

Pre-Report Assurance Outcomes Check Service



An SVI Assurance service delivered by Social Value UK

Outcomes Check Service details

What is it?

The service provides the opportunity for an applicant to check that the stakeholder engagement and defining of outcomes in their analysis have been done in alignment with the Report Assurance Standard criteria. This allows for refinements to be made at an earlier stage in data collection and report development.

This service has been developed in response to the desire to check the defining of outcomes earlier in the analysis, before a report is submitted for full [Report Assurance](#). A key part of the process is the application of Principle 1: Involve Stakeholders, and Principle 2: Understand What Changes, and so a check that covers this allows for an opportunity for enhanced learning as a part of the assurance process.

This allows for better defined outcomes, more robust data, better capture of the value that is being created through the activity under scope, and a higher likelihood of meeting the full Report Assurance Standard.

The Outcomes Check Service will review the submitted documentation against the following Report Assurance Standard criteria:

- 1.1 – Identification of Stakeholder Groups
- 1.2 – Stakeholders involved in defining outcomes (qualitative phase)
- 2.1 – Scope
- 2.2 – Defining Outcomes
- 2.3 – Context of Outcomes

It is advised that the applicant reads all of the Report Assurance Standard criteria before applying. The full Report Assurance Standard is available to download [here](#).

What do I submit?

The applicant must submit evidence of their stakeholder mapping and stakeholder engagement, and how these have been used to define outcomes. The applicant must submit a document outlining this process in a transparent way such that a third-party assessor can fully understand the approach taken. This document will likely be a first or partial draft of their final report.

In the process the assessor will be looking to see how the applicant has defined and engaged with stakeholders and how the outcomes have been defined. The assessor will also be looking to make sure that the scope of the report is clear.

The list of criteria that will be checked is included at the end of this document. This has been taken directly from the Report Assurance Standard that would be checked in full should the report progress to the Report Assurance stage.

Cost

The cost for the Outcomes Check Service is £300+VAT. If the applicant chooses to progress to a full Report Assurance application, they will receive a discount of 10%. This is for both Standard and Fast-Track Report Assurance applications. The discount will not apply to the cost of an amendment period (if one is required).

Timeline

Feedback will be delivered within a 4-6 week turn around.

There is no set time frame in which changes suggested in the feedback must be implemented, but the SVUK team ask to be kept informed of the expected resubmission date if the applicant wants to progress with a full Report Assurance application. This is so that the same assessor can be engaged for both applications.

Report Assurance: Outcomes Check Criteria

1.1	Identification of stakeholder groups
1.1.1	Does the report include a range of stakeholder groups (not just intended 'beneficiaries')?
1.1.2	Does the report identify any subgroups (or potential subgroups) of stakeholders?
1.1.3	Does the report describe how subgroups have been considered based upon evidence of materially different outcomes?
1.1.4	Does the report provide a description and analysis of how stakeholders were involved in identifying other stakeholders, addressing the extent to which it provides a fair representation of the whole stakeholder group? Stating: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the process for selecting representative stakeholders; • the method chosen for involving stakeholders (e.g. focus group, semi structured interviews); • the numbers involved.
1.1.5	Where representatives of a stakeholder group (identified as likely to experience material outcomes) have not been involved in identifying other stakeholder groups, does the report include a rationale to explain why they were not involved and how their perspective is represented in the analysis (if another group has been used as a proxy, an explanation should be provided justifying why they are an appropriate group)?

1.2	Stakeholders involved in defining outcomes (qualitative phase)
1.2.1	Does the report provide a description and analysis of how stakeholders were involved in defining outcomes (and, where necessary, identifying the relevant outcome within a chain of events) addressing the extent to which it provides a fair representation of the whole stakeholder group? Stating: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the process for selecting representative stakeholders; • the method chosen for involving stakeholders (e.g. focus group, semi structured interviews); • the numbers involved.
1.2.2	Does the report include a list of the questions presented to stakeholders in the process of identifying outcomes (and, where necessary, identifying the relevant outcome within a chain of events)?
1.2.3	Do the questions reflect an open approach to identifying outcomes (i.e. including options to identify unintended and negative outcomes)?
1.2.4	Where representatives of a stakeholder group (identified as likely to experience material outcomes) have not been involved in defining the outcomes, does the report include a rationale to explain why they were not involved and how their perspective is represented in the analysis (if another group has been used as a proxy, an explanation should be provided justifying why they are an appropriate group)?

2.1	Scope
2.1.1	Does the report make clear whether the analysis is a forecast or an evaluation?
2.1.2	Does the report make clear the activities that are being analysed?
2.1.3	Does the report make clear the period over which the activities occur?

2.2	Defining Outcomes
2.2.1	Are the outcomes disclosed in the report linked to a stakeholder group that have (or will) experienced that outcome?
2.2.2	Does the report include evidence of how the process of defining outcomes was designed to capture any unintended (and negative) outcomes? This may include reference to similar research.
2.2.3	Are the outcomes disclosed in the report consistent with the outcomes in the value map?

2.3	Context of outcomes
2.3.1	Does the report outline how each outcome is linked to inputs and outputs?
2.3.2	Are all of the outcomes in the report given context with a 'chain of events'? e.g. other outcomes that lead to this outcome.
2.3.3	Does the report identify an outcome from the chain of events that is then taken forward to test for materiality?
2.3.4	Does the report provide a rationale for why each outcome has been selected (from the chains) to be tested for materiality? (see supplementary guidance on well-defined outcomes).
2.3.5	Does the report explain how the chain of events was created? (e.g. the causality between outcomes in the chain of events is based upon stakeholder involvement, suitable third-party research and the experience of the author)