

This is a peer-reviewed, post-print (final draft post-refereeing) version of the following published document:

**Courtney, Paul (2014). *The Local Food programme: A Social Return on Investment Approach. Final Report to the Royal Society of Wildlife Trusts. Technical Report. Local Food.***

Published by Local Food, and available online at:

<http://www.localfoodgrants.org/images/File/SROI/Local%20Food%20SROI%20Report%20-%20web%20version.pdf>

We recommend you cite the published (post-print) version.

The URL for the published version is

<http://www.localfoodgrants.org/images/File/SROI/Local%20Food%20SROI%20Report%20-%20web%20version.pdf>

**Disclaimer**

The University of Gloucestershire has obtained warranties from all depositors as to their title in the material deposited and as to their right to deposit such material.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation or warranties of commercial utility, title, or fitness for a particular purpose or any other warranty, express or implied in respect of any material deposited.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation that the use of the materials will not infringe any patent, copyright, trademark or other property or proprietary rights.

The University of Gloucestershire accepts no liability for any infringement of intellectual property rights in any material deposited but will remove such material from public view pending investigation in the event of an allegation of any such infringement.

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR TEXT.

Local  
Food



The Local Food programme:

# A Social Return on Investment Approach

Final Report



## Acknowledgements

A number of people have made substantial contributions to this study, without which it would not have been possible. At the University of Gloucestershire's Countryside and Community Research Institute (CCRI) thanks are due to James Kirwan for his advice in relation to the wider evaluation of Local Food; to Carol Kambites for leading the Get Growing case study; and to Nick Lewis for managing the online surveys.

The author was fortunate enough to benefit from the advice and guidance of Jenny Rouse of nef consulting

throughout the project, who's input helped to ensure that the research design was in accordance with Social Return on Investment (SROI) protocols.

The research team is also grateful to individuals from the three Local Food projects that took part in the study; and in particular Beren Aldridge from Growing Well, Tamsin Bent from Get Growing and Davey Haydock-Wilson from Growing Greenwich. Sincere thanks are also due to all the Local Food participants from across the three areas who completed the surveys.



# Contents

|   |        |
|---|--------|
| <b>Executive summary</b> .....                                    | pg .4  |
| <b>1 Introduction and background</b> .....                        | pg .6  |
| Assessing the return on investment of Local Food .....            | pg .7  |
| Structure of the report .....                                     | pg .8  |
| <b>2 The Social Return on Investment (SROI) Methodology</b> ..... | pg .10 |
| Setting the parameters of the SROI.....                           | pg .10 |
| Investment in the three Local Food projects .....                 | pg .12 |
| <b>3 Exploring the outcomes of Local Food</b> .....               | pg .14 |
| Mapping the outcomes .....  | pg .14 |
| <b>4 Establishing Impact and calculating the SROI</b> .....       | pg .18 |
| Data collection .....   | pg .22 |
| Deadweight, attribution and displacement .....                    | pg .24 |
| Drop off and discount rate .....                                  | pg .26 |
| Valuation of outcomes .....                                       | pg .26 |
| Calculating the impact .....                                      | pg .27 |
| Sensitivity analysis .....  | pg .28 |
| <b>5 Conclusions and recommendations</b> .....                    | pg .32 |
| <b>Appendix 1</b>   |        |
| Stakeholder Estimates (Growing Greenwich example) .....           | pg .35 |
| <b>Appendix 2</b>   |        |
| The Growing Greenwich community survey .....                      | pg .36 |
| <b>Appendix 3</b>   |        |
| Secondary data to inform calculation of deadweight .....          | pg .44 |
| <b>Appendix 4</b>   |        |
| Financial proxies used to value outcomes .....                    | pg .46 |



# Executive Summary

In March 2013, the University of Gloucestershire’s Countryside and Community Research Institute (CCRI) were commissioned to undertake an assessment of the Local Food programme using the Social Return on Investment (SROI) framework, an established methodology recognised by the Cabinet Office that has been developed from social accounting and cost-benefit analysis.

In SROI, monetary values are used to represent outcomes, which enables a ratio of benefits-to-investment to be calculated and the amount of social, economic and environmental value created for every £1 invested in the programme. Valuing the benefits of Local Food within a consistent framework also provided the basis for comparison across different outcome groups to examine where value is being created. In turn this will assist the Royal Society of Wildlife Trusts (RSWT) and Big Lottery Fund in the planning, management and funding of future programmes.

Three case study projects were selected for inclusion in the SROI, drawn from each of the project categories identified through the wider Local Food programme evaluation.

A theory of change for Local Food was undertaken to explore the nature and significance of the various outcomes, and the

| Project Category       | Project title     | Location                        | Grant type | Approx. Grant Value (£000) |
|------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|------------|----------------------------|
| Enterprise             | Growing Well      | Kendal, Cumbria                 | Main       | £126                       |
| Community Growing      | Growing Greenwich | Borough of Greenwich, London    | Beacon     | £390                       |
| Education and Learning | Get Growing       | Stroud Valleys, Gloucestershire | Main       | £87                        |

relationship between them in a ‘chain of events’. For example, knowledge of food growing and provenance then leads to improved diet and in turn improved physical health over the longer term; reduced social isolation through volunteering can lead to an increased sense of belonging leading to improved resilience and self esteem; and the structure and skills provided

“ Every £1 invested in Local Food is shown to return between £6 and £8 to society in the form of social and economic outcomes including health and well-being, training and skills. ”

by Local Food activities has in many cases led to improved levels of competence and purpose for volunteers and participants, in turn opening new doors for employability or education.

The original aims of Local Food have therefore not only been achieved but the programme is revealed to have led to a whole host of additional outcomes over the medium to longer term.

Three story board workshops were held in each of the case study projects and the findings used to produce impact maps structured around the following outcome groups.

An assessment of their material relevance to the three project groups is indicated in the table below.

| Outcome Group                    | Enterprise | Community Growing | Education and Learning |
|----------------------------------|------------|-------------------|------------------------|
| Food eating and buying           | ✓          | ✓✓                | ✓                      |
| Training education and skills    | ✓✓✓        | ✓✓                | ✓✓✓                    |
| Social and commercial enterprise | ✓✓✓        |                   |                        |
| Community life                   | ✓          | ✓✓✓               | ✓                      |
| Health and well-being            | ✓✓         | ✓✓                | ✓✓                     |
| Environment and sustainability   | ✓          | ✓                 |                        |

A total of 17 distinct and measurable outcomes were identified from the theory of change, of which data was obtained to evidence change in all outcome groups apart from five relating to environmental and social enterprise impacts. Measurable data was collected from 126 stakeholders across the three projects, with surveys administered using a mix of open source, face-to-face and self-completion methods at project meetings and events.

Following SROI convention, financial proxies for all measurable outcomes were identified in order to assign a monetary value to each of the outcomes. For example, the unit cost of Cognitive Behavioural Therapy was used as a proxy for improved mental health, and average weekly household food spend was used to approximate the improvements to food affordability as a result of the programme.

All information was assembled in an SROI model to calculate the impact and produce an indicative benefit-to-investment ratio for Local Food based on the three case study projects. This calculation involved first calculating the present value of

benefits, which involved multiplying the number of stakeholders for each outcome by the indicator value, before calculating the net outcome incidence which takes into account deadweight and attribution. To arrive at the SROI ratio a discounted present value of benefits was divided by the total investment:

$$\text{SROI ratio} = \frac{\text{Present Value}}{\text{Value of Investment}}$$

A sensitivity analysis was undertaken to examine the effects of varying some of the key assumptions underlying the calculations for the most influential outcomes, which produced a confidence range for the ratio.

Total present value in relation to the levels of total investment in the three Local Food projects was as follows:

|                                |             |
|--------------------------------|-------------|
| Total Investment               | £1,687,441  |
| Present value of benefits      | £11,756,653 |
| Ratio of benefit-to-investment | 6.97:1      |
| Confidence range               | 5.85 – 8.09 |

Every £1 invested in Local Food (as evidenced by the three case study projects combined) is shown to return between £6 and £8 to society in the form of social and economic outcomes including health and well-being, training and skills. Environmental outcomes were not evidenced and therefore are not included in the impact estimates. Subject to the limitations of case study scope and related issues, this represents an indicative 700% return on the investment in the Local Food programme.

The value of the initial investment is being returned directly through training, education and skills, with the majority of additional benefits attributed to health and well-being, community benefits in terms of increased participation and vibrancy, impacts on the local economy and improved food affordability.

Breaking down the magnitude of benefit according to the principal areas of change affected by Local Food reveals that the programme is producing almost two thirds of its societal return in the areas of health and well-being (62%), followed by community vibrancy (26%) and then education and skills (8%).

It is worth remembering that the values of increased accessibility to healthy food, and knowledge of food and its provenance, are largely accounted for through the estimates for health and well-being outcomes, as to do otherwise would represent double counting. A number of educational outcomes are similarly represented in the journey of change, whereby for example increased knowledge of healthy food by children manifests itself in improvements in physical health over the medium to longer term.

Through helping people and communities to shape their own future through social innovation, and by combining this with initiatives based on social prescribing to achieve tangible health benefits for individuals, Local Food is shown to be generating real value for its host communities and for wider society.

## 1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Launched in November 2007, as part of the Big Lottery Fund's 'Changing Spaces' programme, Local Food is a £59.8 million funding programme that distributes money from the Big Lottery Fund (BIG) to a variety of food-related projects to help make locally grown food accessible and affordable to communities. Developed by a consortium of 17 national environmental organisations, the fund is managed by the Royal Society of Wildlife Trusts (RSWT).

The programme was opened for applications in March 2008 and has encouraged the development of projects working towards five main themes:

- 1. To enable communities** to manage land sustainably for growing food locally.
- 2. To enable communities** to build knowledge and understanding and celebrate the cultural diversity of food.
- 3. To stimulate local economic activity** and the development of community enterprises concerned with growing, processing and marketing local food.
- 4. To create opportunities** for learning and the development of skills through volunteering, training and job creation.

- 5. To promote awareness** and understanding of the links between local food and healthy lifestyles.

In 2009, Local Food commissioned the University of Gloucestershire's Countryside and Community Research Institute (CCRI), together with local food consultants f3, to undertake an evaluation of the Local Food programme, from 2009 to 2014. The evaluation has revealed that the Local Food programme is bringing small, often neglected pieces of land into production, developing local infrastructure, and contributing to an increase in the physical quantity of food produced at a local level.

