN, 2007; DEFRA, 2012, European Commission, 2012) have grouped the indicators under themes and sub-themes such as poverty, governance, health, education, demographic, natural hazards, atmosphere, land, oceans, seas and coasts, freshwater, biodiversity, economic development, global economic partnership, consumption and production patterns in order to better address the complex relationships and interconnections between issues and their indicators. These indicators are utilised within several tools in order to assess sustainable development. While tools often address a single dimension, integrated assessment method toolkits aim to bring together a broad set of methods from different disciplines, in order to determine a preferred course of action. Assessment is based on multiple indicators in a logical framework with various assessment methods that will provide the evidence to support better decision making (CIESIN, 1995; Curwell and Hamilton, 2000; UNFCCC, 2012; CLG, 2009; Cambridge Centre for Climate Change Mitigation Research, 2012).
Within urban regeneration, the literature review finds that despite the increasing significance of evaluation practice within the field and the public sector in general (Sesnan, 2006), the multifaceted nature of regeneration, the wide range of its stakeholders, coupled with the long term nature of its projects and the intangibility of some of its outcomes pose unique challenges (HM Treasury, 1995; Langer et al, 2003, Blastland, 2010). Furthermore evaluation activity is perceived as an additional exercise rather than a core project activity (CLES, 2009).

The literature reveals that project outcomes that form the focus of evaluation activity are tied to the objectives of the project, which in turn are closely linked to objectives of funding providers (National Audit Office, 2011). As such most evaluation criteria based on these objectives are resultantly related to funding criteria and indicators set by funding bodies such as the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), and statutory organisations that govern the activity of delivery organisations (e.g. the Tenant Services Authority (TSA)).

It is found that despite the extensive list of sustainability indicators developed over the years, the extent to which they are reflected within most urban regeneration evaluation frameworks has until recently remained limited (Hemphill et al, 2004; OECD, 2000), with the foremost framework for the evaluation of regeneration based on Value for Money (Roberts and Sykes, 2000; HM Treasury, 1995). Recently efforts have been made to consider not just established measures of sustainability but also concepts such as value, utility, welfare and wellbeing and looks at things such as life satisfaction (HM Treasury, 2003). In addition, more frameworks have emerged which address different elements of regeneration activity. The literature review finds the most widely used of these to be Local Multipliers like LM3 to assess economic impact; Social Return On Investment and other forms of Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) to assess social impact and tools such as Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) to assess environmental impact (NEF Consulting, 2011; Cabinet Office of the Third Sector, 2009; BRE Global 2012).
8.1.4 Objective 4

The literature review finds that best practice can be drawn from the social, voluntary and technology sectors. The multi agency nature of the social sector bears a semblance to that of the regeneration sector; furthermore the fact that both industries have some shared areas of activity such as healthcare, housing, education and crime/justice means that both sectors have a closely established working relationship. The focus on outcomes within the sector, both in terms of delivery and evaluation is identified as an area of best practice from which positive lessons can be taken (Edgington, 2011; Easterling, 2002). It means that emphasis is placed not just on the direct result of an activity but its long term impact and effectiveness (Smith, 2004). Another area of best practice within the social sector is their use of multiple methods in assessment, combining both performance management and values/impact assessment techniques that adopt both qualitative and quantitative methods. The combination of formative and summative assessment methods allows service providers to focus not just on themselves as an organisation in terms of its activities and processes, but on its clients and users, considering the value of the organisation to them (Shalock, 2001).

The voluntary sector is another sector with a close working relationship with the regeneration sector from which best practice can be drawn in terms of their engagement with stakeholders. The literature finds that although evaluation practice within the sector is not always highly regarded; when conducted effectively, much can be learnt from how they engage and involve stakeholders in the evaluation process. The literature finds that where a high level of stakeholder involvement was encouraged throughout the evaluation process, findings produced were more accurate and comprehensive. Also the inclusion of stakeholders in the evaluation process could provide crucial information and local knowledge that may prove vital during appraisal (National Council for Voluntary Organisations, 2012). Furthermore this level of involvement translated into greater engagement not just in terms of evaluation but also with the organisations’ core activities, which is key to ensuring the sustainability and long term viability of the activity.
Another finding of the literature is that learning can be drawn from the technology sector’s approach to evaluation. Although unrelated, the technology sector possesses a number of positive points with regards to its evaluation practices, such as the fact that evaluation constitutes a core organisational activity and is resourced as such (US Department of Commerce, 2005; Canadian Evaluation Society, undated). This includes adequate provision of funding for evaluation activity as well as staff with appropriate backgrounds, capabilities, and experience; thus reflecting an organisational commitment to evaluation activity (Morino, 2011). The literature review identifies other areas of best practice within evaluation in the technology sector as allowing for innovation in evaluation methods (either developing new tools or combining existing ones where it is appropriate), as well as a willingness to evaluate projects deemed unsuccessful (as a lot stands to be learnt from why projects that have failed to meet their intended objectives) (National Institute of Standards and Technology, 2005).
8.2 Discussion

This section presents the findings produced from results generated in the previous chapter. The findings are woven into a critical discussion that incorporates the findings from the literature review set out in section 8.1 above. Text panels embedded within the discussion draw attention headline findings presented as key points, buttressed by some excerpts from interview transcripts [see e-appendix 4 for summaries].

8.2.1 Strategy

The first emergent theme refers to the evaluation strategy. A clearly thought out strategy forms the basis of effective activity; from a military campaign to an Olympic 200m freestyle final (Course, 2012). Originating from the Greek word which describes the thinking and action of a general, strageos, strategy provides a framework for action. Whether in the military, in sports or in evaluation, a good strategy integrates separate tasks and drives them to a common purpose (Patton, 1990).

Panel 8.1
Key Point: Strategic Development
[see Table 7.3-‘Framework/Basis’ and Fig. 7.2; Table 7.9-‘Coherence’ and Fig. 7.25]

- Evaluation strategies at organisational level are under developed
- Evaluation objectives are based on priorities as set out within organisational strategic documents, however the link between the two is not always clear.

“what we work to is a business plan... it does set out our priorities for the year, and the areas we work in, and some targets are in there”  -CS1PM

“a delivery plan with some objectives and targets attached which are measured on a quarterly basis” -CS1PM

“that [strategic plan] contains all the key milestones, targets, key outcomes etc that we hope to achieve. Every quarter we produce a progress report that goes to the board which assesses how we are performing against those targets” -CS1SM
The main challenge identified by the research in terms of strategy is the underdevelopment (and in some cases sheer lack) of an evaluation strategy within regeneration delivery. While evaluation activity at a national level is more likely to be guided by a structured strategic framework (European Institute for Urban Affairs, 1996; 2006), the research uncovered a lack of robustness within evaluation strategies at organisational level among regeneration delivery vehicles.

Despite evaluation activity being invariably structured around organisational and borough-wide regeneration priorities, the strategy informing this activity remains underdeveloped.

Panel 8.2

Key Point: Strategic Development (continued)

[see Table 7.3-‘Framework/Basis’ and Fig. 7.2; Table 7.7 and Fig. 7.22]

- Organisational strategic documents are written to reflect borough-wide priorities; these are therefore reflected to some extent within evaluation strategies by proxy.

“We acknowledge the council's role as kind of strategic leader, and it is uniquely placed to be able to do that”

-CS4SM

“The RDA has a specific role to help deliver the [borough wide] masterplan as agreed” -CS1PM

“We were conscious of this agenda from the council’s perspective about narrowing the gap of deprivation”

-CS4SM

“We work very closely together [with the council], half of is a sort of strategic partner” –CS1SM
Given the nature of urban regeneration, where several programmes and projects run concurrently delivering to different strands of regeneration activity, the adoption of a strategic framework to guide evaluation is of particular importance (Green and South, 2006). To this end the goals of the evaluation activity need to be made clear from the onset. The purpose of evaluation activity within the organisation needs to be considered and set out within a strategic framework which thus informs evaluation practice. Based on Green and South’s (2006) steps towards evaluation planning, a strategic framework ought to:

1. Clarify the aims and objectives of evaluation activity: thereby aiding the understanding not just of the organisation or project goals but the function of the evaluation activity (improvement-process or assessment-outcome), the approach (summative or formative), as well as the underlying values the organisation intends to ascribe to (accountability, ethical obligation, empowerment etc.)
2. Link organisational/project outcomes to criteria: in so doing, outline a clear path between what the organisation/project has set out to do, how success will be measured, and what indicators or determinants of success will be taken into account.

3. Set up data-collection systems: thus establishing appropriate methods for conducting the evaluation activity based on the previously mentioned considerations.

4. Bring it all together: addressing the reflection on evaluation findings in the context of the objectives set out at the beginning of the process, as well as considering the means of reporting and dissemination of findings and recommendations.

Panel 8.4

Key Point: Strategic Flexibility
[see Table 7.3-'Framework/Basis' & 'Focus'; Table 7.4 and Figs. 7.7-7.12; Table 7.12- 'Support and Guidance' and Fig. 7.31]

- Robust evaluation strategy of the CHALK NDC proved particularly effective. Strategy was flexible, providing guidance but emphasising simplicity. Encouraging the use of narrative helps overcome staff apprehension about undertaking technical evaluations.

"we have these booklets, so we’ve tried to tell stories instead, because if you give people technical evaluations to do, its very difficult." – CS3PE

- Flexibility is key at project level to allow for adoption of appropriate techniques for individual project.

“balance in developing the framework had to be something that could be customised to particular organisations, but still had enough that was standard for comparability” – CS2PE
In the case of a field such as urban regeneration the flexibility of the framework is key due to the broad range of activities that evaluations may cover. This is something the research found the CHALK NDC considered within its strategy (2009c), as it not only provided a framework which set out the core functions and research questions of evaluation activity, but it provided guidance on a range of different tools thus allowing evaluators to “pursue new paths of discovery as they emerge” (Patton, 1990 p.41). Another issue to be considered is that of ethical considerations such as confidentiality, informed consent, etc as although evaluation is applied in a practical context, it is essentially a research activity and such ought to observe accepted standards of research ethics. Although raised within the literature as a consideration of a strategic evaluation framework (Patton, 1990) the research failed to find evidence of such consideration within urban regeneration practice.

Considering evaluation within urban regeneration from a theoretical viewpoint, the inquiry into organisational, programme or project activity constitutes a naturalistic enquiry, in that the focus is on a real world situation as it unfolds in its natural context (Patton, 1990); the context in this case being the communities that are the focus of organisational activity. Building on Stake’s (1975) responsive evaluation, which seeks to place the concerns of the stakeholder at the centre of evaluation activity, Guba and Lincoln (1981) have established a framework that considers the nature of such naturalistic inquiry. This responsive approach is particularly suited to evaluation within urban regeneration, as not only does it allow for the consideration of issues that are relevant to stakeholder needs, but it is flexible enough to accommodate the adoption and integration of other models should the situation call for it. These characteristics lead Guba and Lincoln (1981, p33) to cite responsive evaluation as offering “the most meaningful approach to performing evaluations”. 
Panel 8.5

Key Point: Monitoring vs. Evaluation
[see Table 7.3-‘Subject of Evaluation’, ‘Approach’ & ‘Function’ and Figs. 7.4-7.6; Table 7.6 and Fig. 7.21; Table 7.9-‘Lack of Evaluation’ and Fig. 7.25; Table 7.12-‘Key Organisational Activity’]

• Although organisations engage in some level of formative evaluation in the form of ex-ante project appraisals and baseline surveys, with the exception of specific interim project evaluations and explicitly formative evaluation activity, majority of evaluations carried out are summative in nature. Ex-post evaluations are carried out with the aim of evidencing organisational activity. However there is a shift towards engaging in more formative evaluations.

“there’s evaluation at the end, and usually but not always, formative evaluation as you go through the process.” –CS1CL

“Historically what used to happen was that things got evaluated when they finished, and you tried to learn the lessons from what had happened. Now things are moving to evaluating them while you’re doing things rather than at the end.” –CS3CL

• Without as much emphasis on practice evaluation, there is less evaluation activity which serves a function of assessment and improvement. Evaluation activity predominately serves a monitoring function in terms of performance management.

“the Kingsway Partnership sat monitoring progress, trouble shooting, dealing with issues of one sort or another etc.” –CS1PE

“We monitor progress, development, issues about roads, and that whole project management.” –CS1PE

“we would have quite specific targets to reach and spend to achieve which was monitored all the way through quarterly” –CS1PM

• Despite feedback from monitoring activity informing development, there is a lack of evidence to suggest in-depth reflection on results. There is a marked tension between evaluation and monitoring/managing performance.

“In terms of evaluation we do more monitoring than evaluation” –CS1PE

“sometimes you have to stand back and say are these the right targets really” –CS1PM

“On an ongoing day to day basis, its more to do with feedback rather than necessarily formal evaluations” –CS1CL

“that tension I suspect around evaluation and managing performance” –CS4SM
Another issue raised by the research is the emphasis on monitoring without the reflective and interpretive depth required to constitute evaluation. Business consultants Lloyd Morgan (2008) note that while most corporations claim to have a well defined strategy, what they often have is a business plan focused on delivering more effective outcomes for the organisation; as strategy is often confused with operational planning. The same can be said about evaluation strategy within the context of the research findings, as it is more often than not confused with performance management systems as set out within the organisation’s business plan. Where monitoring centres around the ongoing process of tracking organisational or project performance, evaluation seeks meaning from the information collected by asking critical questions. Although the research found that feedback from monitoring activity serves some formative function within the organisations, and while monitoring information can feed into evaluation activity, it does not constitute an evaluation in and of itself (CLES, 2009). Blalock (1999) flags the issue of the frequent practice of monitoring of performance measures as a substitute for evidence based evaluative judgement. However, there is an argument to be made for integrating monitoring activity into a wider multilevel accountability framework (de Boer, 2001).
The research highlighted extensive variation of evaluation standards due to the fact the higher level evaluation carried out by external consultants was of a considerably superior level of quality than some of the evaluations carried out at project level, largely due to the capacity of project workers who conducted the evaluations. Green and South (2006) echo this problem, attributing it to the extensive range of
programmes at local level; and cite Springett and Young (2002) who observed this phenomenon with programmes involving small community projects. The research revealed a tactic used to mitigate this was the encouragement of the use of narrative, particularly at project level, as focusing on ‘telling the story’ helps compensate for the shortcomings of some staff. Again this is something which is set out within detailed strategic guidance provide at organisational level.

One thing that is common within the research and the literature is the fact that a strategy is a non static entity, and needs to be reviewed on a regular basis (Lloyd Morgan, 2008). This is something that the research found organisations were undergoing; whether in the form of a refresh and development of existing evaluating strategy or the establishment of a framework where one did not previously exist.

Panel 8.7

Key Point: Strategic Review
[see Table 7.10-'Review of Evaluation Strategy' and Fig. 7.26]

- Organisations seek to review their evaluation practices, updating strategies and improving performance management processes. Furthermore forms of assessment which seek to capture ‘softer aspects’ of regeneration are being increasingly explored. Reduced demands on local areas in terms of nationally directed targets provide an opportunity to establish more meaningful local objectives.

“we are in the process at the moment of taking stock and re-evaluating our strategy” – CS2PM

“we spent a lot of time learning about some of the techniques out there for more things like LM3, social return on investment, social accounting” – CS4SM
8.2.2 Organisation

This theme covers three core areas, the first being organisational priorities in the form of aims and objectives. The next two areas are related to the organisational culture in terms of evaluation; i.e. the commitment to evaluation activity, and attitudes towards learning.

8.2.2.1 Strategic Priorities

Panel 8.8

Key Point: Linking organisational priorities to evaluation strategy
[see Table 7.3-'Framework/Basis’ and Fig. 7.2; Table 7.7 and Fig. 7.22]

- Organisational goals and priorities draw upon council and borough-wide regeneration priorities as set out within various strategic documents. The goals reflect environmental, economic, and social priorities.

“we made sure it [corporate plan] was fully aligned with the Greater Manchester strategy as well, because they have become a much more powerful influence on what we do” –CS1SM

“we work to is a business plan, which isn’t highly technical, but it does set out our priorities for the year, and the areas we work in, and some targets are in there.” –CS1PM

“the business plan…contains all the key milestones, targets, key outcomes etc that we hope to achieve” –CS1SM

“beneath that business plan, is the detailed delivery plan which sets out all of the specific targets” –CS1SM

The research highlights a very close alignment of organisational goals to those of their strategic partners as well as borough wide priorities. This is accomplished via some form of local strategic partnership, whose aims and objectives are based on local authority, regional and national priorities. Clear objectives (project, programme
or organisational) form the basis of a clear evaluation strategy (Research Council, 2011). These organisational goals form the basis of the selection of criteria and indicators to measure performance, and therefore evaluation activity. This is supported by findings of the literature review which cite the focus on outcomes within the social sector, as an area of best practice (Edgington, 2011; Easterling, 2002).

As discussed in section 8.2.1, a clear link between organisational aims and objectives, criteria and evaluation objectives needs to be established within the evaluation strategy (Hemphill et al, 2004). The literature review finds that some tools such as Social Return on Investment recommend the use of models such as ‘Theory of Change’ (Anderson, 2005; Harris, 2005) and the Logic Model (Weiss, 1995; McCawley, 1997; ) not only to develop organisational goals, but in the creation of evaluation strategies in order to map them onto outcomes; thus maintaining that ‘golden thread’. The issue raised by the research however is the improper structure of some stated organisational ‘objectives’. While some of the organisations demonstrate good practice in writing objectives, others set out ‘objectives’ which are better described as goals or even aspirational statements. Well structured objectives should be Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound’ (SMART) (Purdie, 2008).

**Panel 8.9**

**Key Point: Linking organisational priorities to evaluation strategy (continued)**

[see Table 7.3-'Framework/Basis' and Fig. 7.2; Table 7.4-'Indicators' and Fig. 7.13]

- Of the four case studies only two organisations show evidence of well structured objectives, which are ‘Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Results-focused and Time-bound’ (SMART). These organisations made a clear distinction between ‘visions’, ‘aims’, and ‘objectives’, with a clear link between objectives and indicators. Organisations with poorly structured objectives struggle with aligning them to indicators for evaluation, indicating a tension between focused indicators, outcomes and wider strategic priorities.

“I think at the beginning they thought they could solve all problems of the world, then realised that actually you couldn’t prove it, so we tried to look at things that were actually measurable.” –CS3PE
Objectives should be specific being that they should each relate directly to a particular outcome. ‘Measurable’ refers to the ability for progress on the objective to be captured. This could potentially be a sticking point within regeneration where some goals are less tangible, however measurability does not always equate to tangibility or quantification but it is necessary for it to be clear when an objective has been accomplished. Achievability as the term suggests implies that the objective should be realistic and feasible; reflecting ‘who’ is to do ‘what’ and considering resources and limitations. Relevance indicates that the objective should be appropriate, fitting and of interest to the various stakeholders involved. This means that organisations should endeavour to engage with stakeholders when establishing priorities. Finally objectives should be time-bound in order that they have a deadline which the organisation works towards. Furthermore a deadline buttresses measurability. While the ‘R’ in ‘S.M.A.R.T.’ is sometimes referred to as ‘Results-focused’ or ‘Realistic’ (UVA Human Resources, 2009; Ambler, 2010), this would appear to be a repetition as specific objectives are already focused on particular outcomes, and objectives are realistic by virtue of being achievable.

8.2.2.2 Culture and Commitment to Evaluation

The study reveals that organisational culture and attitude towards evaluation impacts directly on how evaluation is approached and the level of importance it is granted. Yazdani and Yaghoubi (2011) suggest that culture is one of the most important factors of organisational management. Culture can be defined as a historically transmitted pattern of meanings; a system of inherited conceptions which develop knowledge about and attitudes toward life (Geertz, 1973). It denotes a general body of ideas and values shared by a group. Tierney (1985) states that institutional ideology grounded in the shared assumptions of participants informs the culture of an organisation; attitudes, language, and accepted norms. As Bower (1966) puts it, “the way things are done around here”.
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Drawing on Gordon and Cummins (1979), Betts and Halfhill (1985) and Robbins (1990), Sakdiyakorn and Sunthornvut (2002) identify ten elements of organisational culture as:

- Individual initiative
- Risk tolerance
- Direction
- Integration
- Management support
- Control systems
- Identity
- Reward systems
- Conflict tolerance
- Communication pattern

As Lane et al (2000) highlight, the culture defines the commitments of a group. In the context of this study, the group being an urban regeneration organisation and their commitment is considered in terms of evaluation practice. The study reveals that commitment to evaluation practice is reflected largely in its resourcing, relating to the ‘Management Support’ element listed above, which indicates the degree to which support, assistance, and clear communication is provided (Sakdiyakorn and Sunthornvut, 2002).

**Panel 8.10**

**Key Point: Resourcing evaluation activity**

[see Table 7.4-'Participants’ and Fig. 7.11; Table 7.12 and Fig. 7.31]

- Appointing a designated member of staff responsible for leading on evaluation activity not only aids in the coordination of said activity, but indicates organisational commitment to evaluation practice.

“In terms of [evaluation] delivery, I feel I was a pivot really. I sat in the middle as evaluation manager.” –CS3PE

- Where there is a lack of expertise in-house, positive practice suggests that external staff is brought in to facilitate the process.

“Because health is so difficult to evaluate, we actually put funding into each project so that they had an external evaluation done.” –CS3PE
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Within the study, organisational commitment is demonstrated in staff resourcing, with the appointment of a dedicated evaluation manager responsible for leading on evaluation activity and providing the afore mentioned support and assistance to other members of staff in terms of evaluation. Where there is a lack of expertise in-house, committed organisations bring in external consultants to carry out evaluations and invest in staff training; actions which require financial commitment from the organisations. This is echoed by the findings of the literature review which suggest that organisational commitment is demonstrated by adequate provision of funding for evaluation activity as well as staff with appropriate backgrounds, capabilities, and experience (Morino, 2011).

Aside from commitment demonstrated in terms of funding, commitment is also demonstrated in providing staff with enough time out of their busy schedules to stand back and reflect on emergent findings. This is time for reflection is cited by Orthner et al (2006) as a key factor in developing organisational learning.

Panel 8.11

Key Point: Resourcing evaluation activity (continued)
[see Table 7.9-'Resources’]

- Resourcing evaluation activity is an issue requiring organisations not only to provide funding but also time, so staff have the opportunity to stand back and reflect on emergent findings.

“the evaluation really takes place outside, because you then look back and see what the impact has been, have you actually made a difference?” —CS1PM
Furthermore, organisations with greater levels of commitment to evaluation provide clear guidance and information on conducting evaluation activity (as mentioned in section 8.2.1 above), thus ensuring that staff are well informed and have a clear understanding of the rationale behind evaluation activities. This plays a key role in developing staff buy-in where evaluation is concerned, which is crucial as buy-in is

**Panel 8.12**

**Key Point: Staff buy-in**

[see Table 7.9-'Negative Perceptions'; Table 7.12-'Staff Understanding', 'Support and Guidance' & 'Commitment']

- Providing detailed guidance as well as clear processes and structures ensures that staff are well informed and have a clear understanding of the rationale behind evaluation activities. This is an important part of obtaining staff buy-in.

“What I tried to do was provide support and guidance for projects, so I did a number of things eg. an evaluation template...in very simple language” –CS3PE

“We started off with 3 strands to it; 1. About learning and development, 2. Using and sharing the information, 3. Evaluation in terms of performance.” –CS3PE

“So it was embraced by everybody, it wasn't just me banging on. If I had been doing it and nobody had been interested it wouldn’t have happened. I think they could always see the relevance in doing it, it was more than just ‘lets spend some money over a 10 year period’, it was to learn.” –CS3PE

- Obtaining said buy in is important as it was found that evaluation activity is at times surrounded by negative perceptions such as the large number of targets and bureaucracy attached to certain techniques being oppressive and counter-productive, diverting attention from project delivery.

“what they did do was render a raft of box ticking which was almost counter productive because there were just too many boxes, and too many targets and there was a whole industry being created around them and it became abit oppressive really” –CS1PM

“we are kind of worried about the bureaucracy” –CS4SM

Furthermore, organisations with greater levels of commitment to evaluation provide clear guidance and information on conducting evaluation activity (as mentioned in section 8.2.1 above), thus ensuring that staff are well informed and have a clear understanding of the rationale behind evaluation activities. This plays a key role in developing staff buy-in where evaluation is concerned, which is crucial as buy-in is
key for the creation of a healthy performance culture where evaluation is viewed as an ongoing activity that is necessary not only to evidence activity and account for finances, but to develop practice as well (Morino, 2011). Furthermore evaluation activity can at times be surrounded by negative perceptions; and as found by the literature, is perceived as an additional exercise rather than a core project activity (CLES, 2009). This strengthens the case for evaluation activity to be embedded into programmes and job roles, as indicated by the findings of the literature review in the form of best practice from the technology sector which argues that evaluation ought to constitute a core organisational activity (US Department of Commerce, 2005; Canadian Evaluation Society, undated). The study reveals that evaluation is becoming increasingly part of organisational activity; and as ‘Integration’ as an element of organisational culture suggests, organisations are encouraging a more coordinated approach to evaluation activity.

