Revolving Doors Agency approach to impact

Briefing for Board session, 1 December 2020

This briefing will set out:

1. How we have approached impact measurement at different levels of the organisation and how we have reported impact in the last few years
2. Our proposed plan for development of an impact measurement framework for the Strategy 2020-2024.
3. Reflections on impact reporting going forward

1. Impact approach at different levels

We can see and measure impact at three levels (see Table 1):

- **Organisational/strategic level**: we have committed to developing an impact measurement framework to underpin the strategy and to reporting on progress by the end of the first year. Our priority is therefore to develop that framework for the four main areas of the strategy: police, courts, probation and community sentences, and building lived experience insight into the CJS. Some of these areas are underpinned by major grants (e.g. New Gen for policing and the National Lottery forum grant for building lived experience insight) and therefore have well-developed sets of KPIs. Our work in courts and probation, however, has been mostly driven through social enterprise and we therefore haven't formally done the work to define our desired impact. In the strategy we also make five commitments to building organisational strength, many of which already have well-developed impact measures sitting behind them and that we report on both internally and externally (see Appendix 1 for detail).
- **Team**: for the 2017/18 impact report we developed 2-3 impact measures for each of the teams – research, policy and public affairs, and involvement. Some of these are now well embedded; others less so. We also now have new strategies for policy and research, which are aligned to the main strategy and which have clear objectives for which we will develop impact measures. (See Appendix 1 for detail.)
- **Individual project level**: larger projects (and all of the grant-funded projects) have some consideration of impact and may also have KPIs. Social enterprise projects have been driven more by the impact that the client wants to see and are deliverable focused. They have tended not to have formal impact measures. See Appendix 2 for the results of an audit across all projects to map which projects:
  - Have a clear statement of the impact we are seeking to achieve
  - Have KPIs or other ways of assessing impact
  - Have coproduced impact statements and/or measurement frameworks.

The strategy is underpinned by a theory of change (ToC), which should also inform development of the impact measurement framework. These three levels correspond (roughly) to different levels of the theory of change (see Table 1).

The strategy does not (and was never intended to) capture everything we do. A significant proportion of our social enterprise work sits outside the strategy. And, although it may not contribute to our strategic objectives, we still see significant impact through that work. If we wish to give a full picture of our organisational impact, our overall impact assessment and reporting approach will therefore need to combine elements from all of these levels. However, in recognition

of the immediate need to develop the strategy impact framework, we recommend that we park that question for now. We will also need to think carefully about the narrative that we put around the relationship between the strategy and our other work. Internally, we understand why our strategy is focused on the CJS, and why it doesn't reflect everything we do. However, this may be less well understood externally. The branding work should help with the development of this narrative, and Board will therefore have an opportunity to contribute.

Table 1   Summary of impact approach at different levels

Level	Areas	Notes
Organisational/ strategic level	Strategic areas: 1. Policing 2. Courts 3. Probation and community sentences 4. LE insight into the CJS	• Correspond to ToC outcome level • Mostly to be developed although we have aligned grant-funded projects for policing and LE insight into the CJS, which have KPIs
	Organisational areas: 1. Invest in our people 2. Increase our visibility 3. Connect with others 4. Stay focused on impact 5. Ensure sustainability and ability to deliver	• Partly corresponds to ToC activity level • Mix of inward and outward-facing measures already developed with exception of 1st and 4th areas
Team level	Functional teams: 1. Policy and public affairs 2. Involvement 3. Research	• Corresponds to ToC output level • Some impact measures developed for 2017/18 reporting • Policy and research both have new strategies, which set out objectives for which impact measures need to be developed
Project level	Currently 18 individual projects	• Corresponds to ToC activity level (although individual project outputs and outcomes will contribute to upper ToC levels) • 15 projects have impact statements • 7 projects (mostly larger and grant-funded) have established impact measures

2. Proposed approach for development of the Strategy 2020-2024 impact measurement framework

Making the Revolving Door avoidable and escapable – the four strategic areas

The strategy and theory of change have very high-level impact statements for each of the four main areas, e.g. in policing, "we will work with police services and PCCs to develop mainstreamed responses from first contact to prosecution". A theory of change outcome is that "Individuals are effectively diverted away from the CJS".