CCRI's evaluation of Local Food has revealed that the programme is a vehicle for a number of societal benefits, including community cohesion, regeneration, healthy eating, educational enhancement and skills development. Thus while delivering on the overall aim of making local food more accessible and affordable to communities, the programme is also helping to forge a number of indirect outcomes associated with community capacity building on a material, personal and cultural level. Indeed, to date the evaluation has revealed the benefits that Local Food is delivering for wider society are likely to be significant, in social, cultural and economic terms.



“ Local Food is shown to be generating real value for its host communities and for wider society. ”

Three sizes of grant have been available through Local Food, ranging from ‘Small’ grants (£2,000 to £10,000) to ‘Main’ grants (£10,001 to £300,000) and what are termed ‘Beacon’ grants (£300,001 to £500,000). Within these three overarching categories, there are 17 distinct project types, which in the main evaluation have been reduced to three main categories for ease of analysis:

- **Enterprise**, including box schemes, farmers’ markets, food cooperatives, community supported agriculture, food redistribution, catering and social enterprise.
- **Community Growing**, including composting, allotments, city farms, community food growing, community gardens and community land management.
- **Education and Learning**, including celebrating food cultures, sharing good practice, education and learning, and school grounds.

These three elements are central to the Local Food programme. Projects are funded with the intention of improving local environments, developing a greater sense of community ownership and encouraging social, economic and environmental sustainability. In this sense, Local Food projects are being used as a vehicle for enabling these wider societal changes to take place. By focusing on projects at the community level, the funding from Local Food is specifically working as a catalyst and enabler for positive change within communities.

## ASSESSING THE RETURN ON INVESTMENT OF LOCAL FOOD

With this backdrop RSWT began to recognise the need and value for a further assessment of these societal changes, and specifically a quantification of the various outcomes in order that the return on the original investment could be assessed in a systematic way. In March 2013, CCRI were commissioned to undertake this study using a Social Return on Investment (SROI) framework, an established methodology recognised by the Cabinet Office that has been developed from social accounting and cost-benefit analysis.

In SROI, monetary values are used to represent outcomes,

which enables a ratio of benefits to costs to be calculated and the amount of social, economic and environmental value created for every £1 invested in the programme. Valuation (monetisation) of the benefits of Local Food within a consistent framework would also provide the basis for comparison across different outcomes. In turn this would help to understand their relative significance and assist RSWT and BIG in the planning, management and funding of future programmes.

While one in-depth SROI case study would have in many ways proved sufficient to indicate the societal return of Local Food, the findings of the main evaluation implied that a study covering three SROI case study projects drawn from the project categories (outlined above) would likely reveal a more accurate estimation of this return. The SROI estimates therefore drew upon the activities and outcomes of 3 Local Food projects – each of Enterprise, Community Growing and Education and Learning, allowing a more realistic set of benefit-investment ratios to be produced.

The three SROI case studies are as follows:

| Project Categories     | Project title     | Location                        | Grant type |
|------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|------------|
| Enterprise             | Growing Well      | Kendal, Cumbria                 | Main       |
| Community Growing      | Growing Greenwich | Borough of Greenwich, London    | Beacon     |
| Education and Learning | Get Growing       | Stroud Valleys, Gloucestershire | Main       |

In addition to providing more reliable estimates, the tripartite case study approach also allows the SROI to dovetail with the wider evaluation, and to draw on the vast amount of qualitative and contextual work that helps provide further credence to the empirical estimates presented here. In this spirit the outcomes are also mapped against the three types of community capacity revealed through the qualitative narrative of the evaluation, adding further life and colour to the forms of personal, cultural and material capacity already used to articulate the value of Local Food through a variety of mediums. A summary of the three SROI case study projects is contained in Table 1.



# Structure of the Report

The remainder of this report is divided into four broad sections:

|                      |  |
|----------------------|--|
| <b>Section 2</b>     | Describes the methods that were employed and the decisions that were taken to inform its implementation.   |
| <b>Section 3</b>     | Presents the findings from stakeholder consultation exercises which sought to explore the outcomes of Local Food revealed through the three case studies and in turn to develop a Theory of Change that would enable the outcomes to be identified, mapped and evidenced.                        |
| <b>Section 4</b>     | Explains how the outcomes were measured and subsequently valued using financial proxies. This section also explains the process that was followed to construct the SROI model and how the various elements of the quantitative data were assembled to produce some benefit-to-investment ratios. |
| <b>Final Section</b> | Reflects upon and draws together the qualitative and quantitative findings, discussing them in their broader context and drawing some conclusions. It also contains a series of recommendations for Local Food projects, Local Food programme management (RSWT), and the Big Lottery Fund.       |

“The commitment to nurturing yourself to support yourself...it’s made [her] ensure that she’s looking after herself, and that has made [her] a positive role model to her children and family. It’s having that time out, something for you, it’s positive all round really.”

Table 1: Overview of the three SROI case study projects

| Project (Category)                           | Primary Aim  | Main focus and activities   | Key facts and figures   | Context and points of interest   |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| <b>Growing Well (Enterprise)</b>             | Provides local people with mental health problems with an effective, supportive and inclusive farm-based community.                | Supporting people to improve their mental well-being by involving them in a range of activities within our organic growing business.  | <p>During 2011 provided over 2000 days of activity for 60 people, 26 of whom left during the year and 21 of whom joined the project.</p> <p>Crop Share scheme supplying 80 local families with weekly seasonal veg.</p> <p>City and Guilds centre providing horticultural training at levels one, two and three.</p> <p>Successful programme of school workshops and farm visits that teach children about food growing and how to stay mentally and physically well.</p> <p>Work cooperatively, encouraging our participants to take on a range of responsibilities within the organisation, including membership of our board of directors.</p> | <p>Growing Well is CEVAS accredited for managing people on farms and is a City and Guilds centre for learning. Was named British Rural Enterprise of the Year in 2011, won the North-West Award for Sustainable Food and Farming in 2008, were awarded Cumbrian Social Enterprise in 2008, 2009/2010 and were the North-West winner in the 2010 Social Vision Awards.</p> <p>Analysis of the volunteers' Warwick Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS) revealed that 76% of volunteers showed an increase in well-being at some point during their involvement with GW in 2012. 36% showed a decrease from beginning to end (or last point of data collection).</p> |
| <b>Growing Greenwich (Community Growing)</b> | Build upon existing food growing projects and partnerships to promote local food, food growing and community cohesion.             | Food growing, training and volunteering, taking place mainly at farms, schools, allotments, parks and community centres.  | <p>People: 3 PT and 5 trainer posts supported. 50 volunteers actively involved with around 9,000 FTE volunteer days. 4,157 people trained in food growing (3,957 actively involved in production through training) 2,369 of beneficiaries aged between 5 and 18 years</p> <p>Land: Growing spaces include 517m2 at 22 Primary and Secondary Schools; 142m2 at 12 nurseries and children's centers; 287m2 at 14 community gardens; 514 m2 at 9 estates; 63 m2 at 8 supported accommodation facilities for older people; 500 m2 at 2 allotments and a further 500 m2 at 67 Capital Growth Spaces of various sizes.</p>                              | <p>Typical volunteer roles include: growing food, land management, cooking (including things like jam and bread making) food distribution, running community cafes, running cookery clubs, organising and running community/food events.</p>   |
| <b>Get Growing (Education and Learning)</b>  | Children in food growing, to teach the necessary skills and to encourage an understanding of food production 'from plot to plate'. | Encouraging and helping local primary schools to establish or improve school gardens, to involve children in food growing and cooking. In most cases this is done through school gardening clubs. | <p>The project supports 22 schools, 20 of which have set up gardening clubs and 15 of which are 'active'.</p> <p>It involves about 40 volunteers in total with one or two attached to each school, usually working 2-3 hours a week, and others involved on particular projects. Volunteer input has been costed at £27,430 from start-up to April 2013.</p>  | <p>Schools and volunteers are very positive about the project and appreciative of the input from Stroud Valleys Project that it has funded. Children have enjoyed 'gardening club' and other activities. And most reported knowing more about growing food, healthy food and wildlife. Most also reported eating more fruit and vegetables.</p>  |

## 2. THE SROI METHODOLOGY

SROI is a rigorous measurement framework that helps organisations to understand and manage the social, environmental, and economic value that they are creating. Rather than simply focusing on revenue or cost savings for one stakeholder, the methodology takes into account and values the full range of benefits to all stakeholders. SROI is an outcomes focussed methodology, in other words it seeks to understand and value the most important changes that occur from an organisation, project or programme, rather than valuing only those things that are easy or straightforward to measure. It is also stakeholder driven, relying on consultation with those who are experiencing change and ensuring that recommendations are made to facilitate targeted and effective change for society.

The main stages of SROI are set out below, together with a summary of the principles which underpin how the model should be applied.

### SETTING THE PARAMETERS OF THE SROI

The first task was to establish the scope of the Local Food SROI. The programme management and project teams were consulted in order to establish the aims and scope of the projects, and to gain a brief history of them in terms of activities and successes. CCRI programme evaluation documentation was also drawn upon as part of this, and to ensure that the context was fully understood prior to the SROI work beginning.

Crucial to this process was to understand the full range of stakeholders associated with the three projects, and the principle beneficiaries who would need to be consulted. In accordance with the SROI methodology it was important to identify material stakeholders who have benefited in a significant way, as opposed to those who may have only been impacted marginally.

A project information fact sheet was first completed for each project in order to start gathering relevant information. Central to this was the stakeholder information reproduced in Table 2.