**Panel 8.13**

**Key Point: Embedding evaluation**

[see Table 7.9-'Review of Evaluation Strategy'; Table 7.12-'Key Organisational Activity”]

- Positive practice indicates that evaluation ought to be built into project processes needs to be embedded into the programme and job roles

"evaluation now is much more part of what people do, continuous evaluation, are we doing the right thing?" –CS3CL

Another element of organisational culture from the previous list which is linked to evaluation is ‘Direction’, indicating the degree to which the organisation creates clear objectives and performance expectations (Sakdiyakorn and Sunthornvut, 2002). As discussed previously in sections 8.2.1 and 8.2.2.1 not only does the organisation need to provide a clear strategy which guides its approach to evaluation activity, but the organisation needs to make its priorities clear, including where evaluation sits within that.
The study reveals a perceived apathy towards evaluation activity at national level. There is a feeling that while more emphasis being placed on evidencing value for money, there is not enough guidance being provided with the dissolution of the main national accounting body in the form of the audit commission, and the abolishment of a number of guidance structures such as local area agreements, national assessment frameworks and the national indicator set, as well as sources of local level data like the place survey (Salford Council, 2012c). Recently the International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie) launched a piece of research with the aim to develop a white paper on indicators for commitment to evaluation (c2e) (Davies, 2012). Their consultation covers aspects such as understanding of commitment to evaluation; ranging from conducting evaluation on all programmes, to the use of evidence from evaluation to decide which programme to fund, expand or terminate, improving design and implementation of programmes or policies, and having a strong culture of monitoring and evaluation. Furthermore the consultation explores possible measures of commitment to evaluation considering features such as:

- A strong monitoring and evaluation framework
- An organisational evaluation policy
- An independent evaluation office
- Publication of evaluation results
- Requirement to utilise existing evidence during programme design
- Conduction of impact evaluations for pilot programmes
- Supporting organizations that advocate or conduct impact evaluations

- International Initiative for Impact Evaluation, 2011
8.2.2.3 Learning

Citing Orthner et al (2006), Spector and Davidsen (2006) describe organisational learning as an information management strategy that consists of systematic efforts to transfer knowledge throughout an entire organisation. It is concerned with continuous improvement within an organisation using feedback on both processes and outcomes. Learning should be woven into the fabric of the organisation’s work activities and infrastructure; its culture, systems and structures, leadership, and communication mechanisms, thereby ensuring that attitudes, perceptions and values are aligned where learning is concerned (Preskill and Torres, 1999; Torres et al, 1996). Organisational learning is vital for the development of an organisation, and its continued improvement in delivering its goals. In an investigation into the performance within the American educational sector, Bowen et al (2006) found that the schools which adopted a learning culture organisationally, outperformed those that did not. Further evidence which suggests that ‘organisational learning’ taking place at programme/project level within a wider organisation improved the working of these initiatives is highlighted by research into evaluation practices within the UK Department for International Development (DFID) (Jones and Mendizabal, 2010).

Evaluation plays a key role within organisational learning, and is a crucial element of the continuous learning cycle. This is supported by findings of the literature review which cite learning and development as one of the main functions of evaluation activity, with insights strengthening and improving processes (Chelimsky, 1997). Torres and Preskill (2001, p.387) advocate for evaluation to play a greater role within organisations, with emphasis on learning; suggesting an approach which is “contextually-sensitive, ongoing, and supports dialog, reflection, and decision making at department and programmatic as well as organization-wide levels”. They also highlight the fact that the use of evaluation findings has long been a concern for evaluators, practitioners and researchers alike. The findings of the literature review echo this view, with experts on the ‘Use’ branch of the ‘Evaluation tree’ (see section 4.1.4) such as Stufflebeam, Patton, Alkin, Preskill etc., sharing this concern over the course of the evolution of the practice.
The literature review highlights models such as the Contexts, Inputs, Processes and Products (CIPP) model which stresses that “evaluation’s most important purpose is not to prove but to improve” (Stufflebeam, 2003 p.4). The CIPP model continues to develop (Stufflebeam, 2001, 2002, 2007) including stakeholders in the design of evaluation questions, in planning the evaluation and also in drafting reports and disseminating findings. The literature review also reveals that Patton (1997) went further, not only emphasising the utilitarian function of evaluations in decision making, but the role of the evaluator in ensuring that this utilisation takes place. In his utilisation focused evaluation (UFE) model Patton brings to the fore the importance of stakeholder engagement, buy in and participation; issues directly relevant in the context of regeneration (Roberts and Sykes, 2000) where stakeholder participation plays a key role in ensuring the sustainability of a project (LUDA, 2005).

Barlas and Yasarcan (2006) focus on the role of learning in developing organisational priorities. They suggest that goal formation ought to be a part of a wider organisational feedback process where evaluation constitutes a key element within a double-loop learning cycle (Argyris, 1992). As part of a continuous cycle of improvement, evaluation and learning should play a central role in the development of organisational goals and vice versa; thus reinforcing the connection between processes as highlighted in section 8.2.1.

Torres and Preskill (2001, p.389) list the main challenges faced by organisations in maximising the value of evaluations in terms of learning, citing the following issues:

- Accountability-hungry funders and legislators who continue to demand outcomes within short periods of time
- Employees within organisations who are given little time or support for engaging in reflection and dialog that invites questioning about the underlying assumptions, beliefs, and values of the organization’s programs, policies, and practices
- Leaders who have little experience in basing decisions on data and don’t know how to incorporate systematically derived findings with other forms of information into their decision-making processes
• Overworked program staff that continue to see evaluation as a nonessential, add-on activity for which they have little time
• The difficulty of locating evaluators who have an interest in, and the ability to implement evaluation as a means for, learning and organizational change
• Little support for redesigning jobs and/or influencing organizational culture to sustain organisational learning
• Organization members who may view evaluation as threatening, and remain uncomfortable with group dialog designed to facilitate learning from evaluation
• Midlevel employees who seek to initiate evaluation work and encounter difficulty getting upper-management support.

They go on to state that difficulty is more likely to be encountered when evaluating large-scale, multi-site, policy-oriented subjects, which typically represents the urban regeneration context. Once again these issues mirror the main themes emergent from the research, around organisational commitment, resourcing and support, stemming from organisational culture.

Panel 8.15

Key Point: Commitment to learning
[see Table 7.5-‘Learning/Improvement’; Table 7.9-‘Resourcing’ & ‘Organisational Image’; Table 7.12 and Fig. 7.31]

• Senior management commitment to learning shapes organisational attitudes, particularly in the case where evaluation produces unfavourable findings.

“fair dues to the Chief Executive, saying we’ve got to do this properly, we need to learn from this.” –CS3PE

“you never know what is going to come out... I cant dictate what people are going to say, they might say what you don’t expect.” –CS4PM
The literature review found that the foremost frameworks for the evaluation of regeneration, ‘The Framework for the Evaluation of Regeneration Projects and Programmes’ (HM Treasury, 1995) and ‘The Green Book: Appraisal and Evaluation in Central Government’ (HM Treasury, 2003), are primarily based on Value for Money. Research carried out by the Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action (2001, p.12), which functions in a similar context to urban regeneration, provides an explanation for the prevalence of this focus on value for money, citing an increase in levels of competition for funds along with growing demands from funding organisations in terms of accountability and transparency as a prerequisite for continued support. However they go on to state that while “evaluation has emerged as a key tool for assessing how effectively resources have been used” it is equally essential in highlighting what lessons might be learnt.

Panel 8.16

Key Point: Commitment to learning (continued)
[see Table 7.5 and Figs. 7.19 & 7.20; Table 7.6 and Fig. 7.21; Table 7.12-‘Commitment’ & ‘Action on Findings’ and Fig. 7.31]

- While some amount of learning takes place as a result of all evaluation activity, only one organisation had an explicitly stated strand of evaluation activity focused on learning.

“What used to happen was that things got evaluated when they finished, and you tried to learn the lessons from what had happened.” –CS3CL

“It was more about ‘the how’, and ‘what can you learn from this?’.” –CS3PE

“We started off with 3 strands to it; 1. About learning and development,” –CS3PE

- Furthermore what learning that does take place focuses on internally developing the organisation, with the exception of the NDC programme which aims to share learning as part of its evaluation strategy. As such evaluation activity also seeks to inform learning within external organisations. In addition where evaluations are carried out externally at a national scale, the learning is disseminated nationally across all branches of the programme.

“We started focusing on ‘what were the lessons learnt?’ and how could other people use information from this?” –CS3PE

“There’s a lot of relevant knowledge, and experience, and Case studies, and information and learning that could inform…localism type work.” –CS3PE

“There are still things from that evaluation we will learn from about going forward” –CS2CL
This focus on value for money is reflected in the findings of the case studies which suggest that while some amount of learning takes place as a result of all evaluation activity, not enough emphasis is placed on learning as an explicit function of evaluation activity. Furthermore what learning that does take place focuses on internally developing the organisation, with little to suggest that evaluation activity seeks to inform learning within external organisations; except where evaluations are carried out externally at a national scale, and learning is disseminated nationally across all branches of the programme.

Evaluation Support Scotland’s (2012) case study on evaluation within ‘Heart’s and Mind’s’, an arts in healthcare charity, highlights the benefits of promoting learning from evaluation activity both internally and externally. They state that not only did the organisation adapt and improve processes based on findings, but promoting the external dissemination of findings raised the profile of the organisation, leading others to perceive it as more professional; which saw an increase in the organisation’s confidence in their work and practice. Promoting external learning can be challenging without support from senior management, and as the case study research reveals, particularly in instances where there are concerns about evaluations producing unfavourable findings. Indeed this has been raised by previous investigations into learning from evaluation within the regeneration sector (Sesnan, 2006), with the research revealing that not only was learning lost, but it was actively discouraged in some cases, and findings suppressed where results revealed shortcomings or inadequacies. This is an area of best practice from the technology sector highlighted within the literature review, as the sector demonstrates a willingness to learn from projects that have failed to meet their intended objectives (National Institute of Standards for Technology, 2005). Parallels can be drawn with research within the agricultural sector, as Horton and Mackay (2003, p.127 & 130) state that centres are operating in an increasingly dynamic environment, and as is the case in regeneration, there is pressure to enhance contributions to a wide range of outcomes such as “poverty alleviation, food security and protection of the environment as well as demonstrate the results of their work”. With learning from evaluation gaining prominence within the sector, they emphasise the need for a positive attitude towards learning, suggesting that “openness to admitting mistakes is crucial for learning to occur”.
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While organisational learning has been embraced by the private sector, with it being utilised as a tool to gain and sustain an edge over the competition (Senge, 1990; Porter, 1985; Prahalad and Hamel, 1990), the same level of interest is yet to be seen in the public and non-governmental sectors such as regeneration. Sesnan (2006) suggests that while learning from the evaluation of regeneration initiatives has developed, the majority of learning within evaluation takes place informally; leading him to raise questions about the nature of what is being learnt. Serrat’s (2009) discussion on the nature of learning within the nongovernmental sector, is considered from a regeneration perspective and forms the basis of table 8.1. The table explores key areas of learning highlighted by Serrat (2009) in the context of the typology of stakeholders discussed earlier in this study (see section 3.2.3). While the list presented in table 8.1 is extensive, it is not exhaustive as stakeholders may be interested in the application of a variety of aspects of evaluation findings.

There have been a number of different forays into what conditions create a conducive environment for organisational learning (Torres and Preskill, 2001; Orthner et al, 2006; Serrat, 2009; Jones and Mendizabal, 2010); and mirroring the themes of this study, some reoccurring themes include:

- Well developed evaluation strategy, which asks learning questions and strikes a balancing between the accountability and learning roles of evaluation
- Linking evaluation to organisational goals
- Well developed recommendations with actions attached to them
- Healthy evaluation culture directed at organisational learning, with tolerance of error value placed on innovation, and flexible organisational strategy to respond to lessons
- Providing time for reflective learning

That said, Jones and Mendizabal (2010) highlight the inadequacy of evaluation systems within the developmental sector to cope with the level of complexity that such multifaceted projects pose; thereby limiting the effectiveness and therefore the amount of learning taking place as a result of the evaluation. The Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action (2001) warn that unless the evaluation process recognises its role in relation to institutional learning, it will lose its status.
Table 8.1: Possible learning from Evaluation in Urban Regeneration (Adapted from: Serrat, 2009 p.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHO SHOULD BE LEARNING?</th>
<th>WHAT SHOULD THEY BE LEARNING?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRODUCERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Field Staff             | • Participation in practice (participatory methods of evaluation)  
                          | • Effective empowerment (staff and community)  
                          | • Collaboration with stakeholders  
                          | • Local context  
                          | • Unforeseen effects to be taken into account |
| Technical Specialists   | • Good practice in their area of expertise  
                          | • Ways of integrating with other disciplines  
                          | • How to improve cost-effectiveness  
                          | • How existing internal and external policies affect performance  
                          | • Unforeseen effects to be taken into account |
| Operational Managers    | • What factors make interventions and projects work well or badly, for example, funding conditions  
                          | • How to improve delivery  
                          | • How to coordinate internally and externally  
                          | • Consistency between mission, strategy, and impact  
                          | • Degree of stakeholder satisfaction  
                          | • Unforeseen effects to be taken into account  
                          | • How best to exert influence  
                          | • Local context |
| Strategic Leaders       | • How policy choices and strategies work out in practice  
                          | • What factors make interventions and projects work well or badly, for example, funding conditions  
                          | • How to improve delivery  
                          | • How to make external relationships more effective  
                          | • Unforeseen effects to be taken into account  
                          | • Degree of stakeholder satisfaction  
                          | • New messages to get across to private contributors |
| **USERS**               | • How best to exert influence  
                          | • Unforeseen effects to be taken into account  
                          | • Degree of stakeholder satisfaction  
                          | • Examples of impact (what has worked or failed) |
| **BROKERS**             | • Examples of impact (what has worked or failed)  
                          | • New messages to get across to private contributors  
                          | • Principles and insights to be used in negotiation with professional donors  
                          | • How best to exert influence  
                          | • How to make external relationships more effective |
8.2.3 Methods

8.2.3.1 Methods of Inquiry

The selection of a method of inquiry is predicated on the answers to questions raised within the evaluation strategy; ‘what are the aims and objectives of the project/programme?’, ‘what evidence needs to be collected?’, ‘what is the focus of the evaluation?’ and ‘when will the evaluation be taking place?’ (UCL, 2010).

Panel 8.17

Key Point: Questions asked within evaluation
[see Table 7.4-‘Research Questions’ and Fig. 7.8]

- Enquiry is mainly led by research questions such as:
  - What are goals?
  - What was achieved?
  - Who benefitted?
  - How was it achieved?
  - What unintended outcomes?
  - What were key successes?
  - What could be improved?

“just saying this is what you said initially, and in a structured way, what is it that you have achieved?” –CS3PE

“I started off with that, this is what the project said it was going to do, did it actually achieve that?” –CS3PE
According to the findings of the study, the primary mode of inquiry utilised is quantitative, however this is buttressed by qualitative modes. Both primary and secondary data is collected using a combination of quantitative methods such as questionnaires and surveys, as well as qualitative methods such as Interviews, focus group sessions and observation. Furthermore document review is carried out which generates both qualitative and quantitative data. The use of qualitative methods and data in the form of narrative serves to focus an element of the evaluation activity on relating the process of how outcomes are achieved, providing greater insight and depth (Milburn et al, 1995).

Panel 8.18

Key Point: Multiple methods of inquiry
[see Table 7.4-'Mode of Inquiry' & 'Data Collection’ and Figs. 7.7 – 7.9]

- Evaluation activity is conducted using a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods

“They designed and implemented some before and after questionnaires with the residents” –CS3PE

“I interviewed members of staff who had been involved, and people from other agencies who had been involved” –CS3PE

“It [evaluation] is quite quantitative” –CS1PE

“...interviewed the people, looked at some of the statistics, looking at some economic measures in terms of reduction in the cost of crime etc.” –CS3PE

“Satisfaction is a lead indicator but if we don’t have any qualitative stuff with it you can only tell if somebody is happy or unhappy” –CS4PE

“we’ve tried to tell stories instead, because if you give people technical evaluations to do, its very difficult.” –CS3PE

“it takes some interpretation, but it actually gives a much better representation of what they have done and what they have achieved.” –CS3PE

“What you find is usually, what is more important than the figure is the narrative that goes with it.” –CS1PM
Findings of the literature review indicate that where social policy is concerned, evaluators tend to employ a more eclectic set of methods, as is the case in urban regeneration (Lewis, 2001). While the purpose of an evaluation has a bearing on the selection of methods used in conducting the exercise, Green and South (2006, p.72) highlight other points of consideration including:

- The nature of the project
- Ethical considerations in relation to participants
- Practical and logistical issues
- The target population

The study finds that the target population of participants (Green and South, 2006) within the evaluation has particular influence on the forms of technology utilised in conducting evaluation activity. Furthermore, the stage of the evaluation process also has a bearing on technology used. Websites are used extensively as a means of collecting data as well as disseminating results. In addition online surveys as well as other web-based tools are used both to collect and monitor data. In order to access a wider range of participants, more innovative uses of technology in the form of social media sites, micro-sites and mobile phones are used to collect data as well as disseminate results.

Panel 8.19

**Key Point: Use of technology**

[see Table 7.4-‘Technology/Innovation’ and Fig. 7.12; Table 7.11-‘Avenues for Engagement’ and Fig. 7.29]

- Various forms of technology are incorporated into evaluation activity

“**all of our surveys are now developed in ‘Snap’ [software], and we can do online surveys**” –CS4PE

“**IT allows us to do surveys to mobile phones. We have discovered that 50% of our tenants don’t have access to the internet, but 95% have a mobile phone**” –CS4PE

“**There’s also the website, the annual events where all the stats are published.**” –CS3PM

“**the council have set up this programme around neighbourhood management cum neighbourhoods insight which is on the kind of intranet that we share. [It is] very much about showing in a very graphic way...each of the targeted neighbourhood renewal areas we were working in, how we were performing on each of those kind of indicators.**” –CS3PM
While methodological pluralism is encouraged (Baum, 1995; McDonald, 1996; Coombes, 2000), knowledge of the strengths and limitations of the different methods is required to make an informed decision (Scott, 1998). Furthermore, the evaluator needs to be able to strike a balance between achieving depth of inquiry in an evaluation exercise and breadth of scope of the evaluation. Patton (1990) goes on to stress that above all methodological appropriateness is the primary criterion in the selection of a mode of inquiry. Milburn et al. (1995) add that it is essential that the use of a selected method be justifiable; stating that the mixing of methods should either add depth, strengthen evidence or provide diversification of perspectives. This study adds triangulation of findings to that list, as a purpose of methodological pluralism. The literature review indicates different frameworks which seek to address different aspects of regeneration activity, such as Local Multipliers like LM3 to assess economic impact; Social Return On Investment and other forms of Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) to assess social impact and tools such as Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) to assess environmental impact (NEF Consulting, 2011; Cabinet Office of the Third Sector, 2009; BRE Global 2012). However the study reveals that their uptake in practice is not widespread, with a majority of evaluation activity utilising basic cost benefit analysis tools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel 8.20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Key Point: Use of evaluation tools**  
[see Table 7.4-'Tools' and Fig. 7.10]  
|  
| Uptake of broad range of evaluation tools is not wide spread with only one case study organisation demonstrating extensive use of a broad range of tools, and another organisation demonstrating limited use of different tools. Two case study organisations fail to demonstrate the use of any tools to assess their economic impact on the community.  

“Social accounting looks at the impact that a project or organisation is having, but also looks at the internal assurance processes in terms of how it is organised to deliver; so I used that as an approach to evaluation.” –CS3PE  

“[with] other dimensions like the new economics foundation’s work on the Local Economic Multiplier effect, we started to try to understand the way in which facilities were being managed” –CS3PE  

“we look at all these different methods because a single method is not the most effective way and we’ve got to communicate and get people involved” –CS4PE |
8.2.3.2 Indicators

Increasingly, urban regeneration is witnessing the use of key performance indicators as part of indicator based approaches to measuring and assessing achievement in the field (Audit Commission, 2002; Hemphill et al, 2004). Ruming (2006) states that the use of indicators plays a key role in assessing the performance and effectiveness of both individual agencies as well as combined interventions in regeneration. Citing Burke (2000), he argues that the emergence of the performance indicator birthed the dawn of a revolution in the management of service delivery.

It is necessary for indicators to reflect the outcomes and targets of the programme or project that serves as the subject of evaluation; and as discussed in previous sections, ensure that a clear link is maintained between wider aims and outcomes, specific objectives and targets, and the indicators which seek to reflect performance. A good indicator ought to be relevant, reliable, easy to understand and based on accessible data (Brandon and Lombardi, 2005). Citing Bell and Morse (2003), Langstraat (2010) outlines some key questions to be considered when selecting indicators for used as part of the development of the evaluation strategy; these are:

- What indicators should one select?
- Who selects them?
- Why are they selected?
- What are they meant to help achieve?
- What about balance between the various elements of Sustainable Development?
- How are the indicators to be measured?
- How are the indicators to be interpreted and by whom?
- How are the results to be communicated, to whom and for what purpose?
- How are the indicators to be used?

The study reveals that the indicators in use are linked to organisational strategies and as such borough wide strategies by proxy. While some are required by the council and are reflected in the former national indicator set (NIS), others are tied to EU level outputs as required by ERDF funded projects, as well as major targets and
milestones as set out within the organisational strategies. Furthermore with shared goals and priorities derived from partnerships documents (eg Local Area Agreements and Local Strategic Partnerships) organisations have strived to use common indicators to aid comparability.

Panel 8.21

Key Point: Linking indicators to organisational priorities
[see Table 7.3-‘Framework/Basis’ and Fig. 7.2; Table 7.4-‘Indicators’ and Fig. 7.13; Table 7.7 and Fig. 7.22]

- Indicators are linked to organisational priorities of as well as those of strategic partners; which are largely linked to funders’ priorities

“The criteria were set around the outcomes. Most of them were in the original delivery plan” – CS3PE

“The performance indicators are very straightforward really, based very much on what was required for ERDF” – CS4PM

“the main criteria are outcomes focused performance measures” – CS1CL

“Some of them [indicators] are required by the council and the wider partnership” – CS1SM

“There were 100 plus national indicators, so we used all of those. Though they might be taken away as measures nationally we would continue tracking them.” – CS1CL

“What we tried to do was choose performance measures that were consistent between partners so that we could measure and compare progress over time rather than each partner having their own set of measures.” – CS1CL

“we would try...looking at what others are measuring in similar sort of business, so there’s an ability to sort of benchmark and compare performance” – CS1CL

However as findings of the literature reveal, the extent to which the extensive lists of sustainability indicators developed over the years are reflected within practice is still relatively limited (Hemphill et al, 2004; OECD, 2000). Both the study and the literature indicate that funding body priorities greatly influence the indicators utilised by regeneration deliverers, as in most cases the provision of funding is tied to evaluation activity; therefore it becomes necessary for the organisations to reflect issues the funders deem relevant. The fact that these issues may not always be those that the wider community of stakeholders consider priority buttresses the case for increased stakeholder engagement throughout the evaluation process as discussed in section 8.2.4.
Indicators are required to reflect different aspects of regeneration activity as such encompassing environmental, economic as well as social measures. While the research revealed that at organisational level, the balance of indicators was weighted towards the individual organisational focus in terms of their approach to delivering regeneration (see figures 7.14-7.17), the overall picture showed a more balanced distribution of indicators in use (see figure 7.18).

Panel 8.22

Key Point: Indicators in use
[see Table 7.4-'Indicators' and Figs. 7.13 – 7.18]

- There is limited utilisation of existing sustainable development indicators within evaluation of regeneration
- The percentage distribution of indicators within the respective organisations reflects the focus of the organisation’s approach to regeneration delivery; i.e. Physical and Economic led such as the RDA, or community/socially lead such as the NDC.

“[indicators are] things around the value of private investment, public investment associated with the projects we develop. It can be the amount of floor space targets for development, hectares of land developed. It can be housing units, as part of our role has also been about enabling activity, acquiring land and securing developers for key housing sites in the borough as well” –CS1SM

“We have things like number of businesses attracted, jobs created, enquiries generated, how many marketing initiatives we have run with in the year etc.” –CS1PM

This is also reflected in findings of Hemphill et al’s (2004) investigation into the importance weighting of indicator sets within urban regeneration as shown in table 8.2. However the imbalance at organisational level raises the issue of a lack of emphasis placed on indicators reflecting elements other than the organisation’s key area of focus, thereby creating an underdeveloped and less holistic evaluation framework.
Table 8.2: Importance weighting of indicator sets (Source: Hemphill et al, 2004, p.732)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Weighting (percentage)</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economy and work</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource use</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings and land use</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and mobility</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community benefits</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the average number of regeneration related indicators monitored by the case study organisations is 85, this figure is skewed by the considerably larger number of indicators monitored by the NDC; which although very extensive contained duplication, something other organisations sought to avoid by utilising indicators already in existence such as those tied to funding providers.  Such integration of indicators (Bell and Morse, 2003) circumvents the needs to monitor an overwhelming number of indicators. This is something that is reflected by a recent shift towards a more streamlined approach to performance management and evaluation which has seen a fall in the number of indicators in use both at organisational and national level. As of 2011, all data as required by central government has been brought together under a ‘Single Data Set’ in a bid to reduce the burden of data collection at local level (CLG, 2012b). Data sets serve as a useful tool for developing indicators as they reduce duplication, and offer opportunities for benchmarking and comparison across organisations (Green and South, 2006).

