

EU Grant Agreement number: 101132285

Project acronym: CLiViE

Project title: Cultural Literacies' Value in Europe

Author(s)	Kemal Ahson (UH)
Contributor(s)	Grzegorz Maśloch (SGH)
Version	1.0
Deliverable	1.4 SROI model for arts-based education
WP	WP1: Scoping value and theoretical framework
Due date	31 st July 2024
Submission date	29 th August 2024
Dissemination level	PU

Abstract
This deliverable provides the SROI framework for the project

Document history

Version	Date	Comments	Modified by



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon Europe's programme

The information and views set out in this publication are those of the author(s) only and do not reflect any collective opinion of the CLiViE consortium, nor do they reflect the official opinion of the European Commission. Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the European Commission is responsible for the use which might be made of the following information.

All rights reserved.

Unless otherwise noted, the reuse of this document is authorised under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). This means that reuse is allowed, provided appropriate credit is given and any changes are indicated.

About CLiViE

The Cultural Literacies' Value in Europe (CLiViE) project develops and applies a Theory of Change (ToC) methodology and Social Return on Investment (SROI) framework to increase our understanding of the value of cultural literacy through arts-based education on social cohesion. It will be delivered through four main phases: it 'maps' arts-based education within the context of cultural literacy learning across different learning environments and over different stages of a young person's education; it 'evaluates' arts-based education to help identify and assess their actual outputs and outcomes; it 'values' arts-based education activities through calculating its impact to further contribute to our understanding of the 'where', 'when', 'what' and 'how' young people's cultural literacies are developed, and differentiated in various learning environments; and it 'practices' pedagogies through developing an innovative set of practices and materials to support art-based educators to develop social justice and inclusion and improve the lives of young people through collaborative pedagogy. It has been designed to meet the three main research outcomes of the work programme topic: the ToC methodology and SROI framework for cultural literacies will directly increase our understanding of the value of cultural literacy on social cohesion; the evidencing of value in arts-based education and the collaborative pedagogy practices in cultural literacy through the co-creation of communities of practice (COPs) and a professional development programme (PDP) for arts educators will support the targeted commissioning of activities that will increase cultural literacy in Europe; and the innovative methodology for data gathering (and engaging) through emotional cartography allows young people to find a voice through more effective initiatives to foster cultural literacy around European cultures. CLiViE is funded under the call topic HORIZON-CL2-2023-HERITAGE-01-07 - Promoting cultural literacy through arts education to foster social inclusion, and brings together a multidisciplinary team from thirteen partners across eight countries:

HELSINGIN YLIOPISTO (Coordinator), Finland
UNIVERZITA KARLOVA, Czechia
STICHTING DEFENCE FOR CHILDREN INTERNATIONAL NEDERLAND - ECPAT NEDERLAND, Netherlands
DAUGAVPILS UNIVERSITATE, Latvia
JULIAN COCHRAN FOUNDATION, Poland
ASOCIACIJA KURYBINES JUNGTYs, Lithuania
RIGAS STRADINA UNIVERSITATE, Latvia
SZKOLA GLOWNA HANDLOWA W WARSZAWIE, Poland
SINFONIA VARSOVIA, Poland
TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITAET MUENCHEN, Germany
UNIVERSITA' DEGLI STUDI DI MILANO-BICOCCA, Italy
VYTAUTO DIDZIOJO UNIVERSITETAS, Lithuania
HELSINGIN NUORTEN MIESTEN KRISTILLINEN YHDISTYS RY, Finland

Table of Contents

1.INTRODUCTION.....	5
2. SROI APPROACHES.....	5
3. SROI FRAMEWORK.....	8
ANNEXES	14
Annex 1: Summary of SROI framework.....	14
Annex 2: Breakdown of application of SROI framework to CLiViE work packages	23
Annex 3: Worked example from SROI network	27

1.Introduction

The Cultural Literacies' Value in Europe (CLiViE) project develops and applies a Theory of Change (ToC) methodology and Social Return on Investment (SROI) framework to increase our understanding of the value of cultural literacy through arts-based education on social cohesion.

This deliverable (D1.4) builds on D1.3 ((ToC framework for social cohesion) and presents the SROI framework to be used in the CLiViE project. It provides the basis for the (e)valuation of the case studies and calculation of SROI. It also contributes to four other deliverables: D3.3 (Impact Maps), D4.2 (Maps of Meaning), D5.1 (Calculation of SROI ratio), and D5.2 (Impact Map and SROI report).¹

2. SROI approaches

In general terms SROI provides a framework for measuring and accounting for value that seeks to reduce inequality and improve wellbeing by incorporating social, environmental and economic costs and benefits. A SROI framework can be used for measuring and accounting for value, especially in relation to reducing inequality and environmental degradation and improving wellbeing by incorporating social, environmental and economic costs and benefits. SROI measures change in ways that are relevant to the people or organisations that experience or contribute to it. It tells the 'story' of how change is being created by measuring social, environmental and economic outcomes and uses monetary values to represent them allowing a ratio of 'benefits to costs' to be calculated. For example, a ratio of 3:1 indicates that an investment of 1 Euro delivers 3 Euros of social value. Critically, SROI is about value, rather than money - money is a common unit used as a way of conveying value.²

¹ D3.3 will comprise of the logic model (see D1.3), case study summary (D3.1), data from the excel spreadsheet presenting the inputs and financial values (task 3.3) and non-monetised inputs (task 3.4). D4.2 will comprise a summary of how the outcome and impact indicators are arrived at (task 4.1), a detailed description of the design, development, implementation and (e)valuation of the case study, and the completed excel spreadsheet with data including any value of the actual outcomes (task 4.4). D5.1 will comprise the completed excel spreadsheet from D4.2 with the SROI calculation. D5.2 brings together the information in D3.3, D4.2 and D5.1 in a summary report form.