“...while delivering on the overall aim of making local food more accessible and affordable to communities, the programme is also helping to forge a number of indirect outcomes associated with community capacity building on a material, personal and cultural level.”

| Main stages of the SROI                            | The seven guiding principles   |
|--|--|
| 1. Establishing scope and identifying stakeholders | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Involve stakeholders</li> <li>▶ Understand what changes</li> <li>▶ Value what matters</li> <li>▶ Include only what is material</li> <li>▶ Avoid over claiming</li> <li>▶ Be transparent</li> <li>▶ Verify the result</li> </ul> |
| 2. Exploring and mapping the outcomes              |  |
| 3. Evidencing outcomes and giving them a value     |  |
| 4. Establishing impact                             |  |
| 5. Calculating the SROI                            |  |
| 6. Reporting, using and embedding                  |  |

Table 2: SROI stakeholder materiality and inclusion in the SROI

| Stakeholder sub-group               | Relevant? |      |      | Material? | Why?  | Included in SROI? |           |           |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|------|------|-----------|---|-------------------|-----------|-----------|
|                                     | Enter     | Comm | Educ |           |   | Enter             | Comm      | Educ      |
| Project coordinators                | ✓         | ✓    | ✓    | Yes       | Managing and implementing the project   | Yes (ToC)         | Yes (ToC) | Yes (ToC) |
| Food growers / trainers             | ✓         | ✓    |      | Yes       | Direct and indirect beneficiaries of project and related activities   |                   | ✓         |           |
| Volunteers                          | ✓         | ✓    | ✓    | Yes       | Direct and indirect beneficiaries of project and related activities through growing, education and active involvement                     |                   | ✓         |           |
| Schools and teachers                | ✓         | ✓    | ✓    | Yes       | Indirect beneficiaries of Local Food provision and implementation   | ✓                 | ✓         | ✓         |
| School children and under 5s        | ✓         | ✓    | ✓    |           | Have received education on food growing, provenance and cooking. Health benefits of eating more fresh produce                             |                   |           | ✓         |
| Housing estates                     |           | ✓    |      | No        |   |                   |           |           |
| Tenants and Residents Associations  |           | ✓    |      | No        |   |                   |           |           |
| Local community members             | ✓         | ✓    | ✓    | Yes       | Participants in and recipients of project activities and events   |                   | ✓         |           |
| Community food co-op                |           | ✓    |      | No        |   |                   |           |           |
| Community centres and organisations |           | ✓    |      | Yes       | Involved directly and indirectly in a variety of ways underpinned by increased community integration                                      |                   | ✓         |           |
| Allotment plot holders              |           | ✓    |      | Yes       | Directly involved in food production. Integral to the project's sustainability.   |                   |           |           |
| Local catering businesses           | ✓         | ✓    |      | No        |   |                   |           |           |
| Adults with learning difficulties   |           | ✓    |      | Yes       | Direct and targeted beneficiaries of a number of project activities   |                   | ✓         |           |
| Adults with mental health issues    | ✓         | ✓    |      | Yes       | Direct and targeted beneficiaries of a number of project activities   |                   | ✓         |           |
| Older people                        |           | ✓    |      | Yes       | The project is a key source / focus of community participation and reduced isolation  |                   | ✓         |           |
| NHS / health care trusts            | ✓         | ✓    |      | Yes       | Involved in co-funding and potential beneficiaries of health improvements   |                   |           |           |
| Local Authority                     | ✓         | ✓    |      | Yes       | Responsible for land management, potential for cost savings through health, public good and community provision                           |                   |           |           |
| Environment                         |           |      |      | Yes       | Increase in the amount and quality of land under cultivation / planted with trees - supporting habitats / biodiversity / carbon reduction |                   |           |           |

## INVESTMENT IN THE THREE LOCAL FOOD PROJECTS

A central output of the SROI model is a ratio of benefits to investment. It was therefore important to gain an understanding of the nature and scale of inputs and investment in the three projects from an early stage. In the case of Growing Greenwich, total Beacon grant funding of £390,251 through the Local Food programme obviously constituted a major form of investment

in the project between 2009 and 2013. However, as the data in Table 3 indicates, other forms of investment including both additional sources of funding and volunteer time also need to be factored in order that a realistic ratio of benefits to investment can be calculated.

Table 3: Investment in the three Local Food projects

| Growing Well (Enterprise)                                    |  |  |                  |
|--|--|--|------------------|
| Stakeholder  | Inputs description   | Source / Calculation   | Value (£)        |
| RSWT / BIG Lottery   | Local Food grant   | Growing Well Business Plan 2009 - 2012   | <b>£116,528</b>  |
| Match funding for Local Food grant                           | Growing Well cash reserves   | Growing Well Business Plan 2009 - 2012   | <b>£29,132</b>   |
| Volunteer time for management board                          | 12 * 2 hours per month for 36 months @ professional rate of £20 per hour | Consultation with project manager  | <b>£17,280</b>   |
| Volunteer time by service users for horticultural activities | 12,000 hours per annum @ basic horticultural rate of £7 per hour         | Consultation with project manager  | <b>£252,000</b>  |
| Additional Local Food funding                                |  |  | <b>£9,950</b>    |
| <b>Total Investment</b>                                      |  |  | <b>£ 424,890</b> |
| Growing Greenwich (Community Growing)                        |  |  |                  |
| Stakeholder  | Inputs description   | Source / Calculation   | Value (£)        |
| RSWT / BIG Lottery   | Local Food grant   | Programme documentation / GCDA End of Grant Report   | <b>347,419</b>   |
| Volunteers   | Estimated 9,000 FTE volunteer days since project inception               | Growing Greenwich management team. 1 FTE volunteer day £75 based on an average hourly rate of £10 per hour | <b>675,000</b>   |
| GCDA Reserves  | Cash Match funding   | Business Plan  | <b>8,000</b>     |
| Greenwich Teaching PCT                                       | Cash Match funding   | Business Plan  | <b>47,000</b>    |
| Trust Thamesmead   | Cash Match funding   | Business Plan  | <b>21,000</b>    |
| Additional Local Food funding                                |  |  | <b>42,832</b>    |
| <b>Total Investment</b>                                      |  |  | <b>1,141,251</b> |

“ We provide a really good model of the balance between social and enterprise, we provide a lot of support and advice to local growers. ”

| Get Growing (Education and Learning)               |  |   |                  |
|--|--|---|------------------|
| Stakeholder  | Inputs description                         | Source / Calculation                                  | Value (£)        |
| RSWT / BIG Lottery                                 | Local Food Grant                           | Interview with Chief Executive and project worker     | £ 86,805         |
| Stroud District Council                            | Cash Match Funding                         | Business Plan   | £3,000           |
| HDH Wills Charitable Trust                         | Cash Match Funding                         | Business Plan   | £2,814           |
| Stroud Valley Reserves                             | Cash Match Funding                         | Business Plan   | £1,331           |
| Volunteer carpenter                                | Building and repairing raised beds etc     | 21 days @ £80 (source SVP Quarterly Report MLF001406) | £1,680           |
| SVP gardening volunteer                            |  | 1 day @ £80 (source as above)                         | £80              |
| SVP volunteer                                      | Digging over 3 school gardens              | 3 days @ £50 (source as above)                        | £150             |
| SVP volunteers                                     | Polytunnel construction                    | (source as above)                                     | £300             |
| Students & staff from Cirencester College          | Volunteer groundforce day                  | 9 * £80 (source as above)                             | £720             |
| Ecclesiastical Insurance corporate volunteers      |  | 31 @ £80 (source as above)                            | £2480            |
| Composting expert                                  | Supporting schools                         | 2 days @ £80 (source as above)                        | £160             |
| Food growing champions                             | 66 weeks of 1 hour gardening club sessions | 33 * 66 @ £10 per hour (source as above)              | £21780           |
| <b>Total Investment</b>                            |  |   | <b>121,300</b>   |
| <b>Total Investment relating to all 3 projects</b> |  |   | <b>1,687,441</b> |

Calculation of an SROI ratio for the projects also required an accurate assessment of the number of stakeholders and beneficiaries associated with the project. This data was compiled through consulting the project management teams, relevant project documentation and CCRI programme evaluation data. An example of stakeholder values for the Growing Greenwich project is contained in Appendix 1.

### 3. EXPLORING THE OUTCOMES OF LOCAL FOOD

A Theory of Change was developed for each of the Enterprise, Community Growing and Education and Learning projects to explore the observed and anticipated outcomes in some detail, and to examine how the outcomes interact and play out over time. An important aspect of this was to examine the trajectory of outcomes in a ‘chain of events’, which would not only ensure that the appropriate outcomes were measured, but would also help prevent any double counting in the later empirical stages.

Three Storyboard workshops were held between April and September 2013, revealing a diverse range of outcomes, many of them representing profound changes to stakeholders over the medium to longer term. Following initial discussions, a total of 30 storyboard participants worked in pairs to complete three versions of the nef Consulting Journey of Change Diagram, which proved a useful vehicle for identifying and articulating outcomes as they play out over varying time frames. Crucially it was also possible for participants to recognise the activities that helped one set of outcomes lead to another, in order that the ‘chain of events’ could be identified. Following self-completion of the Journey of Change maps, a group discussion helped to set the various outcomes in context, and to provide a source of verification across the teams. All discussions were recorded and the main essence of the narrative is reflected in the thematic analysis presented here.

A number of themes were revealed by stakeholders through the Journey of Change exercises, however they should not be viewed in isolation from one another, and should instead be viewed as underlying themes which are inevitably cross-cutting but help to articulate change arising through the three projects. The complexity of the outcomes in turn reflects the diverse range and scale of the activities involved in all three projects. A thematic approach therefore helps not only to consolidate and organise the outcomes, but also to accurately assign them to the relevant stakeholder groups. The outcome themes revealed in each of the Storyboard exercises (not all of which are evidenced later in the report) are summarised in Table 4.

Table 4: Main outcome groups for each of the projects

| Outcome Group                    | Enterprise | Community Growing | Education and Learning |
|----------------------------------|------------|-------------------|------------------------|
| Food eating and buying           | ✓          | ✓✓                | ✓                      |
| Training education and skills    | ✓✓✓        | ✓✓                | ✓✓✓                    |
| Social and commercial enterprise | ✓✓✓        |                   |                        |
| Community life                   | ✓          | ✓✓✓               | ✓                      |
| Health and well-being            | ✓✓         | ✓✓                | ✓✓                     |
| Environment and sustainability   | ✓          | ✓                 |                        |

As can be seen from the above summary, the revealed outcomes across the three project types are actually very similar. In particular – beyond a central focus on food and food growing (encompassing elements of accessibility, affordability and knowledge of food provenance) – well-being, community and education outcomes feature strongly across all three projects. The primary focus on school-based activities in the Education and Learning project is reflected in the nature and significance of outcomes themes across the set. Likewise, outcomes relating to the social and commercial enterprise activities of the Enterprise project were emphasised strongly by storyboard participants at Growing Well.