Panel 8.23

Key Point: Indicators in use (continued)
[see Table 7.9-'Negative Perceptions'; Table 7.10-'Review of Evaluation Strategy'; Table 7.13-'Government Policy' & 'Regulatory Bodies']

- Attempts have been made by organisations to minimise the numbers of indicators in use by adopting those within existing indicator sets

“because a few of the centres were funded by ERDF we didn’t want to start creating new performance indicators for what we do with our customers” –CS4PM

“There is now a single data set which is much smaller in numbers but there are some national indicators that are prescribed and that we would use.” –CS1CL

“we have are a set of indicators which we have been whittling down slightly, because we almost had too many” –CS1PM
As discussed in section 8.2.2.2, the shift is perceived by some as apathy towards evaluation activity at national level. However this transitional period has served as an opportunity for organisations to review their indicators in use along with their wider evaluation strategies.

Despite the preoccupation with performance indicators, it is worth bearing in mind that they do not serve as a panacea and utilising too many can in fact be counter-productive as discussed earlier. Furthermore, the function of indicators (as the name suggests) is limited to indicating, thereby providing an indirect measure of a particular aspect of the project in order to allow for the deduction of a reasonable conclusion (Brandon and Lombardi, 2005). Green and South (2006) cite Bodart and Sapirie (1998, p.305) who state that “an indicator does not describe a situation in its entirety; it may only suggest what a situation is or give a clue to an unmeasurable phenomenon”; it is therefore important to acknowledge the limitations of indicators in use when reporting evaluation findings.
The issue of immeasurable phenomena emerges as one of the main challenges of evaluation within urban regeneration. The fact that regeneration activity encompasses more intangible aspects such as community development means that establishing indicators to measure them is difficult. Both the case study research as well as the literature review highlight the intangibility of some outcomes as an ongoing challenge (HM Treasury, 1995; Langer et al., 2003, Blastland, 2010). However as the literature reveals, efforts are being made to consider not just established measures of sustainability but also concepts such as value, utility, welfare and wellbeing and considers aspects such as life satisfaction (HM Treasury, 2003). In addition, it is possible to draw on social value outcome frameworks such as those set out by the National Account of Wellbeing (NEF, 2009) or the New Economics Foundation’s programmes on Local Wellbeing (NEF, 2008) and Social Value (NEF, 2012).

Panel 8.24

Key Point: Intangibility of some regeneration activity
[see Table 7.9-'Access to Data’ and Fig. 7.25]

- Outcomes of intangible aspects of regeneration activity prove difficult to capture

“it is harder to do because some of those outcomes are difficult to measure” –CS1CL

“This is one area where it has been a lot more difficult for us in regeneration than for some other parts of the organisation. If your making widgets, or counting tins of beans its relatively easy to evaluate how somebody has performed or whether you’re achieving your targets. I think this has been a real kind of thorny issue for us. We’re doing quite a lot about it, but not withstanding all that, it will probably continue to be an issue.” –CS4SM
Another challenge associated with data collection is the availability of data, either due to access or the cost of information such as MORI poll results. Furthermore as mentioned earlier, defining successes is also difficult within regeneration, as wider stakeholder expectations tend to be unrealistic.

Another challenge associated with data collection is the availability of data, either due to access or the cost of information such as MORI poll results. Furthermore as mentioned earlier, defining successes is also difficult within regeneration, as wider stakeholder expectations tend to be unrealistic.

In addition, the very nature of regeneration activity poses a challenge as set within a multidisciplinary context, attribution and determining causality poses a challenge. It is at times difficult to link actions to eventual outcomes or isolate contribution to observed impact on certain indicators.
The long term nature of regeneration projects means that managers are required to maintain performance on long term outcomes and aims, while demonstrating achievement of shorter term outputs and objectives (HM Treasury, 1995; Horton and Mackay, 2003; Langer et al, 2003, Blastland, 2010). Prior research as well as the document review found that the Bolton Vision Strategy document (2012) distinguishes between aims, priorities and targets. Furthermore the delivery plan distinguishes between ambitions and targets. This allows not only for monitoring in terms of tracking indicators, but evaluation in the form of reflection on performance against set targets. Moreover, distinguishing between short term targets and long term goals helps to address the challenge of managing and evidencing achievement against both short term and long term priorities.

In addition, the process of developing SMART objectives creates a forum for engaging in a dialogue in order to determine how the ‘success’ is defined. Purdie (2008) distinguishes between goals/aims and objectives stating that while the former are broad, general, long-term and at times cannot be measured directly, the latter are narrow, specific, short term and measurable. Reinforcing points raised in earlier sections, he goes on to state that objectives should map onto goals and contribute to the achievement of said goals as they are met. The challenge of balancing monitoring and evaluation activity is a reoccurring theme within the research as discussed in section 8.2.1; and as the literature review suggests, getting the balance right means that emphasis is placed not just on the direct result of an activity but its long term impact and effectiveness (Smith, 2004).

Panel 8.27

Key Point: Attribution
[see Table 7.9-'Attribution’ and Fig. 7.25]

- Links between cause and effect (whether positive or negative) are not always clear within regeneration

“what outcomes can you claim for our people and which really belong somewhere else? So that’s been a huge challenge.” – CS1SM

“[working in a multi-disciplinary/organisational team] … is the fact that educational attainment is getting worse… the fault of our neighbourhood management? If that gets worse to what extent are they responsible for that? To what extent can they contribute to that indicator?” – CS3PE
8.2.4 Engagement

The study reveals that organisations engage with a broad range of internal and external stakeholders within evaluation activity, with them participating to various degrees of involvement. The broadest range of participation takes place during data collection, with staff, external consultants, partner organisations such as charities and the local authority, as well as users in the form of community researchers engaged in order to collect data. The data is collected from an even broader range of stakeholders, from producers in the form of organisational and staff technical staff, to brokers such as community groups and partner organisations responsible for delivering services, and users such as residents, business owners etc.

Panel 8.28
Key Point: Stakeholder consultation
[see Table 7.4-Participants'; Table 7.11-'During Evaluation - Consultees' and Fig. 7.28]

- Broad range of stakeholders involved as consultees

“I interviewed members of staff who had been involved, and people from other agencies who had been involved.” –CS3PE

“We undertook focus groups with all the staff... We then talked to residents... Partners were split as at one end, you’ve got the lady who runs the yoga class through to the credit union and the community support police.” –CS4PE

An issue that the research highlights is the fact that due to the long term nature of some regeneration outcomes, there is a need to track the beneficiaries several years down the line; however engaging with participants in the long term in order to obtain longitudinal data continues to pose a challenge. Bynner (1996) cites attrition as the most serious problem faced when collecting longitudinal data, with participants being lost over time, either due to the fact that they had changed their names (eg. due to marriage), moved out of the sample area, or simply not interested in engaging with the study anymore. In addition, some participants move in and out of the study depending on availability when the exercise is being conducted. These are issues that are reflected within urban regeneration practice, and as the world becomes increasingly mobile attrition is more common place (Data Quality Campaign, 2007).
Following data collection, a review of the data is conducted primarily by members of staff; however some external stakeholders such as council staff and community members are engaged via the board as well as scrutiny and task groups. Engaging stakeholders in the review and interpretation of evaluation findings is increasing gaining popularity as it not only means that information reaches stakeholders who it might not otherwise have, but it improves the quality, relevance and uptake of evaluation findings (Brennan, 2012). While a broader group of stakeholders (particularly the ‘user’ group) are engaged extensively both as researchers and consultees during the data collection stage of the evaluation process, there is limited evidence of engagement with this group of stakeholders earlier on in the process, such as the development of evaluation strategy. Green and South (2006), cite

Panel 8.29

Key Point: Long term nature of outcomes
[see Table 7.9-‘Access to Data’, ‘Long Term Follow Up’ & ‘Engagement/Access to Consultees’ and Fig. 7.25]

• The fact that some outcomes only materialise several years down the line means that there is a need to track the beneficiaries. However obtaining longitudinal data is a challenge as engaging with participants long term continues to be a challenge.

some of them [outcomes] might be a long way off and therefore you need the output measures as well so you can track progress. –CS1CL

if we’re working with someone who is 5 or 10 years away from a job outcome, then it is kind of important for us to know that they’ve had some CV support, gone on this training course, benefitted from that interview etc. So I think we are inevitably going to need to keep needing do abit of both really. –CS1CL

“in regeneration terms, some of these things are a long time, getting to the outcome that you’re after really.” –CS1CL

“What we’re not always able to track are individuals.” –CS1CL

“there’s only so long that we would maintain a relationship with somebody to understand their individual circumstances.” –CS1CL

Following data collection, a review of the data is conducted primarily by members of staff; however some external stakeholders such as council staff and community members are engaged via the board as well as scrutiny and task groups. Engaging stakeholders in the review and interpretation of evaluation findings is increasing gaining popularity as it not only means that information reaches stakeholders who it might not otherwise have, but it improves the quality, relevance and uptake of evaluation findings (Brennan, 2012). While a broader group of stakeholders (particularly the ‘user’ group) are engaged extensively both as researchers and consultees during the data collection stage of the evaluation process, there is limited evidence of engagement with this group of stakeholders earlier on in the process, such as the development of evaluation strategy. Green and South (2006), cite
Philips et al (1994), Riley and Riley (1998) and Springett (1998) suggesting the inclusion of the community in a bottom up approach to evaluation activity. Here a broad range of stakeholders are involved in developing the evaluation strategy including aspects such as the selection of indicators, which increases the quality scope and depth of the evaluation findings (Preskill and Jones, 2009).

Panel 8.30

Key Point: Participants
[see Table 7.4-‘Participants’; Table 7.11-‘Evaluation Development and Design’, ‘During Evaluation – Researchers’ & ‘During Evaluation – Consultees’ and Figs. 7.27 & 7.28]

- While evaluations are mainly conducted by members of staff, in some cases there is evidence of wider stakeholder participation in delivery

“we get the community researchers in. Or we can pre plan so if we know there is going to be a project they will be booked ahead” – CS4PE

“Groundwork … designed and implemented some before and after questionnaires with the residents.” – CS3PE

“Evaluation from customers … tenants that have agreed to volunteer to have a walk round in communal areas etc and look at them and they have a pro-forma for appraising the status of that location” – CS4CL

The research indicates that a variety of avenues are adopted in order to engage with stakeholders throughout the different phases of the evaluation process, ranging from traditional paper surveys and scrutiny committees to informal door knocking exercises, as well as more innovative means such as organisational websites and social media, micro-sites, mobile telephones and community events.

Panel 8.31

Key Point: Modes of engagement
[see Table 7.4-‘Data Collection’ & ‘Technology/Innovation’ and Figs. 7.9 & 7.12; Table 7.11-‘Avenues for Engagement/Dissemination’ and Fig. 7.30]

- Various methods of engagement are adopted at different stages of the process

“people interact in different ways, but at the moment we still have the traditional paper surveys, we are also talking to people in a much more informal way” – CS4PM

“there will be an overview of scrutiny committee which will be where elected member scrutinise our performance. It’s a public committee so the public can engage with that.” – CS1CL

“we’re now planning an annual door knock” – CS4PE

“We have also developed a facebook page, twitter, and looking at how we can age with different people and different audiences via these mechanisms” – CS4PE

“There’s also the website, the annual events where all the stats are published.” – CS3PM
Findings of evaluation activity are disseminated using a variety of media including technical reports, less formal reports with graphic and colour coded confidence guides, presentations, organisational literature, and websites. Other initiatives such as The Eden Project (2012) have adopted innovative means of engaging with stakeholders such as themed drop-in community planning days, film-making workshops and fieldtrips; and while these may not have been for the purpose of evaluation activity there is scope for the incorporation of some of these methods within evaluation. Other creative methods of engagement such as design charrettes and kitchen table meetings are put forward by the Columbia Basin Trust (2011), who also encourage flexibility and innovation by suggesting projects bear in mind that they can make up their own means of engagement.

### Panel 8.32

**Key Point: Dissemination**

[see Table 7.8-'Reporting'; Table 7.11-'After Evaluation- Reporting/ Dissemination’ & ‘Avenues for Engagement/Dissemination’ and Figs. 7.29 & 7.30]

- Different modes and avenues are adopted for dissemination of evaluation findings

> "They operate sort of a green amber red traffic light system for reaching targets." – CS1PM

> "we have the smiley faces or frowning faces depending on how we think we’re doing” – CS1SM
Another issue arising where engagement is concerned is engaging with hard to reach groups (Torfaen County Borough, 2007). In some cases as revealed by the study, this may be due to busy schedules (particularly where senior members of staff are concerned), language and cultural barriers or a simple lack of interest. The effect is an impact on the robustness of the findings and at times, delays in conducting the evaluation activity. Engaging hard to reach groups remains a long standing challenge within urban regeneration (CLG, 2008b; Curwell, 2010; The Scottish Government, 2011), and extra measures ought to be taken to in order to obtain some level of engagement with such groups as this is necessary for the creation of a balanced picture (Torfaen County Borough, 2007) not only within the evaluation, but also in terms of wider regeneration activity. Preskill and Jones (2009), suggest that engagement benefits from the development of a strategy which considers not only the range and number of stakeholders that ought to be involved in a given exercise, but the amount of time required from them, geographic locations, existing relationships and power dynamics between stakeholders, their familiarity with the evaluation process and their skill levels as well as the budget required. Other important aspects to consider during engagement are the stakeholders’ motivations for participating, which could be due to a personal stake in the project, for professional development reasons, commitment to the goals of the project, or as a means of earning additional income. It is therefore useful to offer incentives to attend either in the form of compensation, providing skills training or simply creating inspired and fun events (Preskill and Jones, 2009; Columbia Basin Trust).
The research confirms that going forward organisations recognise that there is a need to explore means by which they can engage with more difficult to reach stakeholders, and develop means by which the wider community is engaged within the evaluation process. More bottom up approaches as suggested by Green and South (2006) earlier in this section not only seek to bring in stakeholders during the developmental stages of evaluation activity, but to maximise stakeholder involvement throughout the process. Citing evaluations carried out in the community health sector, they recommend the involvement of as broad a range of stakeholders as is feasibly possible, giving the ‘Learning Evaluation and Planning’ (LEAP) framework (The Scottish Government, 2007) as an example of that brings stakeholders together in order to develop a shared vision of change for the area, and can be used to set standards for initiatives that inform evaluation criteria. This engagement allows projects understand, improve and evaluate what is important to the community. That said, it is worth bearing in mind that a balance needs to be struck, as extensive participation of stakeholders who may lack sufficient skills in the technical aspects of evaluating activity runs the risk of compromising the rigour of the exercise (Pursley, 1996; Greene, 1997; House and Howe, 2000); another issue flagged up by the research. This trade-off between proper methodology and representative and robust results is an issue that brings to the fore the evolving role and skill-set of the evaluator; who will not only require the traditional research skills and technical knowledge required by evaluation activity, but a flexible, people centered approach to research as they act as liaisons facilitating interaction between different stakeholder groups while managing the evaluation process (Anyanwu, 1988; Nichols, 2002).

Panel 8.34

Key Point: Engaging the hard to reach (continued)
[see Table 7.10-'Stakeholder Engagement' and Fig. 7.26]

- Organisations acknowledge there is a need to engage hard to reach stakeholders as well as the wider community.

“As part of that [new] survey I want to put in questions about the external community” – CS2PM
Community based evaluation approaches such as deliberative democratic evaluation (House and Howe, 2000) which encourages the use of reflective dialogue among stakeholders in order to establish evaluation priorities, is rooted in the responsive evaluation traditions discussed earlier in section 8.2.1, which focus on the concerns of the stakeholders (Stake, 1975; Guba and Lincoln, 1981). Fetterman’s Empowerment Evaluation (1994) goes a step further actively advocating the role of evaluation in promoting the community’s voice. As Beywl and Potter (1998, p.59) highlight, stakeholder engagement helps to “win the stakeholders’ understanding of and commitment to the evaluation process”; a point reflected in findings of the literature review which cite best practice in the voluntary sector, referencing their approach to stakeholder engagement. This engagement aids not just the quality of evaluation practice, but the long term viability of projects within the sector (Pankaj et al, 2011; National Council for Voluntary Organisations, 2012). This is mirrored in the context of regeneration where stakeholder involvement aids the long term viability and sustainability of projects (LUDA, 2005).

In addition to the afore mentioned benefits of stakeholder involvement in evaluation activity, engagement not only promotes transparent practices, fosters relationships and collaborations, builds capacity of both staff and community alike, but it increases the likelihood that findings will be used for “learning, decision-making, and taking action” (Preskill and Jones, 2009, p.6 ); a key theme discussed in section 8.2.2.3.
8.2.5 Funding

Funding plays three main roles within evaluation activity with:

- Evaluations taking place to account for funds
- Evaluations as a prerequisite for receiving funding
- Funding required to support evaluation activity

While accountability to the wider community did not feature as prominently as a driver for evaluation activity, evidencing delivery with respect to outcomes in order to account for funding obtained from the government, the EU, partner organisations as well as other funding bodies emerged as the main incentive for carrying out evaluations.

Panel 8.35

Key Point: Accountability to funders
[see Table 7.5-'Accountability/Evidence’ and Fig. 7.19]

- Majority of evaluation activity undertaken in order to account for funding

“Whatever the funding stream was that dictated whatever evaluation took place” –CS4PM

“There have been different ways of measuring its [project’s] success and a lot of it has been down to the funding streams” –CS4PM

“we’re under so much scrutiny anyway on terms of providing value for money, monitoring, reports, outputs, justification for spend, procurement processes etc and at the end of it undertaking some kind of evaluation as a result of getting the funding” –CS2CL

This is supported by findings of the literature which reveal the central reason for carrying out evaluations is to justify the appropriation and renewal of funding as well as to provide an evidence base of the effective use of said funding (CLES, 2009). Given the current financial climate, more scrutiny than ever is being employed to ensure that public funds are being used judiciously and to maximum effect (Raphael, 2000). Historically, accountability for funding has played a major role in the development and mainstreaming of evaluation practice. During the 1960’s evaluation practice rose to prominence as activity was carried out to assess the
effectiveness of projects delivered under President Roosevelt’s Great Society programme; accounting for funding received and guiding the use of future funding (The Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action, 2001). Freeman and Solomon (1979) cite the ‘fiscal conservatism’ of the 1970s as responsible for an increased emphasis on expenditure within social programmes, reinforcing the role of evaluation in accounting for public funds.

In other cases funding acts as an incentive for evaluation activity with appraisals carried out as a prerequisite for funding being granted (Roberts and Sykes, 2000). This is a point emergent from the findings of the case studies, with projects required to either to conduct an appraisal at the beginning of the project, detail evaluation provisions in the initial project plan or present an evaluation report in order to have funding renewed.

On the other hand, findings of the literature review warn that having evaluation as a requirement of project funding increases the occurrence of ‘pseudo- evaluations’ such as ‘posturing’ where evaluations are carried out without any intentions of putting the findings to use (Lewis, 2001). Furthermore both the literature review and the case studies reveal that funding body priorities often influence project outcomes (National Audit Office, 2011), and in some cases dictates evaluation criteria.
Another crucial role of funding is supporting evaluation activity, as funding is necessary to undertake evaluation in the first place. Consideration has to be given to funding and resources with a budget for evaluation activity forming part of the wider project or programme budget (Roberts and Sykes, 2000; CLES, 2009). Despite evaluation being an essential part of programme activity, funding provision for evaluation still remains a challenge (US Department of Health and Human Services, 2012). This is reflected in the findings of the study, with the difficulty encountered funding evaluation activity emerging as one of the main challenges faced by organisations. Policy changes under the new government have created feelings of uncertainty where sourcing of funding is concerned; not only for evaluation activity but for project delivery as well. Despite more emphasis being placed on demonstrating value for money, there are less resources to support both regeneration delivery and its assessment. As Minnett (1999, p.354) points out reflecting on evaluation practice in the non-profit sector, despite organisations being under greater scrutiny in terms of accountability for funding and an increase in the importance of evaluation, lack of resourcing and support has seen the role of the evaluator assumed by practitioners, managers and “persons who often lack the requisite technical skills and methodological and analytical expertise, not to mention the interest in such matters”. The fact that interest is not matched by support is an issue that can only be addressed by commitment to evaluation activity as discussed in section 8.2.2.2.
Panel 8.38

Key Point: Funding evaluation activity
[see Table 7.9-'Resourcing'; Table 7.13-'Funding Structures']

- Availability of funds to support evaluation activity remain a concern

“RSLs are impacted very heavily by the ABG funding withdrawal, so the more that they can kind of have some sort of evidence base, the better for them in terms of how they sit” –CS4PM

“Unfortunately what happened was that the funding we had to do that was cut severely... we then found out we couldn’t fund that ongoing evaluation, so the evaluation that took place was in the last year of the programme because we had got some money by then.” –CS1CL

“...I think funding could be one thing that might impact it [evaluation activity]” –CS2CL

“Is it still the council or NEM's remit to continue to fund these [evaluation] activities?” –CS2CL
8.3 Synthesising the Themes: Evaluating Urban Regeneration using Objectives-Based EvaluAction

The ‘Objectives Based EvaluAction Framework’ is a conceptual framework for evaluation practice within urban regeneration. Its aim is to provide a conceptual scaffold to guide the development of evaluation practice within urban regeneration. The framework is developed based on five critical success factors that draw upon the learning emergent from the study. They are derived from the themes outlined in the preceding sections of this chapter. These critical success factors identified are:

- Organisational Culture and Commitment
- Clear Strategy
- Methodological Pluralism
- Communication and Stakeholder Involvement
- Action on Findings

These five elements constitute the building blocks of the framework, and are discussed below.

8.3.1 Organisational Culture and Commitment

Organisational culture is a key factor of successful evaluation practice [see section 8.2.2.2], and forms the basis of the model, on which all other elements are stacked. The cultivation of a healthy evaluation culture is crucial to ensure that evaluation is viewed as an ongoing process which is necessary not only to evidence activity and account for finances, but also to develop practice. Evaluation should be integrated into wider organisational activities and embedded within its structure and job roles. As evaluation should constitute a core organisational activity, it should be resourced as such. A dedicated budget should be set aside for evaluation activity, with adequately skilled staff in place to undertake evaluation activity. While external staff may be brought in to undertake evaluations, it is important for organisations to develop in-house staff capacity as this is serves a key function in ensuring the sustainability of evaluation practice within the organisation. Furthermore, it develops
staff understanding of evaluation practices, thereby increasing staff buy-in and organisation-wide commitment to evaluation. In addition, time for critical reflection needs to be considered and provided to allow for the proper development of findings and recommendations.

8.3.2 Clear Strategy

Defining a clear strategy is important both in terms of evaluation activity and the organisation as a whole [see sections 8.1.4, 8.2.1, 8.2.2 and 8.2.3]. Clearly defined organisational priorities are required to establish the basis of evaluation activity. It is therefore necessary to distinguish between long term goals/aims, and short term targets/objectives; with the latter well structured in a ‘SMART’ manner. Just as important as the organisational strategy is the evaluation strategy, which should clarify the aims and objectives of evaluation activity. The strategy should set out rationale (focusing not just on asking ‘what’ but asking ‘why’), approach, indicators, and methods. The evaluation strategy should clearly define the link between organisational priorities and indicators (see figure 8.1). The evaluation strategy should address the tension that exists between monitoring and evaluation, balancing the assessment of long term goals and short term objectives by incorporating monitoring activity into more robust evaluation activity. The strategies ought to be dynamic documents which undergo regular review; and while both strategies should provide a framework, they should also be flexible with the evaluation strategy allowing for the integration of different methods as appropriate, and the organisational strategy adapting based on feedback and learning.
8.3.3 Methodological Pluralism

Given the multifaceted and multidisciplinary context of urban regeneration, it is important to consider the use of a variety of methods during evaluation in order to tap into different aspects of a project or programme [8.1.4 and 8.3]. Evaluations should be flexible enough to allow for innovative use of both traditional and novel techniques, with the main criterion in terms of selection being whether or not the methods are fit for purpose. The adoption of techniques and methods from other disciplines should be encouraged, with the evaluation strategy drawing on a variety of different backgrounds and areas of practice.
8.3.4 Communication and Stakeholder Involvement

It is essential that engagement with stakeholders forms an ongoing part of the evaluation process [8.1.4 and 8.4]. Ensuring that the lines of communication are kept open between the organisation and its stakeholders (both internal and external) not only helps all parties understand the reasons behind an evaluation practice but can also go a long way to mitigate negative perceptions that often surround evaluation exercises. Clear communication and guidance on evaluation activity should be provided via the evaluation strategy. Involving stakeholders during all the phases of the evaluation process, from development through to review and dissemination of findings can improve the quality, relevance and uptake of evaluation findings. Furthermore this involvement means that information reaches stakeholders that it otherwise may not have. That said, it is important to remember that a balance needs to be struck between widening participation and maintaining research standards.

8.3.5 Action on Findings

“Do not consider an evaluation exercise to be complete when the report is submitted, but only when its findings have been used” (Horton and Mackay, 2003). With learning forming a fundamental function of evaluation activity, actions taken on findings are the most important part of the evaluation process [4.1.4, 8.1.4 and 8.2.3]. For evaluation to have true value it is essential for it to serve some formative purpose, contributing to learning within or outside an organisation. In addition employing key lessons from projects deemed unsuccessful should be encouraged. This requires a positive attitude towards learning; a willingness to admit to mistakes in order to learn from them. Furthermore, organisations should actively foster the use of evaluation findings by:

a) Identifying potential applications for findings, as well as highlighting their value to different stakeholders
b) Improving the structure of recommendations; ensuring they are well developed and have actions attached to them.
As depicted in figure 8.2, findings should inform the review of the organisational strategy, and in so doing, its goals and objectives. In other words the evaluation process should form part of an action learning cycle, where findings are fed forward into the development of organisational priorities.