For each area we would like to take the opportunity to reflect on the impact that we are seeking to achieve – our aim is to develop objectives that are more specific than the strategy impact statements and theory of change outcomes. What would good impact on policing actually look like? How will we know that we have achieved our ambition?

We intend to run a brainstorming session with three groups to develop these objectives: trustees (on 1 Dec) staff and, finally, the LEAP. The sessions will be designed to first surface as many ideas as possible and then to refine it down to the most meaningful objectives. Each session will build on the last – LEAP members, for example, will be able to see what trustees and staff have proposed and to remove and add ideas. The sessions will be run via Zoom and Google Jamboard (see attached link to the boards).

From these sessions we will develop a more limited set of objectives and associated key results for each strategy area for sign-off by the Board in January, together with a first progress report. We would expect key results to be informed by existing project-level targets and indicators, where relevant.

Building our organisational strength – five development areas

We already have good measures (or measurement plans) and internal reporting commitments across some of the five development areas:

- **Invest in our people**: currently no tracking (with the exception of quarterly capacity planning and monitoring) or formal annual reporting internally or externally. Could develop measures around development, engagement, wellbeing, and the extent to which staff feel our values and ways of working have been successfully embedded. **We would be interested in trustee's views on whether they would like to see formal reporting in this area.**
- **Increase our visibility**: we track and have reported on social media, publications, media mentions (traditional and specialist) and speaking engagements in previous impact reports.
- **Connect with others**: the partnerships strategy defines targets against which we will report to Board annually and could include in external impact reporting.
- **Ensure sustainability and ability to deliver**: progress against the Business Plan KPIs will be reported to Board in April; highlights can be included in external impact reporting.
- **Stay focused on impact**: we don't propose meta-level impact monitoring. Success will be assessed by the Board and team, but should focus on the development and implementation of the strategic impact measurement framework, the extent to which we use the framework to inform annual planning, and the extent to which impact measurement is embedded across projects and teams.

If developing an external-facing Strategy progress report, we propose to also report highlights against these areas.

3. Reflections on impact reporting

In January 2020 Board approved a move away from the production of a separate annual impact report, moving instead to using blogs and social media to report impact through the year (see Board paper included as Appendix 3). **We would be interested in trustee's reflections on that approach and, in particular, whether they feel that an annual report has value and is worth reinstating**.

In a sense, the launch of the strategy meant that an annual report has not been missed this year – we had a strong, external-facing document to share with stakeholders setting out our ambition. However, an annual report and a commitment to ongoing reporting need not be mutually exclusive, and stakeholders may expect and wish to see an annual progress report for the remaining four years of the strategy.

Secondly, *if* **Board would like to see the reinstatement of an annual outward-facing impact report, should it be narrowly focused on progress against the strategy, or cover all organisational impact?**

Appendix 1   Detail of current state of play for impact measures at different levels

Table 1   Team-level measures

Team	Existing measures (mostly developed 2017/18)	Further measures to be developed
Policy and public affairs	• Major policy "wins" (subjective measure as defined by us) • Recommendations adopted as a result of our consultation responses	• Policy strategy covers 4 strategic areas (with key actions) and communications (aims and key actions); both should inform development and reporting of strategic impact.
Research	• Research and evaluation client satisfaction (standard questions) • Number of services evaluated, plus number of people those services support annually • Number of evaluation recommendations 1) accepted and 2) adopted	• Key results to be developed for research strategy objectives; many are inward-facing to be reported to Board, but highlights can be incorporated into outward-facing reporting on progress on implementing full strategy.

