

Measuring 'real value of our Cultural Knowledge Exchange work' UKCEH thoughts

Colin Mackechnie, Business Development Manager, UK Center for Ecology & Hydrology

- What do you think alternatives to income as proxy might be, and how could they be measured?

There are a number of issues in measuring the impact/benefits of an intervention including (a) temporal (as some benefits may occur a long time after the intervention), (b) cultural (e.g. a benefit gain in one community is not necessarily seen as a benefit in another), (c) transferability (in order to understand benefits across different sectors, there needs to be a common language) which in turn allows intracomparisons. (d) practicality. Note also there is a difference between income and value, where value is a perceived monetary assignment to a benefit.

On the first point, temporal issues cause a large difficulty in measurement and that related to point (d) practicality. Often benefits happen after the project finishes so there is no resources (staff or cash) to measure them. Hence from a purely practical point of view, easy measures are used – outputs rather than outcomes e.g. number of people at an event rather than what benefit did they get.

On the third point income or monetarised value is the main measure that people understand – especially from those outside a discipline, so there isn't an alternative to that. You can measure less tangible outcomes e.g. increased in perceived wellbeing – and that is clearly a benefit but the issue then is how do you compare that with an increase in monetary value? The accepted solution is that since you can convert wellbeing into value, then for the comparison that's what you do.

So although income and monetarised value are not good measures, it is difficult to see an alternative to income and value

- What methodologies and frameworks from other disciplines or sectors do you think could be usefully applied to, and adapted for, cultural knowledge exchange?
 - Theory of Change (ToC) from the Overseas Development Aid, and increasing Government departments, is a very useful tool to use at the beginning of the project to identify the measurands that need to be evaluated
 - The Government Magenta and Green Books are the standard methods used by Govt departments to determine 'value' of interventions: There are other evaluation type of schemes (e.g. Snowball metrics)
 - <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-magenta-book>
 - <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-green-book-appraisal-and-evaluation-in-central-government/the-green-book-2020>
 - <https://snowballmetrics.com/>
 - The Government has recently introduced Social value to some of its tender. These still tend to be output based
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/procurement-policy-note-0620-taking-account-of-social-value-in-the-award-of-central-government-contracts>
 -
- How can the contribution of partners in KE be better valued and measured?

Use of the ToC gives a picture of the overall benefits that you want to get to, different routes to that goal(s) and the contribution of all the different actors.

Then the ODA process uses the ToC to create a measurement, evaluation and learning process (MEL). This usually involves the measurement of the identified metrics as a baseline, identification of targets and then measurement throughout the project. But because the measurement is through the project it is part of the standard project management process- and is built into the cost. This doesn't address the impact after the project has finished but does address some of the funding issues