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# Executive Summary

This report presents a social return analysis of the work of Supporting Communities carried out throughout 2014/15.

The research shows the considerable impact that community led housing services can have on the health, confidence, pride and general wellbeing of the range of stakeholders of Supporting Communities and the local communities represented. It has revealed significant positive effects on the local communities supported through their member organisations through improved physical and social environments, wellbeing and stable housing.

**Supporting Communities mission is to;**

*“Build strong, cohesive communities.”*

The SROI model, adopted in this study, uses monetary value to represent the social costs and benefits of the programme. Covering the period 1 April 2014 to 31 March 2015 as a reporting period, the study’s results were extrapolated over five-years in line with the SROI methodology. **The £15,259,037 invested in the period generated £119,282,321 of social value.**

This study identified Supporting Communities main inputs, outputs and outcomes, as they relate to the identified stakeholders. Outcomes were all assigned a social value, the most material of which are summarised below:

* **NI Housing Executive**

As a core funder and significant stakeholder in the activities of Supporting Communities the Housing Executive’s core outcomes are supported by the organisation’s work and accrue some 63% of the total social value created as a result of Supporting Communities activities.

***The******overall value to the Housing Executive was £75,266,462 over the period.***

* **Interagency Partners**

Whilst the most significant Interagency Partner, in the form of the Housing Executive, has been separately considered, other partners experience widespread benefit through improved communication and engagement with communities leading to improved problem resolution and increased levels of effectiveness.

***The******overall value to Interagency Partners was £105,730 over the period.***

* **Member Groups**

As the main recipients of support services from Supporting Communities the 450 targeted member groups benefit from multiple outcomes centred around improved functioning; skills and knowledge, confidence, communication, engagement and involvement and access to funding. **Whilst the social value allocated to the groups is relatively small at 1.8% or £2,247,472 over the period, much of the value from their outcomes is apportioned to the Housing Executive*.***

* **Local Communities**

As above, the value of the work completed with member groups translates to direct impact to the local communities represented. Both individuals within the groups and the wider communities are beneficiaries through increased knowledge and skills, confidence and self esteem, access to employment and volunteering – for individuals. The wider communities experience impact in terms of improvements to the physical and social environments, improved sense of belonging to the community for residents and improved levels of stable housing. Cumulatively they equate to a sizeable 35% of the total social value estimated as a result of the services of Supporting Communities.

***The******overall value to individuals and the wider local communities is £824,233 and £40,585,335 respectively over the period.***

* **Digital Trainees**

Through the support from the Department of Finance & Personnel (DFP) Digital Trainees improve their skills, knowledge and motivation to use online technology and complete online transactions for government services.

***The social value estimated to the department and trainees is a small proportion of over impact at just 0.21% but is significant in value at £253,089.***

The **SROI ratio of costs to benefits is 8:1** for every £1 invested in services between 1 April 2014 and 31 March 2015, approximately £8 of social and economic value will be returned. This is broken down by the various stakeholders below:

In determining the ratio, the sensitivity of values was discounted to account for the impact that would have occurred without the intervention of Supporting Communities. This helps to ensure the credibility of the findings, that only the social value created by Supporting Communities is counted and helps to avoid double counting.

The significant value that Supporting Communities services are generating illustrates the importance of involving tenants in shaping services to ensure the delivery of better and more responsive services.

Feedback from stakeholders highlighted the very effective ways in which Supporting Communities staff work with member organisations, support agencies and statutory bodies to provide advocacy for local communities represented. This partnership approach, that builds trust and takes into account the needs and circumstances of the individual areas represented, has enabled the organisation to achieve very significant outcomes.

Moreover, the partnerships that Supporting Communities develops and maintains with other service providers to complement and support their work, helps to ensure an effective and holistic service. These include:

* Housing Executive
* Local Authorities & Councils
* Dept for Regional Development (DRD)
* Police Service of Northern Ireland (PSNI)
* Transport NI
* Dept of Finance and Personnel (DFP)
* Dept for Social Development (DSD)
* Voluntary and Community Groups

# 2. Introduction

## 2.1 Supporting Communities

Supporting Communities is an independent charitable organisation which champions tenant and community participation by developing groups, supporting active citizenship and building cohesive communities.

Supporting Communities have worked effectively for over 35 years advising, supporting, enabling and ultimately empowering communities in all four corners of our province. As the only independent body in the social housing sector, Supporting Communities aims to deliver essential services to all sectors of the community at the highest level without prejudice.

The organisation promotes best practice in community participation in Northern Ireland through a grassroots approach to community development, providing tailored support, advice, information and training to new and existing community groups, statutory and voluntary organisations.

The range of services provided is detailed below:

### 2.1.1 Community Development

Supporting Communities provides a grassroots self-help approach to community development, offering support, advice, information, and training to new and existing community/residents groups, statutory and voluntary organisations.

Within the overarching functions of community development, Supporting Communities helps member organisations with;

* Training
* Funding
* Tenant Participation
* Information Services
* Business Support

### 2.1.2 Digital Inclusion

Supporting Communities Digital Champion Initiative enhances the [Go ON NI](http://www.nidirect.gov.uk/go-on-ni) programme working in partnership with the NI Direct Digital Inclusion Unit. Encouraging a self-help approach to community development the service provides free support, advice, information and training to individuals across Northern Ireland.

Free accredited and non-accredited Computer Essentials Training is delivered to groups as well as signposting to other partnership projects including the [Libraries NI Got IT programme](https://www.librariesni.org.uk/Services/Computers/Pages/Got-IT.aspx).

Some recent achievements of the organisation include:

* Research and information exercises undertaken with members of the Housing Community Network discussing the role and future of tenant and resident participation in the delivery of housing services.
* Partnering with departmental officials during the past year in engaging with tenant representatives through the Housing Community Network in particular, discussing the key elements of the Social Housing Reform Programme with particular emphasis on the Draft Tenant Participation Strategy.
* Supporting Communities has long advocated the establishment of an appropriate context for tenant participation and welcome the new strategy that has been agreed.

## 2.2 Principles

Within the core vision and mission of the organisation Supporting Communities maintains a core set of principles that have shaped seven core aims, as follows:

* Promote, encourage and support meaningful community participation
* Provide an effective funding support service
* Provide an efficient information, research and policy support service
* Provide a tailored training service
* Provide a comprehensive, efficient administrative service
* Act as a champion for community participation in housing
* Maximise opportunities for partnership working

## 2.3 Policy Context

The context for the range of services provided by Supporting Communities is set within the housing and social development policies in Northern Ireland with a particular focus on social housing.

### 2.3.1 Social Development and Housing Executive

As the responsible government department for housing the Department for Social Development and the Housing Executive have a series of relevant strategies and policies that create an environment for and encourage the work of Supporting Communities.

Chief among the myriad strategies is that of “Community Involvement”[[1]](#footnote-1) that is built on the vision;

*“to work in active and meaningful partnership with our communities, to give residents a real say in making their neighbourhoods better places in which to live.”*

The Community Involvement Strategy provides a framework for the Housing Executive and residents to work together toward mutually agreed outcomes. It sets out how residents, along with their local community associations, can get involved in developing their local services to improve their quality of life.