Involvement	• Number of services to which provided LE consultancy/training, plus number of people those services supported annually
	• Member forum feedback (standard measures tracking impact on feelings of agency/hope/identity) – note not been used since move to online forums
	• Member progression:
	    ○ Engagement, training and move-on into employment tracked through Salesforce
	    ○ Exit interviews when members move on – note need to do as standard and to develop standard questions (e.g. "one thing most proud of during my time with RDA", "how involvement has changed my identity")
		• Forum guest feedback – initial thoughts on standard questions:
		    ○ Was it beneficial? (Likert)
		    ○ How did the members influence you?
		    ○ What have you changed/plan to change as a result?
		    ○ Would you attend the forum again/recommend the forum to others? (yes/no)

Table 2   Measuring our organisational strength

Area	Existing measures	Further measures to be developed
Invest in people	None, although we plan and track capacity on a quarterly basis	Could develop measures to report to Board: • Staff development • Staff engagement • Staff wellbeing (e.g. short WEMWBS) • Extent to which staff feel ways of working/values are embedded
Increase our visibility	• Social media tracking (number of Twitter followers) • Media mentions (mainstream and specialist press) • Publications highlights • Speaking engagements highlights	Could track public awareness – for the 25th we tracked press mentions of the "revolving door"
Connect with others	• Number of partnerships by organisation type	New partnerships strategy has targets – will be reported to Board; highlights could be reported externally
Ensure sustainability	Business plan KPIs will measure: • Income • Contract size and duration • Margins • Funder/client diversification • Strategic alignment Will be reported to Board in April; highlights relevant to an external audience could be included in an external report	
Stay focused on impact	No formal measures and no current plans to develop, although would expect Board to continue to hold us to account on the need to focus on impact and on how we do that.	

Appendix 2   Project-level impact audit

Project name	Type of funding	Type of project	Size of project (total value)	Project has considered impact?	Intended impact of the project	How project is measuring impact e.g. KPIs	Impact is being considered in a co-produced way
Help Through Crisis	Social Enterprise	LE Consultancy	£184,282	N		None - deliverable focused	N
Birmingham Changing Futures Together	Social Enterprise	Evaluation	£165,602	Y	To provide useful insight and recommendations into the specific work streams, in particular best practice, areas to be improved and attitudes towards the programme from staff and beneficiaries; as well as evidence of the impact and legacy of the BCFT programme.	None - deliverable focused	No LE input at project design stage, but project is coproduced with peer researchers.
HMPPS probation service design	Social Enterprise	Service design	£9,000	Y	To inform the probation reform programme through obtaining meaningful feedback from service users on their experience of probation and their views on the new Unified Model, and bring in RDA knowledge and expertise.	None - deliverable focused	No LE input at project design stage, but project will be coproduced with a Lived Experience Inquiry Panel.
NECG	Social Enterprise	LE Consultancy	£364,562	Y	To put people with lived experience of multiple and complex needs front and centre of Fufilling Lives, and ensure that co-production is embedded in the way that the programme as a whole, and the 12 Partnerships individually, affect systems change at a national and local level.	KPIs for different stages of the project including impact. Local Partnerships report a positive impact from their involvement in the NECG annually; NECG members are better involved in the development of local systems change priorities within their local FL Partnerships; Positive feedback is received from national and regional decision makers on involvement of the NECG and FL partners are more effective at influencing national	The proposal was coproduced, as were the NECG's strategic approach and priorities.

Project name	Type of funding	Type of project	Size of project (total value)	Project has considered impact?	Intended impact of the project	How project is measuring impact e.g. KPIs	Impact is being considered in a co-produced way
						systems change due to better engagement with the NECG.	
Peer Mentoring in the CJS (Oak Foundation)	Grant	Research	£76,263	Y	The overall project intends to develop a peer mentoring best practice guide through conducting research and consultation across a range of sectors and examining existing evidence.	No KPIs/targets but expected results and outcomes have been considered against the four project objectives e.g. to encourage both commissioners and providers to adopt the best practice guide as a de facto "kitemark" or quality standard.	No LE input at project design stage, but project will have a steering group that includes lived experience members.
St Giles Peer Advisor Network Evalutaion	Social Enterprise	Evaluation	£48,260	Y	To facilitate learning and continuous improvement throughout the project; to suport the development of a strong evidence base on the value of lived experience invovlement; effectively communicating the findings to influence wider change.	None - deliverable focused	No LE input at project design stage (although it was co-designed with the client, including a Theory of Change review); the project is coproduced with peer researchers, who will be involved in a further review of the ToC.
St Andrews Evaluation (Choice Support)	Social Enterprise	Evaluation	£42,724	Y	To evaluate the extent to which the St Andrews model promotes progression for its residents and to uncover and share learning about how the model works, and how it could work even better to	None - deliverable focused	N

