

Group 4 Workshop Briefing Document

Comments on the Grading Scale

- Mixed views on applicability and proportionality of the scale.
- Some felt the scale is fit for purpose but questioned subjectivity and potential negative bias.
- Concerns about how to regionalise local good practice and whether scoring penalises legacy projects.
- System change was a recurring theme, but its definition varied across groups.
- Need for clear guidance, weighting of criteria, and consistent interpretation.
- Importance of considering project maturity and size when applying the scale.

What Evidence Could Be Gathered to Support the Response

- Quantitative evidence: PROMs/PREMs, service usage data, outcome reports, regional surveys.
- Qualitative evidence: case studies, individual stories, Most Significant Change methodology.
- Visual and narrative evidence including behavioural observations and feedback tools for non-verbal users.
- Financial and strategic evidence: social return on investment, mapping to multiple models of care.
- Emphasis on outlining risks if funding ends and embedding evidence collection from the start.
- Need for collaboration on evidence standards and shared templates.

Opportunities and Challenges

Opportunities:

- Small projects can drive system change and influence broader adoption.
- Potential to influence policy and service design through shared learning.
- Encourages strategic alignment and clarity of purpose.
- Use of PESTLE analysis to consider external factors.
- Promotes peer learning and adaptable evaluation methods.

Challenges:

- Ambiguity in definitions (e.g., system change, high-level outcomes).
- Administrative burden for well-established or mainstreamed projects.
- Inconsistent feedback collection and over-reliance on anecdotal evidence.
- Unknown guidance for future funding and match funding expectations.
- Difficulty in quantifying qualitative data and comparing across diverse projects.