#### MAPPING THE OUTCOMES

The trajectory of outcomes as they relate to the various material stakeholders are presented below, distinguishing between short-term and medium-longer term outcomes, and identifying those outcomes for which evidence will be sought. It is necessarily a summary because of the extensive and varied nature of the outcomes. However, it aims to capture the essence of what the observed outcomes of the programme are, as seen by those directly involved and experiencing it through the three case study projects.

The evolution of outcomes over time is also considered to take into account chain of events. In conjunction with this analysis of the qualitative narrative this process allowed the measurable outcomes that should go forward for evidencing to be identified.

“ Three Storyboard workshops were held revealing a diverse range of outcomes, many of them representing profound changes to stakeholders over the medium to longer term. ”

| Food eating and buying                                      |   |
|---|---|
| Short-term outcomes   | Medium-longer term outcomes   |
| Improved knowledge to grow own food and food provenance and | Leading to increased <b>confidence to grow food and source healthier, more affordable food.</b> |
| Increased access to healthy food                            | In turn leading to <b>improved physical health</b>  |

| Training, education and personal skills   |   |
|---|---|
| Short-term outcomes   | Medium-longer term outcomes   |
| Structure for day-to-day activities (together with new friends and connections)       | Improved ability to consider new life and work options, leading more control over life, <b>resilience and self-esteem</b> |
| Improved professional, life and practical skills                                      | Leading to increased <b>competence, engagement and purpose</b>  |
| Improved knowledge and skills (formal and informal) in food, growing and horticulture | And increased <b>employability</b>  |

| Social and commercial enterprise  |   |
|---|---|
| Short-term outcomes   | Medium-longer term outcomes   |
| <b>Local Economy</b>  |   |
| Increase in number of people gaining access to fresh food through veg boxes and reduced spend in supermarkets | Leading to an increase in project revenue for re-investment                                   |
| Support for FT, PT employees and contractors  | <b>Reduced income leakage</b> through food expenditure  |
|   | <b>Generation of local income and employment</b> through contracting                          |
|   | <b>Induced effects for the local economy</b> through the re-spend of project-related salaries |
| <b>Local Business</b>   |   |
| Cost savings through sharing of project equipment and machinery   | Increased trade to local food outlets and related facilities                                  |
| Development of a market for local food in the area  | <b>Income growth and containment</b> through more vibrant local food market                   |
| <b>Social Enterprise</b>  |   |
| Increase in knowledge, support and advice between social enterprises (nationally)                             | Leading to <b>increased efficiency and development in the social enterprise sector</b>        |



| Community Life   |   |
|--|---|
| Short-term outcomes  | Medium-longer term outcomes   |
| New friendships and increased connection to people and local area - leading to integration into a supportive network and community | Leading to an increased sense of trust and belonging                                      |
| Community – Improved links between organisations and   | Leading to a more efficient and vibrant voluntary and community sector                    |
| Increased physical infrastructure and resources to run community events  | And increased community membership and participation                                      |
| Schools  |   |
| Increased knowledge of food and food provenance, combined with facilities for food growing on-site                                 | Leading to Improved quality of school dinners   |
| And developing links between other food projects in schools and the wider community  | Closer integration of schools with the wider community                                    |
|  | Increased job satisfaction for teachers   |
|  | Inspiration for teachers, parents and local families to grow their own food               |
| School Children  |   |
| Increased knowledge about food growing and prevalence, combined with   | Leading to the potential for improved physical health through activity and healthy eating |
| Increased physical activity and a more enjoyable and varied school life, and an improved sense of community and self               | And an increased sense of trust and belonging   |
|  | Improved competence and engagement  |

“ Food growing with children, it does change their relationship with their environment, and it changes how they treat the environment because they have a different understanding of its value. ”

| Health and Well-being   |   |
|---|---|
| Short-term outcomes   | Medium-longer term outcomes   |
| New friends and connections and integration into a community  | Improved ability to consider new life and work options, leading to more control over life, <b>resilience and self-esteem</b>  |
| Leading to a reduced social isolation and sense of belonging, and improved self-expression for those with specific issues | And a greater sense of confidence to initiate life change, security and self-worth  |
| An improved knowledge and skills in food growing and horticulture   | leading to <b>improved mental health</b> and well-being including increased <b>competence, engagement and purpose</b> , and increased <b>sense of trust and belonging</b> |
|   | And further out a <b>reduced dependence on the state for benefits and health services</b>   |
|   | Over time a host of other benefits including an improved ability give up addictions and more fulfilling relationships   |
| Increased access to healthy food, leading to an improved and more knowledgeable attitude towards food                     | Leading to increased physical health and vitality   |
| Increased physical activity through growing, horticultural and related community activities                               |   |

| Environment and Sustainability   |  |
|--|--|
| Short-term outcomes  | Medium-longer term outcomes  |
| Increased area of cultivated and managed land  | Leading to <b>carbon reduction benefits</b> through sustainable behaviours and increase in green space |
| Improvement in soil nutrients and organic matter leading to improved habitats and biodiversity | Improved soil and water quality  |
| Provision of ecosystem services including flood management, soil quality and recreation        | Improved flood management  |
| Increase in sustainable purchasing and food sourcing behaviours                                | Increased aesthetic and cultural value of physical environment   |

## 4. ESTABLISHING IMPACT AND CALCULATING THE SROI

Having explored and mapped the various material outcomes the next stage involved identifying appropriate ways of measuring whether change had taken place in the respective outcomes. For each outcome an indicator of change therefore needed to be identified, which would in turn inform the development of appropriate survey questions through which change in the observed outcomes could be evidenced.

As a number of outcomes were related to well-being, the National Accounts of Well-being was consulted in order

to derive appropriate indicators based on European Social Survey questions, which would ensure both consistency and comparability with larger data sets. It would also ensure that outcome measurements were both conceptually and empirically robust. In some cases a number of indicators were combined to create a composite score, especially in the case of well-being outcomes. Indicators for all material outcomes are set out in Table 5.

Table 5: Indicators developed to evidence the outcomes

| Outcome Group (ToC)            | Outcome   | Enter | Comm | Educ | Stakeholder sub-category                                     | Indicator / Composite indicator   |
|--------------------------------|---|-------|------|------|--|---|
| Food eating and buying         | Increased food affordability                            | ✓     | ✓    | ✓    | Volunteers<br>Trainees<br>Targeted beneficiaries*<br>Elderly | Percentage of stakeholders reporting a decrease in weekly food bill   |
| Training, education and skills | Increased employability                                 | ✓     | ✓    |      | Volunteers<br>Trainees<br>Targeted beneficiaries             | Self-reported change in skills base, employability and qualifications   |
| Training, education and skills | Improved competence, engagement and purpose             | ✓     | ✓    | ✓    | Volunteers<br>Trainees<br>Targeted beneficiaries*<br>Elderly | Self-reported change in sense of accomplishment; getting a chance to learn new things; what doing in life is worthwhile   |
| Training, education and skills | Improved competence, engagement and purpose of children | ✓     | ✓    | ✓    | School children  | Self-report of enjoying school more; Knowing more about how to grow food; Knowing more about wildlife; Teachers report of children feeling a sense of accomplishment; Regularly getting chance to gain practical skills |

“ Children have enjoyed ‘gardening club’ and other activities. And most reported knowing more about growing food, healthy food and wildlife. Most also reported eating more fruit and vegetables. ”

| Outcome Group (ToC)   | Outcome  | Enter | Comm | Educ | Stakeholder sub-category                                     | Indicator / Composite indicator   |
|-----------------------|--|-------|------|------|--|---|
| Health and well-being | Improved mental health                                       | ✓     | ✓    |      | Volunteers<br>Targeted beneficiaries<br>Elderly              | Self-reported improvement in mental health (Composite based on WEMWBS (Short))  |
| Health and well-being | Improved physical health (and vitality)                      | ✓     | ✓    | ✓    | Volunteers<br>Trainees<br>Targeted beneficiaries*<br>Elderly | Self-reported change in levels of physical activity; feeling healthier; visiting GP less  |
| Health and well-being | Improved physical health (and vitality) of children          | ✓     | ✓    | ✓    | School children  | Self-report of spending more time doing outdoor activities; change in i) eating and ii) liking fruit and vegetables; change in eating fruit and veg; Teachers report of children regularly eating i) healthy food and ii) fresh produce |
| Health and well-being | Increased resilience and self-esteem                         | ✓     | ✓    | ✓    | Volunteers<br>Trainees<br>Targeted beneficiaries*            | Self-reported change in feelings of optimism; positive; getting back to normal when things go wrong   |
| Health and well-being | Increased sense of trust and belonging                       |       | ✓    | ✓    | Targeted beneficiaries<br>Elderly<br>Wider community**       | Self-reported change in feelings of belonging and support in the community; trust in other people   |
| Health and well-being | Increased sense of trust and belonging of children           | ✓     | ✓    | ✓    | School children  | Self-report of enjoying school more; Teachers report of children feeling as though they have improved trust and belonging at school   |
| Health and well-being | Reduced dependence on state for benefits and health services | ✓     | ✓    |      |  | Evidenced through increased employability and improved health   |

| Outcome Group (ToC)                     | Outcome  | Enter | Comm | Educ | Stakeholder sub-category              | Indicator / Composite indicator   |
|---|--|-------|------|------|---------------------------------------|---|
| Health and well-being                   | Increase in quality of school dinners                                |       |      | ✓    | School children                       | Evidenced through increased physical health for school children   |
| Community life                          | Increased community membership and participation                     |       | ✓    |      | Wider community**                     | Self-reported change of community members in getting involved in more local events; being a member of more clubs and associations; volunteering in the community more; participating more in local community and charity events |
| Community life                          | More efficient, effective and vibrant voluntary and community sector |       | ✓    |      | Voluntary and Community organisations | Percentage of organisations reporting improved links with wider sector and community  |
| Community life                          | Closer integration of schools with the wider community               | ✓     | ✓    | ✓    | Schools                               | Percentage of schools reporting improved links with other sectors, organisations and wider community  |
| Training, education and skills          | Increased job satisfaction for teachers                              |       |      | ✓    | Teachers                              | Percentage of teachers reporting positive change to job satisfaction  |
| Commercial enterprise and local economy | Reduced income leakage through increased local food expenditure      | ✓     |      |      | Local Economy                         | Self-reported change in food expenditure in supermarkets  |
| Commercial enterprise and local economy | Generation of local income through contracting                       | ✓     |      |      | Local Economy                         | Percentage of expenditure within 30 miles of project site   |
| Commercial enterprise and local economy | Income growth and containment through more vibrant food market       | ✓     |      |      | Local Economy                         | Evidenced though increased income growth and containment  |

| Outcome Group (ToC)                     | Outcome   | Enter | Comm | Educ | Stakeholder sub-category | Indicator / Composite indicator                         |
|---|---|-------|------|------|--------------------------|---|
| Commercial enterprise and local economy | Increased efficiency and development in the social enterprise sector        | ✓     |      |      | Social enterprise sector | Difficulties in collecting data to show robust evidence |
| Environment and sustainability          | Carbon reduction through sustainable behaviours and increase in green space | ✓     | ✓    |      | Ecosystem services       | Difficulties in collecting data to show robust evidence |
| Environment and sustainability          | Improved water and soil quality   | ✓     | ✓    |      | Ecosystem services       | Difficulties in collecting data to show robust evidence |
| Environment and sustainability          | Improved flood management   | ✓     | ✓    |      | Ecosystem services       | Difficulties in collecting data to show robust evidence |
| Environment and sustainability          | Increased aesthetic and cultural value of physical environment              | ✓     | ✓    |      | Ecosystem services       | Difficulties in collecting data to show robust evidence |