Project name	Type of funding	Type of project	Size of project (total value)	Project has considered impact?	Intended impact of the project	How project is measuring impact e.g. KPIs	Impact is being considered in a co-produced way
					feed directly into service improvements.		
Cancer Care in Prisons	Social Enterprise	Research	£22,574	Y	To assess the incidence and potential cost of cancer in English prisons,equity of access to cancer care,and experiences of care,in order to identify areas where the quality of care can be improved, examples of best practice and to develop priorities and recommendations to inform and improve local services and English prison cancer care policy.	No KPIs/targets, but proposal sets out detail of expected impact on knowledge, health, healthcare services and society	No LE input at project design stage, but peer researchers have played an active role in the project governance - including research design, fieldwork and dissemination of findings.
Research Network 2	Grant	Research	£122,757	Y	To continue to collate and build the evidence base on severe and multiple disadvantage. In particular, contributing to understanding about who faces multiple disadvantage, what good support looks like and what happens in practice and how systems are set up, enabled, and run, to support those more in need.	None - deliverable focused	N
New Generation Policing	Grant	Policy	£107,946 (BC) + £304,219 (EF) + £210,952 (LBF)	Y	By 2022 there is a national level commitment to diverting young adults involved with repeat low-level crimes away from the criminal justice system	Project has range of milestones at the end of Year, 1, 2 3 and progress indicators (e.g. forum established with 10 members, roundtable held)	Activities are rooted in the voices and understanding of those with lived experience and service delivery, underpinned by robust research.

Project name	Type of funding	Type of project	Size of project (total value)	Project has considered impact?	Intended impact of the project	How project is measuring impact e.g. KPIs	Impact is being considered in a co-produced way
NHS England - East Midlands Panel	Social Enterprise	LE Consultancy	£267,228	Y	To improve experiences of people receiving healthcare within the secure estate in the East Midlands; and for other organisations to be influenced by co-production with people with Lived Experience (which they hope will also change attitudes towards ex-offenders).	Small number of short and long-term outcomes that the LEP are working towards. Currently co-producing a project tracker to log activities and impact of these, and on who.	Programme Theory of Change co-designed with LEP members, who will also be involved in tracking impact activity.
MEAM Fufilling Lives Consultancy	Social Enterprise	LE Consultancy	£17,145	N		None - deliverable focused	N
NHS Non-Custodial Lived Experience Team (LET)	Social Enterprise	LE Consultancy	£125,989	N		None - deliverable focused	All activities are coproduced and the LET has a good sense of the impact it is seeking to achieve with each activity, but there has not yet been an overall consideration of impact (c.f. the work we have done with the East Mids LEP to coproduce their Theory of Change).
UKRI - COVID 19 Impact of Probation Healthcare	Social Enterprise	Research	£21,716	Y	To improve understanding and learn from the impact of COVID-19 on probation's work to improve the health of people under its supervision.	Deliverables and expected outcomes have been defined at month 3, 6, 12 and 18.	Peer researchers reviewed and commented on proposal, including impact statements. Revolving Doors will be capturing service user views. Through joint working with stakeholders, including NPS and NHSE, findings will directly inform how services are provided in the future.

Project name	Type of funding	Type of project	Size of project (total value)	Project has considered impact?	Intended impact of the project	How project is measuring impact e.g. KPIs	Impact is being considered in a co-produced way
St Mungo's ACE evaluation	Social Enterprise	Evaluation	£39,914	Y	To conduct a meaningful evaluation that robustly evidences both the outcomes and cost effectiveness of ACE, thus supporting the case for re-commissioning through evidence of impact across the key objectives identified. And to offer a quality understanding of the service and 'how it feels on the ground' to both support ongoing service improvement and inform policy.	None - deliverable focused	N
NIHR Improving Health and Healthcare for people on Probation	Grant	Research	£15,120	Y	To improve the measurement, understanding and recording of the health and social care needs of people on probation (better data collection) and to develop QIs for the quality of the care that people on probation receive.	> An improved approach to routine screening of the NPS caseload that can be employed nationally. > An associated set of QIs. >The facility for all NPS LDUs to create a report on the health and social care needs of their caseload and the quality of care that they receive, and share this with commissioners and JSNA authors.	No coproduction at project design stage, but two RDA peer researchers working on the project - including designing research tools and co-analysis. There will also be an opportunity for them to contribute to dissemination activities and outputs.