Supporting Communities led activities are central to this strategy and are recognised within it.

### 2.3.2 Tenant Participation Strategy (Social Housing Reform Programme 2015-2020)

This is a plan to increase tenant involvement in the delivery of social housing services and the decisions that are made about these services. It is for social landlords - the Housing Executive and Housing Associations. It is for social housing tenants, all other residents, homeless people, those living in hostel accommodation and other service users. It aims to improve the quality of social housing services for tenants and landlords. Involving tenants helps landlords to give a better service and also give better value for the money that landlords get from rents and from government.

The Strategy sets out 10 principles of Tenant Participation that Supporting Communities will help to implement and support.

The strategy suggests that;

*“A relatively small investment in participation activities can bring significant benefits for tenants, the wider community and landlords. Tenants who get involved can improve their skills. Neighbours can build stronger links helping communities to stick together. Neighbourhoods can become more settled places. Happier tenants and communities mean properties are not likely to lie empty for long and rents are more likely to be up-to-date.”*

A recent study and publication by the National Tenants Organisation (Tenants Leading Change: An Investment not a cost; The business benefits of tenant involvement, March 2015) found that from the information gathered from a range of housing associations across England that it was correct to suggest that tenant involvement can and does lead to significant business benefits, as well as a range of other social and community benefits.

### 2.3.3 Digital Inclusion

The UK wide ‘Government Digital Inclusion Strategy’[[2]](#footnote-2) sets out how government and partners from the public, private and voluntary sectors will increase digital inclusion. This means helping people become capable of using and benefiting from the internet.

Supporting Communities has been engaged by the Department of Finance and Personnel Digital Inclusion Team to help deliver the strategy through the delivery of training across their membership and network in communities of need.

3. SROI Study

## 3.1 Methodology / Approach

| **Stage** | **Summary of Approach** |
| --- | --- |
| Project initiation | * Project initiation meeting with the project promoter – Supporting Communities
* Agree scope, identify stakeholders and outline activities.
 |
| Desk Review and Planning  | * Programme of consultation agreed;
* Review of the strategic context;
* Collation and organisation of data; and
* Developed the Stakeholder Map and Evaluation Framework for discussion
 |
| Mapping Outcomes | * Survey of member organisations (electronic) developed and disseminated via Supporting Communities
* Focus group with member organisations
* Housing Executive interviews and electronic survey
* Electronic survey of interagency partners
 |
| Data Analysis and SROI Calculations | * Analysis of Findings;
* SROI Calculation
	+ Discount factors
	+ Sensitivity analysis
 |
| Reporting | * Production of draft report; and
* Production of final report.
 |

 Social Return on Investment (SROI) analysis assigns a monetary value to the social and environmental benefit that has been created by an organisation by identifying indicators of value which can be allocated a financial proxy. Comparing this value to the investment required to achieve that impact produces a SROI ratio. It takes standard financial measures of economic return a step further by capturing social as well as financial value.

Table 1: Methodology

SROI was developed in the USA, but has been extended and adapted for a European and UK context. By developing an understanding of the organisation, how it meets its objectives, and how it works with its stakeholders, an organisation can create its own impact map, or impact value chain, which links inputs and outputs through to outcomes and impacts.

The SROI analysis has been a collaborative effort between the independent consultant appointed by Gauge NI and staff working within Supporting Communities and identified stakeholders, focusing on member organisations and the Housing Executive.

More information on SROI can be found at [www.socialvalueuk.org](http://www.socialvalueuk.org).

The delivery process to complete the agreed Evaluative Social Return on Investment report is detailed in Table 1 below.

## Scope of the study

The SROI study for Supporting Communities is retrospective in approach, covering a study period of 1st April 2014 to 31st March 2015 with results extrapolated over a five year period.

The research incorporates measurement of the range of Supporting Communities services supporting their key stakeholders:

* Support for community/ residents groups (e.g. training, establishment/governance support, funding support, PAYE and accounts)
* Independent community brokerage and facilitation of AGMs and interagency meetings
* Facilitated consultation with community/residents groups on the Tenant Participation Strategy. A series of strategy/policy consultation meetings with representatives of tenants groups from all over Northern Ireland
* Provision of IT and online skills training for excluded/vulnerable individuals and communities, and provision of ongoing support through 'digital champions'.

## 3.3 Stakeholders

Stakeholders are defined as people or organisations that experience change, whether positive or negative, as a result of the activity being analysed. A stakeholder is effectively someone who has something to gain or lose through the outcomes of a process or project. In many circles these are called interest groups and they can have a powerful bearing on the outcomes of policy decisions and organisational activities.

Through engagement with the project promoter an exercise to identify and analyse the needs and concerns of different stakeholders was completed.

The resultant Influence Map highlighted those stakeholders with the most significant material change. This was completed following a short listing of the extensive range of internal and external stakeholders. This was achieved by detailing the proposed impact or change and ranking in order of importance based on the level of activity with them and the proposed impact or change for them as a stakeholder.



Figure 1: Stakeholder Influence Map

Table 2 below provides a complete list of all potential stakeholder groups initially considered for inclusion in the study and the rational for inclusion or exclusion.

Table 2: Rationale for Inclusion or Exclusion of Stakeholder Groups

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Stakeholder | Reason for inclusion | Method of consultation |
| Member organisations, individual staff and local communities  | Member organisations of Supporting Communities are the main beneficiaries, most likely to experience significant change | Survey submitted to 450 members (20% completion rate)Focus group with sample of seven members |
| Housing Executive  | As the core funder of the services provided and due to the inextricable link between the Housing Executive objectives and those of Supporting Communities the view of regional managers was essential | Surveys and interviews completed with 27 Housing Managers (37% response rate) complemented by email communications with key managers |
| Department for Social Development (DSD) | Responsible government department for housing and a significantly material stakeholder who’s objectives of tenant | Telephone interview with DSD representative |
| Interagency Partners | Due to the high level of engagement created by the services of Supporting Communities material outcomes were identified | Survey completed by 44 partners and telephone interview with Transport NI |
| Department of Finance & Personnel (DFP) | Key funder of the Digital Inclusion programme as are the participants – both of whom experience noteworthy changes as a result of its delivery | Survey of 71 Digital Inclusion participants and face to face meetings with DFP staff |
| Stakeholder | **Reason for exclusion** |
| Supporting Communities Staff and Board | Staff are key participants in delivering services but not included as a stakeholder as they are not deemed to be a material beneficiary of the activities |

## 3.5 Data Sources and Stakeholder Consultation

In line with SROI principles, data was sourced using qualitative and quantitative methods. Consultations with stakeholders provided qualitative information, helping to build a complete and full picture of what actually changed for stakeholders as a result of Supporting Communities services. The table above provides details of stakeholder engagement.

## 3.6 Materiality

Those stakeholders excluded were believed to be not material either because the value to them was minimal (in terms of the social value generated) or the stakeholder groups were too diverse to measure with any accuracy.

It is the belief that the groups included are the key, material stakeholders of relevance to the study. That is, through the material outcomes of the three core services in this study, they experience:

* Direct (and short-term) financial or social gain as a result of the project/activities;
* Social gain (or social value) that resonates with societal norms and public policy (could generally be regarded as being in society’s interest).