\*Targeted beneficiaries include adults with mental health issues and adults with learning difficulties

\*\* Members of the wider community who are actively involved in projects on a regular basis



“ Being able to say that you are going to have a project that lasts three-four years is very powerful; it’s the length of time that is crucial. ”

## DATA COLLECTION

Evidence to populate the indicators was gathered through a series of questionnaire surveys, administered online and in person at Local Food events and meetings. The surveys were designed to produce standardised measures on each of the material outcomes to be fed into the SROI models. Five principle surveys were designed across the three projects, summarised in Table 6. A copy of the Growing Greenwich community survey is given in Appendix 2 as an illustration.

Surveys were designed to take no more than 15–20 minutes to complete (and the Environment survey only 5 minutes), with many questions based on likert-type scales whereby respondents were asked to select a point on the scale that reflected the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with a statement relating to the respective outcome. These 1–5 scales were then standardised into proportional measures to conform with the requirements of the SROI model.

Surveys were designed for self-completion at project meetings and events, and to be completed online using the Bristol Online software. Respondents were emailed the appropriate survey link from which they could log-on, read the basic instructions, complete the survey and submit the return directly to the survey database, managed by the research team.

Realistic target sample sizes were agreed with the three project management teams at the outset and the teams were proactive in publicising the surveys and in motivating stakeholders to take part in the study. A total of 126 surveys were returned across the three projects, providing an adequate sample to evidence change in the principle outcomes. Given logistical and ethical issues collection of data from school children was only possible in Get Growing, and this data was used as a proxy for change across the three project types. All other data was pooled across the three project types. Mean indicator values for the principle material outcomes (i.e. those evidenced as being material by the Theory of Change (ToC) and for which it is possible to collect data for) across the three projects are given in Table 7.

Table 6: Survey details and sample sizes

| Survey                | Details  | Sample size |           |           |
|-----------------------|--|-------------|-----------|-----------|
|                       |  | Enter       | Comm      | Educ      |
| Storyboard            | Theory of Change exercise to identify and map the outcomes   | 12          | 7         | 6         |
| Volunteer             | Distinguishing between 'core' volunteers with regular on-going involvement from those with more passive involvement.   | 29          | 10        | 5         |
| Local community       | Unique versions created as necessary in order that beneficiary types (e.g. those with specific health and well-being issues) could be targeted in an unobtrusive and sensitive way.  | 31          | 25        |           |
| Teachers and children | Designed to gather data from schools, children and teachers, and on behalf of school. Children's surveys designed in a child-friendly format, using appropriate language and pictures. Administered in specific classroom sessions | 6           | 5         | 16        |
| Environment           | Designed to gather data on ecosystem services, and targeted at appropriate informed stakeholders.  |             |           |           |
| <b>Total</b>          |  | <b>78</b>   | <b>47</b> | <b>27</b> |

Table 7: Indicator values showing reported change in evidenced outcomes as a result of the projects

| Outcome  | Enterprise | Community Growing | Education and Learning | (Mean) Value | Stakeholder values used to estimate impacts  |
|--|------------|-------------------|------------------------|--------------|--|
| Increased food affordability   | +24%       | +29%              | +27%                   | 0.27         | All  |
| Increased employability  | +22%       | +14%              |                        | 0.18         | Enterprise and Community Growing             |
| Improved competence, engagement and purpose                          | +29%       | +12%              | +21%                   | 0.21         | All  |
| Improved competence, engagement and purpose of children              |            |                   | +32%                   | 0.32         | All  |
| Improved mental health   | +30%       | +13%              |                        | 0.22         | Enterprise and Community Growing             |
| Improved physical health (and vitality)                              | +24%       | +25%              | +25%                   | 0.25         | All  |
| Improved physical health (and vitality) of children                  |            |                   | +15%                   | 0.15         | All  |
| Increased resilience and self-esteem                                 | +29%       | +8%               | +17%                   | 0.19         | All  |
| Increased sense of trust and belonging                               |            | +25%              | +25%                   | 0.25         | Community Growing and Education and Learning |
| Increased sense of trust and belonging of children                   |            |                   | +22%                   | 0.22         | All  |
| Increased community membership and participation                     |            | +24%              |                        | 0.24         | Community Growing                            |
| More efficient, effective and vibrant voluntary and community sector |            | +60%              |                        | 0.60         | Community Growing                            |
| Closer integration of schools with the wider community               |            |                   | +55%                   | 0.55         | Education and Learning                       |
| Increased job satisfaction for teachers                              |            |                   | +60%                   | 0.60         | Education and Learning                       |
| Reduced income leakage through increased local food expenditure      | +27%       |                   |                        | 0.27         | Enterprise                                   |
| Generation of local income and employment through contracting        | +80%       |                   |                        | 0.80         | Enterprise                                   |

## DEADWEIGHT, ATTRIBUTION AND DISPLACEMENT

Accounting for deadweight and attribution is an important element of the SROI methodology<sup>1</sup>. Deadweight relates to the extent to which outcomes would have happened anyway without the project while Attribution refers to the extent to which observed and anticipated outcomes can be attributed to the three projects as opposed to other projects, activities or initiatives. Both measures are represented as proportions in the SROI model and were informed through the collection of data in three stages: the story board workshop; the online surveys, and in the case of deadweight, a cross check against equivalent social and environmental trends identified through secondary data sources.

## INSIGHTS FROM THE STORYBOARD WORKSHOPS

In addition to outcomes, Storyboard workshop participants were also asked to consider issues relating to deadweight and attribution. Without more specific questioning it was obviously difficult to ascertain, but four important points emerged. The first is that the very nature of the projects meant that opportunities for food growing and related activities were made available everywhere, and were therefore made very neutral, and open to people that have never accessed the community and its resources and knowledge in this way before. In fact therefore, there are likely to be more groups that have benefited from the project than the ones that are currently known about.

The second point is that some beneficiaries may have been spurred on to learn more about food and grow their own as a result of the increasing popularity of food and cookery based programmes on TV. Another factor which may have produced similar outcomes was the simple fact of food price inflation over the last 3-4 years, which may have prompted people to seek out cheaper, alternative sources of food and lifestyle. However, it is likely that these 'organic' movements towards local food activities and outcomes would not have occurred on anything like the same scale, or in the same way, as they have through the projects. This was especially pertinent in the case of Growing Greenwich. At the very least the projects could be said to have had a significant catalytic effect towards lifestyle and behavioural change in their local areas.



The third and fourth points relate to attribution. One of the interesting things about all three projects is the way in which they have not only helped to develop and strengthen links between sectors and agencies, but the fact that such links have often led to additional investment and action being taken, which in turn has helped to broaden and deepen the outcomes felt.

An obvious example is the direct and indirect 'investment' made by the health service who have championed the Growing Well and Growing Greenwich projects as a form of social prescribing to help foster a more holistic approach to health in the community. In the case of Growing Greenwich, it is evident that the impetus for this support originated from the Growing Greenwich coordination team, and having seen some positive results from early initiatives the NHS were keen to back the project. And in both cases new forms of social prescribing, and with it hitherto unrealised health benefits have come to fruition.

Attributing benefits to a particular project is one thing, but the outcomes associated with the process of planning a project, building partnerships and putting together a business case are often forgotten. In this case it is clear that the bidding process has played an important role in forging the partnerships and engagement that underpinned the business plans. In turn the requirements of the bidding process laid the foundation for a number of initiatives in each of the areas, some of which may have been pursued had the projects not been initiated. However, again it is unlikely that the outcomes would have had the same gravity as they have subsequent to the projects becoming a feature of the communities. In any case it was the Local Food programme that stimulated the business plans. All three coordination teams put great emphasis on the fact that the desired longevity of the projects, and the cultural shift that they appear to have had, is due largely to the careful planning process and partnership building at this early stage.

A related reason in the case of the Community Growing project is the size of the grants. With funding just short of £400,000, the project has been able to make a substantial impact on the local community through the primary vehicle of hands on training and education. And relatively little of this funding has gone on staff salaries as the project has funded less than two full time staff since its inception. In short, the size of the grant has allowed a critical mass of activity and outcomes to have come about which would have been much more difficult to achieve piecemeal through a series of smaller grants. The length of the project is another major benefit, as this allowed it to have a sustained impact and become part of the fabric of the community, which shorter projects are rarely able to achieve.

### PRIMARY SURVEY DATA

Standard SROI survey techniques were employed to gather primary evidence of deadweight and attribution through the online surveys. Context and outcome specific information relating to deadweight was gathered through a series of open questions with responses used to moderate the proportional estimates produced through the analysis of secondary data. Respondents were asked to rank the extent to which observed changes occurring within the principle outcome groups could be attributed to the projects as opposed to other projects or

activities, using a likert scale similar to that used for evidencing the outcomes.

### ANALYSIS OF SECONDARY DATA

Whilst material changes may have occurred through the three projects between 2009 and 2013 it was important to take account of similar changes or trends that may have occurred for society as a whole over the same time period. The potential for over-estimating deadweight could therefore be greatly reduced and the impact estimations made more robust.