While organisational culture and commitment form the foundation of the framework (see figure 8.3); learning from evaluation and action on findings constitute the central focus of the objectives based evaluation concept (see figure 8.4). The framework emphasises the utilisation of evaluations within organisations as a means not just of taking stock and accounting for funding but for the improvement of practice.
Fig. 8.3: The Objectives-based EvaluAction Model
Fig. 8.4: Key themes within the Objectives-based Evaluation Framework with learning as the focus
8.4 Summary

The discussion around the five themes revealed that despite the fact that an evaluation strategy is key to conducting an effective evaluation, strategies remain underdeveloped within urban regeneration. Evaluation within urban regeneration requires the adoption of a multi-method approach, and methods ought to be selected based on their appropriateness for the task at hand. Organisational culture features as one of the most crucial factors that influence evaluation practice, as attitudes dictate the organisation's approach to evaluation activity and learning. Furthermore, the clarity of organisational objectives impacts directly on the effectiveness of evaluation, as criteria ought to be based on organisational priorities. While a broad range of stakeholders are engaged during the evaluation process, majority of stakeholders are only involved as consultees. Increased involvement of stakeholders during other stages of the evaluation process yields more effective results. Funding undertakes three main roles within evaluation, as funding is required to support evaluation activity, but evaluations also take place in order to obtain funds, or to account for funds.

The synthesis of the emergent themes form the objectives-based evaluation framework which is based on five critical success factors being:

- Organisational Culture and Commitment
- Clear Strategy
- Methodological Pluralism
- Communication and Stakeholder Involvement
- Action on Findings

While the framework emphasises a clear evaluation strategy to link organisational objectives to evaluation activity, the main focus of the concept is learning and action on evaluation findings.
CHAPTER 9

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

“One of the more enduring clichés of modern management is that "if you can't measure it, you can't manage it." If we believe that ethical business practices and social responsibility are important functions of corporate governance and management, then we should welcome attempts to develop tools that make more transparent to managers, shareholders, and other stakeholders just how well a firm is doing in this regard.”

- Wayne Norman & Chris McDonald (2004)
This chapter reviews the goals of the research set out in chapter one of this study; answering the research questions and in so doing, drawing conclusions against each of the stated objectives. Furthermore, the chapter reviews the limitations of the research, examining possible areas for improvement. Finally, the chapter presents recommendations for research as well as practice based on the findings of the study.

### 9.1 Research Goals

#### 9.1.1 Aim

The aim of this study is to undertake a critical examination of evaluation and impact assessment methods of regeneration delivery mechanisms, in order to explore improvements to current practice such as better utilisation of indicators and stakeholder involvement in evaluations.

#### 9.1.2 Objectives

The study seeks to achieve this aim by deconstructing it into five objectives, two of which have been broken down into sub-objectives in aid of further clarification.

The objectives of the study are as follows:

1. Critically examine and analyse the terms ‘Regeneration’ and ‘Sustainable Development’ in the context of the various stakeholders.

   **Sub-Objectives:**
   
   - Establish and define the various stakeholders involved in the regeneration process
   - Examine the roles of the various stakeholders in the regeneration process
2. Critically examine the different strategic approaches to regeneration delivery in the context of their role in achieving sustainable development

3. Evaluate the methods by which the delivery of regeneration is currently measured

   **Sub-Objective:**

   - Identify criteria used in assessing regeneration and sustainable development
   - Analyse the evaluation process for regeneration delivery mechanisms

4. Explore best practice in impact assessment and evaluation within other sectors

5. Investigate and recommend improvements to existing evaluation methods
9.2 Conclusions against Objective 1

**Objective 1: Critically examine and analyse the terms ‘Regeneration’ and ‘Sustainable Development’ in the context of the various stakeholders.**

**Sub-Objectives:**
- Establish and define the various stakeholders involved in the regeneration process
- Examine the roles of the various stakeholders in the regeneration process

**Research Question 1**

*What are ‘Regeneration’ and ‘Sustainable Development’?*

Regeneration refers to the process of renewal and re-growth. Within the urban context, regeneration refers to the activities associated with the reversal of the physical, social and economic decline faced within an area. Sustainable development is a compound term that ought to be considered as such; reflecting on its component elements. The accepted definition offered by The World Commission on Environment and Development (1987 p.43), “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” is recursive as it self-references the term ‘development’. Sustainability is defined as the ability for a given state to be maintained over an extended period of time. Sustainability is about equilibrium between the economic, environmental and social elements set within a temporal and spatial context; it explores the dynamic of an activity around these elements within a space over a period of time. Development essentially refers to a state of advancement or progression, and is applicable to a variety of disciplines from healthcare and education to construction and economics. Bringing these two concepts together and considering the term sustainable development from the point of view of its practical application, sustainable development can be considered as physical, economic or social progression within a spatial boundary maintained over an extended period of time.
A stakeholder refers to any individual with a vested interest in a particular activity; in this case, urban regeneration. Here, the term applies to the key actors within urban regeneration who are affected by, or can influence the process; this includes funders, delivery agencies and professionals, policy makers, non-governmental organisations, developers and community members. Though interests and levels of involvement differ, all stakeholders play a part in the development of an area (See table 3.2). This study classes stakeholders as:

- Producers: responsible for developing, creating funding or delivering the regeneration project such as the funders, built environment professionals, the local authority and the regeneration delivery mechanisms.

- Users: who are the ‘consumers’ or beneficiaries of urban regeneration, such as local residents, local businesses, and non-resident users (e.g. commuters). This class includes the ‘non-user’ users who are stakeholders in surrounding communities affected (either positively or adversely) by the project, despite not using the facilities or services provided as a result of the regeneration.

- Brokers: who act as intermediaries and facilitators such as community groups, charities, pressure groups, aid organisations, non-governmental organisations and service providers. While brokers tend to advocate for a particular agenda, they can be invited into the frame by either producers (e.g. debt advice providers) or users (e.g. the ramblers association).

While this typology refers to the primary functions of the various stakeholders, it is important to note that these roles are fluid and often overlap depending on circumstances, as it is possible to have stakeholders that fall into more than one class. The concept of power and influence between stakeholders is dynamic and evolving. While majority of the power tends to lie with the producers as they control key assets and have the ability to effect change within the project as well as take strategic decisions, users can exert a considerable amount of influence on producers to sway their decision making. Furthermore, with the advent of social media, new
planning policy and shifting social values, some stakeholders with less power have been able to wield a considerable amount of influence and effect real change in the communities around them.

These issues highlight the need for the inclusion of a wider range of stakeholders (particularly the users) within the evaluation process in order to develop evaluation capacity within the community as the evolving dynamic following the introduction of the Localism Act will see communities play a more active role in regeneration. In addition, with the neighbourhood community budget pilot programme set to see the first set of budgets delivered in the 2013/14 financial year (Local Government Association, 2013a), the funding and crucially the accountability will lie in the hands of the community. It is therefore vital that they possess adequate skills to conduct effective evaluations of the work that is being undertaken via the programme.
9.3 Conclusions against Objective 2

Objective 2: To critically examine the different strategic approaches to regeneration delivery in the context of their role in achieving sustainable development

Research Question 2

How is Regeneration and Sustainable Development delivered in England?

Modern urban regeneration in England is rooted in 1970s planning policy which was aimed at the redevelopment of inner city areas facing decline. The movement dates back to the late 1800 slum clearance programmes across the country, which sought to improve the standards of living in these areas of severe deprivation. In the decades since, the various strategic approaches to regeneration delivery have evolved (see table 3.3). While the primary focus of earlier approaches was on the physical and environmental aspects of regeneration, emphasis has since shifted through social and economic aspects to a combination of all three in an attempt to achieve sustainable urban development. The main strategic approaches examined by this study are identified below:

- Reconstruction (1945-1950s): Here the main focus is on the physical and environmental aspects of development; building and reconstructing of older areas of towns and cities.

- Revitalisation (1960s): As an extension of the previous Reconstruction strategy, emphasis still lies on physical/environmental development with development activity expanding from towns and cities into suburban areas.

- Renewal (1970s): Under this strategy, focus extends from simply the physical/environmental to include social aspects as well, as neighbourhood renewal incorporates elements of community development within its environmental improvements.
• Redevelopment (1980s): Here, the main foci are physical/environmental and economic development, with major flagship projects and financial incentives at the heart of policy to encourage development activity.

• Regeneration (1990s -2000s): This strategy adopts a more holistic approach to development with emphasis on integrating strategies which consider physical/environmental, economic and social aspects simultaneously.

• Regrowth (2010s – present): While this strategy maintains a holistic approach to regeneration activity, there is greater emphasis placed on the economic aspects of development.

It has only been in the last three decades that real attempts have been made to reflect a more sustainable approach to regeneration delivery which sees a balance between the different dimensions of sustainable development. However the combination of the global financial crisis and the ascension into power of a part conservative government has seen a slight shift of this equilibrium with greater emphasis being placed on the economic aspects of regeneration. Private sector led Local Enterprise Partnerships, social enterprise and community action are seen as central to the delivery of regeneration in this new context.

The introduction of policies such as the ‘Big Society’ seeks to promote a shift in culture “from government action to local action” (Cabinet Office, 2013, p.1). Furthermore legislation like the National Planning Policy Framework, and the Localism bill (with the community rights to challenge, bid and build that go along with it) not only make it easier for communities to challenge developments in their area, but also to bid for assets, and deliver projects of their own (CLG, 2012a; Local Government Association, 2013b; Locality, 2013). Regeneration delivery is set to become more about tapping into social capital; placing not just more power to make decisions with the local communities, but also responsibility for delivery as regeneration practitioners take on a more facilitatory role within the process. While
government states that it is providing support in the form of resources and training to members of the community and the voluntary sector in order to put them in a position to play an active role in this new form of regeneration (Cabinet Office, 2013), questions still remain about the capacity of the community to fully engage with these policies; not least of all in consideration of the fact as discussed within this study, that regeneration areas often suffer from a low level of skills to begin with. A key part of the future of regeneration delivery will be about setting the right conditions for the community to take the lead on local projects; equipping them with the skills required to deliver those projects, and evaluate them as part of the process. Tools such as the Design Council’s new Building for Life 12 standard which is based on the National Planning Policy Framework (Design Council, 2012) will be useful for stakeholders, as it lends some structure to the process for those involved in delivering and evaluating local developments.
9.4 Conclusions against Objective 3

Objective 3: Evaluate the methods by which the delivery of regeneration is currently measured

Sub-Objective:
- Identify criteria used in assessing regeneration and sustainable development
- Analyse the evaluation process for regeneration delivery mechanisms

Research Question 3

How is Regeneration and Sustainable Development delivery assessed in England?

Both the literature review and case study portions of the research conclude that the main criteria for assessing sustainable development are structured around the dimensions of sustainability; environmental, social and economic. The United Nation’s list of sustainable development indicators aims to provide a basis for decision making on issues relating to the matter, by translating accumulated knowledge in the field into manageable units. Following this publication, other organisations such as the Department for Sustainable Development and the European Commission have compiled indicators of sustainable development (see section 4.2.1). Different indicators are utilised within several tools in order to assess sustainable development. While tools often address a single dimension, integrated assessment method toolkits aim to bring together a broad set of methods from different disciplines, in order to determine a preferred course of action based on a multiple indicators in a logical framework with various assessment methods that will provide the evidence to support better decision making.

However the research concludes that indicators utilised within urban regeneration are heavily influenced by funding, and despite the extensive list of sustainability indicators developed over the years, the extent to which they are reflected within most urban regeneration evaluation frameworks has until recently remained limited, with a majority of the indicators in use tied to funding body priorities. Given the
changing context of evaluation under the Coalition Government as discussed in the conclusions against objective two [see section 9.3], the nature of regeneration funding is set to change dramatically with fewer grants and increased emphasis on social entrepreneurialism. With bodies such as the Big Society Bank, the Social Impact Business Group (SIB) and other social investors emerging as key sources of funding (Third Sector Online, 2012; Localist, 2013; SIB, 2013), presenting a good business case (and as such a good evaluation strategy as part of that) will become vital in order to secure project funding.

Until 2011, the National Indicator Set provided a list of indicators for monitoring local level service delivery. Despite its abolishment by the new government the indicators are still in use by regeneration delivery mechanisms. The balance of indicators reflecting the different aspects of regeneration activity is weighted towards different dimensions of sustainable development dependent on the specific approaches to regeneration delivery, which results in a less holistic approach to evaluating regeneration activity. This was reflected in the findings of the case studies with a deficit in the consideration of environmental indicators of sustainability, due the primary foci of the organisations’ activities on more socio-economic issues. This strengthens the case for organisations to take a triple bottom line approach towards assessment activity, in order to ensure a holistic view is taken to evaluation, and a comprehensive selection of indicators which are representative of all dimensions of sustainability is utilised. The issues of indicators particularly for intangible aspects of regeneration remains a challenge, however efforts are being made to consider measures for concepts such as value, utility, welfare, wellbeing and life satisfaction.

The research concludes that the evaluation of urban regeneration primarily seeks to evidence activity in a bid to account for funding; as a result methods focus on cost benefit analysis and centre on value for money and gross value added. Recently other methods such as LM3, environmental impact assessments, and social accounting/ return on investment have been adopted in a bid to create a more holistic picture of the regeneration activities of deliverers. Given the diversity of
activities that are involved within urban regeneration, evaluators often adopt a mix of both quantitative and qualitative methods predominantly surveys and questionnaires. While regeneration organisations engage with a wide range of internal and external stakeholders to varying degrees of involvement within evaluation activity, there is limited evidence of engagement with a wider group of stakeholders during the development of the evaluation strategy. Furthermore, engaging with participants long term in order to obtain longitudinal data proves challenging, primarily due to attrition. Another the key challenge of evaluation within urban regeneration is attribution, and determining causality of recorded effects (positive and negative) as a result of the broad range of activities and disciplinary cross-over involved in regeneration delivery.

Based on other challenges identified by the research, the study concludes that:

- The nature of regeneration requires a balance to be struck between the evaluation of long term goals while monitoring short term objectives.
- Due to increasing stakeholder involvement in evaluation, evaluators require new skills to enable them carry out technically sound evaluations but also be flexible enough to adopt a people cantered research approach while facilitating interaction between different stakeholder groups.
- A balance needs to be struck between widening participation and maintaining research standards; as extensive participation of stakeholders who may lack sufficient skills in the technical aspects of evaluation activity runs the risk of compromising the rigour of the exercise.
- Despite more emphasis being placed on demonstrating value for money, interest is not matched by support as there are fewer resources available to support evaluation activity.
- Policy changes under the new government have created feelings of uncertainty, particularly where sourcing of funding is concerned; not only for evaluation activity but for project delivery as well.
- The main criticism of evaluation practice in the sector is the lack of utilisation of evaluation for formative purposes; limited learning takes place from evaluation activity as most evaluations are geared towards accountability. This is exacerbated by underdeveloped evaluation strategies at organisational level. Clear evaluation strategies would aid in setting out the purpose of evaluation activity creating an opportunity to encourage the utilisation of findings.
9.5 Conclusions against Objective 4

Objective 4: Explore best practice in impact assessment and evaluation within other sectors

Research Question 4

What improvements/ best practice can be identified from evaluation in other related sectors?

The key areas of best practice identified within evaluation from other industries are:

- Focus on outcomes
- Use of multiple methods
- Engagement with stakeholders
- Viewing evaluation as a core organisational activity
- Willingness to evaluate projects deemed unsuccessful

From the social sector, the study highlights the focus on outcomes of evaluation activity which in the context of the regeneration sector means that emphasis is placed not just on the direct results of an intervention but its long term impact and effectiveness. Furthermore, utilisation of multiple methods of assessment means that evaluators can combine both performance management and impact assessment techniques that adopt both qualitative and quantitative methods, thereby striking a balance between monitoring and evaluation activities. The mixing of both qualitative and quantitative methods as well as formative and summative assessment methods is particularly suited to the multidisciplinary context of regeneration; allowing for organisations to focus not just on their outcomes as delivered to stakeholders, but also their practice and processes. This is particularly relevant as case study findings suggest that while some element of qualitative assessment is undertaken by regeneration organisations, evaluation activity remains predominantly quantitative.

Engagement with stakeholders is an area of best practice identified from the voluntary sector. The involvement of stakeholders throughout the evaluation process, particularly in the development and execution of evaluation activity has
resulted in the production of more robust, representative, and better quality reports. Stakeholders are able to bring local knowledge into the evaluation process, producing findings which are more comprehensive and relevant. In addition, the higher levels of engagement encourage stakeholder buy-in and support, not just where evaluation activity is concerned but also in terms of the organisation’s other activities. This support from stakeholders is vital in ensuring the sustainability and long term viability of the organisation’s activities. The case studies revealed that organisations such as the CHALK NDC have gone some way to demonstrate this element of good practice with extensive stakeholder engagement and participation embedded into the structure of the organisation.

Finally the study highlights learning from evaluation in the technology sector, citing their commitment to evaluation, viewing it as a core organisational activity and resourcing it as such. Evaluation is built into wider organisational activities, and is adequately provided for in terms of funding, staffing and time. Furthermore, there is a willingness to learn from evaluation within the sector as reflected by the consideration of projects which have failed to meet their stated objectives. This emphasis on learning is a crucial area of good practice for regeneration, as the study reveals that evaluation within the sector is mainly driven by accountability for funding, with only one case study organisation clearly stating the role of evaluation in organisational learning. In addition, the case studies reveal that since funding is so strongly linked to evaluation and project performance, there is concern among practitioners about unfavourable findings resulting from evaluation activity; thus a fundamental shift in attitudes towards ‘failed projects’ is vital.
9.6 Conclusions against Objective 5

Objective 5: Investigate and recommend improvements to existing evaluation methods

Based on the conclusions drawn against objectives 3 and 4 above, the study concludes that there are five critical success factors for evaluation practice within urban regeneration. These are:

- **Organisational Culture and Commitment**: Evaluation should constitute a core organisational activity; something that should be reflected in its resourcing, ensuring there is adequate provision for evaluation exercises.

- **Clear Strategy**: Having a clear understanding why the evaluation is taking place, and clearly defining elements such as objectives and criteria.

- **Methodological Pluralism**: A multifaceted and multidisciplinary field like urban regeneration requires methodological pluralism within its evaluation processes in order to tap into different aspects of a project or programme. Evaluations should be flexible enough to allow for innovative use of both traditional and novel techniques.

- **Communication and Stakeholder Involvement**: It is important to maintain clear lines of communication with all stakeholders, working collaboratively with them throughout the evaluation process. In this context, the term stakeholder as defined by the study refers to all key actors within urban regeneration who are affected by, or can influence the process (including producers, users, and brokers).

- **Action on Findings**: Just as important as the evaluation itself is the response to the findings and the learning taken from the process. Evaluations should drive organisational improvement, and regeneration organisations should seek to ensure that evaluation findings are fed forward to inform future activities.
These success factors form the basis of the ‘Objectives based EvaluAction’ framework detailed in section 8.3. The framework focuses on the incorporation of each of the above success factors into the evaluation process. The emphasis is on the utility of evaluation activity, with learning at the heart of the concept. Built on a foundation of a healthy evaluation culture and guided by a clear strategy, evaluation activity based on the framework seeks to monitor performance and assess impact, while endeavouring to maximise stakeholder involvement.
9.7 Original Contribution to Knowledge

Philips and Pugh (2000) as well as Cryer (2006) set out a number of measures in order to determine the originality of a study [see section 1.2.3]. These definitions of originality form the basis upon which this section outlines the original contributions to knowledge of the research undertaken; these are:

- A critical review of regeneration and sustainable development delivery in the North West of England [see section 3.3, chapter 5 and chapter 6]. A review of existing literature as well as insights derived from in-depth case studies, add to the existing body of knowledge available in the field to both practitioners and researchers alike.

- The development of a new typology of stakeholders within the urban regeneration process [see section 3.2.3].

- A critical review of criteria used in assessing regeneration and sustainable development, providing relevant and novel information on their use in practice [see section 4.2 and chapters 5-8]. This has informed reports (Akinsete and Nelson, 2012a; 2012b), and will inform papers developed for publication based on the study.

- A critical analysis of the techniques adopted in the assessment of regeneration and sustainable development [see section 4.2 and chapters 5-8]. This has informed organisational reports (Akinsete and Nelson, 2012a; 2012b), and will inform papers developed for publication based on the study.

- The identification of good practice in evaluation from other sectors and relating it to the context of urban regeneration in a way that it has not been done previously [see section 4.2.3 and chapter 8]. This has informed organisational reports (Akinsete and Nelson, 2012a; 2012b) and will inform papers developed for publication based on the study. The dissemination of
which will benefit not only cross disciplinary evaluation research but regeneration practice.

- The development of improvements to existing methods evaluating regeneration delivery, working with case study organisations to improve their own practices (Akinsete and Nelson, 2012a; 2012b) [see chapters 5 and 6; appendix 9D].

- The development of the Objectives based EvaluAction Framework for regeneration evaluation [see section 8.3]. Based on the synthesis of findings from the literature review as well as the primary research; the framework addresses gaps and best practice while bringing to bear traditional evaluation theory on evaluation practice within the sector [see chapter 8].

- The development of ‘paradigm clusters’ as a means of navigating the field of research methodology [see section 2.1.1]

- The utilisation of a novel blend of research approaches and methods as described in chapter 2, thereby making an original contribution to the body of knowledge within mixed methods research. This has formed the basis of a paper on research methodology (Akinsete and Nelson, 2012c).
9.8 Limitations of the Study

9.8.1 Methodological Limitations

The two noteworthy limitations of the research resulting from the methodology are:

- The use of self reported data; meaning primary data collected from interviews is limited by memory of the participants, exaggeration and individual bias (University of Southern California, 2012). This is mitigated within the research by utilising data source triangulation (Patton, 1999) in the form of cross referencing with secondary data as well as selective sampling of credible participants [see section 2.3.1].

- Issues to do with generalisability of findings as a result of the adoption of a case study strategy. This issue is examined in section 2.3.1 of the thesis. In addition table 9.1 below addresses some misconceptions relating to the use off case studies within research.

Table 9.1: Misconceptions about the use of case studies (Source: Merriam, 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MISCONCEPTION</th>
<th>RESTATEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General knowledge is more valuable than context-specific knowledge</td>
<td>Universals can't be found in the study of human affairs. Context-dependent knowledge is more valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One can't generalize from a single case so a single case doesn't add to scientific development</td>
<td>Formal generalization is overvalued as a source of scientific development; the force of a single example is underestimated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The case study is most useful in the first phase of a research process; used for generating hypotheses.</td>
<td>The case study is useful for both generating and testing of hypotheses but is not limited to these activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The case study confirms the researcher's preconceived notions.</td>
<td>There is no greater bias in case study toward confirming preconceived notions than in other forms of research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is difficult to summarize case studies into general propositions and theories</td>
<td>Difficulty in summarizing case studies is due to properties of the reality studied, not the research method.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.8.2 Limitations of the Researcher

- Longitudinal effects: due to the limited amount of time the researcher has been allocated to conduct the study (Fenton and Mazulewicz, 2008), it has not been possible to pursue more long term studies and further action cycles.

- Access to participants: was at times limited due to their availability, or scheduling conflicts. This impacted on the timescales for conducting the data collection.

- Bias: is always an issue to a certain extent within any form of research. While the researcher strives to maintain an objective standpoint, given the involved nature of this action oriented study it is important to acknowledge issues to do with subjectivity and perspective, as well as the role the reflexivity of the researcher plays in addressing this within the research process [See epilogue].
9.9 Recommendations

9.9.1 Recommendations for Practice

Recommendations for practice outlined within this section are presented under the headings of the main stakeholders identified by the research, and guided by the five key success factors highlighted within the Objectives based EvaluAction Framework. It also makes recommendations for researchers in the field of urban regeneration evaluation.

9.9.1.1 Producers

Producers such as the urban regeneration delivery vehicles, and local authorities should:

- Foster a healthy evaluation culture by creating an environment where evaluation is seen as a core activity; with organisational commitment bolstered by providing adequate resourcing, both in terms of funding and time (which is crucial for critical reflection). As such, a dedicated budget should be set aside for evaluation activity, as well as time for critical reflection to allow for the proper development of findings and recommendations.

- Provide adequate guidance and support for workers, as well as training and capacity development where necessary; particularly as possession of in-house skills is likely to become increasingly crucial as less funding is available for the commissioning of external consultants. The development of in-house staff capacity serves to ensure the sustainability of evaluation practice within the organisation. Furthermore, improving staff understanding of evaluation practice increases staff buy-in and organisation-wide commitment to evaluation.

- Embed evaluation within organisational life-cycle processes, ensuring that it is integrated into wider organisational activity. The adoption of a triple bottom line
corporate accounting framework will ensure a more cohesive approach to evaluation across all strands of regeneration activity. It will see organisations report performance against social and environmental targets alongside financial ones, thereby providing a more rounded view of achievement as well as fulfilment of obligations to all stakeholders including customers, employees, suppliers and the wider community (Norman and McDonald, 2004).