Project name	Type of funding	Type of project	Size of project (total value)	Project has considered impact?	Intended impact of the project	How project is measuring impact e.g. KPIs	Impact is being considered in a co-produced way
NLCF - Reaching Communities - Forum	Grant	LE Consultancy	£343,712	Y	1. Systems change at a regional and national level that helps to stop the revolving door. 2. Functional skills which allow Forum Members to better influence this change.	Project has 3 outcomes (with associated indicators): - People with LE of the revolving door have increased confidence to speak truth to power - People with LE of the revolving door have developed the skills to successfully influence decision making at a systemic level - Senior decision makers in the CJS and beyond make changes to their commissioning or decision making practices so that they are inspired by LE insight	Project co-designed with members through consultation process that lasted over a year.
City Bridge Trust - London Regional User Forum	Grant	LE Consultancy	£133,130	Y	Using the grant to invest in the regional London forums and provide (peer research or facilitation) training to members: and therefore enable members to build communities and using their experience and knowledge to make significant policy shifts or systems change.	45 people with lived experience of the revolving door of crisis and crime have increased confidence to speak truth to power and have developed the skills to successfully influence decision making at a systemic level. Three senior decision makers in the CJS make changes to their commissioning or decision making practices so that it takes into account lived experience insight of the revolving door of crisis and crime	Grant application was made following feedback that members wanted more structured and accredited training.

Project has clear targets/KPIs/key results	Project impact, outcomes/targets etc. were coproduced
No targets, but the project has a detailed understanding of its intended impact and its key audiences	Project impact not explicitly coproduced, but the project itself is coproduced

Appendix 3 Impact report paper for January 2020 Board

Background

Our impact report for 2017/8 was produced within the momentum for our 25th Anniversary and was a significant step forward for Revolving Doors' impact reporting; we developed a number of quantitative metrics that gave a real feeling for the scope of our delivery. It sat within the printed materials produced for the 25th event and gave a good overview of the work we had delivered. It was helpful as a communication to (re)position us in the minds of some people who perhaps were more familiar with our older forms (for example, as a service provider, or as entirely grant funded).

However, there are a number of constraints with printed impact reporting:

1. It is a "one-hit" which in terms of communications will have limited impact – repeated small communications have significantly more impact on audiences and allow the potential to reach wider audiences ("more bites at the cherry")
2. It is of necessity retrospective and often feels both dated and redundant by the time it is published
3. It is an investment of time and money – and there are questions for small charities about how much money they should put into printing what can be perceived as a self-promotional report
4. It is not clear what the point is – there is a need for us to hold ourselves accountable for delivery of the strategy and for our impact, but we should not require this type of reporting for this. Other than self-congratulations, we largely use the impact report for funders and it is not clear this is the best form of communication for them. (Additionally, in the coming couple of years, funders who do not know us well are not core to our income strategy.)
5. One document tends to provide one authorial positions, giving primacy to the staff team/ "corporate voice" in our impact reporting.

Proposal

That we move away from one printed report as our impact reporting to a multi-channel communications plan focused on highlighting our *current* work and its impact. This would demand we continue to proactively develop ways of measuring our impact, including in delivering our strategy and for our projects.

The aim of the communications plan would be to allow multiple perspectives on our impact – staff team members, forum members, Board members, clients, sector colleagues, maybe officials. It would capture and communicate our activity and our impact metrics closer to the delivery time.

We would use, for example, video clips on Twitter, wall posters for the meeting room, sector press to reflect on individual projects; the aim would be to reach different audiences through different channels. We would specifically look to represent what we achieve, our values and all aspects of Revolving Doors (for example, we would position lived experience as integral and ensure that policy impacts did not dominate in our communications).

An annual report would come to Board of the impact reporting communications; if required, this could form the basis of a future impact report document if we felt there was value in this.

Board decision

The Board agreed to the new approach to impact reporting.