A range of national level secondary data was assembled to represent the main outcomes revealed through the Theory of Change (See Appendix 3), with proportional changes used to produce estimates of deadweight (by outcome group) in the model. These estimates were triangulated against the qualitative information gathered through the Storyboard exercises and online surveys to further improve their accuracy. Values for deadweight and attribution calculated by outcome group for each of the 3 projects are given in Table 8.

Table 8: Deadweight and Attribution values, by outcome group

| Outcome Group                    | Deadweight | Attribution |
|----------------------------------|------------|-------------|
| Food eating and buying           | 0.04       | 0.62        |
| Training, education and skills   | 0.15       | 0.64        |
| Social and commercial enterprise | 0.05       | 0.63        |
| Community life                   | 0.11       | 0.61        |
| Health and well-being            | 0.07       | 0.63        |

Taking health and well-being deadweight as an example, secondary data indicates that around 7% of benefits would have occurred anyway, for example as part of the national drive towards well-being improvements and/or changes to the delivery of health services at a local level. Survey responses imply that 63% of observed health and well-being improvements can be attributed to the Local Food as opposed to other factors.

## DROP OFF AND DISCOUNT RATE

It was also important for the SROI ratios to account for diminishing impacts of the project over time, and for the value of money to change over time, and these were accounted for by the inclusion of estimates for drop-off and discount rate.

**Drop-off:** Over time the amount or significance of an outcome is likely to reduce, or if it remains constant, is more likely to be influenced by other factors, meaning that the attribution of the outcome to Growing Greenwich is lower. Drop-off was used to account for this, and was calculated for those outcomes deemed to last more than one year.

Drop-off is calculated by deducting a fixed percentage from the remaining level of outcome at the end of each year. For example, an outcome of 100 that lasts for 3 years but drops off by 10% per annum would be 100, 90 and 81 in years 1, 2 and 3 respectively.

As with duration, accurate measurement of this on-going value would require systematic surveys over longer periods of time. It was therefore necessary to build in an estimate of drop-off, drawing on the material gathered through the Theory of Change work and consulting benchmarks of drop-off calculation used in comparable SROIs<sup>2</sup>. On this basis a drop-off coefficient of 25% was applied to all outcomes where the benefit period was longer than one year.

**Discount Rate:** Discounting recognises that people generally prefer to receive money today rather than tomorrow because there is a risk (e.g. that the money will not be paid) or because there is an opportunity cost of investing the money elsewhere. This is known as the 'time value of money' and it is standard practice to incorporate an annual discount rate into the impact calculation. The basic rate recommended by HM Treasury is 3.5% and this is the rate used in the majority of SROI studies. A yearly discount rate of 0.035 was therefore applied to all outcomes.

## VALUATION OF OUTCOMES

Central to the SROI methodology is the monetisation of outcomes in order that they can be measured in a consistent way using a common currency. This of course allows computation of a ratio of benefits to costs as the measure of impact which, expressed in monetary terms, can be set against the initial financial investment.

Monetisation under this approach, however, represents more than a primary currency facilitating a cost-benefit analysis, and the process of monetisation should not be viewed as purely reductionist in the sense that powerful, often context specific, outcomes are simply 'reduced' to a monetary unit for the purposes of financial and economic accounting. The process undertaken in measuring impacts and selecting financial proxies is more a form of social accounting, within which monetisation allows the 'significance' of outcomes to be compared in a consistent way. The approach usefully allows a range of benefits to be included in the analysis that might otherwise be missed out or ignored.

The process of monetising the relevant outcomes involves identifying financial proxies for each separate outcome. In other words, approximations of value were sought for each outcome, which in some cases may not be wholly representative of the specific outcome in question. They are instead the 'best approximation' (or one of the best) available through which to assess the significance of the outcome to society or the state, and thus allow comparison with other (monetised) outcomes.

There were 4 main types of approximation, or valuation, methods, used in this process. These are:

**Cost/income** - equivalent cost or income that would produce a similar outcome

**Potential cost saving** - to an agency or the state as a result of a negative outcome being partially mitigated

**Revealed preference** - the inference of valuations from the prices of market-related goods.

**Stated preference** - whereby people are asked how they value things relative to other things or in terms of how much they would pay to have or avoid something - Willingness to Pay (WTP)

“ Subject to the limitations of case study scope and related issues, this represents an indicative 700% return on investment for the Local Food programme ”



An important strength of the Local Food SROI model is its limited reliance on more indirect valuations using methods such as Revealed Preference or WTP, although these valuation techniques were useful for certain outcomes, such as those relating to ecosystem services. A description of the provisional financial proxies (subject to final scrutiny and revision) assigned to the relevant outcomes, including their source and rationale for inclusion, is given in Appendix 4.

### CALCULATING THE IMPACT

All of the information set out in the previous sections was then brought together in order to calculate the impact and produce an indicative SROI ratio for Local Food based on 3 case study projects drawn from each of the respective categories identified through the main programme evaluation.

This calculation involved first calculating the Present Value (PV) of benefits, which involved multiplying the number of stakeholders for each outcome by the indicator value before reducing the outcome incidence to take account of deadweight

and attribution. Annual total value figures were then calculated for outcomes lasting more than one year using compound drop-off estimates. Finally, total values were converted to Present Values by applying HM Treasury’s coefficient of 0.035.

This process was repeated for each outcome with the totals then summed to arrive at the Total PV. It was then possible to calculate an initial SROI ratio that would indicate the financial return to society for every pound invested in Local Food. To arrive at the ratio the discounted value of benefits is divided by the total investment:

$$\text{SROI ratio}^3 = \frac{\text{Present Value}}{\text{Value of Investment}}$$

Total PV in relation to the levels of total investment in the three Local Food projects is summarised thus:

|                                       |               |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|
| Total Investment                      | £1,687,441    |
| Present value of benefits             | £11,756,653   |
| <b>Ratio of benefit-to-investment</b> | <b>6.97:1</b> |

Findings therefore suggest that every £1 invested in Local Food (as evidenced by the three case study projects combined) has returned £7 to society in the form of social and economic outcomes including health and well-being, training and skills. Subject to the limitations of case study scope and related issues, this represents an indicative 700% return on investment for the Local Food programme.

Breaking down the magnitude of benefit according to the principle areas of change affected by Local Food reveals that the programme is producing almost two thirds of its societal return in the areas of health and well-being, followed by community vibrancy and then education and skills. It is important to note that whilst outcomes relating the environment and social enterprise were revealed through the theory of change exercises, it was not possible to evidence them here. On that basis the relative proportions of benefit shown in the final column of table 9 are likely to be slightly lower.



Table 9: Contribution of outcomes groups to societal return from Local Food

| Outcome Group                    | Constitution of Present Value | % of societal return |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|
| Food eating and buying           | £0.17                         | 2%                   |
| Training , education and skills  | £0.53                         | 8%                   |
| Social and commercial enterprise | £0.12                         | 2%                   |
| Community life                   | £1.81                         | 26%                  |
| Health and well-being            | £1.66                         | 24%                  |

It is also worth remembering that the value *increased accessibility to healthy food* and *knowledge of food and its provenance* are largely accounted for through the valuation of health and well-being outcomes, as to do otherwise would represent double counting. A number of educational outcomes are similarly represented in the journey of change, whereby for example increased knowledge of healthy food by children manifests in improvements in physical health over the medium to longer term.

## SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS

The total Present Value (PV) is made up of 17 outcomes. On further inspection it is found that around two thirds of the total PV accrues to 3 outcomes: improved physical health (23%); increased sense of trust and belonging (27%); and increased community membership and participation (16%). It is therefore prudent to undertake a sensitivity analysis on these three outcomes, and test some of the assumptions on which the impact estimates are contingent.

The aim of the sensitivity analysis is to challenge the robustness of the assumptions and in turn how sensitive the SROI ratio is to changes in key indicators and proxies. This allows a confidence range to be presented, based upon the information currently available.

For each of the three outcomes identified the judgments made in arriving at their value are examined in more detail and more and less favourable scenarios are calculated. Key assumptions (such as deadweight, attribution and stakeholder population) are varied in order to compute upper and lower limits of present value for each one, and in turn examining the impact that this has on the overall ratio . Applying the outside ranges of these proportional variations then allows a confidence range to be computed for the ratio.

### Outcome 1: Increased physical health

| Upper limit            |                      |                     |   |
|------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---|
| Element                | Existing calculation | Possible variations |   |
| Stakeholder population | 605                  | 725                 | Number of beneficiaries coming into contact with the projects steadily increases                                      |
| Financial proxy        | 34,818               | 38,299              | Public sector inefficiencies increase equivalent costs by 10%   |
| Attribution            | 0.63                 | 0.78                | Number of other social prescribing programmes in the respective areas decreases due to further public sector cuts     |
| Impact                 | £2.683m              | £4.379m             |   |
| Effect on SROI ratio   | 6.97                 | 7.97                | +14%  |
| Lower limit            |                      |                     |   |
| Element                | Existing calculation | Possible variations |   |
| Stakeholder population | 605                  | 485                 | Number of beneficiaries coming into contact with the projects is steadily decreasing                                  |
| Financial proxy        | 34,818               | 31,336              | Public sector efficiency improvements decrease equivalent costs by 10%  |
| Attribution            | 0.63                 | 0.48                | Number of other social prescribing programmes in the respective areas begins to increase as the good practice spreads |
| Impact                 | £2.683m              | £1.475m             |   |
| Effect on SROI ratio   | 6.97                 | 6.25                | -10%  |

### Outcome 2: Increased trust and belonging

| Upper limit                     |                      |                     |   |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---|
| Element                         | Existing calculation | Possible variations |   |
| Self-reported change in outcome | 0.25                 | 0.30                | Beneficiaries under estimated the change in trust and belonging   |
| Deadweight                      | 0.07                 | 0.03                | Over estimation of the success of central government attempts to improve well-being                       |
| Financial proxy                 | 15,666               | 18,016              | Informants in supporting academic study under estimated value of friends, relatives and neighbours by 15% |
| Impact                          | £3.155m              | £4.541m             |   |
| Effect on SROI ratio            | 6.97                 | 7.97                | +12%  |

| Lower limit                     |                      |                     |  |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|--|
| Element                         | Existing calculation | Possible variations |  |
| Self-reported change in outcome | 0.25                 | 0.20                | Beneficiaries overestimated the change in trust and belonging  |
| Deadweight                      | 0.07                 | 0.11                | Under estimation of the success of central government attempts to improve well-being                     |
| Financial proxy                 | 15,666               | 13,316              | Informants in supporting academic study over estimated value of friends, relatives and neighbours by 15% |
| Impact                          | £3.155m              | £2.053m             |  |
| Effect on SROI ratio            | 6.97                 | 6.31                | -10%   |