- Seek to clarify their evaluation strategies. This will not only ensure that the rationale for evaluation activity is clearly stated, but it will help to ensure that appropriate indicators are utilised during the process. Furthermore, the process of defining these strategies will provide a forum for the review of organisational objectives in a bid to ensure they are not only well structured, but are representative of the organisations activities in the wider context of sustainability.

- Distinguish between long term goals/aims, and short term targets/objectives; ensuring they are clearly set out, with objectives designed in a ‘SMART’ structure. Well structured objectives are crucial as they play a vital role in developing the strategy for the subsequent evaluation (Hemphill et al, 2004; Research Council, 2011), by answering the question ‘what have we set out to do?’. As such getting the organisational objectives right forms a solid basis from which to develop performance indicators and in turn a robust evaluation framework.

- Ensure that indicators reflect project and organisational targets rather than funders’ priorities. A clear evaluation strategy will maintain a link between wider aims and outcomes, specific objectives and targets, and the indicators which seek to reflect performance. There is an extensive list of exiting indicators provided by organisations such as the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (2012) to reflect different aspects of sustainability at varying levels; and with indicators tied to well developed objectives, a balanced view of sustainability will be considered during evaluation.
• Encourage the use of a combination of methods to assess the impacts of a full array of regeneration activities, therefore allowing for flexibility and innovation in order to utilise the most appropriate techniques for the particular task.

• Seek to integrate these various methods within exploring a triple bottom line framework as mentioned earlier. This serves as a sturdy base for accountability; utilising tools such as environmental impact assessments like BREEAM, LEED and SHIFT, as well as social impact assessment tools like Social Accounting and Auditing, AA1000s, and Social Return on Investment (SROI), in addition to traditional financial assessments and economic impact tools like LM3.

• Increase stakeholder involvement not just in the delivery of regeneration but throughout the evaluation process; particularly in the development of the evaluation strategy. Structures such as the ‘Learning Evaluation and Planning’ (LEAP) framework (The Scottish Government, 2007) provide models for stakeholder participation with specific emphasis on participation within evaluation design.

• Should endeavour to reach out to local community groups and third sector partners, in order to tap into their networks and knowledge. In light of new legislation such as the localism bill, the evolving landscape of regeneration delivery is set to see regeneration organisations and professionals play a more facilitatory role in the process; with the actual delivery left to community structures. As such, building community capacity not just in terms of delivering regeneration but its evaluation is essential.

• Foster a positive attitude towards learning and demonstrate a willingness to admit to mistakes in order to learn from them.
• Ensure that learning from evaluation activity (whether findings are positive or negative) serves as the focus of the assessment, thereby informing development and improvement. This will help to progress evaluation activity from merely monitoring to assessing; carrying out the necessary reflection needed to develop a deeper understanding of what works, what does not, and why, in order to embed learning within a more robust performance management system. The evaluation process should form part of an action learning cycle, where findings are fed forward into the development of organisational priorities.

• Actively foster the use of evaluation findings by seeking to identify potential areas where the findings may be applied practically; highlighting their value both within the organisation as well as to external stakeholders.

• Improve the structure of recommendations by ensuring they are targeted at particular actors, with specific actions attached to them.

Producers such as the government and policy makers should:

• Seek to provide some amount of guidance where evaluation is concerned as not only does this help to clarify requirements at organisational level, but it demonstrates a degree of importance placed on evaluation at national level thereby countering perceptions of apathy. However regulations should not be overly prescriptive as this limits flexibility and can lead to excessive bureaucracy which is resultantly counterproductive.

• Encourage the utilisation of a variety of methods and approaches towards evaluation; raising the profile of existing tools and methods that tie into emerging policies (eg the localism Bill and the new National Planning Policy Framework). Increased guidance should be made available for tools such as the new Building for Life (Design Council, 2012) and the National Account of Wellbeing (NEF, 2009) which consider these new policies in their development.
• Promote the role of evaluation within decision making and leverage their strategic position to encourage the utilisation of findings between agencies in order to promote best practice and improve both the delivery and evaluation of regeneration.

Producers classed as funders should:

• Seek to incentivise effective evaluations by requiring the development of an evaluation strategy as a condition of funding. In this case, an effective strategy is one that reflects assessment against the wider objectives of sustainable regeneration activity (environmental, social and economic), and demonstrates mechanisms for utilising findings in order to develop practice.

9.9.1.2 Users

Users such as local residents and businesses should:

• Make an effort to engage with the evaluation process at different levels, working in collaboration with regeneration organisations to deliver more effective evaluations.

• Be willing to put themselves forward to undergo training workshops where available, as the emerging context of regeneration delivery will see more of the practical project delivery undertaken by community stakeholders. Such project delivery will extend to project evaluation.
9.9.1.3 Brokers

Brokers such as community groups, NGOs, and charities should:

- Capitalise on their roles as ‘go-betweens’ to bridge the gap between the ‘producers’ and the ‘users’, thereby facilitating the process of engagement between both groups of stakeholders.

- Aid in the delivery of evaluation training (around identified methods and tools) to staff and community members alike in a bid to develop both in-house and community capacity.

- Share their knowledge of community engagement as well as fund raising. These are areas where the third sector has well established skills, which are set to become increasingly relevant within both the delivery and evaluation of regeneration practice.

Brokers such as service providers should:

- Be willing to work in collaboration with other stakeholders in the regeneration process, particularly in terms of sharing data. While certain restrictions may apply due to data protection regulations, local service providers should endeavour to make data available for the purpose of evaluation as findings often prove useful in the context of their own delivery. As mentioned earlier, a focus on learning by the regeneration organisations will see evaluation findings disseminated to external stakeholders. This is will highlight the value of evaluation activity within regeneration to their respective organisations, and encourage a more open exchange of information in future.
9.9.1.4 Recommendations for regeneration and evaluation researchers:

- Mirroring some findings of this study, it is important for researchers to adopt research frameworks and approaches that are flexible enough to accommodate the complex and sometimes unpredictable nature of regeneration research. This is particularly relevant when working collaboratively with case study organisations, as in such cases the utilisation of a framework with enough room to grow as the research matures is beneficial.

- Research within the field is as much about building relationships as it is about consulting literature. Building and engaging with a rich network of stakeholders keeps the researcher’s ‘finger on the pulse’ and informs the selection of credible participants.

- Researchers should make efforts to disseminate the findings of their work not just within the academic community, but to industry practitioners as well as policy makers, in order to effect positive change based on findings.

- With evaluation highlighted as a form of research, researchers should seek to engage with regeneration organisations; working collaboratively to develop and deliver evaluation activity. Given the need to develop evaluation capacity within the community under emergent regeneration policy, there is a role for research professionals within the field in the provision of support as well as training to members of the community where evaluation is concerned.

- Researchers should view the issue of regeneration holistically; considering their research in the context of the bigger picture, thereby recognising the wider impacts of regeneration (social, economic and environmental). As such, it is important for researchers to engage with a broad range of stakeholders in order to ensure the rounded view of the issue is reflected.
9.9.2 Recommendations for Further Research

- Revisit research on a wider scale eg nationally or internationally, sampling a wider range of case study organisations.

- Revisit individual case study organisations, conducting focused action research progressing from 'loop 1' observed within this study.

- Undertaking a longitudinal study thereby observing trends over time.

- Explore the applications of the Objectives Based EvaluAction framework in alternative fields of practice.
9.10 Summary

The study aims to undertake a critical examination of evaluation and impact assessment methods of regeneration delivery mechanisms, in order to explore improvements to current practice such as better utilisation of indicators and stakeholder involvement in evaluations. It outlines five objectives in a bid to achieve this aim, and draws conclusions against each of these objectives.

The original contribution to knowledge made by the research is defined based on the criteria outlined by Philips and Pugh (2000) as well as Cryer (2006). Furthermore limitations of the study are presented before recommendations for both practice and research are put forward.
Reflective practice involves thoughtfully considering your own experiences as you make the connection between knowledge and practice, under the guidance of an experienced professional within your discipline”

- Donald Schon (1996)
A Quest for Truth

Lipman (2003, p.95) describes the inquiry as “a quest for truth… a quest for meaning”. Inquiry, along with critical thinking and reflection lie at the heart of the research process. They are activities that I have carried out practically all my life albeit in ‘auto pilot’ mode, and it wasn’t until undertaking my PhD research that I have become more consciously aware of these activities; the actual process by which I carry them out. Asking the right questions; probing, investigating, and working through the answers, critically analysing them, and carrying out some form of reflection to arrive at a conclusion. These are processes that I am distinctly more aware of not only since moving into education and teaching, but over the course of my PhD research. Having had experience of conducting research in the past, I am no stranger to these concepts and processes but utilising an overarching action research strategy [see section 2.1.3] within my doctoral study has not only provided me with a deeper understanding of the concepts, but related issues too.

In carrying out any form of practitioner research, it is important for the researcher to consider the ‘positioning’ of their role as an insider researcher. Nettleton (2011) suggests that there are three possible stances a practitioner researcher could take within the context of their research, namely; as a ‘master of nothingness’, a ‘native’, and a ‘connected critic’. Being the ‘master of nothingness’ refers to a situation where the researcher attempts to step outside the situation, while the ‘native’ position refers to the exact opposite where the practitioner is very much embedded in and amongst not just the situation but the people being researched. Finally, the ‘connected critic’ refers to the tensions between the two previous positions; with the critic, who despite being intellectually and/or emotionally attached, seeks the success of the common enterprise over the welfare of the natives (Walzer, 1987). While in this case I would consider my positioning as that of a connected critic, I do not see myself as placing the success of the study ahead of the welfare of my participants. As discussed later in this chapter ethical considerations were made at different stages of the research [also see section 2.2.1]. I would therefore brand myself as a ‘concerned’ connected critic or a ‘friendly outsider’ as Greenwood and Levin (1998) put it.
As mentioned in chapter 2 of this thesis, in addition to the actual subject of my research, the study explores the meta-process of conducting the research and the development of my practice as a researcher. This epilogue draws upon research notes, journals, course material and literature, reflecting on key aspects of the journey undertaken in completing my PhD. The action research structure adopted may be most closely linked to Kolb’s (1984) and Greenway’s (2002) models of reflective practice. The reflection presented here may be considered as a summary piece between the end of loop one and the beginning of loop two of the action research spiral, as depicted in figure 11.1 below.

**Fig. 10.1 Positioning of Reflective Piece within the Study**
Reflections on the REVIEW/PLAN: Research Formulation

Coming into the PhD process I knew my area of study would centre around Regeneration and Sustainable Development, however the specific focus of my research was as yet undetermined. Not surprisingly, my initial research topic changed several times not just over the course of my research formulation, but as the research progressed and was refocused. Having started it with a working title of ‘strategic approaches to urban regeneration delivery’, I decided to focus on the issue of evaluation specifically following a preliminary literature review. However this decision was largely influenced by discussions and informal focus groups sessions with industry parishioners and local authority staff. This was due to the fact that coming from a professional background in the built environment, the practical and industrial grounding of whatever research I was about to embark on was important to me. It was important to me that my research sought not just to investigate and generate knowledge, but to provide some form of improvement within the research context (Kember, 2000). Furthermore, I was interested in utilising a case study approach in order to foster close working relationships with industry during the course of the research itself. It was this sort of thinking that shaped the development of my research proposal, the result being my selected study of evaluation and impact assessment within regeneration delivery.

Having a community of inquiry in the form of the departmental research group as played a crucial role in the formulation of my research. Having the research group with members from varied backgrounds as a sounding board, for my ideas was invaluable. Hearing my ideas out loud while presenting them to the group, as well as having some of those ideas questioned and challenged was an essential part of forging my ideas into a concrete research proposal, as well as the continued development of the study and my learning through that process (Dewey, 1991; Garrison et. al., 2001; Lipman, 2003). In hindsight, the R1 process was a turning point for me in terms of research formulation. What initially appeared to be yet another element of the extensive QAA form filling associated with beginning the PhD, turned out to be a key avenue for the clarification and refinement of my research formulation and proposal. In addition the R1 required me to create a detailed project plan breaking down activities. Which in many ways made the PhD ‘real’ to me; it was happening and this was how I was going to tackle it.
Reflections on the ACTION: Conducting the Research

Strands of Learning and Activity

It is impossible to fully reflect on the ‘action’ portion of my research cycle, taking my PhD study in isolation without considering the other strands of learning and activity that I have been involved in over the duration of the process. These different strands are inextricably linked by a core of reflective practice, and have informed the development of each of the respective strands in their own right.

Learning

My main areas of learning have been around my research process (in terms of methodology), and the actual subject areas of my research (urban regeneration, sustainable development and evaluation). While undoubtedly, the literature review process involved a great amount of learning and saw me attain a firm grasp of my area of research (particularly where evaluation theory and research was concerned), I believe the learning associated to my research process, provided a greater amount of personal growth.

Delving into the world of research methods, theory, epistemology and ontology, revealed a lot to me not just as a researcher but as a person, and helped me understand how one impacts on the other and vice versa. I developed deeper insights into how I learn, how I see/take in the world around me, and more importantly how I process all this information and how it affects my research (Morgan and Smircich, 1980; Creswell, 1998). Transitioning from a more quantitative built environment grounding to a more qualitative one was not always an easy process, as it in many ways required a shift in my mind-set. The Manchester Metropolitan University Summer Institute on Qualitative Research played a big part in developing my understanding of qualitative research theory, and was particularly useful in expanding my horizons where research theory is concerned. It helped me develop a clearer understanding of where both myself and my research sat in the wider context of research methodology. Having this understanding helped me clarify my pragmatic philosophical stance (Kuhn, 1962), and gave me the confidence to navigate the
murky waters of methodology with the aid of a self developed structure that I felt worked for myself as well as my research.

Again putting the bare bones of these thoughts on paper in the R1 helped me think through the process. By the time I came to the R2, mastering my research stance gave me the confidence to give an assured presentation to the progression panel. Being able to hold my ground when faced with questions around my methodology further boosted my confidence, and positive feedback from the panel reassured me that I was on the right path. Once again, having a community of inquiry in the form of the research group played a big part in helping me refine and distil my research at every stage.

Activity
In terms of activity, the actual process of conducting my PhD research is the obvious aspect and is covered in subsequent sections of this reflection. However an equally important strand of activity has been teaching on the regeneration and sustainable communities programmes. Lecturing on the introduction to regeneration module provided not just an avenue for polishing m presentation skills and disseminating learning from my research, but also as a forum for learning from experiences of the students themselves.

Facilitating students on the Inter-Disciplinary Inquiry Based Learning (IDIBL) modules was a unique opportunity to supervise an action research project, while conducting action oriented research of my own. I was able to pass on knowledge from my own experiences undertaking the process, and at the same time learn from the research my students were conducting. Furthermore group marking and course committee discussion meant that there was yet another community of inquiry created centred around teaching and learning. However as the teaching and learning activity in this case was centred around action oriented research, it meant that issues raised at times had bearing on activities taking place within my own research (e.g. ethical considerations).
The teaching activity provided an opportunity to explore discussions and ideas around my subject of inquiry, in a sense creating an alternative albeit related community of inquiry which fed into my research. Combining both activities created an interesting circumstance where I was able to access learning about a range of topics from different parts of the learning cycle (Kolb, 1984) simultaneously.

Another major offshoot from my teaching activity was my participation in the PGCHE in Teaching and Learning. The course offered an invaluable opportunity to explore the use of an action research process in conducting a mini project. Conducting the mini project contributed an immense amount of experiential learning, in terms of carrying out an action oriented study. Developing a deeper understanding of action research on the PGCHE contributed greatly when it came to developing my methodology chapter of the PhD thesis.

**Conducting Case Studies**

The selection of the case study organisations was also something that changed based on the development and review of the research proposal. The total number of case studies was revised in light of time constraints, and the sampling strategy of the specific case studies was as revised based on reflection on the writings of Travers (2001) as well as Eisenhardt and Graebner (2007).

As highlighted in figure 11.1, the case study process involved sub-cycles of research. This process allowed for the creation of a developmental spiral where specific research skills were concerned. I was able to refine my skills such as interview techniques, transcription, and presentation of data, based on reflection on my experiences from the previous case study cycle (Moon, 2004). The more interviews I conducted, the more confident I felt about what I was doing; and the greater my ability to stimulate a more conversational flow within the semi structured interviews. Similarly, while I manually transcribed all my interviews, I did so without the use of a transcription pedal for the first few. Having reflected on ways in which I could carry out the process more efficiently, I adopted the use of a pedal which
dramatically reduced the time it took me to transcribe. This time was further reduced as I became more adept at transcribing.

While conducting the case studies provided me with learning about the research process, my involvement in the live case studies provided me with experiential learning of the focal subject of the study (i.e. evaluation of regeneration delivery), thereby providing more rounded learning in relation to the subject. The collaborative approach of the study and the close working relationship developed with case study organisations meant that the feeding forward some of the preliminary findings within the pilot study emerged as a possibility. The grounded theory approach of the study allowed for the flexibility to review the research plan to take advantage of this new avenue of research. This final stage of the research process provided an opportunity for validation of the research. Furthermore my hands on involvement in the process not only provided me with unique insight into the social accounting process, but also led to my being called back to sit on the social audit panel, which serves as an area of professional development.

**Reflections on the OBSERVATION: Carrying out analysis**

Reflection was an intrinsic part of my analysis process given the grounded theory approach of the study (Cohen and Crabtree, 2006). I found the codification frameworks provided by Taylor and Gibbs (2010) as well as Charmaz (2006) invaluable in the development of my analytical framework. Keeping research notes, memos and journals (such as the ones utilised in writing this piece) was a key part of developing that reflective practice. Despite the fact that it was not something that came naturally to me given my pragmatist philosophy (Mills, 1959), like any other skill it is something that can be developed with practice. As all three modules of the PGCHE course required the use of a reflective diary and the production of reflective journals, I had an opportunity to further develop this skill. More obvious developments occur in areas relating to hard skills such as the use of software like Nvivo which prior to commencing this PhD I had not even heard of.
One issue I have had to take into consideration is that of reflexivity; acknowledging my involvement as what is effectively a practitioner within some of my case studies. I had to remain aware of my role as a practitioner researcher being part of the situation I was researching. Again this was a concept I had time to wrap my head around as a result of the PGCHE action research project; considering my role as both constructive and disruptive within the process (Macbeth, 2001).

Like the case studies, analysis was also carried out cyclically to an extent, and as a result I was able to learn from practice during earlier rounds. Furthermore, as I became more familiar with the software, my use and practice increased in efficiency.

And Finally...

The PhD process has been an illuminating journey of enlightenment. Much more than the finished output of a thesis which contains an original contribution to knowledge in a chosen field of study, the process of conducting the PhD itself has afforded me an opportunity to develop myself both as a researcher and as an individual. Training programmes I have attended such the ones provided by Vitae have had a distinct focus on my development as a researcher, while others have gone beyond to focus on more personal aspects like employability. In addition such events have offered ample networking opportunities.

While the development of my reflective practice has already been alluded to earlier in this chapter, other aspects of my personal development such as time management and organisation have been an intrinsic part of the process of getting through the PhD. Although the strands of learning and activity have been simplified in previous sections of this epilogue for the sake of clarity, the reality is that they overlap and juggling all those demands in addition to any sort of personal life forces you to adapt, evolve and improve where personal organisation is involved.

Confucius (date unknown) stated that knowledge is acquired by three means; “first, by reflection, which is noblest; second, by imitation, which is easiest; and third by experience, which is the bitterest.” It is safe to say that the knowledge acquired over the course of my doctorate study has seen me utilise all three.
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APPENDIX 1: Data Collection

A) Data Collection Framework

B) Case Study Participant Information and Informed Consent
APPENDIX 1A: Data Collection Framework
Adapted Case Study Framework

CONTEXT
What is the Background of Organisation?
Where does Organisation sit within the scheme of Regeneration in Location?
Where does Project sit within this context?

STRATEGY
What strategy/strategies has Organisation adopted to tackle the issue of regeneration?
Does Project have specific strategies to address regeneration?
If so, where does the Project strategy/strategies fit into the Organisation strategy?

FUNCTION
What is the organisational structure of Organisation?
Do these structures support their functions effectively?
Do their operational processes link up to organisational strategies?

FEATURES
Are there any special aspects or initiatives that distinguish Organisation and the Project from similar organisations?
What are the key processes in Organisation and Project delivery of regeneration?
Is there any innovation?
EVALUATION

GENERAL

What form of evaluation takes place within Organisation and the Project?

What is the timeline for the evaluation process? (When does it take place? How long does it take? How often does it take place?)

Is there a review and feedback process?

If so, who is evaluation fed back/ reported to?

What criteria are used?

Who selected these criteria?

CURRENT REVIEW

What is the reason behind this review?

Who will be involved in the review?

What is the timeline for the evaluation process?

Who is evaluation fed back/ reported to?

What criteria are being used?

Who selected these criteria?

What criteria would you like to see used/ prioritised in the evaluation process and why?

FUTURE

What are/were the key opportunities and threats to future development?

What are the plans for development of future activities?

Is there any succession planning in place? (Eg, what if the current ballot comes back with a “no” vote?)

What would be your critical appraisal of regeneration delivery within Organisation and Location?

Who else would you recommend I interview for the purpose of this study?
APPENDIX 1B: Case Study Participant Information and Informed Consent
Thank you very much for your interest in contributing to this study. Before you proceed it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully.

**Title of Study: Approaches to Regeneration and Sustainable Development: A Study of Impact Assessment and Evaluation**

The aim of this study is to identify improvements to existing methods of regeneration delivery and impact assessment, with emphasis on evaluation methods and procedures.

This data collection phase of the research involves undertaking case studies with various regeneration delivery vehicles undertaking evaluation and speaking to members of staff involved with the evaluation process. This is the basis upon which you have been selected for interview.

You are under no obligation to take part, but if you do, you will be given this information sheet to keep and be asked to sign a consent form. If you decide to take part you are still free to withdraw at any time and without giving a reason.

The interview will be transcribed into written text and a copy can be sent to you upon request. All documents will be treated with sensitivity and stored in a restricted access folder until destroyed.

If you require any further information please contact me at the address below:

**Ebun Akinsete**

Graduate Teaching Associate  
School of Built Environment and Engineering  
University of Bolton

Email : e.akinsete@bolton.ac.uk  
Tel : +44 (0) 1204 903537

Again, thank you for your time and valued contribution.
PhD Case Study - Informed Consent Form

I consent to participate in the interview  
Yes ☐ No ☐

I have read and understood the attached information sheet  
Yes ☐ No ☐

I have been given opportunity to ask questions  
Yes ☐ No ☐

I understand that I am under no obligation to take part in this interview, and I am free to withdraw at any time  
Yes ☐ No ☐

I am happy for my name to be used in the report  
Yes ☐ No ☐

I am happy for the data provided to be used in further studies (e.g. Papers)  
Yes ☐ No ☐

Name  .................................................................

Signature  .............................................................

