Matter of Focus

Evidence Standards Template

Every organisation needs to agree the basis on which they will rate their progress towards outcomes and their confidence in their evidence within OutNav. This document provides a starting point from which to do that.

NOTE
The developmental approach to evaluation that Matter of Focus and OutNav encourage, emphasises embracing complexity, learning from difficulties or lack of progress, and reflection, redirection where needed. The purpose of judging progress and confidence in data is not for performance management purposes but to allow this kind of learning and reflection.

It is likely that you will come up with a rating of no progress in some places in your outcome map, especially if this is the first time you have scrutinised processes. The OutNav approach is flexible and allows for redirection and innovation if things don't go as planned. You can change and adapt your outcome maps as you learn about what is working well and what isn't. They are not intended to be set in stone and used as a way to judge performance.

Suggested Progress Ratings

Progress assessment	Criteria
Great progress	- Enough people and groups will experience this in the timescale you have defined - Risks have been mitigated and assumptions achieved
Some Progress	- Some people and groups experience this in the timescale you have defined - Some risks have been mitigated and some assumptions achieved
No Progress	- Not enough people and groups experience this in the timescale you have defined - Risks have not been mitigated and some assumptions found to be unrealistic

The most robust projects will have a project plan specifying timescales over which different levels in a pathway will be achieved.

Other progress issues to consider
- Are you measuring current service users?
- The number of people we aim to serve, or a proportion of population who we could serve?
- Is this a formative or summative judgement (formative to think about progress, summative to say something about overall programme effectiveness)?
- How often will you rate your progress?
- Will you measure progress as you go, or rate solely against your final aims?

Confidence
Confidence measures are the standards that your organisation seeks to achieve in data quality and robustness that will allow you to make solid progress ratings. Organisations take different approaches to this. For example are you seeking evidence for every part of your outcomes map, or could you use reflection as the basis on which you rate progress?

In general, confidence in evidence is based on a combination of the following factors:

- How many sources of evidence are there?
- Is there agreement/disagreement between evidence sources?
- How robust is the evidence (how collected, how many people, purposefully collected data or opportunistic?)

Suggested Confidence Ratings

Confidence assessment	Criteria
Very confident	Most of these criteria apply • more than one source of evidence with appropriate balance of types • evidence collected purposefully and for this purpose • reasonable number of responses • no disagreement between evidence sources • backed up by other research • analysis is clear and purposeful (someone else could replicate and get broadly the same results)

Some confidence	**Some of these criteria apply** • more than one evidence source with appropriate balance of types of evidence • evidence is collected purposefully and for this purpose • reasonable number of responses • no disagreement between sources • backed up by other research • analysis is clear and purposeful (someone else could replicate and get broadly the same results) **And / or** • there is some disagreement or lack of clarity of the findings • the data is mostly gathered opportunistically
Little confidence	**Few of the above criteria apply AND / OR** • there is disagreement within the data • assessments are based solely on an individual's perspectives