### Outcome 3: Increased community membership and participation

| Upper limit          |                      |                     |  |
|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|--|
| Element              | Existing calculation | Possible variations |  |
| Benefit period       | One off              | 1-2 years           | Benefits of increased volunteering are felt over a longer period                                   |
| Financial proxy      | 13,500               |                     | Underlying study's estimation of value placed on volunteering was correct                          |
| Attribution          | 0.61                 | 0.70                | Extent to which other local initiatives are producing comparable benefits have been over estimated |
| Impact               | £1.924m              | £3.808m             |  |
| Effect on SROI ratio | 6.97                 | 8.08                | +16%   |

| Lower limit          |                      |                     |   |
|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---|
| Element              | Existing calculation | Possible variations |   |
| Benefit period       | One off              |                     | Beneficiaries experience only a one-off benefit from volunteering                                   |
| Financial proxy      | 34,500               | 9,450               | Underlying study over estimated the value placed on volunteering by 30%                             |
| Attribution          | 0.61                 | 0.50                | Extent to which other local initiatives are producing comparable benefits have been under estimated |
| Impact               | £1.924m              | £1.104m             |   |
| Effect on SROI ratio | 6.97                 | 6.48                | -7%   |



The results indicate that by varying these more sensitive judgments for this influential set of outcomes, the estimates of impact could be up to 10% lower and up to 16% higher. Results of the above sensitivity analysis therefore imply that a confidence range of between -10% and +16% of the overall ratio is appropriate, and would provide a more realistic estimate of the return on investment for Local Food given the judgments and data that have influenced their computation.

In the interests of ensuring that, if anything, this estimate is a conservative one, the confidence range presented below assumes that the derived ratio is accurate to within 84%, with the confidence range falling with +/-16% of 6.97.

| Benefit to Investment Ratio | Confidence range |
|-----------------------------|------------------|
| 6.97                        | 5.85 – 8.09      |

For the purposes of reporting it would therefore be appropriate to state that, based on the three case study projects comprising the SROI study, and the associated limitations of sample size and assumptions influencing the benefit estimates, Local Food

has been shown **to deliver a return to society of between £6 and £8 for every £1 invested in the programme.** This is comparable to other community food programmes which have been shown to have a similar magnitude of benefit<sup>4</sup>.

“ The aim of the sensitivity analysis is to challenge the robustness of the assumptions and in turn how sensitive the SROI ratio is to changes in key indicators and proxies. This allows a confidence range to be presented, based upon the information currently available. ”

“ Through the community it builds, the healthy lifestyle that it promotes and knowledge that it diffuses into so many walks of life, Local Food quite literally has changed lives in so many ways. ”

## 5. CONCLUDING REMARKS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study has employed a Social Return on Investment (SROI) framework to explore and measure the value of Local Food to society and the state. In so doing it has sought to capture the broader concept of value; valuing not only those changes which are more difficult to measure, but also those which are less conventional and are often left out of cost-benefit analyses. These changes range from improvements in mental health and well-being to increased community vibrancy and participation through to the development of vibrant markets for local food.

Capturing the broader concept of value allows the wider benefits of Local Food to be recognised and more fully understood by those who have developed, funded, managed and played a role in implementing the programme. As well as providing an empirical metric to communicate this value to different audiences, the SROI findings complement and deepen those of the wider evaluation of Local Food<sup>5</sup>, which has been running alongside the programme since 2009. In itself the Theory of Change helps to demonstrate how the original remit of the programme – to make locally grown food more accessible and affordable to communities – has delivered so much more to society, and indirectly to the state.

Through a ‘chain of events’, the programme has improved the quality of life of individuals and communities across England in terms of health, well-being, education, and employability. Through the community it builds, the healthy lifestyle that it promotes and knowledge that it diffuses into so many walks of life, Local Food quite literally has changed lives in so many ways. The opportunities for volunteering, training and support that the programme provides has helped to make communities more vibrant and participatory whilst providing structure to lives and confidence to individuals who have made new friends, learnt new skills and enjoyed the pleasures of growing and eating healthier, seasonal food. In short the programme has achieved something which its creators perhaps only dared to dream of: it

has made people happier, on so many different levels.

The range of outcomes revealed, evidenced and monetised through the SROI framework serve to reinforce and magnify the three forms of capacity identified through the wider programme evaluation. Whilst the capacities themselves are not independent of each other, it is evident from the analysis here that the process of developing material capacity (both physical infrastructure and supporting knowledge) has a range of material benefits which manifest in personal capacity (skills, training, competence and health) and cultural capacity (encompassing elements of well-being, reduced social isolation and community vibrancy).

The SROI findings reveal the magnitude of impact of fostering personal and cultural capacity through processes of social innovation, where communities are facilitated to drive their own development and with it their own future. The findings also illustrate that Local Food is a success story in terms of both social innovation and social prescribing, whereby health professionals are utilising Local Food projects to help deliver tangible benefits to physical and mental health. And in fact the processes of social innovation both create and enhance a fruitful environment for social prescribing which future community programmes could learn from.

Whilst examining the broader concept of value has provided richness that respects the inherent complexity and depth of change delivered through Local Food, the measurement – and specifically the monetisation – of its outcomes comes with its own set of health warnings. Monetising the outcomes has allowed the broad range of outcomes to be viewed in a common currency, which in turn allows their relative significance to be acknowledged and compared. But this monetisation should not be viewed as reductionist in the sense that potentially life-changing outcomes are simply reduced to an empirical set of costs and benefits in a spreadsheet.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

The real value of any evaluative study lies in the recommendations that arise from it, especially for those actively engaged in the development, management and implementation

of Local Food and comparable programmes in the future. Three sets of recommendations are offered here: for Local Food projects who are about to enter a new phase in their evolution as the funded programme comes to an end; for Local Food programme management (RSWT) as they manage this transition and reflect upon the programme's implementation and management through this closing period; and for the Big Lottery Fund as they seek to deliver further value for society and the state through future community projects and programmes

#### **FOR LOCAL FOOD PROJECTS:**

Drawing on the principles and information contained in this report, Local Food projects should consider undertaking their own evaluation using the SROI framework. A simple Theory of Change exercise will in itself reveal the nature of project outcomes, and indicate the extent to which the project is delivering on its objectives and providing value for the community, beneficiaries and wider society. In addition, the process of undertaking the exercise should reveal potential improvements to planning, management, implementation and record keeping activities that will help ensure the project's longevity. And of course the result of this exercise may be useful in helping to lever additional funding to build on or expand the scope of the project.

The SROI approach can also be used to provide a framework for ongoing monitoring and evaluation of the project, which will further help to sustain it into the future, whilst providing confidence to funders that the project is well run and that it's coordinators take impact seriously. The importance of ensuring that monitoring and evaluation is both driven by stakeholders and is focused on outcomes is integral to this, and to ensuring that the project continues to reach out to beneficiaries in the most effective way possible.

#### **FOR LOCAL FOOD PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT (RSWT):**

In relation to the above it will be useful for RSWT to support projects in the ongoing evaluation of their activities as it will help the programme to be sustained beyond the life of the funding. The framework provided by this report, including

the range of indicators and proxies to evidence outcomes, could play a role in this support, and the co-production of knowledge is likely to become more important as funding sources become more diverse and programme impacts become more diffuse.

It may prove especially useful to build outcome exploration and measurement into the process of project feedback and evaluation, and to use this information to direct resources into both ongoing evaluations of the most established and successful projects, and into future project management activity. While it may not be possible to do this comprehensively within the framework of the current programme, it is certainly worth considering in any future programmes.

#### **FOR THE BIG LOTTERY FUND:**

The Big Lottery Fund should be aware of 'chain of events' effects when designing future programmes and to think more broadly about potential outcomes from the start so that they might be anticipated and promoted accordingly.

In tandem with this they should consider undertaking forecast evaluations that dovetail both qualitative and quantitative approaches, which could make use of the SROI framework. Such evaluations could in turn help identify potential areas worth consideration for further development, or even funding.

“ The original remit of the programme – to make locally grown food more accessible and affordable to communities – has delivered so much more to society, and indirectly to the state. ”



# Appendices

|             |  |
|-------------|--|
| Appendix 1  | Stakeholder Estimates (Growing Greenwich example)  |
| Appendix 2: | The Growing Greenwich community survey             |
| Appendix 3: | Secondary data to inform calculation of deadweight |
| Appendix 4: | Financial proxies used to value outcomes           |

## APPENDIX 1: STAKEHOLDER ESTIMATES (GROWING GREENWICH EXAMPLE)

| Stakeholder group   | Number / Value | Notes   | Source   |
|---|----------------|---|--|
| Volunteers  | 50             | 35 + 15 (1% of 1398 wider community)  | GCDA End of Grant Report / Project management team               |
| Adults with mental health needs   | 45             | 17+28 (2% of 1398 wider community)  | GCDA End of Grant Report / Project management team               |
| Adults with learning difficulties   | 58             | 30 + 28 (2% of 1398 wider community)  | GCDA End of Grant Report / Project management team               |
| Elderly   | 220            | 150 + 70 (5% of 1398 wider community)   | GCDA End of Grant Report / Project management team               |
| School children (and under 5s)  | 2,881          |   | GCDA End of Grant Report   |
| Trainers trained (through pilot)  | 20             |   | GCDA End of Grant Report   |
| Wider Community (Working directly with Growing Greenwich)                 | 1,258          | 1398 – 10% estimated as falling into the targeted beneficiary categories  | Growing Greenwich case study factsheet / Project management team |
| Wider Community (Material)  | 6,090          | 3% of 203,000 recorded as having attended events etc are deemed by the project management team to be material, based on at least one month's involvement in the project and/or recognised benefits from training workshops. | GCDA End of Grant Report / Project management team               |
| Households (material)   | 3,365          | Based on average household size for Greenwich Borough of 2.3  |  |
| Community organisations (deemed to have benefited from Growing Greenwich) | 212            |   | GCDA End of Grant Report   |
| Sites where food has been grown   | 143            |   | GCDA End of Grant Report / Project management team               |
| Primary and secondary schools   | 22             |   | GCDA End of Grant Report / Project management team               |
| Teachers  | 44             | Based on 2 teachers actively involved per school  |  |
| Nurseries and children's centres  | 12             |   | GCDA End of Grant Report   |
| Supported accommodation for older people                                  | 8              |   | GCDA End of Grant Report   |
| Total land area used in project (m <sup>2</sup> )                         | 2919           |   | Growing Greenwich case study factsheet                           |

## APPENDIX 2: THE GROWING GREENWICH COMMUNITY SURVEY

### Growing Greenwich

Social Return on Investment (SROI)  
Local Community Questionnaire

#### INTRODUCTION

Thank you for agreeing to take part in this important survey. The aim of the survey is to help us understand the impact of the Growing Greenwich project, which has been funded through the Big Lottery's Local Food programme and managed by the Royal Society for Wildlife Trusts (RSWT). The survey should take no more than 20 minutes to complete.