Date  .................................................................
APPENDIX 1C: List of Participants
List of Case Study Participants

Individuals:
Executive Director of Council
Service Director for Regeneration within Council
Head of Strategic Housing within Council
Assistant Director, Policy Partnerships and Communication within Council
Principal Economic Regeneration Officer within Council
Group Leader, Regeneration Strategy and Co-ordination within Council
Chief Executive of Regeneration Organisation (x2)
Regeneration Organisation Board Member and Regeneration Consultant
Regeneration Organisation Board Member
Director of Regeneration for Organisation
Director of Physical Regeneration for Organisation
Assistant Director Neighbourhood Services of Organisation
Evaluation Manager for Regeneration Organisation
Project manager for housing association
Knowledge and Information Manager within Regeneration Organisation
Neighbourhood Manager within Regeneration Organisation
Resident
Deputy Director of Public Health, NHS of Location
Emeritus Professor of Community Development and Social Justice
Professor and Built Environment Consultant
Research and Evaluation Practitioner

Organisations:
Bolton At Home
Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council
Centre for Facilities Management
Charlestown and Lower Kersal New Deal for Communities
Manchester City Council
New East Manchester Ltd.
One Central Park Ltd.
Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council
Rochdale Development Agency
Salford City Council
Salix Homes
APPENDIX 2: Case Study 1 Analysis

A) CS1 Coding Summary Report (Sample)

B) CS1 Coding Reference Totals

C) CS1 Axial Coding (Sample)

D) CS1 Bar Charts

E) Rochdale MBC Indicators
APPENDIX 2A: CS1 Coding Summary Report (Sample)

See e-App2A for full report
# Coding Summary
## CS1

### 23/06/2012 06:26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hierarchical Name</th>
<th>Aggregate</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Number Of Coding References</th>
<th>Number Of Users Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internals\CS1CL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Node</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\attribution</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.34 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\benchmarking</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.06 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\challenges</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>9.03 %</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\change</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.86 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\community involvement</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.98 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\council evaluation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8.10 %</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\criteria</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.87 %</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\customer feedback</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.18 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\dissemination</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.09 %</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\embedding</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.98 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\evaluation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>26.99 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\follow up</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.00 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\formative</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.58 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\hard to measure</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.68 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\improvement</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.18 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\indicators</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.98 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\lack of evaluation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.38 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\learning</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.46 %</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\long term</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.78 %</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\methods</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.22 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\monitoring</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.26 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\national</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.66 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\NDC</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.98 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\ongoing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.36 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\outcomes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.71 %</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\partners</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.91 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\programme evaluation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.52 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\project evaluation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.59 %</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\refocus</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.99 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\resourcing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.75 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical Name</td>
<td>Aggregate</td>
<td>Coverage</td>
<td>Number Of Coding References</td>
<td>Number Of Users Coding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\SRB</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.98 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\strategy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.14 %</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\structure</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.79 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\timeframes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.57 %</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\varied evaluation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.75 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internals\CS1PE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Node</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\challenges</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.36 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\council evaluation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5.01 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\dissemination</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.95 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\evaluation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>12.02 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\indicators</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6.38 %</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\kingsway evaluation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7.00 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\lack of evaluation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.68 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\methods</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.54 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\monitoring</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6.69 %</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\participants</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.04 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\rda evaluation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.04 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\strategy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.04 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\timeframes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.81 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internals\CS1PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Node</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\ambitions</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.28 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\business plan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.30 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\challenges</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.52 %</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\council evaluation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.28 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\criteria</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.38 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\dissemination</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.84 %</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\evaluation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>18.08 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\future</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.67 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2B: CS1 Coding Reference Totals
### APPENDIX 2B: Case Study 1 Coding Reference in Array and By Percentage

- Top 10 referenced by both total and percentage (Prevalent Codes)
- Top 20 referenced by both total and percentage

#### Case Study 1: Open coding in Array

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODES</th>
<th>CS1CL</th>
<th>CS1PE</th>
<th>CS1PM</th>
<th>CS1SM</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 : challenges</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 : timeframes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 : kingsway evaluation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 : methods</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 : monitoring</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 : dissemination</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 : indicators</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 : structure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 : criteria</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 : evaluation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 : participants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 : rda evaluation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 : council evaluation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 : lack of evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 : strategy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 : national</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 : objectives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 : outcomes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 : project evaluation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 : targets</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 : future</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 : learning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 : long term</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 : ongoing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 : system review</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 : benchmarking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 : formative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 : government</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 : HMR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 : outputs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>partners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>performance management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>programme evaluation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>SRB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>accountability</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ambitions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>attribution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>audit commission</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>business plan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>community involvement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>complex</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>customer feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>embedding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>external v internal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>follow up</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>funding</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>hard to measure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>improvement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>inconsistent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>milestones</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>NDC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>NWDA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>perception</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>qualitative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>rda objectives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>reflection</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>refocus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>resourcing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>stakeholder views</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>varied evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Case Study 1: Top Codes According to Percentage Coverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODES</th>
<th>CS1CL</th>
<th>CS1PE</th>
<th>CS1PM</th>
<th>CS1SM</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16: evaluation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28: kingsway evaluation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: challenges</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34: monitoring</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11: council evaluation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57: structure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60: timeframes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32: methods</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27: indicators</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14: dissemination</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42: participants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49: rda evaluation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12: criteria</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56: strategy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40: outcomes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29: lack of evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38: objectives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47: project evaluation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41: outputs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31: long term</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2C: CS1 Axial Coding (Sample)

See e-App1A for complete table
APPENDIX 2C: Case Study 1 Axial Coding and Analysis (Sample)

See e-App1A for complete table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODEL ELEMENT</th>
<th>AXIAL CODE</th>
<th>SUB CODES</th>
<th>CS1PE</th>
<th>CS1PM</th>
<th>CS1SM</th>
<th>CS1CL</th>
<th>SECONDARY DATA</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phenomenon</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>RDA evaluation</td>
<td>There are a suite of indicators tracked at borough level, through an economic bulletin which comes out monthly. At council level, the focus is on 5 neighbourhoods where there is a greater concentration of deprivation, and these are monitored even more closely. The council monitors all-cause worklessness, an aggregate of job seekers allowance, disability benefit, skill level attainment which come in annually. JSA is also monitored on a monthly basis. Certain health indicators are also monitored. Reports go to the</td>
<td>The URC possibly doesn’t do enough evaluation and the council probably does a bit more. They tend to be consumed with hitting the targets, rather than standing back and asking if these are the right targets. Most assessment criteria is selected by the council, who generate the indicators and then the negotiate those with government office. They are then built into their performance management structure which the URC is a part of. The URC is happy to work with a performance management structure as long as there is a clear set of objectives</td>
<td>The organisation has its own internal processes as well, and has targets for the year in its business plans. Every quarter a progress report is produced that goes to the board which assesses performance against those targets. In terms of the URC, there’ve been 2 aspects; one consultant who did a retrospective on the organisation,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
council's economic partnership, which has sub-groups that suggest corrective action when appropriate. and targets that can be measured realistically. The URC feeds information on their performance into the council's system which comes out as a spreadsheet saying what the URC have done. In terms of evaluation, it's really measurement of target against achievement, now those are set and agreed at the outset as to what the URC is trying to achieve. and the other was a benchmarking study looking at the URC compared to other organisations, and also built in a kind of customer satisfaction survey. How different partners and stakeholders viewed the organisation.
APPENDIX 2D: CS1 Bar Charts
APPENDIX 2E: Rochdale MBC Indicators
Appendix 2E: Rochdale MBC Indicators in Use

- NI 1 - % of people who believe people from different backgrounds get on well together in their local area.
- NI 2 - % of people who feel that they belong to their neighbourhood
- NI 3 – civic participation in the local area
- NI 4 - % of people who feel they can influence decisions in their local area
- NI 6 – participation in regular volunteering
- NI 7 – environment for a thriving Third sector
- NI 15 – serious violent crime rate
- NI 16 - serious acquisitive crime rate
- NI 17 – perceptions of anti social behaviour
- NI 18 – adult re-offending rated for those under probation supervision
- NI 20 – assault with injury crime rate
- NI 21 – dealing with local concerns about anti social
- NI 23 – perceptions that people in the area treat one another with respect and consideration
- NI 24 – satisfaction with the way the police and local council dealt with anti social behaviour
- NI 25 – satisfaction of different groups with the way the police and local council dealt with anti social behaviour
- NI 26 – specialist support to victims of a serious sexual offence
- NI 27 – understanding of local concerns about anti social behaviour and crime by the council and police
- NI 28 – serious knife crime rate
- NI 29 – gun crime rate
- NI 30 – re-offending rate of prolific and priority offenders
- NI 31 – re – offending rate of registered sex offenders
- NI 32 – repeat incidents of domestic violence
- NI 33 – arson incidents
- NI 34 – domestic violence – murder
- NI 36 – protection against terrorist attack
- NI 38 – drug related (class A) offending rate
- NI 39 - alcohol related hospital admission rates
- NI 40 – drug users in effective treatment
- NI 41 – perceptions of drunk or rowdy behaviour as a problem
- NI 42- perception of drug use or dealing as a problem
- NI 49 – number of primary fires and related fatalities and non fatal casualties excluding precautionary checks
- NI 115 – substance misuse by young people
- NI 143 – offenders under probation supervision living in settled and suitable accommodation at the end of their order or licence
NI 144 – offenders under probation supervision in employment at the end of their license or order
NI 151 – overall employment rate
NI 152 – working age people on out of work benefit
NI 153 – working age people claiming out of work benefits in the worst performing neighbourhoods
NI 161 – learners achieving a level 1 qualification in literacy
NI 162 – learners achieving an entry level 3 qualification in numeracy
NI 163 – working age population qualified to at least level 2 or higher
NI 164 - working age population qualified to at least level 3 or higher
NI 165 - working age population qualified to at least level 4 or higher
NI 166 – average earnings of employees in the area
NI 171 – new business registration rate
NI 172 - % of small businesses in area showing employment growth
NI 173 – flows on to incapacity benefits from employment
NI 174 - Skills gaps in current workforce reported by employers

- Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council, 2011a
APPENDIX 3: Case Study 2 Analysis

A) CS2 Coding Summary Report (Sample)
B) CS2 Coding Reference Totals
C) CS2 Axial Coding (Sample)
D) CS2 Bar Charts
E) NEM Indicators in Use
APPENDIX 3A: CS2 Coding Summary Report (Sample)

See e-App2B for full report
# Coding Summary

## CS2

### Document

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hierarchical Name</th>
<th>Aggregate</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Number Of Coding References</th>
<th>Number Of Users Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internals\CS2CL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Node</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\accountability</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.07 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\broad range</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.83 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\criteria</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.81 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\dissemination</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.55 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\evaluation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>16.35 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\external v internal</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.49 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\funding</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6.33 %</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\future</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.17 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\interim evaluation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.27 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\monitoring</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.07 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\neighbourhood management</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.51 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\nem evaluation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.27 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\partners</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.11 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\project evaluation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.01 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\strategy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.51 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\timeframes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.28 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internals\CS2PE1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Node</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\cbfm framework</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>54.43 %</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\community engagement</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>22.87 %</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\criteria</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11.47 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\evaluation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>96.26 %</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\fm</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6.53 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\innovation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7.87 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical Name</td>
<td>Aggregate</td>
<td>Coverage</td>
<td>Number Of Coding References</td>
<td>Number Of Users Coding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\methods</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11.11 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\ocp evaluation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>74.56 %</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\past use of framework</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11.57 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\social impact</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>16.69 %</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\stakeholder perspective</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.07 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\strategy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>57.07 %</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\tools</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5.17 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\wide scope</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5.04 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Internals\CS2PE2**

**Node**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hierarchical Name</th>
<th>Aggregate</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Number Of Coding References</th>
<th>Number Of Users Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\cbfm framework</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>54.70 %</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\challenges</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7.92 %</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\criteria</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10.48 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\dissemination</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>9.13 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\evaluation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>92.99 %</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\external v internal</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.50 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\future</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>9.99 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\innovation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>21.09 %</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\integration</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.53 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\learning</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>13.22 %</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\methods</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>28.22 %</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\ocp evaluation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>65.28 %</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\participants</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>12.63 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\past use of framework</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.69 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\stakeholder perspective</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>18.44 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\strategy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>31.55 %</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\structure</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5.53 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\system review</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.88 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\timeframes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6.56 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3B: CS2 Coding Reference Totals
APPENDIX 3B: Case Study 2 Coding Reference in Array and By Percentage

Top 10 referenced by both total and percentage (Prevalent Codes)

Top 20 referenced by both total and percentage

---

Case Study 2: Open coding in Array

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODES</th>
<th>CS2CL</th>
<th>CS2PE1</th>
<th>CS2PE2</th>
<th>CS2PM</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26 : ocp evaluation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>35 : strategy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9 : evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 : cbfm framework</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>21 : methods</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16 : innovation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6 : community engagement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7 : criteria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>31 : social impact</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5 : challenges</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>13 : funding</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>20 : learning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>27 : participants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>29 : past use of framework</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>33 : stakeholder perspective</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>8 : dissemination</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10 : external v internal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>12 : fm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>14 : future</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>37 : system review</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>timeframes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 : accountability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 : action on evaluation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 : broad range</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 : feedback</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 : improvement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 : integration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 : interim evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 : KPIs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 : monitoring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 : neighbourhood management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 : nem evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Case Study 2: Top Codes According to Percentage Coverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODES</th>
<th>CS2CL</th>
<th>CS2PE1</th>
<th>CS2PE2</th>
<th>CS2PM</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 9 : evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 26 : ocp evaluation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 4 : cbfm framework</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 35 : strategy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 21 : methods</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 16 : innovation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 7 : criteria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 6 : community engagement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 33 : stakeholder perspective</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 31 : social impact</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 29 : past use of framework</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 27 : participants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 20 : learning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 39 : timeframes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 13 : funding</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 28 : partners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 25 : objectives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 38 : targets</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 15 : improvement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 23 : neighbourhood management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 18 : interim evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 24 : nem evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 : accountability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 : statistics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 : KPIs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 : stakeholder feedback</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3C: CS2 Axial Coding (Sample)

See e-App1B for complete table
### APPENDIX 3C: Case Study 2 Axial Coding and Analysis (Sample)

See e-App1B for complete table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODEL ELEMENT</th>
<th>AXIAL CODE</th>
<th>SUB CODES</th>
<th>CS2PE1</th>
<th>CS2PE2</th>
<th>CS2PM</th>
<th>CS2CL</th>
<th>SECONDARY DATA</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phenomenon</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>NEM evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A mid term review of the URC was carried out in 2007 and the key findings from that were that there’s a lot of great work that’s been done, and if the was to be taken off the pedal and let the rock roll back down, it might actually roll back down further than the point were it all started.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCP</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>The current evaluation was a proposal by Centre for Facilities Management to the organisation partially following the original evaluation, but addressing</td>
<td>It examines the fairly unusual remit that the organisation has; on the one hand as an education centre, which involves the FE provider, and on the other hand In terms of evaluation, the organisation has certain statistics that provide a benchmark, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
therefore more of the community content of what it was set up to do. Trying to evaluate from a user/community/broad stakeholder perspective, and the extent to which the organisation was meeting its objectives. The research that underpins the development of the framework is guided by regeneration outcomes (such as Framework for Regeneration Outcomes), and the framework that is used in the Northwest, checking along the way the relationships between the dimensions of the model and the metrics that used as a business incubator center. However its managed on a stand alone basis, so the Chief Exec is responsible for the overall strategic direction of that site, its functionality and promotion. So the idea was to think about whether the building does what it says it does, does it have some link with the community, how that is evaluated etc. So it was reviewing the organisation using the sort of in-progress evaluation methodology that CFM had developed. there are also certain targets which the organisation is trying to achieve in terms of skills and procurement policies. The organisation is also looking at putting down some new targets for assistance in regeneration and the creation of an awareness and therefore closer links with OCP and the local
APPENDIX 3D: CS2 Bar Charts
APPENDIX 3E: NEM Indicators in Use
Appendix 3E: New East Manchester Indicators in use

- Neighbourhoods and Places:
  - Population
  - New Homes Built
  - Net Additional Homes
  - % Home Ownership
  - New Retail Floorspace
  - Homes Improved
  - Average House Price
  - % Voids
  - Resident Satisfaction
  - Green Flag Parks

- People and Communities
  - % children level 4 Key stage
  - % young people 5 A*-C
  - GCSE
  - Secondary attendance
  - Secondary Persistent Absence
  - Rate of serious acquisitive crime
  - Resident perceptions of ASB
  - Perceptions of effectiveness of police and LA partnership in tackling ASB
  - Standard Mortality rate
  - Under 18 conception
  - Overall self reported measure of health

- Economy and Employment
  - Additional Floor Space
  - Residents Supported into work/Jobs created
  - Working Age Claimants
  - Unemployment rate
  - Job Seekers Allowance over 6 months
  - Incapacity Benefit Claimants
  - Long term Incapacity Benefit Claimants
  - % population having skill level 2
  - % Population having skill level 3
  - % Population having skill level 4
  - Number gaining Qualifications
  - % of NEETs

- NEM, 2008b
APPENDIX 4: EKOSGEN Consultees
### Annex A Consultees

**Figure A.1: Stakeholder and Project Consultee List**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Taylor</td>
<td>Beacons Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Booth</td>
<td>Beacons Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian O’Connor</td>
<td>NEM; Principal Area Programme Monitoring Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridget Halliday</td>
<td>Bang of the Voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Bartram</td>
<td>NEM; Head of Economic Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Moore</td>
<td>Credit Union Chief Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Evans</td>
<td>Chief Executive 4CT Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Thompson</td>
<td>Greater Manchester Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Lea</td>
<td>NWDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farzana Hussain</td>
<td>Job Centre Plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Copitch</td>
<td>Chief Executive of People’s Voice Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Lamb</td>
<td>Ex Manager of Regeneration Apprentices; Principal Economic Regeneration Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene Baron</td>
<td>Resident on Board (Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie Hynes</td>
<td>Community Safety Eastlands Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqui O’Neill</td>
<td>GONW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lance Thomas</td>
<td>GMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Roberts</td>
<td>North Manchester Primary Care Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Bowman</td>
<td>MAES District Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Wagner</td>
<td>Resident representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorna Rushton</td>
<td>Head teacher Ashbury Meadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesley Shackleton</td>
<td>Outlook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesley Spencer</td>
<td>NEM; Principal Regeneration Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libby Graham</td>
<td>NEM; Director of Social Programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandy Powell</td>
<td>Generation Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie McGowan</td>
<td>Outlook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Hill</td>
<td>DISCUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam Foy</td>
<td>Connexions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam Tideswell</td>
<td>District Commissioning Manager Children’s Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Wood</td>
<td>Children’s Centre Manager Ashbury Meadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Cullen</td>
<td>Ex Beacons Crime &amp; Community Safety Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Bradley</td>
<td>NEM; Principal Regeneration Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Hulston</td>
<td>Greater Manchester Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean McGonnigle</td>
<td>Ex Beacons Co-ordinator, now Assistant Chief Executive Neighbourhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manchester City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Doran</td>
<td>Chief Executive of Eastlands Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Mycio</td>
<td>Beacons Board Member and Deputy Chief Executive, Manchester City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Price</td>
<td>NEM: Director of Neighbourhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey Annette</td>
<td>Manchester City Council and former Beacons Resident Liaison Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 5: New Deal for Communities Partnerships
## Appendix 5: List of New Deal for Communities Partnerships

(Source: The Centre for Regional Economic and Social Research, 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District (GO Region)</th>
<th>NDC Partnership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Birmingham Kings Norton (GOWM)</td>
<td>3 Estates, Kings Norton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Birmingham Aston (GOWM)</td>
<td>Aston Pride Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bradford (GOYH)</td>
<td>Bradford Trident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Brent (GOL)</td>
<td>South Kilburn NDC Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Brighton (GOSE)</td>
<td>Ebnndc (East Brighton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Bristol (GOSW)</td>
<td>Community @ Heart Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Coventry (GOWM)</td>
<td>Coventry WEHM Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Derby (GOEM)</td>
<td>Derwent Community Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Doncaster (GOYH)</td>
<td>Doncaster Central NDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Hackney (GOL)</td>
<td>Shoreditch Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Hammersmith &amp; Fulham (GOL)</td>
<td>North Fulham Community Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Haringey (GOL)</td>
<td>The Bridge NDC Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Hartlepool (GONE)</td>
<td>Hartlepool NDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Hull (GOYH)</td>
<td>Preston Road NDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Islington (GOL)</td>
<td>EC1 New Deal for Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Lambeth (GOL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Leicester (GOEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Lewisham (GOL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Liverpool (GONW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Luton (GOEE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Manchester (GONW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Middlesbrough (GONE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Newcastle (GONE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Newham (GOL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Norwich (GOEE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Nottingham (GOEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Oldham (GONW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Plymouth (GOSW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Rochdale (GONW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Salford (GONW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Sandwell (GOWM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Sheffield (GOYH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Southampton (GOSE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Southwark (GOL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Sunderland (GONE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Tower Hamlets (GOL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Walsall (GOWM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Wolverhampton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 6: Charlestown and Lower Kersal NDC Documents

A) CHALK NDC Outcomes and Indicators (Sample)
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### NDC Outcomes 2009/10

**OUTCOMES** are the changes or differences which a project will have within the local community. Each project will have a set of outcomes, which happen because of the work which the project does. The New Deal Delivery Plan also has a set of strategic outcomes, which represent the difference which it is hoped New Deal will make to the lives of the people of Charlestown and Lower Kersal. Following a review of the programme in 2006, Delivery Plan outlines a number of key priorities for the future, as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Theme</th>
<th>Priorities for the future</th>
<th>NDC Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Building Communities**         |  - Promoting community cohesion taking account of changing local demography of the area;  
                                 |  - Increasing and integrating community influence in relation to other NDC priorities, other local community-focused structures and the planning and delivery of mainstream services in the area;  
                                 |  - Maximising community benefit from new and existing facilities in the area.  
                                 | **Local Area Agreement Emerging Priorities:**  
                                 |  - Community Cohesion  
                                 |  - Community Engagement / Empowerment                                                                                                                                | BC1, H5 BC2 |
| **Crime and Community Safety**   |  - Reducing levels of juvenile nuisance/anti-social behaviour and related criminal damage;  
                                 |  - Narrowing the gap with City levels of crime;  
                                 |  - Engaging with and influencing the mainstream to address above and sustainability of progress against targets.  
                                 | **Local Area Agreement Emerging Priorities:**  
                                 |  - Tackling anti-social behaviour  
                                 |  - Reducing fear of crime  
                                 |  - Reducing re-offending                                                                                                                                             | C3,C7 C1,C2,C4,C6,C8,C9 |
| **Education, Children and Young People** |  - Raising educational attainment rates locally;  
                                 |  - Engaging young people including those particularly at risk of exclusion;  
                                 |  - Supporting the development of sustainable childcare in the area;  
<pre><code>                             |  - Responding to the new agenda of Every Child Matters and changes in City priorities, structures and delivery arrangements to ensure they respond to the needs of children and young people in the area. | CY6,CY7,CY8,CY9,CY10 CY4,CY11,CY12,CY13 CY1 CY2? |
</code></pre>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Local Area Agreement Emerging Priorities:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➢ Raising attainment and achievement at all levels of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Reducing child poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Parenting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Physical Environment</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➢ Implementation of the Development Framework;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Addressing issues arising from HMR funding post-2008;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Establishing effective delivery mechanisms for ongoing delivery;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Delivering mixed and sustainable local communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Local Area Agreement Emerging Priorities:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➢ Environmental Attractiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Providing affordable homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Ensuring services and transport developments are co-ordinated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Climate change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Health</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➢ Maximise the local benefit of new health facilities in the area;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Target investment at changing behaviours leading to improved health;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Engage and influence mainstream service providers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Local Area Agreement Emerging Priorities:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➢ Smoking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Obesity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Teenage Pregnancy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Business, Employment and Skills</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➢ Address levels of worklessness in the area;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Improve the skills and qualifications of local residents particularly those of working age;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Develop the economic base of the area, supporting existing businesses and attracting new investment to the area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Local Area Agreement Emerging Priorities:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➢ Worklessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Increase participation in appropriate higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Increasing income levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Investment levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Increasing enterprise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PE1, PE2, PE3, PE4, PE5, PE6, PE7, PE8, PE9, PE10**

**H1, H3, H4, H5, H6, H7, H8, H9, H10**

**BES1, BES2, BES3, BES4, BES5, BES9, BES10**
Index of Multiple Deprivation Data

Improving areas

Areas with lower IMD rank
### NDC OUTCOMES - Building Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NDC Outcome measures and indicators</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Area of measure</th>
<th>Year 0 baseline</th>
<th>Year 2 actual 2002/3</th>
<th>Year 4 actual 2004/5</th>
<th>Year 6 actual 2006/7</th>
<th>Year 8 actual 2008/9</th>
<th>Year 10 target 2010/11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BC1</strong> - secure the success of the NDC programme by ensuring that as many people as possible are aware of and empowered to participate in the programme supported by an effective communications network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels of awareness of NDC</td>
<td>MORI QCO8 *diversity</td>
<td>NDC All NDCs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents able to influence decisions that affect their area</td>
<td>MORI QCO5 *diversity BVPI Big Listening Place survey NI 4 (LAA) DCLG</td>
<td>NDC All NDCs City East Salford City national</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33% (2006)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% residents who think that NDC has improved the area a great deal / fair amount as a place to live</td>
<td>MORI QCO10 Core PI NI 5</td>
<td>NDC All NDCs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction
This document provides a guide to performance indicators for 2008-11. The information in it lets residents, customers, councillors and staff know how the council is doing. It shows the impact of the council’s and partners’ work to help people improve their live.

The tables in this document record performance in 2010/11 against the council’s pledges using national indicators and others. It supports the council’s cabinet work plan, its corporate plan and directorate business plans. The cabinet work plan provides the strategic framework for the council. The corporate plan outlines the full range of its functions. Directorate business plans enable performance management at corporate level.

The Government has abolished comprehensive area assessment, the Place Survey, the national indicator set and local area agreements. It still collects some data associated with national indicators as part of its single data list for local government. This catalogues all the data it requires from local government. The procedures for collating and submitting these datasets have existed for a number of years and remain unaltered. Latest information on the single data list for local government (external link) is available from the CLG website, including the final single data list (external link) itself.

The indicators
For each indicator, the tables include actual performance for 2008/09 (baseline year), 2009/10 and 2010/11. In some cases, the data is shown as “not available” because

- the performance information was not provided by the council service responsible for it
- the council has never collected data for them
- services no longer collect data for them.

The Place Survey 2010 did not take place. The results for the 18 associated indicators relate to the 2008 survey.

The Tellus Survey did not take place either. It had gathered children and young people’s views. Ofsted organised Tellus4 and published the results in October 2009. Tellus supported NI50, NI69, NI110, NI115 and NI199.
Key
The colours and symbols used in the 2010/11 table columns represent the following in terms of performance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PI Status</th>
<th>Long Term Trends</th>
<th>Short Term Trends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alert</td>
<td>Improving</td>
<td>Improving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Getting Worse</td>
<td>Getting Worse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The arrows after each indicator heading/title, ↑ or ↓, show whether an increase or a decrease is the desired direction of performance.


There were more indicators in 2008/09 and 2009/10 than in 2010/11 because the government deleted 46 indicators before abolishing the whole prior national indicator set in autumn 2010. Directorate Business Plans 2011-14 indicated that they would monitor 189 indicators during 2011/12.

If you have any comments or queries about the data or its contents, please contact chris.howl@salford.gov.uk.

Comparison of 2010/11 with 2008/09 and 2009/10 (as of 5 October 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008/09</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
<th>2010/11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual targets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator targets met</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator targets missed</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators without any data</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators showing positive trend</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators showing negative trend</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators showing stable trend</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators without any data</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Improving health in Salford (Pledge One)**

The council pledges to improve the health of individuals and communities in Salford, working with partners to improve life chances and promote healthy lifestyles. We will improve and redesign services to maximise access and to reduce inequalities. Poor health has an impact on the ability of communities to lead quality lives and to take up employment and skills opportunities.