The stakeholders identified and consulted with were chosen based on their materiality i.e. how relevant and significant the outcomes are in relation to the core aims and activities of Supporting Communities.

# 4. Report Findings & Outcomes

Outcomes are central to SROI analysis as they detail what changes as a result of the investment and activities of Supporting Communities. The outcomes identified and assessed in this report were:

**Housing Executive**

|  |
| --- |
| * Increased communication and engagement with residents and communities in these areas, and with other statutory agencies
 |
| * Improved exchange of information and knowledge between Housing Executive and tenants as well as other statutory agencies
 |
| * Effectiveness and efficiency of problem solving between the Housing Executive, Community/Residents Groups, and other statutory agencies, in your area (e.g. reaching appropriate resolutions to physical maintenance and other problems)
 |
| * Increased tenant satisfaction
 |
| * Increased tenancy sustainment / increased housing stability / reduced tenant turnover leading to reduced costs
 |
| * Reduced voids / maximised occupancy which increases rent collections
 |
| * Reduced physical damage
 |
| * Reduced anti-social behaviour
 |

**Member Organisations – including individual members and local communities**

|  |
| --- |
| * Increased knowledge and skills to do the (community group) job (e.g. knowledge about the housing system, statutory agency responsibilities or tenancy legislation, or organisational, governance or financial skills)
 |
| * Increased confidence in group’s ability to function (e.g. confidence in ability to run a committee, manage meetings, run a community hub or engage knowledgeably with statutory agencies)
 |
| * Improved communications and relationships with Statutory agencies (e.g. direct phone calls and meetings with relevant agencies, knowing who to talk to, and having confident, respectful, productive two-way engagement)
 |
| * Increased effectiveness and efficiency in problem solving with Statutory agencies (e.g. getting quick, appropriate resolutions to physical maintenance problems, dealing with an issue quickly and without too much effort or complication)
 |
| * Sense of 'involvement' or 'having a say' in relation to housing environment and related services (e.g. being involved in decision-making with statutory agencies, being able to put residents views forward for consideration)
 |
|

|  |
| --- |
| * Access to funding
 |

 |

**Interagency Partners**

|  |
| --- |
| * Increased communication and engagement with residents and communities in these areas, and with other statutory agencies
 |
| * Improved exchange of information and knowledge between statutory agencies and communities/service users (and other agencies)
 |
| * Improved (easier, more effective) problem resolution
 |
| * Increased service efficiencies - maintenance needs identified and undertaken in a timelier manner than would otherwise be the case (reduced engagement costs and costs associated with delayed maintenance).
 |

**Digital Inclusion Trainees**

|  |
| --- |
| * Efficient implementation of the digital inclusion programme (Operational cost-savings)
 |
| * Increased government transactions online (Reduced government transaction costs)
 |
| * Increased ITC knowledge and skills
 |

The outcomes identified were collated into an agreed Logic Model or Theory of Change for the organisation, outlined below, that illustrates the relationship between the investment made, activities delivered, outputs met and the outcomes achieved as a result:

Figure 2: Logic Model/Theory of Change

The framework was developed in partnership between the Supporting Communities Senior Management Team & Gauge. It was tested throughout the research process that resulted in a significant increase in initially identified outcomes and others identified throughout the research.

Figure 3: Logic Model for Supporting Communities

The following sections further detail each stage of the model illustrating:

* Inputs
* Activities and outputs, and
* Outcomes.

## 4.1 Inputs

This report is an evaluation of the social return from the three core services of Supporting Communities:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Funder / Stakeholder | Input investment |
| Housing Executive  | £621,260 Core Grant£15,458 Non-Monetary contribution (staff time) |
| Member Organisations | £6,583 Fees £14,585,136 Non-Monetary contribution (staff and volunteer time) |
| Department of Finance & Personnel | £30,000 Grant (Digital Inclusion Training Programme) |
| TOTAL | **£15,259,037** |

Table 3: Project Inputs

**Total investment in the period 2014/15 was £15,259,037** made up ofcore grants, fees and non-monetary contributions.

It is these non-monetary contributions, in the form of volunteer and staff time invested to achieve the desired and proposed outcomes that are most significant.

## 4.2 Project outputs

The activities of Supporting Communities achieved some significant outputs in the period, as summarised below:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Activity | Total | Details |
| Member Organisations | 545 Active Groups | Provided support for 71 AGMs, 137 committee meetings, 672 group and 142 individual contact meetings88 Groups assisted with Charity Commission NI registration |
| Administrative support | 40 groups122 staff | PAYE services, financial assessments and financial management support as well as administrative activities such as community surveys, mailing lists and governance paperwork |
| Funding Services | 263 Groups | £899,064 secured by groupsFortnightly Funding Information to 1,200 groups |
| Training | 464 participants | 87 Participants in Accredited Training and 377 in individual group training (265 groups participated) with high levels of satisfaction (92% and 94%)  |
| Inter Agency Meetings  | 198 meetings | Engaging 641 external agencies and 116 MLAs/Councillors |
| Digital Inclusion | 234 Champions | Supported 234 champions adding to the existing network of 432  |

Table 4: Outputs

## 4.3 The Theory and Experience of Change

“The theory of change is an account of how the organisation takes in resources (inputs) to do its work (activities) which leads to direct results (outputs) and longer term or more significant results (outcomes), as well as the part of those outcomes the organisation can take credit for (impacts).”

The theory of change is central to SROI, as it “tells the story” of how the organisation (Supporting Communities) utilises its inputs to produce outputs which, in turn, create outcomes for the stakeholders, as illustrated in Figure 2 on page 11.

This study presents the inputs, outputs and outcomes and the linkages between each, such that the overall theory of how Supporting Communities creates change for each stakeholder is unveiled.

Consultation and research with each stakeholder group through the study period helped to build an understanding of what changes were experienced, and how. Whilst all stakeholders experienced change, some were more significant than others.

For example, the most significant change experienced by local communities was ‘Improved physical environment’ as reported by 64% of respondent organisations.

The theory of change upon which we are basing our analysis is that;

Through the provision of facilitated support, local communities can build strong, cohesive communities through improved engagement, confidence, sustainability and inclusivity ensuring the delivery of better and more responsive services.

From this overall theory many direct outcomes are generated and the wide ranging social changes experienced by beneficiaries of Supporting Communities services, include:

|  |
| --- |
| * Increased knowledge and skills to do the (community group) job
 |
| * Increased confidence in group’s ability to function
 |
| * Improved communications and relationships with statutory agencies
 |
| * Increased effectiveness and efficiency in problem solving with statutory agencies
 |
| * Sense of 'involvement' or 'having a say' in relation to housing environment and related services
 |
|

|  |
| --- |
| * Access to funding
 |

 |

A theory of change has been identified for each stakeholder group. An illustration of the theory of change for the two main beneficiary groups, in the form of the Housing Executive and member groups, is outlined below whilst Appendix 2 provides a theory of change for each stakeholder.

### 4.3.1 Housing Executive

The work of Supporting Communities contributes to core **Housing Executive** objectives of ‘Building Stronger Communities’, which is reflected in the theory of change, outlined on page 15.