² It is important to recognise the work of Georg Simmel and his argument around the perceived 'neutrality' of money and how it can reproduce certain social structures (see Simmel, Georg, et al. *The philosophy of money*. Routledge, 2011. Also see

The use of SROI, however, has not gone uncriticised. Aspects, such as the quantification of benefits, the valuing of volunteering and the ways in which judgement and discretion are exercised have come under scrutiny.³ Moreover, one of SROI's more prominent features – the SROI ratio – is treated by some to be both attractive and a danger,⁴ and the temptation to compare different entities according to a common metric is arguably a major weakness in its use.⁵

Whether qualitative issues can be easily quantified, translated into monetary values, and compared to each other is, therefore, a matter of considerable debate. But it also raises important ethical and political concerns. As detailed in D1.1 we recognise that any form of quantification is seductive as it offers concrete, numerical information that allows for easy comparison. We also recognise that targets and indicators can be undermined and distorted and lead to a paradox when it comes to addressing issues related in inclusion and inequality.⁶ Put differently, they can be seen to be part of a particular 'social imaginery' that fulfills a self-serving function, for instance, for policy-makers and politicians.⁷

In the CLiViE project we recognise all of these weaknesses. We also recognise that the processes to arrive at indicators are not value free,⁸ and the need to identify and reflect the 'epistemic infrastructure' that provides the framework for them.⁹ Furthermore, we recognise that any approach to calculating a SROI for arts-based education will be framed by social and political processes of knowledge production and that any claim to legitimacy of truth is reflected in the social and cultural environments that create them. In particular, our work in developing and using SROI considers whose interests are being served by, for example, arts-

Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2017). *Assembly*. Oxford University Press) for a further discussion on the role of money in creating and maintaining particular social structures.

³ Arvidson, M., Lyon, F., McKay, S., & Moro, D. (2013). Valuing the social? The nature and controversies of measuring social return on investment (SROI). *Voluntary sector review*, 4(1), 3-18.

⁴ Maier, F., Schober, C., Simsa, R., & Millner, R. (2015). SROI as a method for evaluation research: Understanding merits and limitations. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 26, 1805-1830.

⁵ Espeland, W. N., & Stevens, M. L. (1998). Commensuration as a social process. *Annual review of sociology*, 24(1), 313-343.

⁶ Fukuda-Parr, S. (2019). Keeping out extreme inequality from the SDG Agenda—the politics of indicators. *Global policy*, 10, 61-69.

⁷ Taylor, C. (2004). *Modern social imaginaries*. Duke University Press.

⁸ Ball, SJ (1993). What is policy? Texts, trajectories and toolboxes. *The Australian Journal of Education Studies*, 13 (2), 10-17.

⁹ Merry, S. E. (2019). The sustainable development goals confront the infrastructure of measurement. *Global Policy*, 10, 146-148.

based education, who defines its aims, and what is valued in the process?¹⁰ Given the context of our work, we are especially mindful that some of the institutionalised values that are quantified risk initiating young people in a world where everything, including their imagination, can be measured.¹¹

As detailed in the CLiViE proposal in seeking to *calculate* the impact of arts-based education we are not seeking to adopt a reliance on mathematical language in policy-making. Fundamentally, we believe that any fixation with mathematics does not help in our understanding of inequality.¹² Instead, we want to use the process of arriving at a calculation of the SROI to give young people a voice in the construction of categories and measurements and to encourage points of resistance that can have positive impacts.

Accordingly, a fundamental aspect of our approach is ensuring that the young people we work with, and from whom we collect data about the value of arts-based education, identify and inform the ‘measuring what matters’. Here we draw inspiration from Antoine de Saint-Exupéry’s, *Le Petit Prince*: ‘it is only with one’s heart that one can see clearly. What is essential is invisible to the eye’.¹³ In the book the *Fox* highlights that emotions do not have to make logical sense and that it will grieve the *Petit Prince* because he has established an emotional bond with him that causes him to value his company.¹⁴ This appreciation of emotions and how young people feel in and through arts-based education supports our ambition to develop democratic and co-creative ways of designing our arts-based education case studies and to develop relevant indicators for ‘measuring’ their success. Moreover, when it comes to how we (e)valuate the case studies we will consider how to create categories and classifications that reflect social life and how to then encode and classify individual phenomenon into one category or another.¹⁵ However, to reiterate an earlier point, any calculation of the SROI of the case studies is not for comparative reasons but simply to provide points of reflection on how

¹⁰ Matarasso, F. (2019). *A restless art. How participation won, and why it matters. Digital edition. London: Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation. Viitattu, 15, 2020.*

¹¹ Illich, I. (1971). *Deschooling Society*. Marion Boyars.

¹² Piketty, T. (2014). *Capital in the twenty-first century*. Harvard University Press.

¹³ The original text in French reads: ‘On ne voit bien qu’avec le Coeur. L’essentiel est invisible pour les yeux.’

¹⁴ In the book the *Petit Prince* tames the *Fox* and then prepares to leave him by allowing the snake to bite him and die.

¹⁵ Merry, S. E. (2016). *The seductions of quantification: Measuring human rights, gender violence, and sex trafficking*.

University of Chicago Press

www.clivieproject.eu

Contract No. 101132285

to ‘value’ what is being done.

3. SROI framework

As detailed in D1.3 our approach to SROI is supported by a ToC framework underpinned by three fundamental aspects:

- We will work back using our ToC from the social impact to be achieved to the design of the arts-based education activity;
- We will use qualitative data from our case study pilots to support any available quantitative data; and
- We will co-create the indicators that measure any SROI and ‘what matters’¹⁶ with the case study participants.

