

# **EVALUATION PROTOCOL**

Prepared by GambleAware

December 2019

**Approved by**  
Research & Evaluation Committee  
November 2019

## About Us

GambleAware is an independent, grant-making charity commissioning prevention and treatment services across England, Scotland and Wales in partnership with expert organisations and agencies, including the NHS, across three areas:

- Commissioning the National Gambling Treatment Service
- Producing public health campaigns on a national scale and providing practical support to local services
- Commissioning research and evaluation to improve knowledge of what works in prevention.

Regulated by the Charity Commission for England and Wales, and the Scottish Charity Regulator, GambleAware is wholly independent and has a framework agreement with the Gambling Commission to deliver the National Strategy to Reduce Gambling Harms within the context of arrangements based on voluntary donations from the gambling industry.

<https://about.gambleaware.org/>  
<https://twitter.com/GambleAware>

© 2020 GambleAware

## Introduction

The purpose of this protocol is to ensure we have a robust framework for evaluation which builds the evidence base to inform future projects and programmes. Our intention is to produce high quality evaluations which are proportionate, undertaken at the most appropriate time and focussed on the needs of policy makers.

The research and evaluation function is how GambleAware develops knowledge that:

- Builds the evidence for education and prevention approaches and tools, and for treatment design and commissioning
- Informs advocacy and influences policy-making at national and local level
- Informs public awareness.

We have a key role to play in supporting and mobilising other partners (government, academics, other research funders) to undertake research and grow the research and evaluation capability in the gambling field

This work builds on a previous protocol undertaken in the sector ([https://about.gambleaware.org/media/1228/evaluation\\_protocol\\_-\\_april\\_2016.pdf](https://about.gambleaware.org/media/1228/evaluation_protocol_-_april_2016.pdf)). It provides a framework for evaluation for the next 3-5 years which:

- Gives **GambleAware** a strategic framework for evaluation and aims to develop the capacity and capability for high quality evaluation work within the organisation
- Offers **delivery partners** clear guidance for our expectations of project and programme monitoring
- Enables **Evaluators** to undertake evaluations that are focussed and in line with a set of key principles and strategic outcomes

## An organisational approach – Inward and outward facing evaluation

This protocol recognises the need for an organisational approach to evaluation which can be applied across all GambleAware projects and programmes.

There will be some cases where evaluation has been commissioned by an external organisation, for example the NHS or Public Health England. Although the evaluation methods may differ from those outlined here, we are committed to supporting and learning from these external evaluations.

## The characteristics of good evaluation

We see the following three areas as the key characteristics of good evaluation:

- Measures consequential change: evaluating the level and type of change that a service has on the people accessing it rather than simply assessing the number of people accessing a service.
- Informs service design: producing recommendations and areas of focus that can inform the shape and design of future projects commissioned by GambleAware and others.
- Is effectively communicated to the gambling and wider public health sector: any evaluation can only have impact if its results are communicated to all relevant stakeholders.

## Key Principles of evaluation

This checklist of principles for how GambleAware will set up and carry out evaluations is intended to ensure evaluation activity is set up in line with the organisational protocol. It includes the previous evaluation protocol. Some of these principles are generic (and would be part of any evaluation protocol). Others are specific to GambleAware.

- Incorporates the voice of people with lived experience: any activity we commission incorporates the voice of people with lived experience of gambling harms as a fundamental check on the relevance and quality of the work we do. This extends to evaluation activity as much as any other.
- Is robust and credible: using appropriate evaluation approaches to generate robust evidence, perceived as credible by stakeholders.
- Is independent: there are significant advantages in independent evaluations which are perceived as more objective and robust, resulting in more credible results and increased stakeholder confidence.
- Is underpinned by a robust theory of change: each project/programme we commission will be underpinned by clear logic models (see appendix A for a worked example).
- Reflects and reinforces GambleAware's values: evaluation will be undertaken in accordance with GambleAware's values demonstrating a commitment to:
  - acting with integrity;
  - being evidence-based;
  - maximising impact and value for money.
- Is proportionate: any evaluation undertaken will be proportionate to the project(s) to be evaluated. The level of evaluation will be decided through a prioritisation/decision-making tool but in general the proportionality of an evaluation will be based on:
  - The length of a project / programme
  - How much it costs
  - The expected reach of the project (by this we mean the expected level of impact/number of potential beneficiaries)

- The level of innovation
- Represents value for money: any external evaluator will be commissioned in line with the GambleAware Procurement and Payment process.
- Is thematic: wherever possible evaluations will be grouped under themes so as to deliver multiple project learning compared to evaluating individual projects in isolation.
- Is informed by previous evaluation: to ensure a cycle of constant improvement.
- Represents best practice: GambleAware is committed to ensuring that developments in evaluation best practice are built into this protocol over time. This protocol needs to be flexible as a result.
- Uses appropriate structure and use of language: it should be possible to condense findings into a short briefing
- Has clear objectives: the questions we seek to answer through any evaluation are clearly stated so evaluators know what we are asking them to evaluate.