**Salford Agreement Indicators**

Our Salford Agreement performance indicators for 2010/11 are shown below. Some are delivered with other organisations, but they provide an overview of performance in the city.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>2008/09 Value</th>
<th>2009/10 Value</th>
<th>2010/11 Value</th>
<th>Did we achieve our target?</th>
<th>Short Term Trend</th>
<th>Long Term Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Promoting a healthy lifestyle and tackling health inequalities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Smoking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI123/PCT/LAA</td>
<td>Stopping smoking</td>
<td>↑ 923</td>
<td>1,074</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Obesity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI008/CO/LAA</td>
<td>Adult participation in sport and active recreation</td>
<td>↑ 18.4</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI053/PCT/LAA</td>
<td>Prevalence of breast-feeding at 6-8 wks from birth - Percentage of infants being breastfed at 6-8 weeks</td>
<td>↑ 37.15</td>
<td>33.77</td>
<td>32.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI053b/PCT/LAA</td>
<td>Coverage of breast-feeding at 6-8 wks from birth - Percentage of infants for whom breastfeeding status is recorded</td>
<td>↑ N/A</td>
<td>94.66%</td>
<td>97.26%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI055/PCT/LAA</td>
<td>Obesity among primary school age children in Reception</td>
<td>↓ 9.8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI056/PCT/LAA</td>
<td>Obesity among primary school age children in Year 6</td>
<td>↓ 21.11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI057/CH/LAA</td>
<td>Children and young people’s participation in high-quality PE and sport</td>
<td>↑ 88</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI120a/PCT/LAA</td>
<td>All-age all cause mortality rate – Males</td>
<td>↓ 910</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX 7A: CS3 Coding Summary Report (Sample)
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## Coding Summary

**CS3**

### 14/06/2012 13:34

### Hierarchical Name | Aggregate | Coverage | Number Of Coding References | Number Of Users Coding
---|---|---|---|---
**Document**

- **Internals\CS3CL**
  - **Node**
    - **Nodes\council evaluation**
      - No
      - Aggregate: 15.52%
      - Coverage: 4
      - Users: 1
    - **Nodes\criteria**
      - No
      - Aggregate: 1.23%
      - Coverage: 2
      - Users: 1
    - **Nodes\dissemination**
      - No
      - Aggregate: 3.99%
      - Coverage: 1
      - Users: 1
    - **Nodes\end of project**
      - No
      - Aggregate: 1.34%
      - Coverage: 1
      - Users: 1
    - **Nodes\Evaluation**
      - No
      - Aggregate: 19.72%
      - Coverage: 2
      - Users: 1
    - **Nodes\feedback**
      - No
      - Aggregate: 3.99%
      - Coverage: 1
      - Users: 1
    - **Nodes\feeding forward**
      - No
      - Aggregate: 4.68%
      - Coverage: 3
      - Users: 1
    - **Nodes\flexibility**
      - No
      - Aggregate: 1.95%
      - Coverage: 1
      - Users: 1
    - **Nodes\funding**
      - No
      - Aggregate: 1.15%
      - Coverage: 1
      - Users: 1
    - **Nodes\interim evaluation**
      - No
      - Aggregate: 1.69%
      - Coverage: 1
      - Users: 1
    - **Nodes\learning**
      - No
      - Aggregate: 7.20%
      - Coverage: 4
      - Users: 1
    - **Nodes\legacy**
      - No
      - Aggregate: 1.16%
      - Coverage: 1
      - Users: 1
    - **Nodes\ndc evaluation**
      - No
      - Aggregate: 1.89%
      - Coverage: 1
      - Users: 1
    - **Nodes\ongoing**
      - No
      - Aggregate: 6.03%
      - Coverage: 3
      - Users: 1
    - **Nodes\organisational culture**
      - No
      - Aggregate: 1.08%
      - Coverage: 1
      - Users: 1
    - **Nodes\project evaluation**
      - No
      - Aggregate: 1.04%
      - Coverage: 1
      - Users: 1
    - **Nodes\pulling the plug**
      - No
      - Aggregate: 2.99%
      - Coverage: 2
      - Users: 1
    - **Nodes\refocus**
      - No
      - Aggregate: 2.80%
      - Coverage: 1
      - Users: 1
    - **Nodes\resourcing**
      - No
      - Aggregate: 1.15%
      - Coverage: 1
      - Users: 1
    - **Nodes\SRB evaluation**
      - No
      - Aggregate: 1.69%
      - Coverage: 1
      - Users: 1
    - **Nodes\strategy**
      - No
      - Aggregate: 5.52%
      - Coverage: 4
      - Users: 1
    - **Nodes\structure**
      - No
      - Aggregate: 3.99%
      - Coverage: 1
      - Users: 1
    - **Nodes\success factor**
      - No
      - Aggregate: 1.95%
      - Coverage: 1
      - Users: 1
    - **Nodes\timeframes**
      - No
      - Aggregate: 6.67%
      - Coverage: 4
      - Users: 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hierarchical Name</th>
<th>Aggregate</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Number Of Coding References</th>
<th>Number Of Users Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internals\CS3PE Node</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\additionality</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.76 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\agma</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.37 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\alleygating evaluation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>14.19 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\assumptions</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.36 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\broad approach</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7.16 %</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\catalytic effect</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.22 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\challenges</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.71 %</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\commitment</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.44 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\community budgeting</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.22 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\community engagement</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7.94 %</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\criteria</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7.04 %</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\cross cutting</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.73 %</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\dissemination</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6.04 %</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\engagement</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.59 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Evaluation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>55.64 %</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\evaluation culture</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.33 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\exploring HOW</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.28 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\feedback</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5.75 %</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\feeding forward</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.37 %</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\focus</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.79 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\funding</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.06 %</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\future</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>14.14 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\health</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.40 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\impact outside boundary</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.69 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\improvement</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.85 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\incentive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.27 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\internal v external</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.24 %</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\learning</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6.44 %</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\legacy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.96 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\limitations</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.29 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\local focus</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.81 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\localism</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.77 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\methods</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>13.68 %</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\monitoring</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.47 %</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\MORI survey</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.59 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\national framework</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.61 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\ndc evaluation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>39.26 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\non mandatory</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.03 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 7B: CS3 Coding Reference Totals
## APPENDIX 7B: Case Study 3 Coding Reference in Array and By Percentage

- **Top 10 referenced by both total and percentage (Prevalent Codes)**
- **Top 20 referenced by both total and percentage**

### Case Study 3: Open coding in Array

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODES</th>
<th>A : CS3CL</th>
<th>B : CS3PE</th>
<th>C : CS3PM</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 67 : strategy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 34 : learning</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 72 : timeframes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 39 : methods</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 10 : community engagement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 13 : criteria</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 22 : feeding forward</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 15 : dissemination</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 45 : objectives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 49 : participants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 68 : structure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 69 : success factor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 5 : broad approach</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 18 : Evaluation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 14 : cross cutting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 21 : feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 25 : funding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 46 : on going</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 48 : outcomes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 54 : project evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  challenges</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 : council evaluation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 : internal v external</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 : organisational culture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 : partnership working</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 : unique features</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 : evaluation culture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 : legacy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 : monitoring</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 : national framework</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 : perception</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 : standards</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 : statistics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 : use of narrative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 : wider benefits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 : additionality</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 : alleygating evaluation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 : future</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 : incentive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 : interim evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 : MORI survey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 : ndc evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 : pulling the plug</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 : refocus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 : research questions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 : resourcing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 : succession plan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 : agma</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 : assumptions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 : catalytic effect</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 : commitment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 : community budgeting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 : community feedback</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 : end of project</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 : engagement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 : exploring HOW</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 : flexibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 : focus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 : hard to measure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 : health</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 : impact outside boundary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 : improvement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 : limitations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 : local focus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 : localism</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 : non mandatory</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 : process evaluation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 : programme evaluation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 : rigorous controls</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 : rigour</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 : role of regeneration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 : simplicity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 : social accounting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 : SRB evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 : template</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74 : use of evaluation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 : wording</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case Study 3: Top Codes According to Percentage Coverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODES</th>
<th>A : CS3CL</th>
<th>B : CS3PE</th>
<th>C : CS3PM</th>
<th>% Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 : Evaluation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 : ndc evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 : strategy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 : alleygating evaluation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 : timeframes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 : success factor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 : methods</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 : council evaluation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 : learning</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 : criteria</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 : community engagement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 : on going</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 : structure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 : participants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 : objectives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 : feeding forward</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 : broad approach</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 : future</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 : outcomes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 7C: CS3 Axial Coding (Sample)

See e-App1C for complete table
### APPENDIX 7C: Case Study 3 Axial Coding and Analysis (Sample)

See e-App1C for complete table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODEL ELEMENT</th>
<th>AXIAL CODE</th>
<th>SUB CODES</th>
<th>CS3PE</th>
<th>CS3PM</th>
<th>CS3CL</th>
<th>SECONDARY DATA</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Phenomenon    | Evaluation | NDC evaluation       | All new deal projects had and appraisal framework and they set up, and were first approved, and the funding was approved, they filled in a form and said 'this is what the project is going to do, these are the outcomes we hope to achieve, this is the need, this is the way we are going to do it, etc etc'. | Focus on the things the project has set out to achieve and measure against those. Looking at the proposal in the 1st place, it was about being safer and feeling safer, using the space as an outdoor space, reducing actual crime, anti-social behaviour, environmental crime, encouraging ownership, physical activity, neighbourhood cohesion. Everything that went with regeneration and sustainability as set out in the appraisal in the 1st place, was measured in the evaluation. | The NDC had much more long term, thorough evaluations focused on stopping spending on things that weren’t working, following feedback from the evaluations, and moving forward with funding for other things. In that respect, the NDC have been doing evaluations for the last 4 years which won’t finish now until after the programmes. | CHALK NDC (2009b; 2011b) SCC (2012a, 2012b) | Linking the criteria to project outcomes is key to success
|               |            | Cross cutting        |                                                                       |                                                                       |                                                                       |                | Aligning evaluation to not only project outcomes/objectives but exploring wider ndc themes and objectives |
|               |            | National framework   |                                                                       |                                                                       |                                                                       |                | Learning from evaluations determined if a project should be terminated, or if strategy needed to be refocused |
outcomes we hope to achieve, this is the need, this is the way we are going to do it, etc etc'.

There was a national evaluation team which looked at some of cross cutting issues across all NDCs using case studies.

There were project evaluations which were reported to the monitoring and evaluation sub-committee, and then there were these cross-cutting evaluations most of which were conducted by external consultants.

The cross-cutting evaluations were looking at how the NDC empowered the community, improved the physical
APPENDIX 7D: CS3 Bar Charts
CS3PM - Coding by Node

Percentage coverage:
- Evaluation: 16%
- Success factor: 8%
- Strategy: 6%
- On going: 5%
- Outcomes: 4%
- Criteria: 3%
- Objectives: 3%
- Community engagement: 2%
- Participants: 2%
- Timeframes: 2%
- Statistics: 2%
- National framework: 2%
- Methods: 2%
- Succession plan: 2%
- Follow-up: 2%
- Structure: 1%
- Feedback: 1%
- Organisational culture: 1%
- Evaluation culture: 1%

637
Node
APPENDIX 8: Case Study 4 Analysis

A) CS4 Coding Summary Report (Sample)

B) CS4 Coding Reference Totals

C) CS4 Axial Coding (Sample)

D) CS4 Bar Charts
APPENDIX 8A: CS4 Coding Summary Report (Sample)

See e-App2D for full report
## Coding Summary

### CS4

### 17/06/2012 15:09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hierarchical Name</th>
<th>Aggregate</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Number Of Coding References</th>
<th>Number Of Users Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internals\CS4CL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Node</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\BAH evaluation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.27 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\borough plan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.92 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\broad range</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.84 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\council evaluation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8.57 %</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\criteria</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.21 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\customer feedback</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.45 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\dessemination</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.08 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\dissemination</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.52 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Engagement</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.45 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Evaluation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>19.22 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\evidence base</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.40 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\ex ante</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.52 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\external scrutiny</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.51 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\feedback</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.60 %</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\levels of evalutation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.84 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\methods</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.45 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\monitoring</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.77 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\neighbourhood renewal strategy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.77 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Outcomes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.29 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\outputs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.93 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\participants</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.45 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\private sector renewal</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.31 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\review</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.62 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Strategy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8.36 %</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\structure</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6.24 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\targets</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.62 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\timeframes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5.15 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical Name</td>
<td>Aggregate</td>
<td>Coverage</td>
<td>Number Of Coding References</td>
<td>Number Of Users Coding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\work plans</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.82 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internals\CS4PE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Node</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\audit commision</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.28 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\BAH evaluation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.08 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\benchmarking</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.28 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\challenges</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.38 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\collaboration</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.21 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\commissioned evaluation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.87 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\community engagement</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.29 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\council evaluation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.21 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\criteria</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5.17 %</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\data</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.71 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\data collection</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10.05 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\dissemination</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.62 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Engagement</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>9.87 %</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Evaluation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>79.26 %</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\feedback</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.71 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\follow up</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.97 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\funding</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.63 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\future</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.44 %</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\hard to hard to measure</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.52 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\indicators</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.15 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\innovation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.77 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\internal v external</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.79 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\methods</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>32.32 %</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\neighbourhood centres</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.84 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\participants</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>13.99 %</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\project consultations</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.50 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\relationship with council</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.21 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\research questions</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>9.42 %</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\social media</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.77 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\software</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.86 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\standards</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.28 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Strategy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.55 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\technology</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.97 %</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Top 10 referenced by both total and percentage (Prevalent Codes)
Top 20 referenced by both total and percentage

Case Study 4: Open coding in Array

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODES</th>
<th>CS4CL</th>
<th>CS4PE</th>
<th>CS4PM</th>
<th>CS4SM</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 46 : methods</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 55 : participants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 8 : challenges</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 77 : ucan evaluation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 23 : Evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 74 : timeframes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 20 : Engagement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 3 : BAH evaluation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 14 : criteria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 19 : dissemination</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 29 : feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 32 : funding</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 64 : research questions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 70 : Strategy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 13 : council evaluation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 33 : future</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 39 : indicators</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 45 : measuring success</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 53 : Outcomes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 1 : accountability</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 : expectations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 : incentive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 : outputs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 : partners feedback</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 : performance indicators</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 : relationship with</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 : technology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 : benchmarking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 : borough plan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 : customer feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 : data</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 : data collection</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 : ex ante</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 : external scrutiny</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 : hard to hard to measure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 : innovation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 : internal v external</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 : neighbourhood centres</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 : neighbourhood renewal strategy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 : perfomance management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 : software</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 : structure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79 : ucan resources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 : value for money</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 : audit commision</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 : broad range</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 : bureaucracy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 : collaboration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 : commisioned evaluation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 : commitment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 : community engagement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 : dessemination</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 : environmental assessment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 : environmental responsibility</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 : evaluation v Perf Mngt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 : evidence base</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 : follow up</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 : formative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 : government</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 : hard to reach</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 : improvement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 : LAA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 : lack of evaluation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 : levels of evalutation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 : monitoring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 : NW Housing network</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 : organisingational culture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 : other directorates</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 : partners objectives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 : private sector renewal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 : project consultations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 : quality management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 : review</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 : social media</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 : social responsibility</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 : standards</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Case Study 4: Top Codes According to Percentage Coverage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODES</th>
<th>CS4CL</th>
<th>CS4PE</th>
<th>CS4PM</th>
<th>CS4SM</th>
<th>% Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23 : Evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>46 : methods</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>77 : ucan evaluation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>55 : participants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8 : challenges</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>74 : timeframes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>70 : Strategy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>20 : Engagement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>64 : research questions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>13 : council evaluation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>33 : future</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>14 : criteria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>32 : funding</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>17 : data collection</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3 : BAH evaluation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>78 : ucan locations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>29 : feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>71 : structure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>45 : measuring success</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1 : accountability</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 8C: CS4 Axial Coding (Sample)

See e-App1D for complete table
### APPENDIX 8C: Case Study 4 Axial Coding and Analysis (Sample)

See e-App1D for complete table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODEL ELEMENT</th>
<th>AXIAL CODE</th>
<th>SUB CODES</th>
<th>CS4PE</th>
<th>CS4PM</th>
<th>CS4SM</th>
<th>CS4CL</th>
<th>SECONDARY DATA</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phenomenon</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>BAH</td>
<td>All surveys across the organisation are developed using ‘Snap’ The organisation works closely with the council sharing information where appropriate. B@H KIM team, works closely with their counterparts at the council particularly in areas where they don’t have a lot of experience, Eg Health. Both organisations use the same software packages eg Snap and SPSS to facilitate collaborative evaluation across the organisation. Evaluation is carried out on a rolling programme looking at different aspects of the organisation’s services. Following the restructure, B@H planned to carry out an organisation-wide review in anticipation of the stock transfer. This is something the UCAN Review was able to tie into.</td>
<td>Senior management states that the organisation undertakes various different forms of evaluation but the concern is seeing that the all come together to form a representative picture of the organisation’s activities and performance.</td>
<td>B@H uses volunteer residents to undertake evaluation of their estates. Volunteers walk around communal areas completing a pro-forma. B@H will report to the council on a quarterly basis on its performance against the offer document. It will also do its own report to the B@H board.</td>
<td>Strategic performance report quarter 3 2011-12.pdf Annual Report 09/10 (period spanning case study) Performance Update Report for Bolton at Home Q3 09/10 Q2 2010-2011 neighbourhood performance reports Performance Update Report</td>
<td>Bolton at Home undertakes various forms of evaluation on an ongoing basis, with quarterly performance reports Different directorates carry out assessments for their component parts. Neighbourhood performance reports have focused on housing service provision as opposed to wider aspects of regeneration (Q do these...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The main form of analysis carried out on UCAN centres had previously been based on the numbers of people visiting the centres.

The UCAN Review was the first time an evaluation of the centres had attempted to incorporate the views of the main stakeholders of the UCANs; staff, customers, and partners.

Most evaluation within the UCANs had been determined by funding streams; e.g. ERDF.

In the past there hasn’t been any robust evaluation carried out on the UCANs. Ad-hoc reports have been produced detailing feedback and views from partners.

The main performance indicators utilised by the centres are:

| UCAN evaluation | Most evaluation within the UCANs had been determined by funding streams; e.g. ERDF. In the past there hasn’t been any robust evaluation carried out on the UCANs. Ad-hoc reports have been produced detailing feedback and views from partners. | Annual Report 09/10 (period spanning case study) Performance Update Report for Bolton at Home Q3 09/10 Q2 2010-2011 neighbourhood performance | There has historically been a distinct lack of evaluation particularly where the UCAN centres are concerned, with evaluation activity taking the form of monitoring service usage i.e. number of residents |}

| | | | |
APPENDIX 8D: CS4 Bar Charts
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APPENDIX 9A: Bolton at Home Regeneration Directorate Performance
Outcome Measures
Regeneration Directorate  
Performance Outcome Measures

*indicates where the outcome and direction of travel is also measured at a neighbourhood level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Objective</th>
<th>Outcome (What changes for the people or the groups you serve?)</th>
<th>Outcome Indicator</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Responsible Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transforming Estates: Estate Improvements</td>
<td>Improvements to environmental works to property</td>
<td>% of customers satisfied with physical improvements</td>
<td>Post work survey (Great Estates)</td>
<td>Paul Mellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transforming Estates: Estate Improvements</td>
<td>Increased satisfaction with open spaces</td>
<td>% of customers satisfied with open spaces</td>
<td>Baseline survey</td>
<td>Stuart Dagg/Neighbourhood Managers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Transforming Estates: Estate Improvements | Increased satisfaction with the local area | % customers satisfied with their local area as a place to live  
*% of people who think that their local area has got better over the last 12 months | Baseline survey | Stuart Dagg/Neighbourhood Managers |
| Social Issues | Improve general health & wellbeing of customers | % of respondents who assess their health as either very good or good  
Mortality rates | Baseline survey | Stuart Dagg/Neighbourhood Managers |
| Social Issues | Feeling safer | *% who feel safe during the day in their local area  
*% who feel safe after dark in their local area | Baseline survey | Stuart Dagg/Neighbourhood Managers |
<p>| Social issues | Feeling safer | *% of people who think that there is a problem with people not treating each other with respect and consideration in their local area | Baseline survey | Stuart Dagg/Neighbourhood Managers |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Objective</th>
<th>Outcome (What changes for the people or the groups you serve?)</th>
<th>Outcome Indicator</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Responsible Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Issues</td>
<td>Improve general health &amp; wellbeing of customers</td>
<td>* % of people who agree that parents take enough responsibility for the behaviour of children in their local area</td>
<td>Baseline survey</td>
<td>Stuart Dagg/Neighbourhood Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feeling safer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Offer</td>
<td>Reduction in levels of worklessness</td>
<td>No./% of customers claiming out of work benefits</td>
<td>Customer satisfaction survey</td>
<td>Patricia Quinn/Stuart Dagg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Cohesion</td>
<td>People identify with a neighbourhood and get on better</td>
<td>* % of people who believe people from different backgrounds get on well together in their local area</td>
<td>Baseline survey</td>
<td>Stuart Dagg/Neighbourhood Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People have an influence over Regeneration work</td>
<td>People agree that they can influence decision making in their area</td>
<td>% of people who agree that they can influence decision making in their area</td>
<td>Baseline survey</td>
<td>Stuart Dagg/Natalie Stokes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of tenants satisfied that their views are being taken into account</td>
<td>Customer satisfaction survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People have an influence over Regeneration work</td>
<td>Enhanced insight to the levels of staff satisfaction</td>
<td>% of overall staff satisfaction with working for Bolton at Home (Regen Directorate)</td>
<td>Staff satisfaction survey</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People have an influence over Regeneration work</td>
<td>Increase in tenants involved in community engagement activity</td>
<td>% of tenants involved in community engagement activity</td>
<td>Internal database (available from September 2010)</td>
<td>Natalie Stokes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 9B: Bolton at Home Social Accounting Interview Schedule
Having read the participant briefing note, would you say these aims and objectives reflect the work of Bolton at Home as a housing association?

What do you understand by the term Neighbourhood Management?

What would you consider the key impact areas of neighbourhood management on the work of Bolton at Home in achieving its vision? (positive and negative)

How would you say neighbourhood management sits within the Bolton at Home organisational context?

What do you think neighbourhood management means for customers?

What do you think neighbourhood management means for partners?

What do you think Bolton at Home could be doing better?
Having read the participant briefing note, would you say these aims and objectives reflect the work of Bolton at Home as a housing association?

What do you understand by the term Neighbourhood Management?

What would you consider the key impact areas of neighbourhood management on the work of Bolton at Home in achieving its vision? (positive and negative)

How would you say neighbourhood management sits within the Bolton at Home organisational context?

What do you think neighbourhood management means for customers?

What do you think neighbourhood management means for partners?

What do you think Bolton at Home could be doing better?
Having read the participant briefing note, would you say these aims and objectives reflect the work of Bolton at Home as a housing association?

How do these objectives relate to the council’s objectives?

What do you understand by the term Neighbourhood Management?

What would you consider the key impact areas of neighbourhood management on the work of Bolton at Home in achieving its vision? (positive and negative)

What would you consider the key impact areas of neighbourhood management on the work of Bolton Council? (positive and negative)

How would you say neighbourhood management sits within Bolton Council’s organisational context?

What do you think neighbourhood management means for customers? (both Bolton at Home’s and the council’s)

What do you think Bolton at Home could be doing better?
Having read the participant briefing note, would you say these aims and objectives reflect the work of Bolton at Home as a housing association?

How do these objectives relate to your directorate’s objectives?

What do you understand by the term Neighbourhood Management?

What would you consider the key impact areas of neighbourhood management on the work of Bolton at Home in achieving its vision? (positive and negative)

What would you consider the key impact areas of neighbourhood management on the programmes you deliver? (positive and negative)

What do you think neighbourhood management means for customers? (both Bolton at Home’s and yours)

What do you think you as a partner contribute to neighbourhood management?

What do you think Bolton at Home could be doing better?
Having read the participant briefing note, would you say these aims and objectives reflect the work of Bolton at Home as a housing association?

How do these objectives relate to your organisation’s objectives?

What do you understand by the term Neighbourhood Management?

What would you consider the key impact areas of neighbourhood management on the work of Bolton at Home in achieving its vision? (positive and negative)

What would you consider the key impact areas of neighbourhood management on the programmes you deliver? (positive and negative)

What do you think neighbourhood management means for customers? (both Bolton at Home’s and yours)

What do you think you as a partner contribute to neighbourhood management?

What do you think Bolton at Home could be doing better?
Social Accounting Interview – 00/05/12, (Telephone) University of Bolton

Having read the participant briefing note, would you say these aims and objectives reflect the work of Bolton at Home as a housing association?

What do you understand by the term Neighbourhood Management?

What would you consider the key impact areas of neighbourhood management on the work of Bolton at Home in achieving its vision? (positive and negative)

What does neighbourhood management mean in terms of your work with the Bolton at Home Community Development Officers?

What do you think Bolton at Home could be doing better?
Having read the participant briefing note, would you say these aims and objectives reflect the work of Bolton at Home as a housing association?

How do these objectives relate to the committee’s objectives?

What do you understand by the term Neighbourhood Management?