Our approach, in contrast to the Our Place model we are adapting, has several distinct features. First, each case study will produce its own completed logic model. We recognise that those who are measured typically lack a voice in the construction of categories and measurements and that to address this issue we need to promote the co-creation of the interventions. Therefore, although project partners can provide a first draft of their logic models for their individual cases studies based on their own experience and understanding of the conditions and issues to be addressed, these need to be revised as the intervention is developed with potential beneficiaries. This aspect of co-creation is especially relevant when it comes to ‘measuring what matters’ and ascribing a ‘value’ to these measures.¹⁷

Second, the starting point for developing the logic model for each case study is to select a high-level ‘learning outcome’, from which to work back to the design, development, implementation and (e)valuation of the intervention. As detailed in Section 3 of D1.1 (Critical review of the

¹⁶ Also see Deliverable 1.1 and Deliverable 1.2

¹⁷ The first version of the case study logic model can be submitted as part of D3.1 (Case Study Summaries). The revised case study logic model, following consultation with the beneficiaries and other stakeholders, around ‘measuring what matters’ and ascribing a ‘value’ to these measures, can be submitted as part of D3.3 (Impact maps for each case study). The process of arriving at the indicators and the data also needs to be documented in D5.2 (Impact Map and SROI report for each case study).

literature for theoretical framework), the ‘learning outcomes’ are taken from the UNESCO Global Citizenship Education (GCE) framework and relate to the Horizon Europe call topic that the CLiViE project responded to.

Third, having started with the (high-level) impacts in the logic model we need to turn to the outputs and outcomes needed to deliver them.¹⁸ For example, when it comes to the impact of art-based education, we can look at skills development, increased self-esteem, self-efficacy and confidence, enhanced social ties and networks, and/or improved attitudes toward school. Some potential (although not exhaustive) outcomes relevant for the CLiViE project can be found in the Culture and Sport Evidence (CASE) programme.¹⁹ This was a joint programme of strategic research in the UK led by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) in collaboration with the Arts Council England (ACE), English Heritage (EH) and Sport England (SE).²⁰

Fourth, one of the challenges in the CLiViE project is the need to ensure good data are captured for the (e)valuation and calculation of the SROI. The causality between the delivery of certain outputs and achieving particular impacts is challenging but the logic models that are prepared for each of the case studies should provide the evidence base and rationale for the particular intervention being proposed. Therefore, the gathering of relevant output data is relatively easy, such as increased attendance or participation in arts. From this it may be possible to calculate the SROI on certain outcomes and impacts, such as ‘increased level of volunteering’ or ‘reduced antisocial behaviour’. However, data on other outcomes and impacts may be harder to capture for the SROI, such as ‘greater trust and reciprocity’. In this case partners need to think about potential ‘proxy’ indicators (or be circumspect about what particular outcomes and impacts they will seek to achieve from their arts-based activity). That noted, any quantitative data gathered here does not exclude qualitative data gathered in developing,

¹⁸ It is also useful to understand the difference between ‘outcomes’ and ‘impacts’ because they are often used interchangeably. Essentially, outcomes are things we will be measuring, such as changes for our beneficiaries or organisations, and impacts are the things that other people will be measuring, such as changes in headline statistics that local authorities or education providers may record. Also, impacts should link back to the contextual evidence presented in the first logic model box.

¹⁹ Other relevant outcomes and outputs may also emerge from the co-creation activities with the beneficiaries of the case studies.

²⁰ https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a74a738ed915d0e8bf1a0d6/A_review_of_the_Social_Impacts_of_Culture_and_Sport.pdf

www.clivieproject.eu
Contract No. 101132285

delivering and (e)valuating activities and needs to be included in D3.1 (Case Study Summaries) and D3.3 (Impact maps for each case study).

Despite these hefty caveats in using SROI we believe that using the optic of a SROI analysis can help us understand how to 'value' arts-based education activities used to promote social inclusion and reduce inequality. Our approach to SROI builds on existing best practice originally developed in 2009 by the UK Cabinet Office. It was then updated in 2012 as a result of consultation with practitioners, members, academics and others with an interest in social and environmental value and impact measurement. A summary of this *Guide to Social Return on Investment* is presented in **Annex 1**.²¹ In **Annex 2** these have been broken down into WP3, WP4 and WP5 of the CLiViE project. As part of **WP5 (Valuing impacts in arts-based education)** a project template for our 'measuring' is available.²² In addition, we will identify some possible data sources²³ around the particular learning outcomes partners will be seek to deliver which will also be part of a list of 'proxies'.²⁴ Finally, **Annex 3** has an example of a completed template used by the UK Cabinet Office.

In general terms, based on current best practice, an SROI analysis needs to be structured around a number of key principles:

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

²¹ SROI Network (2012). *A Guide to Social Return on Investment*. SROI Network.

²² This will be ready in January 2025 as part of WP5 and is based on Section 9 of the *Guide to Social Return on Investment*. In this section there is a checklist (pages 99-101) and a template (pages 102-105).

²³ For example, The Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) Research Team (formerly New Economy) has pioneered the development of a cost benefit analysis (CBA) methodology which has created a useful unit cost database. See <https://www.greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk/what-we-do/research/research-cost-benefit-analysis/>

²⁴ These data sources are only suggestive.

For the CLiViE project the SROI analysis in the case studies may take different forms, such as the social value generated by an entire project or organisation, or focus on just one specific aspect of the work that is being done in the case study. The final SROI applied to the case studies will be driven by the context of project activities being designed and delivered and can be a mix of both evaluative (conducted retrospectively and based on actual outcomes that have already taken place) and forecast (which predicts how much social value will be created if the activities meet their intended outcomes).²⁵ Ultimately, how we employ the SROI framework in the CLiViE project requires judgement and decisions about materiality, such as why information and data have been included or excluded in the logic model.