A core outcome proposed from the services of Supporting Communities is the potential reduction in void housing.

Figure 4: Housing Executive Voids data

The Housing Executive experienced a 10%, equating to 142 units, reduction in voids in 2015 with the outcomes experienced from Supporting Communities services a major contributory factor to this.

Feedback from the research supports the findings with the following quotes from Housing Managers illustrating the immediate outcomes experienced by individual managers:

**“Having active community groups are central to a lot of the work we do within communities and SCNI play a vital role in supporting and sustaining those.”**

**“Estate walkabouts have improved communication between agencies and ourselves to lead to a better service for our tenants.”**

Notably, one respondent suggested that the impact experienced would be considerably higher in the coming year;

“In the subject year 2014/15 the input from Supporting Communities (support provided by) would not have been as robust or effective as it is now.”

### 4.3.2 Member groups

Member organisations of Supporting Communities experience change significantly in for groups, the communities represented and individuals within organisations through:

* Increased knowledge & skills, confidence, communication and engagement (exchange of information & knowledge) with the Housing Executive and other agencies leading to…
* …‘having a say’, more effective problem resolution and access to funding (sustainability).

Feedback and evidence suggests that Supporting Communities is meeting its aims of creating ‘engaged’ communities. Whilst aim four of the Service Level Agreement with the Housing Executive SLA (relating to ‘Access to Funding’) is being efficiently met coupled with improvements to organisational management and governance leading to more ‘sustainable’ communities, as evidenced further by the testimony from members, below.

**“Without the help of Supporting Communities staff we could not have achieved the work within the community as we would not have had the capacity.”**

**“Have made me more confident in dealing with people I had found above me in intelligence and I found hard to approach. Now I feel more their equal in dealings with them.”**

**“SCNI staff have been very supportive around governance, organisational skills and developing good practice. The interagency meetings have helped develop relationships with voluntary and statutory groups. Working in partnership with SCNI and other agencies and being encouraged and directed has made a positive impact on local volunteers.”**

The theory of change for each of these stakeholders is illustrated below:

Figure 5: Theory of Change - Member Groups

Figure 6: Theory of Change – Housing Executive

The ‘Summary of Feedback’ illustrated opposite in Figure 7 offers a snapshot of the outcomes experienced by the range of stakeholders engaged with through the evaluation process.

Figure 7: Summary of Feedback

The outcomes are very reflective of ‘shared value’ in that they are highly interlinked. The outcomes across the range of stakeholders contribute to the Housing Executive objective of “Building stronger communities” whilst also reflecting Supporting Communities mission of developing “Engaged, confident, sustainable and inclusive communities.”

## 4.4 Outcomes Summary

Full details of all outcomes and their analysis can be found in the Impact Map in Appendix 1. However, a summary of the outcomes experienced by the stakeholders is provided below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Group | Impact value | % |
| Housing Executive | £75,266,462 | 63.10% |
| Member Groups | £2,247,472 | 1.88% |
| Local Communities  | £40,585,335 | 34.02% |
| Individual Com &Com group  | £824,233 | 0.69% |
| Interagency Partners | £105,730 | 0.09% |
| Dept Finance & Personnel (Digital Inclusion) | £253,089 | 0.21% |
|  Total | £119,282,321 | 100% |

Table 5: Social Value created

**The Social Return on Investment of Supporting Communities activities produced a ratio of approximately £8 for every £1 invested in the services.**

Figure 8: Total Social Value - by Stakeholder

As indicated, the most significant beneficiary is the Housing Executive, representing 63% of the total outcome value.

Figure 9: Supporting Communities Total Value %

### 4.4.1 Who’s value is it?

The £8 estimated social value is roughly distributed among the stakeholder groups as follows, with the Housing Executive and local communities experiencing the most significant value:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Group | Impact value |
| NIHE | £5.05 |
| Member Groups | £0.15 |
| Local Communities  | £2.72 |
| Individual Com &Com group  | £0.05 |
| Interagency Partners | £0.01 |
| Dept Finance & Personnel (Digital Inclusion) | £0.02 |
| Total | £8.00 |

Table 6: Impact value breakdown

# 5. The Social Return Calculation

## 5.1 Social Impact Created by Supporting Communities

The financial proxies have been chosen that represent the value to the stakeholders as much as possible. In certain

cases, this has been easier than others. Where it has not been possible to identify a value representing the change for the stakeholder directly, other values have been considered which include changes for other relevant stakeholders or the state.

The impact, or the total value of each change, is calculated as;

* the financial proxy
* multiplied by the quantity of the outcome
* minus any deadweight, attribution and/or displacement

This calculation has been carried out for each row of the Impact Map. The total impact is then the total of all the impact calculations for each outcome. The total impact at the end of the period of analysis of activities analysed was valued at £119,282,321 using this calculation and is shown on the Impact Map (summarised below in Table 10) and in full in Appendix 1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Total Present Value (TPV)** | **£119,282,321** |
| **Net Present Value** **(NPV = PV – Inputs)** | **£104,023,283** |
| **Social Return** | **£7.82: £1** |

The social return is expressed as a ratio of present value divided by value of inputs. For this analysis, the social return ratio is therefore:

|  |
| --- |
| £119,282,321= £7.82 : £1 |
| £15,259,037 |

This is the normal way of presenting social return and the overall figure produced by this analysis.