### A framework for good evaluation

While our aim is to contribute to both the wider body of evidence and to national policy, we recognise the importance of evaluating the efficiency of a project alongside its effectiveness for GambleAware's own purposes. Furthermore, we recognise that evaluation is an ongoing process and the efficiency of a project will need to be evaluated at more regular intervals.

#### Evaluating effectiveness and efficiency:

- Effectiveness (impact evaluation): this is about measuring the outcomes and impacts an individual project has made and to what extent any anticipated benefits have been realised. Generally, this will come towards or at the end of a project
- Efficiency (process evaluation): This is about investigating how successfully a project has been set up, implemented and monitored. This is good housekeeping but is crucial, as project effectiveness will become more difficult to measure if that project has not been delivered efficiently.

#### Types of evaluation

GambleAware will use a combination of the different types of evaluation listed below, informed by the principles listed above:

- Process Evaluation: seeks to understand if a strategy, initiative or programme is being implemented as planned and according to the schedule of work; assesses if the effort is producing the intended outputs; identifies strengths and weaknesses of the effort. This is critical for informing adjustments to the effort. There are two elements to process evaluations:
  - Project / programme design – evaluating whether the programme was set up effectively

- Project / programme implementation – evaluating whether the programme was delivered effectively
- At GambleAware we undertake process evaluations internally by:
  - Light-touch reviews
  - Full deep dives. These will be internal reviews commissioned by a director. These are likely to be commissioned when the organisation is concerned about the ongoing or future delivery of a project/programme
  - Internal lessons learned
- Performance Monitoring: is crucial on any project/programme and forms part of overall evaluation. It ensures that outcome evaluations can be carried out successfully. It seeks to check progress against planned targets and can be defined as the formal reporting and evidencing that spend and outputs are successfully delivered, and milestones met. It is crucial that GambleAware works closely with its delivery partners to ensure this data is available and reported on at the appropriate timescales. At GambleAware, performance monitoring means:
  - Ensuring there are clear sets of key performance indicators (KPIs) on projects and programmes that are understood by the organisation and the delivery partner. These may be a mixture of quantitative and qualitative data dependant on the project/programme outcomes. These KPIs will be monitored at regular intervals determined on a project by project basis.
  - Ensuring there is an effective project governance structure into which KPIs and other relevant information can be fed. This may include, regular monitoring meetings, project, steering and advisory boards.
- Outcome/Impact Evaluation: Outcome and impact evaluations investigate whether a strategy, initiative or programme achieved the desired outcomes, and what made it effective or ineffective. It assesses if the effort is sustainable and replicable.

GambleAware will commission its outcome/ impact evaluations in line with the decision-making process below, the theory of change, its strategic outcomes and key principles.

## The decision-making process for evaluation

The decision-making framework below is a tool which provides a method to help decide the type and level of evaluation a project or programme receives:

Budget & Profile	High	Large programme with significant budget and / or high profile and potentially high impact	Level 2	Level 3	Level 3
	Medium	Medium-sized programme with moderate budget and / or high profile and expected to have sizeable impact	Level 2	Level 2	Level 3
	Low	Small budget and / or limited public interest and potential impact	Level 1	Level 2	Level 2
Level 1 - Light touch, internal evaluation Level 2 - Consider commissioning externally with proportionate budget allocation Level 3 - Externally commissioned evaluation with budget of 1-5% of total programme recommended			Low-risk programme with low uncertainty around outcomes	Low-risk programme but some uncertainty around outcomes	Complex programme, significant risk and low certainty around expected outcomes
Budget thresholds - <100k low, 100-500k medium, >500k high			Low	Medium	High
			Risk & Uncertainty		

In addition to the above, there are two other factors which may need to be considered when deciding the level of evaluation a programme receives:

- Time: shorter projects and programmes may require lower levels of evaluation.
- Level of innovation: projects and programmes that are new, innovative or different could require greater levels of evaluation.

## Appendix A

### Setting SMART evaluation goals

GambleAware commissions evaluations across a wide range of Prevention and Treatment projects. These projects vary significantly, and can be complex. It is therefore important to define precisely the decisions the evaluation is expected to inform as well as what evidence will be needed and why. It is essential to have clarity on the underpinning rationale for how and why the evaluation is being conducted, as well as clearly defined goals and objectives. We adopt the SMART framework as a tool to help us to define these.

<b>SPECIFIC</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the evaluation clear and capable of being understood by those familiar with the context of the intervention?</li> <li>• Is it well defined and relevant to the rationale for the intervention?</li> </ul>
<b>MEASURABLE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there a measurable achievement at intervention conclusion?</li> <li>• Will it deliver and Evidence based assessment of appropriate results through direct measures or proxy indicators?</li> </ul>
<b>ACHIEVABLE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it provide evidence-based analysis related to the decision making needs of the intervention?</li> <li>• Is it capable of supporting understanding or measurement to inform judgement?</li> </ul>
<b>REALISTIC</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does it establish an appropriate level resources relevant to the scale maturity and nature of the intervention?</li> </ul>
<b>TIMEBOUND</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does it establish a specific timeframe for evidence gathering, analysis reporting and communications which is relevant to decision-makers' needs</li> </ul>

### Theory of change

This protocol recognises the importance of overarching theories of change on any project, programme or intervention. At GambleAware, we understand that theories of change are an integral part of overall impact evaluation. As such, we will ensure that there are clear theories of change and underpinning logic models on the programmes and projects we commission, to ensure that effective and efficient evaluation activities can be undertaken.

Each logic model should include the following:

1. A clear, concise statement of the **challenge** that the programme/intervention will address
2. The **inputs** needed to put this in place and make it work
3. The **outputs** expected to be delivered
4. The **outcomes** and **impact** expected to result from the inputs and outputs- with a distinction made between what consequential changes can be expected in the short term, and in the longer term



A worked example of a logic model

**Programme – Work to Improve Delivery of School-Based Preventative Gambling Education**

**Challenge – To increase and improve the delivery of school-based preventative gambling education in order to reduce gambling harms amongst school-aged children and young people**

Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Impact	Overall Aim
<p><b>Literature review:</b> desk-based research building on previous reviews which have identified key principles of effective practice for prevention education, to assess their likely applicability to gambling education.</p>	<p><b>Evidence review:</b> Wide lens evidence scope of ‘what works’ in gambling education</p> <p><b>Safe practice guidance:</b> for external organisations visiting schools</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An evidence base about what works in gambling education is established</li> <li>• Schools make informed decisions about involving external visitors in the delivery of gambling education</li> <li>• Primary schools are supported to deliver gambling education</li> <li>• Schools integrate learning about gambling across their PSHE curriculum e.g. into education about online safety, economic wellbeing, media literacy</li> <li>• School children can identify indicators of gambling harm and know where to go for advice and support</li> <li>• School children are supported to make informed decisions about gambling</li> <li>• Teachers deliver high quality, evidence-based gambling education through PSHE in schools</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gambling harms amongst school children are reduced</li> <li>• Gambling education is embedded as a standard aspect of PSHE education</li> <li>• A prevention approach is promoted which develops parity with prevention of other risk behaviours e.g. smoking, drinking, drug taking.</li> </ul>	<p>A reduction in gambling harms amongst school-aged children and young people</p>
<p><b>Survey of teachers</b> on current gambling education</p> <p>2 teacher <b>focus groups</b> (one primary and one secondary) to explore barriers and opportunities in relation to gambling education</p>	<p><b>Teacher research report:</b> research into teacher attitudes, exploring current practice and opportunities for improvement</p>			
<p><b>Researching and writing</b> a best practice guide for PSHE teachers with four one-page briefings</p>	<p><b>Gambling education handbook:</b> evidence-based guidance for teachers on the delivery of school-based gambling education</p>			
<p><b>Qualitative research</b> in four primary schools, 2x groups in each (Y3/4 and Y5/6 pupils) Writing and testing materials</p>	<p><b>Primary-age lesson materials:</b> two lesson plans and resources</p>			
<p><b>Promotion of guidance and briefings</b> to the PSHE Association network of over 20,000 PSHE practitioners</p>	<p><b>Podcast:</b> podcast on gambling education disseminated to network of over 20,000 practitioners</p>			

## For more information

GambleAware  
Pennine Place  
2a Charing Cross Rd  
London  
WC2H 0HF

Email: [Research@gambleaware.org](mailto:Research@gambleaware.org)

Phone: +44 (0) 20 7287 1994

<https://about.gambleaware.org/>

<https://twitter.com/GambleAware>