Several additional features of our SROI framework need to be highlighted:

- We use UNESCO's Global Citizenship Education (GCE) framework to highlight the socio-emotional domain that best lends itself in providing a framework for promoting cultural literacy through arts education to foster social inclusion.
- Although the selection of the particular arts-based education activity is not being prescribed (and by extension the design and implementation of the case study) the evaluation and measures to be assessed can draw on suggested topics from UNESCO covering different levels of identity, different communities people belong to and how these are connected, and difference and respect for diversity.
- The case studies broadly focus on geographically and demographically diverse young people from two cohorts of age groups (10-13 and 15-18) which characterise distinct phases when young people are often transitioning in formal education and may allow relevant contextual data to be identified and gathered to support the SROI.
- The evaluation of the case studies will be individual and tailored in line with the particular outcomes and impacts that have been identified in the logic model and ToC.

²⁵ SROI Network (2012). *A Guide to Social Return on Investment*. SROI Network.
www.clivieproject.eu
Contract No. 101132285

- The need to ensure good outcomes data during the evaluation of the arts-based case studies needs to be recognised from the outset but can also include qualitative data gathered in developing, delivering and evaluating activities.
- Each case study will have an individualised impact map covering the monetised and non-monetised inputs data and will clarify the outputs that the arts-based education is seeking to deliver.²⁶
- A collaborative approach to data gathering for the SROI will be promoted and, therefore, when we gather data we will be as interested in ‘how’ particular knowledge, such as through the identification and use of relevant ‘proxies’ and indicators, is produced, as the data themselves.²⁷
- The outcome indicators to measure any change (over time and space) that has happened through the arts-based education, and its measurability in terms of expressing an outcome indicator in terms that are measurable (rather than finding an indicator that is easy to measure), will be co-created with the young people and main stakeholders.
- A uniform set of indicators for simple comparison purposes will not be created given that they may be framed by implicit theories of what is important and what is not and draws on a body of thought that data and indicators emerge from social processes that are shaped by power relations.
- The calculation of impact and SROI for the case studies will be individualised and its presentation will combine both quantitative and qualitative information.²⁸
- The SROI analysis will be referenced against the wider ‘maps of meaning’ which aim to present different spatial and emotional realities upon the felt geography of cultural literacies in different learning environments.²⁹

²⁶ This will be part of D3.3 and D4.2

²⁷ These will be detailed in D5.2

²⁸ This will be part of D5.1

²⁹ This will be part of D5.2

Above all, the use of a SROI framework will be part of a wider exercise to bring young people and key stakeholders together to support agency and affect positive change.

Annexes

Annex 1: Summary of SROI framework

There are six main stages detailed in the *Guide to Social Return on Investment*.³⁰

- Stage 1: Establishing scope and identifying stakeholders
- Stage 2: Mapping outcomes
- Stage 3: Evidencing outcomes and giving them a value
- Stage 4: Establishing impact
- Stage 5: Calculating the SROI
- Stage 6: Reporting, using and embedding

Stage 1: Establishing scope and identifying stakeholders

Before you start your SROI analysis, you need to clarify what you are going to measure and how, and why you are embarking on a measurement process. The three main aspects to this are: establishing scope, identifying stakeholders, and deciding how to involve stakeholders.

The scope of an SROI analysis is an explicit statement about the boundary of what is being considered. It is often the result of negotiations about what is feasible for you to measure and what you would like to be able to improve or communicate. You will need to be clear about why you are conducting the analysis and what resources are available, and define the priorities for measurement. This stage will help ensure that what is being proposed is feasible and should be outlined in the case study summary and logic model. The following questions need to be considered:

- What is the purpose of the SROI?
- Who is it for?
- What is the background?
- What resources do you have available?
- Who will undertake the SROI?
- What activities will you focus on?
- What period of delivery will your analysis cover?
- Is the analysis a forecast, a comparison against a forecast or an evaluation?

The next step is to identify and involve your stakeholders. Stakeholders are defined as people or organisations that experience change or affect the activity, whether positive or negative, as a result of the activity being analysed. For the CLiViE project the main stakeholders are the

³⁰ SROI Network (2012). *A Guide to Social Return on Investment*. SROI Network. Please refer to the Guide for a more detailed explanation of how to apply this framework to the individual case studies. Partners responsible for the design, development, implementation and (e)valuation of the case studies in WP3, WP4 and WP5 will be supported by SGH and UH in calculating the SROI.

young people we are working with and people involved in and around the delivery organisation. Critically, for the CLiViE project we are also interested in working with stakeholders who have included experience change that is related to the activity being developed and presented in the logic model.

In this stage of the SROI you need to think about how to collect information from the different stakeholders. Given that the young people will be involved in co-creating the measures of success this will influence how to collect information. However, there are different methods for involving stakeholders – interviews, workshops or questionnaires, for example – and project leads will need to decide on what is appropriate. It will also be important to ensure that assent/consent and ethical clearances is secured before any work is undertaken (see D8.1) and that any work is in line with any data issues (see D8.2). It is important to be sensitive to the amount of time and resources stakeholders can give to this project.

Stage 2: Mapping outcomes

The Impact Map is an important aspect of the SROI analysis. For the CLiViE project an Excel template will be created which is based on Section 9 of the *Guide to Social Return on Investment*.³¹ Information from the logic models will feed into the Impact Maps. It is important to involve a range of stakeholders in constructing the Impact Map to ensure that the outcomes that matter to those who are directly affected will get measured and valued.

In putting together the Impact Map model think about how to structure the work. *The Guide to Social Return on Investment* suggests five steps when filling out an Impact Map but the first draft of the logic model for each case study will be the starting point.

The inputs column refers to the financial value of the inputs. You need to identify what stakeholders are contributing in order to make the activity possible – these are their inputs. Inputs are used up in the course of the activity, such as money or time, for example. The value of the financial inputs, especially for a single grant or a contract, is usually easy to establish, although it is important that you include the full cost of delivering the services. In some situations there are other contributions being made, including noncash items, which need to be valued.

Non-monetised inputs (other than the financial investment), such as volunteer time also need to be included. For example, if the activity would not go ahead to the same extent without these inputs, then you will want to put a value on them. This will ensure that you are transparent about the full cost of delivering your service. This section is for those that want to give a value to their non-monetised inputs. The two main types of non-monetised inputs are volunteer time and contributions of goods and services in kind. This aspect of the work also allows case study deliverer to have a greater appreciation of the wider ‘capital’ they draw upon to deliver positive outcomes.

³¹ This will be prepared by SGH as part of WP5 by January 2025
www.clivieproject.eu
Contract No. 101132285

SROI is an outcomes-based measurement tool, as measuring outcomes is the only way you can be sure that changes for stakeholders are taking place. Be careful not to confuse outputs with outcomes. For example, if a training programme aims to get people into jobs then completion of the training itself is an output, getting the job is an outcome. Identifying outcomes is not always immediately intuitive, be sure to spend sufficient time understanding the ToC and to ensure that you are measuring the right things.

In deciding on outcomes, you should consider other factors, such as the organisation's objectives, as well as the views of your stakeholders. Stakeholders' views are critical but they are not the only factors in deciding which outcomes are significant. SROI is described as stakeholder-informed (rather than stakeholder-led) to recognise this. The CLiViE project focuses on particular 'learning outcomes' for young people which can be considered as high level 'impacts' and can be broken down into the following:³²

- Cultivate and manage identities, relationships and feeling of belongingness;
- Share values and responsibilities based on human rights; and
- Develop attitudes to appreciate and respect differences and diversity.

Some potential outcomes relevant for the CLiViE project can be found in the Culture and Sport Evidence (CASE) programme.³³

Stage 3: Evidencing outcomes and giving them a value

It is important to develop outcome indicators and use these to collect evidence on the outcome that is occurring. The *Guide to Social Return on Investment* highlights four steps here: developing outcome indicators, collecting outcomes data, establishing how long outcomes last, and putting a value on the outcome.

Indicators are ways of knowing that change has happened. In SROI they are applied to outcomes as these are the measures of change that we are interested in. We need indicators that can tell us both whether the outcome has occurred, and by how much. When thinking about the indicators that are co-created with the young people we also need to think about what data are available. It is important to ask the young people them how they know that change has happened to them. For example, if the outcome was an increase in self-confidence, ask them whose self-confidence is increased what they now do as a result, or ask them to tell you what they mean by self-confidence. In this way you are more likely to get to something that you can measure and 'value'.

Sometimes you need to use more than one indicator so try to mix subjective (or self-reported) and objective indicators that complement each other. There are risks of relying on self-reporting measures that can be offset by supporting them with objective indicators.

³² See D1.1 and D1.3

³³ Other relevant outcomes and outputs may also emerge from the co-creation activities with the beneficiaries of the case studies.

Importantly, any quantitative data gathered here does not exclude qualitative data gathered in developing, delivering and (e)valuating activities and our approach to SROI is through a collaborative approach to data gathering. Therefore, when we gather data we will be as interested in ‘how’ particular knowledge, such as through the identification and use of relevant ‘proxies’ and indicators, is produced, as the data themselves.

The *Guide to Social Return on Investment* also highlights a common mistake with the misinterpretation of what is meant by ‘measurable’. A basic principle of SROI is to measure and value the things that matter. Measurability means expressing the outcome indicator in terms that are measurable, rather than finding an indicator that is easy to measure. Therefore, avoid using inappropriate indicators just because they are readily available - if the outcome is important you will need to find a way to measure it. But try to think of more than one indicator per outcome to strengthen your findings and help you be sure that the outcome has occurred.

Use and review the data you plan to collect in the case study. It is important to recognise that it is more time-consuming and costly to gather data about an impact *after* the event, and existing data and self reported change may have to suffice. New data will come from the young people directly involved in the case studies.

Finding relevant data can be difficult, so use the best available information or make assumptions or estimates. Do not worry about not being able to collect every piece of data. You may even conclude that it would be best to go back to Stage 1 and redefine your scope until more resources are available and organisational priorities permit. Remember that in order to be transparent you will need to explain what you have used. The table below gives you some examples of collecting outcomes data for a community-based employment-mentoring programme.

Stakeholder	Outcome	Indicator	Data collection
Unemployed person	Gains and maintains employment	Whether in work after 12 months	Annual postal survey of stakeholders and telephone follow up
Participant with physical disability	Reduced social isolation	Frequency of social contact with friends	Gathered systematically at six month review between client and worker
Young person	Improved behaviour	Number and type of school exclusions	Report by teacher
Local government	Increase in recycling	Amount of waste going to landfill	Monitoring of change in amount of waste
Local community	Reduced fear of crime	Number of local people who report feeling safer	Government crime mapping tool

The impact of some outcomes will last longer than others and some depend on the activity continuing and some do not. For example, in helping someone to start a business it is reasonable to expect the business to last for some time after your intervention. Conversely, providing a service so that people do not visit their General Practitioners (GPs) so often may depend on the service being available all the time. Where you believe that the outcome will last after the activity has stopped, then it will also continue to generate value. The timescale used is generally the number of years you expect the benefit to endure after your intervention. This is referred to as the duration of the outcome or the benefit period.

One important aspect to the CLiViE SROI is the importance of valuation. This process of valuation is often referred to as monetisation because we assign a monetary value to things that do not have a market price. All the prices that we use in our day-to-day lives are approximations – ‘proxies’ – for the value that the buyer and the seller gain and lose in the transaction. The value that we get will be different for different people in different situations. For some things, like a litre of milk, there is considerable agreement on and consistency in the price. For other things, such as a house, there is likely to be a wider spread of possible prices. For others – a new product that has never been sold before, for example – there may be no comparison.

All value is, in the end, subjective.³⁴ Markets have developed, in large part, to mediate between people’s different subjective perceptions of what things are worth. In some cases this is more obvious than in others. But even where prices are stable and have the semblance of ‘objective’ or ‘true’ value, this is not really the case. At the heart of the CLiViE project is the idea that as

³⁴ Michel Serres gives an interesting example of the subjective notion of value with his example of the value of a ‘joker’ in a pack of cards. See Serres, M. (2014). *Pantopie: de hermès à petite poucette*.
www.clivieproject.eu
 Contract No. 101132285

well as using existing data on values from the outcomes we have delivered is the idea that we will also co-create value with our stakeholders.

Sometimes monetisation is a fairly straightforward process – where it relates to a cost saving, for example. SROI also gives values to things that are harder to value so are routinely left out of traditional economic appraisal. There are different ways in which this can be done. For example, in stated preference and contingent valuation we ask people directly how they value things either relative to other things or in terms of how much they would pay to have or avoid something. This approach assesses people’s willingness to pay, or accept compensation, for a hypothetical thing. For example, you may ask people to value a decrease in aircraft noise in their town – their willingness to pay for it. Conversely, you may ask them how much compensation they would require to accept an increase in crime. There are problems with of these techniques, and there are no hard and fast rules as to which you would use in given situations – it requires creativity and research.

The *Guide to Social Return on Investment* also provides examples of proxies that have been used in previous SROI analyses (see next table).

The choice of proxies needs to be explained to the reader and supporting evidence for choosing particular proxies should also be used.³⁵

³⁵ These will be detailed in D5.2.
www.clivieproject.eu
Contract No. 101132285

Stakeholder	Outcome	Indicator	Possible proxies
Person with mental health problem	Improvement in mental health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amount of time spent socialising • Extent to which participants engage in new activities • Level of use of mental health services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost of membership of a social club/network • Percentage of income normally spent on leisure, • Cost of counselling sessions
Local community	Improved access to local services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take-up of those services, and by whom 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Savings in time and travel costs of being able to access services locally
Person with physical health problem	Improved physical health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of visits to doctor • Extent of improvements in health (self reported) • How often they exercise 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost of visiting private doctor clinic • Cost of health insurance • Cost of gym membership
The environment	Less waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amount of waste going to landfill • Level of carbon emissions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost of landfill charges • Cost of CO² emissions
Offenders	Reduced reoffending	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequency of offences for which participant is charged • Nature of offence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forgone wages due to time spent in prison or doing community service
Care leaver	Reduced homelessness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access housing upon leaving care • Satisfaction with appropriateness of housing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rent • Cost of hostel accommodation
Women offenders	Improved family relationship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Child continues living in the family home 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amount that parents spend on their children annually • Value of time spent with children • Cost of childcare
Local community	Improved perception of the local area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents report improvements in local area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change in property prices • Amount spent on home improvements

Stage 4: Establishing impact

Establishing impact is important as it reduces the risk of overclaiming and means that your story will be more credible. It is only by measuring and accounting for all of these factors that a sense of the impact that the activity is having can be gained. Otherwise there is the risk of investing in initiatives that do not work, or do not work as well as they are intended. There are several aspects to this. Firstly, ‘deadweight’ is a measure of the amount of outcome that would have happened even if the activity had not taken place. It is calculated as a percentage. For example, an evaluation of a regeneration programme found that there has been a 7% increase in economic activity in the area since the programme began. However, the national economy grew by 5% during this time. Researchers would need to investigate how much of the local economic growth was due to wider economic changes and how much to the specific intervention being analysed. To calculate deadweight, reference is made to comparison groups or benchmarks. The perfect comparison would be the same group of people that you have affected, but seeing what happened to them if they had not benefited from the intervention.

In addition, ‘attribution’ is an assessment of how much of the outcome was caused by the contribution of other organisations or people. Attribution is calculated as a percentage (i.e. the proportion of the outcome that is attributable to your organisation). It shows the part of deadweight for which you have better information and where you can attribute outcome to other people or organisations.

In future years, the amount of outcome is likely to be less or, if the same, will be more likely to be influenced by other factors, so attribution to your organisation is lower. Drop-off is used to account for this and is only calculated for outcomes that last more than one year.

All of these aspects of impact are normally expressed as percentages. Unless you have more accurate information it is acceptable to round estimates to the nearest 10%. In some cases you might consider that there is an increase in the value rather than a reduction

Stage 5: Calculating the SROI

There are four steps to calculating the ratio of the case study.³⁶ The first step in calculating your ratio is to project the value of all the outcomes achieved into the future.

In order to calculate the net present value (NPV) the costs and benefits paid or received in different time periods need to be added up. In order that these costs and benefits are comparable a process called discounting is used. Discounting recognises that people generally prefer to receive money today rather than tomorrow because there is a risk (such as the money will not be paid) or because there is an opportunity cost (such as potential gains from investing the money elsewhere). This is known as the ‘time value of money’. An individual

³⁶ Partners responsible for the design, development, implementation and (e)valuation of the case studies in WP3, WP4 and WP5 will be supported by SGH and UH in calculating the SROI.

may have a high discount rate – for example, if you would accept 2 units of currency in one year's time, instead of 1 unit now, that implies a discount rate of 100%.

Finally, the initial SROI ratio is arrived at by dividing the discounted value of benefits by the total investment. After calculating the ratio, it is important to assess the extent to which your results would change if you changed some of the assumptions you made in the previous stages.

Stage 6: Reporting, using and embedding

SROI aims to create accountability to stakeholders. As such it is important that the results are communicated to stakeholders in a meaningful way. The CLiViE project will create an Impact map and SROI for each case study (D5.2).³⁷

³⁷ A provisional structure of the report will be provided by June 2025
www.clivieproject.eu
Contract No. 101132285

Annex 2: Breakdown of application of SROI framework to CLiViE work packages

WP3: Mapping Outputs of arts-based education

Task 3.1: Establishing scope

This task will identify at least four case studies in each case study country covering the two groups of young people involved in both formal and informal education (minimum of twenty-eight for the project). We will also select different art forms and mediums to be measured, valued and compared, and using the information from WP1 and WP2, and identify the main stakeholders (including beneficiaries) and consider how to co-create with them. This task will have a particular focus on ensuring that the data gathering methods engage and empower young people.