The findings will be used to estimate the return to society of investing in Growing Greenwich, which should help Growing Greenwich Cooperative Development Agency and RSWT fund similar projects so that the impacts can be replicated both here and elsewhere.

Please be assured that all results will be treated in the strictest confidence. If you have any questions about the survey or the Growing Greenwich SROI project, please do not hesitate to contact the project Director, Professor Paul Courtney, of the University of Gloucestershire.

---

#### Your involvement in Growing Greenwich

1. Which of the following categories do you fall into? Please tick all that apply.

- Local resident / community member
- Volunteer for Growing Greenwich
- Local Community leader
- Local business owner/manager
- Other (Please state)

2. What has been your role in / experience of the Growing Greenwich project? And which Growing Greenwich projects / activities / events have you been involved in?

Please write a couple of sentences to explain

.....  
.....  
.....

3. Please indicate your average frequency of involvement in Growing Greenwich activities since the project started.

- At least once a week
- At least twice a month
- At least once a month
- At least once every three months
- At least once a year
- Less than once a year

---

The remainder of the survey is divided into the four main sections, these are:

- ▶ Food eating and buying habits
- ▶ Health and well-being
- ▶ Skills and employment
- ▶ Community life

Each section should take no longer than a few minutes to complete.

The majority of questions ask you to reflect upon your attitudes, behaviour and feelings and how they have changed since the Growing Greenwich project started, or since you became involved or came into contact with it.

At the end of each section you will also be asked about the extent to which you think outcomes may have happened anyway with Growing Greenwich or as a result of other projects or initiatives you may be aware of.

We appreciate that this may be easier for some questions than others, but please do try and complete every question as best you can.

### SECTION 3: FOOD EATING AND BUYING HABITS

4. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements, under both a) and b).

| a) Before your involvement in growing Greenwich | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither agree or disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|----------------|-------|---------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| I ate healthy food and was happy with my diet   |                |       |                           |          |                   |
| b) Since your involvement in growing Greenwich  | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither agree or disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| I eat healthy food and am happy with my diet    |                |       |                           |          |                   |

5. Has your weekly food bill changed since your involvement in Growing Greenwich?

- Yes
- No
- Stayed about the same

If YES,  
Please indicate how your weekly food bill has changed.

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Approximate weekly food bill before your involvement in Growing Greenwich | £ |
| Approximate weekly food bill since your involvement in Growing Greenwich  | £ |

6. How has your food buying habits changed since becoming involved with Growing Greenwich?

|                                       | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither agree or disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|-------|---------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| I now eat healthier food              |                |       |                           |          |                   |
| I now eat more local food             |                |       |                           |          |                   |
| I now eat better quality food         |                |       |                           |          |                   |
| I now buy food from supermarkets less |                |       |                           |          |                   |
| I now eat more fresh produce          |                |       |                           |          |                   |

7. Think about the way you have responded to the questions in this section on food eating and buying habits.

If overall you have seen an improvement, how much of this change is down to Growing Greenwich?

| Not at all (0%) | A little (25%) | Some (50%) | Quite a lot (75%) | A great deal (100%) |
|-----------------|----------------|------------|-------------------|---------------------|
|                 |                |            |                   |                     |



## SECTION 2: HEALTH AND WELL-BEING

8. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements, under both a) and b).

| a) Before your involvement in growing Greenwich | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither agree or disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|----------------|-------|---------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| My life involved a lot of physical activity     |                |       |                           |          |                   |
| I had a lot of energy                           |                |       |                           |          |                   |
| I felt generally healthy                        |                |       |                           |          |                   |
| I visited my GP quite regularly                 |                |       |                           |          |                   |
| b) Since your involvement in growing Greenwich  | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither agree or disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| My life involves a lot of physical activity     |                |       |                           |          |                   |
| I had a lot of energy                           |                |       |                           |          |                   |
| I felt generally healthy                        |                |       |                           |          |                   |
| I visited my GP quite regularly                 |                |       |                           |          |                   |

9. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements, under both a) and b).

| a) Before your involvement in growing Greenwich | None of the time | Rarely | Some of the time | Often | All of the time |
|---|------------------|--------|------------------|-------|-----------------|
| I had been feeling optimistic about the future  |                  |        |                  |       |                 |
| I had been feeling useful                       |                  |        |                  |       |                 |
| I had been feeling relaxed                      |                  |        |                  |       |                 |
| I had been dealing with problems well           |                  |        |                  |       |                 |
| I had been thinking clearly                     |                  |        |                  |       |                 |
| I had been feeling close to other people        |                  |        |                  |       |                 |
| I had been able to make my mind up about things |                  |        |                  |       |                 |

| <b>b) Since your involvement in growing Greenwich</b> | None of the time | Rarely | Some of the time | Often | All of the time |
|---|------------------|--------|------------------|-------|-----------------|
| I've been feeling optimistic about the future         |                  |        |                  |       |                 |
| I've been feeling useful                              |                  |        |                  |       |                 |
| I've been feeling relaxed                             |                  |        |                  |       |                 |
| I've been dealing with problems well                  |                  |        |                  |       |                 |
| I've been thinking clearly                            |                  |        |                  |       |                 |
| I've been feeling close to other people               |                  |        |                  |       |                 |
| I've been able to make my mind up about things        |                  |        |                  |       |                 |

10. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements, under both a) and b).

| <b>a) Before your involvement in growing Greenwich</b>                                   | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither agree or disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|--|----------------|-------|---------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| In general I felt very positive about myself   |                |       |                           |          |                   |
| I was always optimistic about my future  |                |       |                           |          |                   |
| When things went wrong in my life it generally took me a long time to get back to normal |                |       |                           |          |                   |
| <b>b) Since your involvement in growing Greenwich</b>                                    | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither agree or disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| In general I feel very positive about myself   |                |       |                           |          |                   |
| I am always optimistic about my future   |                |       |                           |          |                   |
| When things go wrong in my life it generally takes me a long time to get back to normal  |                |       |                           |          |                   |

11. Think about the way you have responded to the questions in this section on health and well-being.

If overall you have seen an improvement, how much of this change is down to Growing Greenwich?

| Not at all (0%) | A little (25%) | Some (50%) | Quite a lot (75%) | A great deal (100%) |
|-----------------|----------------|------------|-------------------|---------------------|
|                 |                |            |                   |                     |

## SECTION 3: SKILLS AND EMPLOYMENT

12. Do you claim any form of income or welfare support?

If no, please go to question 13.

If yes,

Has your level of reliance on income/welfare support changed in any way since your involvement in Growing Greenwich?

- Increased
- Decreased
- Stayed about the same

If increased or decreased,

To what extent have your weekly benefits have changed?  
Please approximate to the nearest £5.

Increase by approximately £ .....

Decrease by approximately £ .....

13. Has your involvement in Growing Greenwich helped you to secure employment, a new job or other position / role (including voluntary or educational)?

Please explain.

.....

.....

.....

14. What impact has Growing Greenwich had on your overall skills base and employability?

|                                    | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither agree or disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|------------------------------------|----------------|-------|---------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| I now have a wider range of skills |                |       |                           |          |                   |
| I am now more employable           |                |       |                           |          |                   |

15. Think about the way you have responded to the questions in this section on skills and employment.

If overall you have seen an improvement, how much of this change is down to Growing Greenwich?

| Not at all (0%) | A little (25%) | Some (50%) | Quite a lot (75%) | A great deal (100%) |
|-----------------|----------------|------------|-------------------|---------------------|
|                 |                |            |                   |                     |



## SECTION 4: COMMUNITY LIFE

16. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements, under both a) and b).

| <b>Before your involvement in growing Greenwich</b>                                 | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither agree or disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|----------------|-------|---------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| I felt like I had a sense of belonging with, and support from, people where I live  |                |       |                           |          |                   |
| I trusted most people in my local area  |                |       |                           |          |                   |
| <b>Since your involvement in growing Greenwich</b>                                  | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither agree or disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| I feel like I have a sense of belonging with, and support from, people where I live |                |       |                           |          |                   |
| I trust most people in my local area  |                |       |                           |          |                   |

17. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements, under both a) and b).

| <b>Before your involvement in growing Greenwich</b>                     | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither agree or disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|----------------|-------|---------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Most days I felt a sense of accomplishment in what I did                |                |       |                           |          |                   |
| I got a chance to learn new things                                      |                |       |                           |          |                   |
| I generally felt that what I did in my life was valuable and worthwhile |                |       |                           |          |                   |
| <b>Since your involvement in growing Greenwich</b>                      | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither agree or disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Most days I feel a sense of accomplishment in what I do                 |                |       |                           |          |                   |
| I get a chance to learn new things                                      |                |       |                           |          |                   |
| I generally feel that what I do in my life is valuable and worthwhile   |                |       |                           |          |                   |

18. How has your involvement in the wider community changed since becoming involved with Growing Greenwich?

|  | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither agree or disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|--|----------------|-------|---------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| I get involved in local events more                      |                |       |                           |          |                   |
| I am a member of more clubs and /or associations         |                |       |                           |          |                   |
| I volunteer in the community more                        |                |       |                           |          |                   |
| I participate in local community and charity events more |                |       |                           |          |                   |

19. Are you involved in helping run or manage a community organisation, or do you sit on any local forums or committees?

- Yes
- No

If yes,

Since Growing Greenwich started has your organisation now got better links with the following types of local organisation?

- Health Service
- Education Authority
- Local Authority
- Community and Voluntary Sector

- Social care
- Police and criminal justice
- