

**New Services and Innovations in Healthcare  
Guidelines for monitoring and evaluation arrangements for grants over  
£20,000**

During the lifetime of a grant, the Charity requires reports as follows:

- Final reports (financial and evaluative) at the end of the grant for all grants. An example of the pro forma evaluation form can be downloaded from the website.
- Interim reports (financial and monitoring) at the end of the first year and second year (if applicable) for grants of more than one year. An example of the pro forma monitoring form can be downloaded from the website.

In accepting a grant, the applicant undertakes to provide the monitoring and evaluation reports. The payment of grants is linked to the receipt of reports.

The grant-holder does not have to provide the financial reports as these are supplied by the finance department of the organisation to which the grant is paid.

The Charity places great emphasis on monitoring and evaluation and the failure of the applicant to understand this and pay due care and attention to monitoring and evaluation arrangements in the application form is the most common reason for applications being unsuccessful.

Applicants should not try and make monitoring and evaluation more complex than necessary. Sometimes, as described below, evaluation is best left to experts but that is not the norm. You should think about quality not quantity. What is the minimum amount of high quality, useful information which can be collected in the easiest way that will meet monitoring and evaluation requirements? Grants are made ranging from £20,000 to £1million for an enormous range of projects. The information that will need to be collected will similarly vary enormously depending on the size and/or complexity of the project.

The following information may help with filling in the application form:

### **Monitoring**

Monitoring is undertaken to answer the question “how are we doing?” and involves the presentation of information that demonstrates to the Charity the progress you are making with achieving project objectives.

Deciding what information should be collected is part of the thought process that leads to the formulation of the project design and implementation plan.

If there are likely to be ongoing revenue costs after the charitable grant has been used up, you will need to make a business case for continued exchequer funding.

Although monitoring precedes evaluation it also informs it so you need to think about monitoring and evaluation at the same time.

The Charity does not intend that information that does not serve an identified and useful purpose is collected.

In answering the monitoring question on the application form, the following structure may be helpful.

- What difference do I want this project to make?
- What information will I need to collect to help to make an objective, informed judgement that the desired change has been achieved?
- Do I have the baseline data in order to be able to make a comparison at the end of the project?
- Who will take overall responsibility for data collection and what mechanisms will be put in place to ensure that it is collected and quality assured?
- Who will collect the data? At what intervals? How will it be collected? How will it be useful?
- Will I have all of the information necessary for a full business case (if appropriate)?

## **Evaluation**

Evaluation answers the question “what difference have we made?”

Evaluation is an interpretation of the information collected throughout the lifetime of the project. Most of this information will have been collected for monitoring purposes although it may not be possible to collect some information until the project has finished.

The information will be quantitative and/or qualitative. It must be high quality and accurate. For example, evaluations often include an analysis of patients' and/or staff's viewpoint obtained from questionnaires or interviews at the end of the project. To get high quality qualitative information from such surveys, the questionnaires must be correctly structured. If you intend such a survey to be the focus of your evaluation of a grant you should append the questionnaire in order to assure the committee that you will get the information you intend.

There are two types of evaluation:

- Self-evaluation
- Evaluation by an external expert

All grants over £20k are subject to self-evaluation. Applicants have to decide whether evaluation by an external expert is also appropriate.

### **Self-evaluation**

By this is meant that, at the end of the grant, the grant holder will be expected to complete the Charity's pro forma evaluation report. These reports are used by the Charity to make a judgement about the overall effectiveness of the grants programme and to account to the public on how charitable funds have been used to benefit health care.

### **Expert evaluation**

In certain circumstances, it is appropriate for a grant to be evaluated by an expert. This will be a fairly rare occurrence and only applies when the project will lead to new knowledge. An example of this would be when research becomes a new patient treatment for the first time. Such a project should be formally evaluated with a view to publishing the findings to add to the evidence base for the benefit of the wider NHS. The expert will usually be someone from the NHS Trusts' local academic partners.

If an applicant feels their application should be evaluated by an expert, this will need to be justified on the application form and the Charity will consider funding the evaluation up to the value of 10% of the cost of the grant.

The committee will decide whether the applicant has made the correct decision about which method of evaluation is appropriate. It may decide that the applicant has made the wrong choice by not suggesting external evaluation when this is appropriate. If the applicant has convinced the committee that careful thought was given to evaluation even though the committee does not agree with what was decided, the application will be deferred whilst this is rectified. If the applicant has suggested expert evaluation but the committee does not feel this is appropriate, this would not affect the decision whether or not to award a grant although the cost of the evaluation would not be met.

Hopefully all applicants will have discussed their applications with the Charity's grants staff so that any uncertainty about evaluation does not arise.