Task 3.2: Evaluation of case studies

This task will undertake an initial evaluation of the case studies and focus on monitoring how they are doing in relation to established targets. It will also include formative and process evaluations with the aim of improving practice. An initial outcomes evaluation will also be considered to explore whether the selected case studies have met their aims and objectives and to assess the effects and impacts on beneficiaries. This task will use the framework developed in WP1.

Task 3.3: Identify inputs and financial values

For each case study the main inputs and financial values and the *potential* outcomes and impacts that accrue from the arts-based education activities will be identified and categorised. This will use information from Task 3.2 and involve a detailed assessment of the types of activities delivered and identifying the stakeholders contributing to make the activity possible. A mix of project plans, published reports, financial summaries and evaluation and monitoring data (internal and external) used by the educators and funders, supported by one-to-one interviews with key stakeholders, will be used. All these data will be entered into an Excel spreadsheet for each case study which forms the basis of their impact map.

Tasks 3.4: Identify non-monetised inputs

This task will identify and assess the non-monetised inputs, such as volunteer time or contributions of goods and services, and provide a 'value' to them. For the hours given by volunteers a value equivalent to the average hourly rate for the type of work being done will be given. In addition, one of the key aspects will be to gain some understanding of the importance (and value) of *place* for the arts-based education. This task will use best practice examples of how to identify and value non-monetised inputs presented in WP1. It will cross-reference the qualitative interviews with key stakeholders and add data to the impact map.

Task 3.5: Create an 'impact' map

This task will create an initial impact map for each of the case studies covering the monetised and non-monetised inputs from tasks 3.3 and 3.4. The impact map is the main source of data and will clarify the outputs that the arts-based education is seeking to deliver (quantitative summary of an activity) as well as the potential outcomes that are being sought. The views of all the stakeholders in identifying what outcomes are considered critical (although here it will be stakeholder-informed, rather than stakeholder-led) will be gathered. Furthermore, intermediate outcomes (or distance travelled) will be identified as impacting on social cohesion may not be easily observable and cannot be viewed in isolation from other activities or initiatives.

WP4: Evaluating outcomes and the effectiveness of arts-based education

Task 4.1: Develop outcome indicators

This task aims to develop outcome indicators to measure any change (over time and space) that has happened through the arts-based education. It will clarify one or more indicators for each of the outcomes on the impact map created in WP3 to show an outcome has occurred, and by how much. The focus here is on measurability in terms of expressing an outcome indicator in terms that are measurable (rather than finding an indicator that is easy to measure). These measures will be cross-referenced with the impact maps created for each case study in WP3.

Task 4.2: Data gathering tools and training

This task will introduce the young people, artists and educators (and other stakeholders) to ‘emotional cartography’ and participative mapping. It will focus on how they can be used to capture both qualitative and quantitative data to measure value in education promoting social cohesion. For each of the case study countries training on participative mapping will be organised and delivered. Critically, part of this task will be to explore different ways in which young people can ‘map’ and how the ‘output’ of the ‘maps of meaning’ can be presented. Here – in the spirit of artistic freedom - the aesthetic form of the maps to be co-created by the young people, partners and stakeholders will not be prescribed.

Task 4.3: Co-create maps of meaning

This task will develop modes of mapping through a variety of art forms – painting and drawing, photography, sound, theatre, for example – and co-create the ‘maps of meaning’ as a way to present different emotional, spatial and temporal realities of outcomes upon the felt geography of different learning environments. The maps will also reflect different lifelong learning journeys in the case study countries covering the two target age groups. The careful selection of different ‘sites’ where the maps are created will also ensure that a range of socio-economic, cultural and digital conditions will be taken into account.

Task 4.4: Evaluating and valuing outcomes

This task will use the data and information on the *actual* outcomes of the arts-based education and establish the duration of outcomes and the effect on value. This task will involve cross-referencing with any longitudinal or trend data to support the duration of the outcome. Appropriate financial values will be identified which allow us to present the relative importance of any changes in young people and the local context. Different ways in which to value arts-based education highlighted in WP1 as well as ‘proxies’ to give a value – cost of anti-social behaviour, lack of investment into an area, or increased income, for example – will be used in this task. A ‘pool’ of indicators across the case studies will then be created. All these data will be entered into our impact maps.

WP5: Valuing impacts in arts-based education

Task 5.1: Establishing Impact

This task will triangulate the data and information from WP3 and WP4 and work out the SROI for each of the case studies. It will involve calculating the deadweight of the measure of the amount of outcome that would have happened even if the activity had not taken place through looking at trends over time in the places where the arts-based education activities are taking place. It will be cross-referenced to other data, such as reoffending rates or educational outcomes for the young people, as well as how much of the outcome was caused by the contribution of other organisations, people or policies outlined in WP2 and WP3. This task will also look for any signs of drop-off of the impact of these activities and use a mix of published socio-economic and forecasting data and follow-up (national) workshops. Both the quantitative and qualitative data from this task will be entered into our impact maps created in task 3.5.

Task 5.2: Calculating SROI (M22-24)

This task will calculate the impact and SROI for the case studies including adding up all the benefits, subtracting any negatives and comparing them to the investment. This will involve calculating the value of all the outcomes achieved into the future. Following this, this task will calculate the net present value (NPV) the costs and benefits paid or received in different time periods. From this an initial SROI ratio for each of the case studies will be calculated and provide the basis of how to value arts-based education.

Task 5.3: Reporting SROI (M22-24)

This task will finalise the impact maps and prepare individual SROI summaries for the case studies. They will include both quantitative and qualitative information from the case studies and a description of the scope of the analysis, details of stakeholder involvement, methods of data collection, and any assumptions and limitations underlying the analysis. The reports will also include the impact map, with relevant indicators and any proxies. The details of the calculations, and a discussion of any estimates and assumptions will also be included.