**This means that this analysis estimates that for every**

**£1 invested in Supporting Communities activities there is approximately £8 of social value created.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Stakeholder** |  | **Outcome** | **Quantity Affected** | **Financial Proxy** | **Source - Value** | **Source** |
| Housing Executive | 1.1 | Increased communication and engagement with residents and communities in these areas, and with other statutory agencies | 27 | Cost of participation in Collaboration NI support structures | £797 | £797 average cost per organisation delivery costs of Collaboration NI in 2013 |
| 1.2 |  Improved exchange of information and knowledge between Housing Executive and tenants as well as other statutory agencies |
| 1.3 | Effectiveness and efficiency of problem solving between Housing Executive, Community/Residents Groups, and other statutory agencies, in your area (e.g. reaching appropriate resolutions to physical maintenance and other problems)  |
| 1.4 | Increased tenant satisfaction | 142 | Cost of void - average cost of failed tenancy based on 6 month temporary accommodation | £14,909 | <http://www.homelessactionscotland.org.uk/uploads/The%20Cost%20of%20Tenancy%20Failure%202011.pdf>  |
| 1.5 | Increased tenancy sustainment / increased housing stability / reduced tenant turnover leading to reduced costs |
| 1.6 | Reduced voids / maximised occupancy which increases rent collections |
| 1.7 | Reduced physical damage |
| 1.8 | Reduced anti-social behaviour | 353 | Cost of Anti-social behaviour  | £15,730 | Nixon & Hunter (2006) <http://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/files/jrf/9781905018109.pdf>  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Community/Residents Groups | 2.1 | Increased knowledge and skills to do the (community group) job (e.g. knowledge about the housing system, statutory agency responsibilities or tenancy legislation, or organisational, governance or financial skills)  | 321 | Level 3 certificate in housing services(4 day qualification) similar to the kind of knowledge and skills gained by community/residents' groups through interactions with SCNI - as discussed in focus group  | £995 | <http://www.cih.org/training/display/vpathDCR/templatedata/cih/training/data/Wales/CIH_Level_3_Certificate_in_Housing_Services_south_wales> |
| 2.2 | Increased confidence in group’s ability to function (e.g. confidence in ability to run a committee, manage meetings, run a community hub or engage knowledgeably with statutory agencies) | 304 | Cost of Assertiveness and Self-Confidence Training (in-house) | £1,556 | Global Value Exchange - <http://www.globalvaluexchange.org/valuations/8279e41d9e5e0bd8499f5aeb>   |
| 2.3 | Improved communications and relationships with Statutory agencies (e.g. direct phone calls and meetings with relevant agencies, knowing who to talk to, and having confident, respectful, productive two-way engagement) | 309 | £525 + VAT Cost of a Stakeholder Engagement Course by Business in the Community | £525 | BITC - <http://www.bitc.org.uk/services/training-bitc/accredited-training/bitc-training-one-day-courses/stakeholder-engagement>   |
| 2.4 | Increased effectiveness and efficiency in problem solving with Statutory agencies (e.g. getting quick, appropriate resolutions to physical maintenance problems, dealing with an issue quickly and without too much effort or complication) | 304 | Cost of a training course that would provide similar skills/outcome - Action Learning for effective problem solving, by The Knowledge Academy. | £695 | <https://www.theknowledgeacademy.com/courses/personal-development-training/action-learning-for-effective-problem-solving/belfast/>  |
| 2.5 | Sense of 'involvement' or 'having a say' in relation to housing environment and related services (e.g. being involved in decision-making with statutory agencies, being able to put residents views forward for consideration) | 292 | Social value captured in above outcome |
| 2.6 | Access to funding | 263 | £899065 total funding accessed by groups. Averaged across the 263 organisations | £3,418.50 | Programme/Admin data  |
| Local Communities | 3.1 | Improved physical environment | 6802 | Regeneration of the local area leads to a 0.33 increase in life satisfaction, valued at about £6,500 per year per person.  | £6,500 | Community investment values from the Social Value Bank HACT and Daniel Fujiwara (www.hact.org.uk / www.simetrica.co.uk) *Source:* www.socialvaluebank.org(HACT 2013, The Social Impact of Social Housing Providers)  |
| 3.2 | Improved social environment | 6346 | Socialising on most days of the week (Value of Social networks and involvement) | £3,000 |
| 3.3 | A sense of well-being | 6579 | Cost of an 8 week mindfulness course | £215 | [Discover Mindfulness NI http://discovermindfulnessni.co.uk/discover-mindfulness-ni/upcoming-courses/](http://discovermindfulnessni.co.uk/discover-mindfulness-ni/upcoming-courses/)  |
| 3.4 | A sense of belonging | 6686 | Feel belonging to a neighbourhood | £3,919 | Community investment values from the Social Value Bank HACT and Daniel Fujiwara (www.hact.org.uk / www.simetrica.co.uk) *Source:* www.socialvaluebank.org(HACT 2013, The Social Impact of Social Housing Providers)  |
| 3.5 | A sense of safety and security | 6113 | Living in a safe area life satisfaction increases by 0.029, which has a value of about £650 per annum per person.  | £650 |
| 3.6 | More stable housing – people moving less often | 4149 | Social value captured in above |
| Individual Com &Com group | 4.1 | Increased knowledge and skills | 409 | Participation in one adult learning course  | £754 | Community investment values from the Social Value Bank HACT and Daniel Fujiwara (www.hact.org.uk / www.simetrica.co.uk) *Source:* www.socialvaluebank.org(HACT 2013, The Social Impact of Social Housing Providers)  |
| 4.2 | Increased self confidence and self-esteem | 390 | Learning that helped people to feel more confident with family and others | £690 |
| 4.3 | Paid employment outside of community group (Financial outcome) | 3737 | Ave value (direct financial only) of paid workValue of part-time employment (non-salary related benefits) | £2,150£1,176 | (Community group survey result)Community investment values from the Social Value Bank HACT and Daniel Fujiwara (www.hact.org.uk / www.simetrica.co.uk) *Source:* www.socialvaluebank.org(HACT 2013, The Social Impact of Social Housing Providers)  |
| 4.4 | Volunteering opportunities outside of community group | 244 | Value of regular volunteering per individual per year | £2,307 |
| Interagency Partners | 5.1 | Increased communication and engagement with residents and communities in these areas, and with other statutory agencies | 27 | Saving of 2 hours per week estimated over 36 weeks + value of dedicated CRM system | £4,900 | Average salary of Community Development or Youth Worker role NJC Scale 6, £22,221 + Salesforce basic licence at £17 pm per user |
| 5.2 | Improved exchange of information and knowledge between statutory agencies and communities/service users (and other agencies) |
| 5.3 | Improved (easier, more effective) problem resolution |
| 5.4 | Increased service efficiencies - maintenance needs identified and undertaken in a more timely manner than would otherwise be the case (reduced engagement costs and costs associated with delayed maintenance).  |
| DSD | 6.1 | Tenant-informed strategy/policy development | 1 | The budget for a similar stakeholder consultation and strategy development process. (Cultural Strategy, Derry City 2013)[[3]](#footnote-3) | £15,000 | <https://www.google.co.uk/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=5&ved=0ahUKEwjdyo3_lOTJAhUHzRQKHW3oBsoQFgg2MAQ&url=http%3A%2F%2Fcomartspartner.org%2Fwp-content%2Fuploads%2F2013%2F07%2FCultural-Strategy-tender-document.docx&usg=AFQjCNHFiWZn5DOYsHyd8OHkkgS3S5tpbA&sig2=XsWbO-EYQHlGtR5CZk_k3A&cad=rja>  |
| 6.2 | Increased communication and engagement with residents and communities |
| 6.3 | Improved exchange of information and knowledge between DSD and housing sector participants |
| 6.4 | Increased buy-in of service users to the Tenant Participation Strategy |
| Department of Finance and Personnel (Digital Inclusion Team) & Government purse | 7.1 | Efficient implementation of the digital inclusion programme (Operational cost-savings) | 125 | Cost per person of providing the DI training. | £147 | Calculated using costs of training fees, venue hire, travel costs, etc. Set out in separate spreadsheet. |
| 7.2 | Increased government transactions online (Reduced government transaction costs)The potential savings of an effective digital strategy have been calculated by Price Waterhouse Coopers , working in conjunction with the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG). (They found that social housing providers could save more than £340m a year if using more cost - effective online communications to communicate with their 9.5m residents.)  | 125 | Potential savings per person.  | £36 | Based on data from: <http://www.northern-consortium.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/The-Business-Case-for-Digital-Inclusion.pdf>  |
| 7.3 | Increased ITC knowledge and skillsThis comes from having more confidence, making financial savings online, less boredom, opportunities to pursue hobbies, new jobseeking skills, and a reduction in social isolation. www.justeconomics.co.uk | 125 | Value of digital inclusion for a new user as £1,064 per annum.  | £1,064 | 2014 <https://www.btplc.com/Betterfuture/ConnectedSociety/Creatingpossibilities/Valueofdigitalinclusion/Valuing-Digital-Inclusion.pdf>  |
|  | **Present Value (PV)** | £119,282,321 |
|  | **Net Present Value (NPV = PV – Inputs)** | £104,023,283 |
|  | **Social Return** | **£7.82 per £1** |

Table 7 Impact Map

Each financial proxy and its source are detailed on the Impact Map in Appendix 1.-

## 5.2 Verifying the result

It is necessary to “discount” the values generated by each of the financial proxies in order to ensure a realistic and credible figure is utilised. The following methods are most commonly used with the SROI model:

**Deadweight:** An assessment of how much of each of the outcomes would have happened anyway, without Supporting Communities proving them i.e. that the service user would have taken action to alter behaviour. For example, that member groups would have accessed alternative support for fundraising and grants support, we have suggested that 20% of users could have done so and reduced the value attributed to Supporting Communities as such.