What would you consider the key impact areas of neighbourhood management on the work of Bolton at Home in achieving its vision? (positive and negative)

What do you think neighbourhood management means for customers?

What do you think the committee contributes to neighbourhood management?

What do you think Bolton at Home could be doing better?
“Bolton at Home is striving to achieve Homes and neighbourhoods we can all be proud of...”

**Bolton at Home is committed to:**
- Delivering on its promises
- Being open, honest and fair
- Listening to you and learning from what you tell them
- Working with you to get it right first time
- Delivering services that are flexible and adaptable
- Welcoming change to improve what they do

**Bolton at Homes objectives are:**
- Homes we can all be proud of
- Neighbourhoods we can all be proud of
- Putting customers first
- Keeping a strong, financially viable, well governed business
- Developing and growing

‘Social Accounting and audit is a framework which allows an organisation to build on existing documentation and reporting and develop a process whereby it can account for its social, environmental and economic performance and impact, report on that performance and impact and then, draw up an action plan to improve and overall be accountable to its key stakeholders’

Bolton at Home already has a strong performance management framework but there are some areas of the organisation which have not comfortably fitted into the traditional performance measurements we use. More recently, organisations both public and private have been looking at the way in which they can demonstrate the real impact they have on people, on the environment and on the local economy and many are using Social Accounting as a tool.
The organisation is currently trialling the methodology around Neighbourhood Management, reviewing and documenting in a comprehensive way work that has been undertaken on Ucans, % for Arts and Community Development as well as gaining new information from discussions with partners and customers.

If you want any further information you can contact me at the address below.

Stuart Dagg
Knowledge and Information Manager
Telephone 01204 335758
Mobile 07739 189405
Email stuart.dagg@boltonathome.org.uk

Bolton At Home
1-3 The Courtyard
Calvin Street
Bolton
BL1 8PB
Thank you very much for your interest in contributing to this social accounting exercise. Before you proceed please take time to read the following information carefully.

As part of a trial of the Social Accounting methodology within the organisation, a set of social accounts are being produced focusing on Neighbourhood Management activities. The process involves discussions in order to gain input from various stakeholders and it is on this basis that you have been selected for interview. You are under no obligation to take part, but if you do, you will be given this information sheet to keep and be asked to sign a consent form. If you decide to take part you are still free to withdraw at any time and without giving a reason up until the point you confirm the summary of the interview. It is on this basis that your participation has been requested. Interview transcripts will be analysed and results fed into the final social accounting report which will then be reviewed by a Social Audit Panel. Extracts from the transcripts may be quoted within the document.

Furthermore, data collected from the interview will serve as part of a PhD research project investigating evaluation practice in regeneration. The aim of this study is to identify improvements to existing methods of regeneration delivery and impact assessment, with emphasis on evaluation methods and procedures. To this end the data will be anonymised before undergoing qualitative analysis. All documents will be treated with sensitivity and stored in a restricted access folder until destroyed.

If you require any further information please contact me at the address below:

Ebun Akinsete
Graduate Teaching Associate
Faculty of Advanced Engineering and Sciences
University of Bolton
Email: e.akinsete@bolton.ac.uk
Tel: +44 (0) 1204 903537

Again, thank you for your time and valued contribution.
Social Accounting Informed Consent Form

I consent to participate in the interview  Yes ☐ No ☐

I have read and understood the attached information sheet and briefing note  Yes ☐ No ☐

I have been given opportunity to ask questions  Yes ☐ No ☐

I understand that I am under no obligation to take part in this interview, and I am free to withdraw at any time up until the point you confirm the summary of the interview  Yes ☐ No ☐

I am happy for direct quotes that may be used in the social accounts report to be attributed to myself  Yes ☐ No ☐

I am happy for the data provided to be used as part of the PhD research  Yes ☐ No ☐

Name ...................................................................................
Signature ...........................................................................
Date ...................................................................................
APPENDIX 9D: Letter of Support from Assistant Director (Neighbourhoods), Bolton at Home
To whom it may concern

I write with regard to Ebun who has worked on supporting Bolton At Home in the production of its first set of social accounts.

Ebun assisted with the work looking at the views of our strategic partners on our social and economic impact. Specifically she helped us construct the discussion questions with those partners and then went out and conducted them and wrote up the discussions for the purpose of the social accounts.

Ebun was part of the audit panel and the learning from this first audit will enable us to integrate our measurement of social and economic impact into what we do as an organisation. In addition there are specific learning outcomes around us expressing more clearly our aims and objectives within regeneration going forward and to that end we are looking at a rewrite of our regeneration strategy.

The work Ebun has done has been a real asset to us as an organisation.

Yours faithfully

Mark Turnbull
Assistant Director (Neighbourhoods)
Direct Line: 01204 335678
E-mail: mark.turnbull@boltonathome.org.uk
APPENDIX 10: Cross Case Analysis

A) Case Study 1 Coding Tree
B) Case Study 2 Coding Tree
C) Case Study 3 Coding Tree
D) Case Study 4 Coding Tree
E) Breakdown of Indicators in Use
APPENDIX 10A: Case Study 1 Coding Tree
APPENDIX 10B: Case Study 2 Coding Tree
Case Study 2

Evaluation
- MM evaluation
- ODP evaluation
- Closed evaluation
- Broad range
- Monitoring
- Project evaluation

Strategy
- Strategy
- Stakeholder perspective
- Risk analysis
- Social impact

Methods
- SMART framework
- Pilot test of framework
- PI
- Criteria
- MPA
- Statistics
- Target tools
- Internal
- Participants

Motivations
- Accountability

Learning
- Learning
- Aim on evaluation
- System review
- Improvement

Engagement
- Communication engagement
- Stakeholder feedback

Dissemination
- Dissemination
- Feedback

Innovation

Organisation
- Structure
- Policies
- Objective

Timeframes
- Timeframes
- Interim evaluation

Challenges
- Challenges

Future
- Integration
- Sustainability management
APPENDIX 10E: Breakdown of Indicators in Use
CASE STUDY 1: RDA

Total regeneration related indicators tracked at borough level - 47
Total RDA indicators - 25

**Environmental**
1. Amount of Land acquired (ha) *(AGMA)*
2. ◇ Amount of Buildings acquired *(m□)*
3. ◇ Amount of Brownfield land redeveloped (ha)
4. ◇ No. of New housing developed (no. units) *(AGMA)*
5. ◇ Amount of Serviced employment land brought forward (ha)
6. ◇ Amount of Employment floorspace created *(m□)*
7. ◇ No. of Commercial properties improved (no. units)
8. ◇ No. of environmental improvement schemes (no. units)
9. ◇ new property developed (sq metre) at Kingsway *(AGMA)*

**Economic**
1. ◇ No. of jobs created by new investment (no. jobs) *(AGMA)*
2. ◇ No. of referrals to employment support agencies (no referrals)
3. ◇ No. of companies assisted with relocation from outside the borough (no. companies) *(AGMA)*
4. ◇ No. of local companies assisted with relocation (no companies) *(AGMA)*
5. ◇ No. of local companies given general business/property assistance (no companies)
6. ◇ Amount of Public Sector investment (£M)
7. ◇ Amount of Private Sector investment (£M)
8. New business registration rate BERR DSO per 10,000 population *(AGMA) (NI 171)*

**Colour Key**
- Required by Council
- Required by AGMA
- National Indicator set
9. % of high growth businesses in Rochdale borough (AGMA)
10. number of business ambassadors (AGMA)
11. Gross Value Added to Rochdale Borough economy
12. number of ‘inward investment’ enquiries received by RDA (AGMA)
13. number of visits to the town centre measured by pedestrian footfall (AGMA)
14. Metro link operational to Rochdale Railway Station by 2012 and the Town Centre by 2014 (AGMA)
15. new public services offices in Rochdale incorporating a customer service centre and library by March 2013 (AGMA)
16. the new transport interchange by Dec 2013 (AGMA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Measured as</th>
<th>2011/2012</th>
<th>2012/2013</th>
<th>2013/2014</th>
<th>Rochdale Developmen t Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NI 171</td>
<td>New business registration rate BERR DSO per 10,000 population</td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Rochdale Developmen t Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP3014</td>
<td>Increase the number of high growth businesses in Rochdale borough</td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP3015</td>
<td>Increase the number of local companies assisted to stay or relocate in the borough by the RDA</td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP3016</td>
<td>Increase the number of business ambassadors doubling the number year on year</td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP3017</td>
<td>Increase the Gross Value Added of the Rochdale Borough economy</td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>Awaiting data</td>
<td>Awaiting data</td>
<td>Awaiting data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP3018</td>
<td>Increase the number of jobs safeguarded/created by companies relocating within the borough through RDA</td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP3010</td>
<td>Increase the number of new property developed (sq metre) at Kingsway</td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60000</td>
<td>43000</td>
<td>Rochdale Developmen t Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP3011</td>
<td>Increase the number of new jobs (to the borough) created by businesses relocating to Kingsway</td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGMA/RDA INDICATORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP3021</td>
<td>Increase the amount of land brought to market by RDA-related projects (Hectares)</td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rochdale Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP3022</td>
<td>Increase the total number of ‘inward investment’ enquiries received by RDA</td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP3031</td>
<td>Increase visits measured by pedestrian footfall to the town centre a within the Wheatsheaf Centre b within the Exchange</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Sustain</td>
<td>Sustain</td>
<td>Sustain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP3032</td>
<td>Metro link operational to Rochdale Railway Station by 2012 and the Town Centre by 2014</td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP6.H</td>
<td>Build new public services offices in Rochdale incorporating a customer service centre and library by March 2013</td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP.1K</td>
<td>Complete construction of the new transport interchange by Dec 2013</td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI 171</td>
<td>New business registration rate BERR DSO per 10,000 population</td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP3014</td>
<td>Increase the number of high growth businesses in Rochdale borough</td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP3015</td>
<td>Increase the number of local companies assisted to stay or relocate in the borough by the RDA</td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP3016</td>
<td>Increase the number of business ambassadors doubling the number year on year</td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP3017</td>
<td>Increase the Gross Value Added of the Rochdale Borough economy</td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>Awaiting data</td>
<td>Awaiting data</td>
<td>Awaiting data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP3018</td>
<td>Increase the number of jobs safeguarded/created by companies relocating within the borough through RDA</td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP3010</td>
<td>Increase the number of new property developed (sq metre) at Kingsway</td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60000</td>
<td>43000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP3011</td>
<td>Increase the number of new jobs (to the borough) created by businesses relocating to Kingsway</td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Rochdale Development Agency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CASE STUDY 2: NEM

Total RDA indicators - 34

Environmental

1. Population
2. New Homes Built
3. Net Additional Homes
4. % Home Ownership
5. New Retail Floorspace
6. Homes Improved
7. Average House Price
8. % Voids
9. Resident Satisfaction
10. Green Flag Parks

Social

1. % children level 4 Key stage
2. % young people 5 A*-C
3. GCSE
4. Secondary attendance
5. Secondary Persistent Absence
6. Rate of serious acquisitive crime
7. Resident perceptions of ASB
8. Perceptions of effectiveness of police and LA partnership in tackling ASB
9. Standard Mortality rate
10. Under 18 conception
11. Overall self reported measure of health

**Economic**

1. Additional Floor Space
2. Residents Supported into work
3. Jobs created
4. Working Age Claimants
5. Unemployment rate
6. Job Seekers Allowance over 6 months
7. Incapacity Benefit Claimants
8. Long term Incapacity Benefit Claimants
9. % population having skill level 2
10. % Population having skill level 3
11. % Population having skill level 4
12. Number gaining Qualifications
13. % of NEETs
**OCP INDICATORS**

**Economic**

1. Total income and expenditure
2. Number of qualified enquiries
3. Area let/unlet, number of lettings in period
4. No of firms on science park
5. No of firms being incubated
6. No of firms assisted
7. Floor Space occupied
8. Jobs Created
9. Sales Generated plus Investment
10. Length of Occupancy
11. Length of Employment

**Social**

1. No of events and participants in period
2. No of collaborators with knowledge base

**Colour Key**

NEM Indicators
NEM Indicators

- Social: 29.41%
- Economic: 38.24%
- Environmental: 32.35%
CASE STUDY 3: CHALK NDC

Total CHALK NDC indicators - 267

Environmental

1. % of residents who want to move/ wish to stay in the area
2. % of residents who want to move, who wish to move outside UK
3. % residents at current address for less than 3 years
4. % new residents (in area less than 1 year) attracted by recent improvements
5. Customer satisfaction with Block Improvements programme
6. % turnover of local authority housing stock
7. % of households in LA housing
8. % households owner occupiers
9. Number of homes improved or built
10. Data from HMRF programme
11. Number of void public housing properties
12. Number of vacant and blighted properties vacant for at least 6 months brought back into use
13. Vacancy Rates
14. Increase the percentage of residents satisfied / fairly satisfied with their neighbourhood as a place to live
15. Proportion of residents satisfied with the state of repair of their homes
16. Average house price in New Deal area

696
17. Mean House Price (all properties)
18. Number of house sales
19. % residents feeling that run down / boarded up properties are a problem
20. % residents feeling that their quality of life is very / fairly good
21. % residents very / fairly satisfied with the condition of the streets
22. % businesses stating that poor local image is one of the main barriers to their growth
23. % businesses stating that image is an important regeneration issue for the New Deal area
24. % residents regarding poor quality or lack of parks and open spaces as a problem
25. % residents very / fairly satisfied with parks and open spaces
26. Environmental / dereliction index score
27. % residents feeling that litter and rubbish in the streets is a problem
28. % residents feeling that dogs causing a mess is a serious problem
29. % residents feeling that the speed and volume of road traffic is a serious problem
30. % residents thinking that the City has got cleaner in the last 12 months
31. % population of NDC area within catchment area of Greenspace standard?
32. % residents regarding poor public transport a problem
33. % residents very / fairly satisfied with public transport
34. Number of times that the mini bus has been used
35. Number of drivers who have been MIDAS trained
36. Total number of passengers in the mini bus
37. Number of new / improved footpaths
38. Number of traffic calming schemes
39. % residents very/fairly satisfied with sports facilities
40. Number of local residents using local sports facilities
41. % residents who feel that the area has got worse to live in
42. % new residents (in area less than 1 year) attracted by recent improvements
43. Number of dwellings subject to energy efficiency measures
44. Number of capacity building events (pre-masterplanning)
45. Number of consultation events
46. Number of community spaces created
47. Number of new community facilities
48. Number of new properties completed
49. Number of affordable homes
50. Number of homes matching the house building sustainability code

**Economic**

1. % households in paid work
2. % households having someone registered unemployed
3. % households having someone not registered unemployed but seeking work
4. Employment rate
5. % residents economically active
6. % residents economically inactive
7. % population living in households receiving out of work means tested benefits
8. Worklessness count
9. Unemployment Count (number of people on JSA)
10. JSA claimants as a % of working age population
11. % JSA claimants out of work for more than 6 months
12. Work limiting Illness count (people on IB and SDA)
13. Number of local people going into employment through new Deal projects
14. Number of jobs created through New Deal projects
15. Number of jobs safeguarded
16. Number of people accessing improved careers advice
17. Local Businesses employing New Deal residents
18. % households receiving income support
19. % respondents receiving state benefits
20. % residents on low income: 698
21. % residents over 16 not in full-time education who have taken part in education or training in the past year
22. Number of person weeks of job related training
23. Number of people trained entering work
24. Number of adults gaining at least one skills for life qualification
25. Number of people receiving job training
26. Number of adults in the workforce who lack NVQ2 or equivalent
27. Residents entering education or training
28. % residents wanting to undertake additional education or training
29. % residents in full time education
30. % businesses stating that availability of skilled labour is one of their main barriers to growth
31. % adults of working age with no qualifications
32. % households having someone over 16 in full time education
33. Number of adults obtaining qualifications through NDC projects (certificates)
34. % of 16-18 years olds not in education, employment or training
35. % school leavers from Albion High School NEET
36. % school leavers from All Hallows High School NEET
37. % residents economically active
38. % residents in paid work
39. % residents having access to a PC at home
40. Number of jobs safeguarded
41. Total number of business premises improved
42. Total floor space brought back into business use
43. Total number of new staff recruited following NDC support to local businesses
44. Total private sector investment in local business
45. Total non-NDC public sector investment in local business
46. % local businesses recruiting in the last year
47. Businesses - staffing levels over the last 3 years
48. % local businesses trading for less than 5 years
49. % local businesses employing less than 5 people
50. % local businesses employing over 50 people
51. Number of local businesses receiving advice and support
52. % local businesses in receipt of business support
53. Number of business start-ups
54. Number of business start-ups still trading after 12 months
55. Number of business start-ups still trading after 36 months
56. Number of new businesses supported

Social
1. % voluntary and community groups affirming growth in last year in terms of financial turnover and volunteering
2. Number of community groups / organisations represented in decision-making structures
3. Number of NDC based community groups registered with the Community Committee
4. Number of active Community groups in NDC area
5. Number of capacity building initiatives
6. Number of people employed in voluntary work
7. Number of times that community groups have received support
8. Number of new or improved community facilities
9. Number of people using new or improved community facilities
10. Number of voluntary organisations supported
11. Number of community consultation events
12. % residents with English as a first language
13. Number of community chest type grant awarded
14. Number of times that community groups have received support
15. % residents agreeing that people from different backgrounds get on
16. % residents who feel that neighbours look out for each other
17. % residents involved in a local organisation as a volunteer
18. % residents who have volunteered in the last 12 months
19. % residents who feel they very or fairly strongly belong to their neighbourhood
20. % residents who feel part of the community
21. Number of residents regularly involved in the NDC programme
22. Number of good news stories
23. % NDC residents feeling very / fairly informed about NDC activities
24. % residents trusting NDC a great deal / fair amount
25. % residents involved in activities organised by NDC in last 2 years
26. % residents who think that NDC has improved the area a great deal / fair amount as a place to live
27. Number of residents able to influence decisions that affect their area
28. Levels of awareness of NDC
29. Residents stating that they feel a bit / very unsafe after dark
30. % residents very / fairly worried about being physically attacked by strangers
31. % residents feeling very / fairly safe in the area
32. % residents feeling that the area is more safe than 2 years ago
33. % residents feeling that people being attacked or harassed is a problem in the area
34. Number of community safety initiatives
35. Number of victims of crime supported
36. % local businesses stating that crime and vandalism is a main barrier to their growth over the next 5 years
37. Total number of recorded crimes
38. Total police recorded crime rate
39. Number of CCTV cameras monitored and installed
40. Number of additional police
41. Number of additional PCSOs
42. % local businesses reporting that they have been victims of crime in the past 12 months
43. Serious acquisitive crime rate
44. % businesses reporting being victim of car crime
45. % businesses reporting being victim of personal crime
46. % businesses reporting being victim of property crime
47. % businesses reporting being victim of other crime
48. Assault with injury
49. Criminal damage
50. Levels of recorded criminal damage
51. Levels of recorded juvenile nuisance
52. Number of first time entrants to the youth justice system who are aged 10-17
53. Total number of recorded incidences of burglary
54. % residents feeling that household burglary is a problem in the area
55. % respondents who have experienced burglary in the last 12 months
56. % respondents who have had something stolen from outside their home
57. % residents very / fairly worried about burglary
58. Burglary dwelling
59. Number of homes with improved security
60. Total number of recorded incidences of vehicle crime
61. % residents feeling that abandoned / burnt out cars is a very / fairly serious problem
62. % residents reporting that car crime is a serious problem
63. % respondents worried about having car stolen
64. Total vehicle Crime
65. Incidence of anti-social behaviour
66. Incidence if juvenile related ASB
67. % local residents who consider teenagers hanging around on streets is a problem
68. % local residents reporting vandalism / graffiti a fairly / serious problem
69. % residents feeling fairly / very worried about being robbed / mugged
70. % residents feeling that property being set on fire is a problem
71. % residents feeling that disturbance from crowds / gangs or hooliganism is a problem
72. % residents who say people using or dealing drugs is a very or fairly big problem in their area
73. % residents who say that noisy neighbours and loud parties is a very or fairly big problem in their area
74. Re-offending rate (adults)
75. Detection of hate crime
76. % residents feeling that racial harassment is a problem
77. % respondents very / fairly worried about being subject to a physical attack because of skin colour, ethnic origin or religion
78. % respondents stating that they have been harassed or racially abused
79. % respondents very / fairly worried about being physically attacked by someone you know
80. Number of domestic violence finalised prosecutions
81. Achievement of level 3 qualification by age 19
82. Achievement of level 2 qualification by age 19
83. % of 16-18 years olds not in education, employment or training
84. % 17 - 18 year olds staying on in non-advanced full time education
85. Rate of entry to HE for under 21s from the NDC area
86. % pupils going on to further education
87. % half days missed due to unauthorised absence - All Hallows
88. % half days missed due to unauthorised absence - Albion High School
89. Number of half days missed through unauthorised absence in local schools (primary and secondary)
90. % local residents having great deal of trust in local schools
91. % local residents very/fairly satisfied with local secondary schools
92. % pupils achieving 5 or more GCSE A*-C grades
93. KS3 English achieving level 5
94. Contextual added value measure
95. Number of teachers / teaching assistants attracted or retained in schools serving NDC children
96. Number of pupils benefiting from projects designed to enhance / improve attainment
97. % pupils achieving level 4 or more (KS2) - Science
98. % pupils achieving level 4 or more (KS2) - Maths
99. % pupils achieving level 4 or more (KS2) - English
100. Number of registered childcare places
101. % local residents very/fairly satisfied with local childcare provision
102. % local residents satisfied with pre-school nursery provision
103. Indicators and measures from evaluation of Children's Activities and Services Project (incl. Holiday Fun)
104. Number of groups providing activities for children
105. Measure of how satisfied children are with childcare provision
106. Number of 3-4 year olds in free early education (all providers)
107. Percentage of children aged 3-4 accessing free early years care
108. % local residents who are very/fairly satisfied with local play facilities
109. Measure of how satisfied children are with local play facilities
110. % local residents who consider teenagers hanging around on streets is a problem
111. Positive measures from projects
112. Evidence from intergenerational work
113. % young people who think that their views are considered, and can influence decisions in the area
114. Number of young people participating in decision making bodies
115. Indicators from Youth Participation project
116. Membership of VOICE group
117. Number of first time entrants to the youth justice system who are aged 10-17
118. Number of young people benefiting from youth inclusion / diversionary projects
119. % local residents very/fairly satisfied with local health facilities
120. % local residents very/fairly satisfied with doctors
121. % local residents who have a great deal / fair amount of trust in the local health service
122. % residents rating access to doctors as being very / fairly easy
123. Number of people benefitting from new or improved health facilities
124. % households having someone with a limiting, long term illness
125. Number of people on various benefits
126. Standardised illness ratio
127. % households with member suffering from anxiety/problems with nerves/depression/stress
128. % households with member suffering from other mental health problems
129. % residents feeling ‘down in the dumps’ all/most/some of the time
130. % population who regard their health as good/fairly good over the last year
131. % residents who say that they have been happy all/most/some of the time
132. % adults under 60 being treated for mood and anxiety disorders
133. Mental Health needs index
134. Incidence of hospitalised for mental health reasons
135. Rates of self harm
136. % residents who feel part of the community
137. % single person households
138. % households with a member suffering loneliness or isolation
139. % households single parent families
140. Number of young people receiving alcohol intervention
141. Number of hospital admissions for NDC residents due to all conditions attributed to alcohol
142. Number of young people hospitalised due to alcohol
143. Levels of binge drinking
144. Levels of violence attributable to alcohol
145. Death in hospital due to alcohol related disease
146. Levels of obesity in reception pupils
147. Levels of obesity in year 6 pupils
148. % children classed as obese
149. Number of women breast feeding for at least 6 months
150. Low birth weight
151. Number of women continuing to smoke at delivery
152. % residents who smoke (16+)
153. Number of women continuing to smoke at delivery
154. Number of people who have stopped smoking for at least 4 weeks
155. Smoke free homes data
156. % residents stating that they often have ‘no physical activity for at least 20 minutes at a time’
157. % adult residents having a BMI over 30
158. % population who regard their health as good/fairly good over the last year
159. % residents feeling that their health has been much / somewhat better over the last year
160. % residents having 5 portions of fruit a day
161. Number of people benefitting from healthy lifestyle projects
CASE STUDY 4: Bolton at Home

Total BAH Regeneration indicators - 14

**Environmental**

1. % of customers satisfied with physical improvements
2. % of customers satisfied with open spaces
3. % customers satisfied with their local area as a place to live
4. % of people who think that their local area has got better over the last 12 months

**Economic**

1. % of customers claiming out of work benefits

**Social**

2. % of people who believe people from different backgrounds get on well together in their local area
3. % of people who agree that they can influence decision making in their area
4. % of tenants satisfied that their views are being taken into account
5. % of overall staff satisfaction with working for Bolton at Home (Regen Directorate)
6. % of tenants involved in community engagement activity
7. % of respondents who assess their health as either very good or good
8. % of people who think that there is a problem with people not treating each other with respect and consideration in their local area
9. % of people who agree that parents take enough responsibility for the behaviour of children in their local area

708
Bolton at Home Regeneration indicators

- Social: 64%
- Economic: 7%
- Environmental: 29%
Distribution of Regeneration indicators

- Social: 39.16%
- Economic: 32.59%
- Environmental: 28.25%

Total number of indicators in array: 14, 25, 34, 267
Median: 29.5 (30)
Mean: 85