Annex 3: Worked example from SROI network

Social Return on Investment – The Impact Map for the worked example					
Organisation	Wheels-to-Meals				
Objectives	Provide luncheon club for 30 elderly local residents with additional health and social benefits by bringing residents to meals				
Scope	Activity	30 places for eligible elderly and/or disabled local residents 5 days a week, 50 weeks of the year			
	Contract/Funding/Part of organisation	Local Authority Grant			
Stage 1 →			Stage 2 →		
Stakeholders	Intended/unintended changes	Inputs		Outputs	The Outcomes
		Description	Value £		Description
Who do we have an effect on? Who has an effect on us?	What do you think will change for them?	What do they invest?		Summary of activity in numbers	How would you describe the change?
elderly / disabled residents	residents use health services less	time	£0	luncheon club: – group activities (board games, craft, mild/therapeutic exercise, info and awareness sessions)	the mild/therapeutic group exercise sessions made residents fitter, they had fewer falls and ended up in hospital less
	residents get out of the house more				the nurse led group sessions helped residents manage their health and symptoms better and they were healthier
					residents made new friends and spent more time with others through the group activities
					residents had nutritious meals with 3 (out of) 5-a-day and they were healthier
local authority	residents provided with nutritious meal	meals on wheels contract (annual)	£24,375		material outcomes for residents only (not for local authority). All outcomes for this stakeholder already considered above.
Wheels-to-Meals volunteers (retired)	keep active	time (at min wage) 4 volunteers x 3 hrs x 5 days x 50 wks x £6 (forecast)	£18,000	– transport for 30 people	healthier volunteers (retired)
neighbours of elderly/ disabled residents	look out for neighbours	time	£0	– 7500 hot meals annually	reduction in neighbourly care/shopping and breakdown of informal community networks
Total			£42,375		

Objective of Activity	Time Period	1 year (2010)
Purpose of Analysis	Forecast or Evaluation	Forecast

Stage 3

The Outcomes (what changes)						
Indicator	Source	Quantity	Duration	Financial proxy	Value £	Source
How would you measure it?	Where did you get the information from?	How much change was there?	How long does it last?	What proxy would you use to value the change?	What is the value of the change?	Where did you get the information from?
fewer falls and associated hospital admissions/stays annually	oneoff research	7	1 year	accident&emergency	£94.00	NHS cost book 07/08
			1 year	geriatric assessment inpatient	£4,964.00	
			1 year	geriatric continuing care-Inpatient (average 5 wks x £1,444)	£7,220.00	
fewer visits to the doctor annually (appointments) and residents report improvement in physical health	questionnaire and interviews	90	5 years	consultation with doctor	£19.00	NHS cost book 2006
new clubs/group activities joined during year and residents report an increase in personal wellbeing/feeling less isolated	questionnaire	16	1 year	average annual membership/cost	£48.25	current average costs of bus trips, bingo and craft clubs
fewer District Nurse visits and residents reporting increased physical activity of 3 hours or more a week	questionnaire	14	2 years	District Nurse visits	£34.00	NHS cost book 07/08
volunteers report increased physical activity of 3 hours or more a week since volunteering	volunteer annual assessment	4	1 year	annual elderly residents swimming pass	£162.50	local authority
fewer instances of neighbours shopping for residents annually	One-off survey	275	3 years	supermarket online shopping delivery fee	- £5.00	www.tesco.co.uk

Social Return on Investment – The Impact Map for the worked example (continued from previous page)

Organisation	Wheels-to-Meals	
Objectives	Provide luncheon club for 30 elderly local residents with additional health and social benefits by bringing residents to meals	
Scope	Activity	30 places for eligible elderly and/or disabled local residents 5 days a week, 50 weeks of the year
	Contract/Funding/Part of organisation	Local Authority Grant

Stage 1 duplicate	Stage 2 duplicate	Stage 4			
Stakeholders	The outcomes	Deadweight	Attribution	Drop Off	Impact
	Description	%	%	%	
Groups of people that change as a result of the activity	How would you describe the change?	What would have happened without the activity?	Who else contributed to the change?	Does the outcome drop off in future years?	Quantity times financial proxy, less deadweight, displacement and attribution
elderly / disabled residents	the mild/therapeutic group exercise sessions made residents fitter, they had fewer falls and ended up in hospital less	0%	5%	50%	£625.10
					£33,010.60
					£48,013.00
	the nurse led group sessions helped residents manage their health and symptoms better and they were healthier	0%	10%	10%	£1,539.00
	residents made new friends and spent more time with others through the group activities	10%	35%	0%	£451.62
	residents had nutritious meals with 3 (out of) 5-a-day and they were healthier	100%	0%	0%	£0.00
local authority	material outcomes for residents only (not for local authority). All outcomes for this stakeholder already considered above.				£0.00
Wheels-to-Meals volunteers (retired)	healthier volunteers (retired)	70%	10%	35%	£175.50
neighbours of elderly/ disabled residents	reduction in neighbourly care/shopping and breakdown of informal community networks	5%	0%	5%	-£1,306.25
Total					£82,508.57

Objective of Activity	Time Period	1 year (2010)
Purpose of Analysis	Forecast or Evaluation	Forecast

Stage 5					
Calculating Social Return					
Discount rate (%)		3.5%			
	Year 1 (after activity)	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
	£625.10	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
	£33,010.60	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
	£48,013.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
	£1,539.00	£1,385.10	£1,246.59	£1,121.93	£1,009.74
	£451.62	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
	£175.50	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
	-£1,306.25	-£1,240.94	-£1,178.89	£0.00	£0.00
	£82,508.57	£144.16	£67.70	£1,121.93	£1,009.74
Present Value*	£79,718.43	£134.58	£61.06	£977.70	£850.17
Total Present Value (PV)					£81,741.93
Net Present Value					£39,366.93
Social Return £ per £					£1.93: £1