**Displacement:** An assessment of how much of each of the outcomes displaced other activities or outcomes that would otherwise have occurred. For example, that the outcomes for the Housing Executive may have displaced funding to other providers to deliver similar services, we have estimated a 10% likelihood of this.

**Attribution:** An assessment of how much of each of the outcomes was generated by the contributions of other organisations or people e.g. referral sources, family members etc. For example, through surveys it was suggested that Local Community beneficiaries would apportion 50% of the improvements to physical environment to Supporting Communities.

**Drop-off***:* In future years, beyond the initial year of service delivery, the amount of each outcome that can be directly attributed to the project will be greatly reduced as it becomes more influenced by other factors. Coupled with the discount rate of 3.5% suggested by HM Treasury guidance this ensures credibility of forecasting social value. In this study for Supporting Communities the social value is accrued and calculated for the single year only and as such drop off is not included.

## 5.3 Sensitivity analysis

Given that the analysis contains estimations and assumptions, it is prudent to review where these decisions have had a significant effect on the overall SROI calculation and to consider, therefore, the assertion that can be placed on such figures.

The sensitivity analysis explores the impact on the SROI ratio of changing some of the study’s key assumptions. Discount rates thought to be significant were amended to clarify the impact of changing attribution, deadweight or displacement.

Outcome values generated from research methods were adjusted to determine the impact of changing particular values, given that questionnaires results were extrapolated over the full stakeholder group.

The most significant (or sensitive areas) for the analysis relate to:

* Local Communities – Improved physical environment (41.5% of total outcome value)
* Local Communities – Improved sense of belonging to the community (26.75% of total outcome value)
* Local Communities – Improved social environment (18.72% of total outcome value)

Collectively these three outcomes accounted for a considerable 87% of the assumed value of social impact.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Stakeholder | Outcome | Deadweight | Displacement | Attribution | Details |
| Housing Executive | 1.1 | Increased communication and engagement with residents and communities in these areas, and with other statutory agencies | 20% | 10% | 49% | Survey data completed by the sample group of Housing Executive Managers asked the question of:* What outcomes would have happened anyway?
* What could have been achieved by the organisation itself?
* What level of the outcome can be attributed to Supporting Communities?
 |
| 1.2 | Improved exchange of information and knowledge between the Housing Executive and tenants as well as other statutory agencies | 20% | 10% | 44% |
| 1.3 | Effectiveness and efficiency of problem solving between Housing Executive, community/residents groups, and other statutory agencies, in your area (e.g. reaching appropriate resolutions to physical maintenance and other problems)  | 20% | 10% | 56% |
| 1.4 | Increased tenant satisfaction  | 20% | 10% | 62% |
| 1.5 | Increased tenancy sustainment / increased housing stability / reduced tenant turnover leading to reduced costs | 20% | 10% | 79% |
| 1.6 | Reduced voids / maximised occupancy which increases rent collections | 20% | 10% | 80% |
| 1.7 | Reduced physical damage | 20% | 10% | 74% |
| 1.8 | Reduced anti-social behavior | 20% | 10% | 71% |
| Member Groups | 2.1 | Increased knowledge and skills to do the (community group) job (e.g. knowledge about the housing system, statutory agency responsibilities or tenancy legislation, or organisational, governance or financial skills)  | 7% | 5% | 44% | Survey data completed by the respondent Member Groups of Community/Residents Groups asked the question of:* What outcomes would have happened anyway?
* Other groups that could have helped just as much?
* What level of the outcome can be attributed to Supporting Communities? Other contributing bodies identified included Housing Executive, Local Council, other statutory bodies and community organisations
 |
| 2.2 | Increased confidence in group’s ability to function (e.g. confidence in ability to run a committee, manage meetings, run a community hub or engage knowledgeably with statutory agencies) | 7% | 5% | 39% |
| 2.3 | Improved communications and relationships with statutory agencies (e.g. direct phone calls and meetings with relevant agencies, knowing who to talk to, and having confident, respectful, productive two-way engagement) | 7% | 5% | 37% |
| 2.4 | Increased effectiveness and efficiency in problem solving with statutory agencies (e.g. getting quick, appropriate resolutions to physical maintenance problems, dealing with an issue quickly and without too much effort or complication) | 7% | 5% | 41% |
| 2.5 | Sense of 'involvement' or 'having a say' in relation to housing environment and related services (e.g. being involved in decision-making with statutory agencies, being able to put residents views forward for consideration) | 7% | 5% | 38% |
| 2.6 | Access to funding | 20% | 8% | 0% |
| Local Communities | 3.1 |  Improved physical environment | 9% | 4% | 50% | Survey data completed by the community representatives asked the question of:* What outcomes would have happened anyway?
* Other groups that could have helped just as much?
* What level of the outcome can be attributed to Supporting Communities?
 |
| 3.2 | Improved social environment | 9% | 4% | 48% |
| 3.3 | A sense of well-being | 9% | 4% | 47% |
| 3.4 | A sense of belonging | 9% | 4% | 46% |
| 3.5 | A sense of safety and security  | 9% | 4% | 48% |
| 3.6 | More stable housing – people moving less often | 9% | 4% | 48% |
| Individual Community Group Reps | 4.1 | Increased knowledge and skills  | 50% | 10% | 25% | The level of discounting was based on the feedback from the completed focus groups that encouraged participants to identify if and how the outcome in question could have been achieved with the input of other agencies – statutory bodies and community based organisations were listed as contributors. |
| 4.2 | Increased self confidence and self-esteem  | 50% | 10% | 25% |
| 4.3 | Paid employment outside of community group (financial outcome) | 50% | 10% | 25% |
| 4.4 | Volunteering opportunities outside of community group | 50% | 10% | 25% |
| Interagency Partners | 5.1 | Increased communication and engagement with residents and communities in these areas, and with other statutory agencies | 12% | 7% | 43% | Survey data completed by the community representatives asked the question of:* What outcomes would have happened anyway?
* Other groups that could have helped just as much?
* What level of the outcome can be attributed to Supporting Communities?
 |
| 5.2 | Improved exchange of information and knowledge between statutory agencies and communities/service users (and other agencies) | 12% | 7% | 43% |
| 5.3 |  Improved (easier, more effective) problem resolution | 12% | 7% | 43% |
| 5.4 | Increased service efficiencies - maintenance needs identified and undertaken in a more timely manner than would otherwise be the case (reduced engagement costs and costs associated with delayed maintenance).  | 12% | 7% | 41% |
| DSD | 6.1 | Tenant-informed strategy/policy development | 20% | 20% | 20% | Based on the interviews completed with DSD personnel it was estimated that approximately 1/5th or 20% of the outcomes listed could be subject to deadweight, displacement and attribution e.g. that around 1/5th of the communities benefiting would have done so anyway |
| 6.2 | Increased communication and engagement with residents and communities |  |
| 6.3 | Improved exchange of information and knowledge between DSD and housing sector participants |
| 6.4 | Increased buy-in of service users to the Tenant Participation Strategy |
| DFP (Digital inclusion team) | 7.1 | Efficient implementation of the digital inclusion programme (Operational cost-savings)  | 0% | 0% | 0% | The DSD would not have been able to access the client group without the input of Supporting Communities. As such, no discounting has been applied. However, it is believed that a small percentage of trainees would have accessed the skills through other sources such as family members or community based providers. |
| 7.2 |  Increased government transactions online (Reduced government transaction costs) | 20% | 20% | 20% |
| 7.3 | Increased ITC knowledge and skills | 5% | 15% | 31% |

Table 8: SROI Sensitivity Calculations

The sensitivity of the calculations is important in verifying the result and ensuring that outcomes are not overvalued or over claimed. The four most significant outcomes, and the judgements made in arriving at the value of them, are examined in more detail here and some less favourable scenarios calculated.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Stakeholder | Outcome | Factor chosen | Changed to | Ratio  |
| Local Communities | 3.1 Improved physical environment. Regeneration of the local area leads to an increase in life satisfaction | Financial Proxy | Reduced to £20.50 per hour per week equating to £1.066 per annum (household expenditure on home improvements) | £4.92 |
| Deadweight | Increase from 9% to 20% | £7.41 |
| Displacement | No change | - |
| Attribution | Increase from 50% to 66% | £6.71 |
| Local Communities | 3.4 Improvement in a sense of belonging for the local community. | Financial Proxy  | Increased value to reflect a relatively older population of aged 50+ (to £6,004 from £3,919) | £9.00 |
| Deadweight | Increase from 9% to 25% | £7.44 |
| Displacement | No change | - |
| Attribution | Increase from 46% to 66% | £7.00 |
| Local Communities | 3.2 Improved social environment – social interaction. | Financial Proxy  | Increased based on the University of London report ‘Putting a price tag on friends, families and neighbours’ of £9,300 (based on a 60% change in the outcome) | £10.55 |
| Deadweight | Increase from 9% to 25% | £7.59 |
| Displacement | No change | - |
| Attribution | Increase from 48% to 66% | £7.37 |

Table 9: Sensitivity of key outcomes

This sensitivity analysis produces a range of ratios from £4.92 - £10.55 by either amending the financial proxy used to measure the outcome, increasing the discount factors to reduce the proposed effect of the project or finally, by amending the number of service users affected by the outcome. This range illustrates that the outcomes are not overly sensitive to change, that Supporting Communities can be deemed responsible for much of the change and illustrates that the financial proxies chosen and sensitivity analysis are robust in not over claiming for outcomes.

Whilst analysing the social value it is important to recognise that the worse set of scenarios of the sensitivity analysis results in a proposed social value of £5:£1.

The impact of Supporting Communities activities, represented by **a value of £7.82:£1 appears justified and appropriate**, if a little conservative.

**However, to represent better the fact that the analysis is based on a range of judgements, a value likely to be about £8:£1 is the most appropriate conclusion that can be drawn from the information currently available.**

It is not possible to assess impact without making judgements and these should be tested and appropriately

represented by a range of values as provided above.

# 6. Discussion

Participants found it difficult to limit their consideration of outcomes to the 2014-15 year, as they have been involved with SCNI for much longer. There is a risk that the outcomes for that particular period do not exactly match the range of outcomes over time. However, there was consistent feedback from participants about the nature of the outcomes (for them) of Supporting Communities work.

Consequently, there can be little doubt about the types of outcomes achieved by Supporting Communities during the 2014-15 period.

## 6.1 Conclusions

The following summary of the values and outcomes help to represent what Supporting Communities has achieved and is achieving, for its members and funder (Housing Executive) primarily, and external stakeholders.

The social value for community groups is enormous. This value however can be assigned to the Housing Executive as a stakeholder due to the nature of the outcomes that are reflected in the SLA (Service Level Agreement) with Supporting Communities.

The groups themselves benefit in terms of increased capacity and capability to undertake their primary functions and meet their legal obligations.

Individual group members’ benefit in their own lives from the increased confidence, knowledge and skills gained from their training and interactions with Supporting Communities.

The wider communities within which the groups operate benefit from improvements to their physical and social environments which are directly attributable to the work of the community groups facilitated by the organisation.

A key value for Housing Executive is in relation to the organisation’s stated organisational objective of ‘Building Stronger Communities’. All of the value created for communities as outlined above is therefore also delivering for Housing Executive on that objective.

Another value for the Housing Executive and for Interagency Partners (as well as community groups) is in having an independent broker there to mediate, to be the unbiased translator smoothing the path of communication and problem-solving between tenants and agencies. This makes life easier and more efficient for everyone involved.

**The value for DSD (and as a result the Housing Executive) and DFP (and other statutory agencies) lies in Supporting Communities vast network of community/residents' groups, a well establish communication network, and easy access to residents and venues across the province.**

**Working with Supporting Communities to deliver training or engage in consultations with communities is therefore an efficient and cost-effective option.**

The aim for Supporting Communities with this evaluative report has been to have a review of the key organisational activities and the impact of the services for relevant stakeholders. From this, the organisation hopes to be able to see where successes have been made, where significant impact exists and where to improve to sustain a good level of social return.

It is hoped that this report and impact map will give stakeholders an idea of the social value of their engagement with Supporting Communities.

The key outcomes experienced by stakeholders are summarised below:

|  |
| --- |
| Stakeholder Identified Outcomes |
| Housing Executive | Supporting Communities independence, community brokerage and facilitation of interagency meetings in areas of social housing (leads to)>* Increased communication and engagement, improved exchange of information and knowledge between NIHE & tenants >
* Improved problem solving, increased service efficiencies and tenant satisfaction >
* Tenant sustainability (reduced voids) and stability
 |
| Member Groups | Supporting Communities activities lead to outcomes for groups, communities and individuals:* Increased knowledge & skills, confidence, communication and engagement (exchange of information & knowledge) with NIHE and other agencies >
* ‘having a say’, more effective problem resolution and access to funding (sustainability)
 |
| Local Comm-unities  | * Improved physical environment
* Improved social environment
* A sense of well-being
* A sense of belonging
* A sense of safety and security
* More stable housing – people moving less often
 |
| Individuals within groups  | * Increased knowledge and skills
* Increased self confidence and self-esteem
* Volunteering and employment opportunities
 |
| Inter-agency Partners | * Increased communication and engagement with residents and communities
* Improved exchange of information and knowledge with communities/service users (and agencies) >
* Improved (easier, more effective) problem resolution, and
* Increased service efficiencies
 |
| Dept Finance & Personnel (Digital Inclusion) | * Provision of IT skills training for excluded/vulnerable individuals >
* Increased knowledge and skills, confidence and motivation for use of online technology as well as online transactions >
* Reduced government transaction costs
 |

Table 10: Stakeholder & Outcome Summary

## 6.2 Recommendations

The aim for Supporting Communities in completing this evaluative report has been to review the key activities of the organisation and the impact of the services for the relevant stakeholders. As a result, the organisation can identify where successes have been made, where significant impact exists and where to improve in order to sustain a positive social return.

It is hoped that this report and resultant SROI Impact Map will provide stakeholders with an understanding of the social value of engaging with Supporting Communities; an perception into what service users and beneficiary groups feel they gain as a result of utilising services and the ultimate outcomes experienced by stakeholders.

The following recommendations are made for the future assessment of impact for Supporting Communities:

1. Supporting Communities should investigate future stakeholder engagement to identify unintended and negative changes. These are difficult to forecast and so only estimations have been made in this report. Specifically, indicators and values from the stakeholders perspective should be explored to confirm (or otherwise) the estimations used in this forecast.
2. The organisation may consider inclusion of an additional stakeholder group for future evaluations. For example, Housing Associations could be consulted with in more depth and may be considered as a standalone stakeholder.
3. The organisation might consider some further support or training before re-doing their SROI or other impact assessment. This would help to embed the activity throughout the service.
4. Taking stock to review the outcomes will allow Supporting Communities to select only the most material to the stakeholders to allow for a more streamlined and easily maintained SROI analysis in the future.

# 7. Appendices

## 7.1 Impact Map

## 7.2 Stakeholder Engagement & Findings

SCNI SROI - Stakeholder Feedback Summary

DSD

Theory of change

SCNI facilitated consultation with community/residents groups on the Tenant Participation Strategy

RESULTED IN

* Increased communication and engagement with residents and communities
* Improved exchange of information and knowledge between DSD and housing sector participants

LEADING TO OUTCOMES

* User-informed policy and strategy development
* Increased buy-in of service users to the tenant participation strategy

Without SCNI's involvement

The strategy would have been less robust and not user-informed. If working with SCNI had not been an option, a different, less effective, less efficient, process would have to have been undertaken to achieve the same outcome.

Transport NI (Interagency Partner):

Theory of change

SCNI facilitation of interagency meetings in areas of social housing

RESULTED IN

* Increased communication and engagement with residents and communities in these areas, and with other statutory agencies
* Improved exchange of information and knowledge between transport ni and these communities/service users (and agencies)

LEADING TO OUTCOMES

* Improved (easier, more effective) problem resolution, and
* Increased service efficiencies - maintenance needs identified and undertaken in a more timely manner than would otherwise be the case (reduced engagement costs and costs associated with delayed maintenance).

Without SCNI's involvement

If working with SCNI had not been an option, other community group structures might be used to try to achieve the same outcomes, however, SCNI is an independent unbiased facilitator/mediator which is of benefit for managing the agency-community relationships.

Housing Executive:

Theory of change

SCNI’s independence, community brokerage and facilitation of interagency meetings in areas of social housing (AND OTHER OUTPUTS)

RESULTS IN:

* increased communication and engagement with residents and communities in these areas, and with other statutory agencies
* improved exchange of information and knowledge between the Housing Executive and tenants as well as other statutory agencies

RESULTING IN

* improved (easier, more effective) problem resolution
* increased service efficiencies - maintenance needs identified and undertaken in a more timely manner than would otherwise be the case (reduced engagement costs and costs associated with delayed maintenance)
* increased tenant satisfaction

WHICH LEADS TO OUTCOMES

* increased tenancy sustainment / increased housing stability / reduced tenant turnover leading to reduced costs
* reduced voids / maximised occupancy which increases rent collections
* reduced physical damage
* reduced anti-social behaviour

Without SCNI's involvement

Allocating specific resources to an independent external organisation to undertake community engagement ensures that it can be achieved.

DFP:

Theory of change

 1. Provision of IT and online skills training for excluded/vulnerable individuals and communities, and provision of ongoing support through 'digital champions':

RESULTS IN (OUTCOMES FOR TRAINEES)

Increased knowledge, skills, confidence and motivation for use of online technology (for personal communication use (e.g. skype/email) as well as for online transactions, including government interactions)

RESULTING IN

Increased government transactions online

LEADING TO THE OUTCOME FOR DFP OF

Reduced government transaction costs

2. Use of SCNI to deliver training:

RESULTS IN

Access to an existing community engagement infrastructure and network (with communication channels, venues and trainers and ongoing community engagement capacity)

RESULTING IN

More efficient implementation of the Digital Inclusion programme

LEADING TO THE OUTCOME FOR DFP OF

Operational Cost-savings

Without SCNI's involvement

To achieve the same outcome would have been more difficult, time-consuming and expensive

.

Community/Resident Groups, Wider Communities and Individuals:

SCNI’s activities to support Community/Resident Groups leads to outcomes for communities and individuals

Theory of Change

SCNI’s activities:

RESULT IN (OUTCOMES FOR COMMUNITY/RESIDENT GROUPS)

* Increased knowledge and skills
* Increased confidence in group’s ability to function
* Increased communication and engagement with residents and communities in these areas, and with other statutory agencies
* Improved exchange of information and knowledge between the Housing Executive and tenants as well as other statutory agencies

LEADING TO OHER OUTCOMES FOR COMMUNITY/RESIDENT GROUPS

* Sense of 'involvement' or 'having a say' in relation to housing environment and related services
* Improved (easier, more effective) problem resolution
* Access to funding

RESULTING IN OUTCOMES FOR COMMUNITIES

* Improved physical environment
* Improved social environment
* A sense of well-being
* A sense of belonging
* A sense of safety and security
* More stable housing – people moving less often

OUTCOMES FOR INDIVIDUAL COMMUNITY GROUP MEMBERS

* Increased knowledge and skills
* Increased self confidence and self-esteem
* Volunteering and employment opportunities

Without SCNI’s Involvement

Community/Residents Groups say:

* They wouldn’t know what was going on
* Their groups would not be able to operate
* As residents/communities they would not have the extensive representation through the housing system/sector that they do currently have
* They could work with other community development officers, such as those employed by Councils, but they wouldn’t have the independence of SCNI, so therefore there would be less trust
* There would be more of a ‘them and us’ culture which SCNI has managed to largely eliminate.
1. <http://www.nihe.gov.uk/community_involvement_strategy_report_2014.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/government-digital-inclusion-strategy/government-digital-inclusion-strategy> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. <https://www.google.co.uk/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=5&ved=0ahUKEwjdyo3_lOTJAhUHzRQKHW3oBsoQFgg2MAQ&url=http%3A%2F%2Fcomartspartner.org%2Fwp-content%2Fuploads%2F2013%2F07%2FCultural-Strategy-tender-document.docx&usg=AFQjCNHFiWZn5DOYsHyd8OHkkgS3S5tpbA&sig2=XsWbO-EYQHlGtR5CZk_k3A&cad=rja> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)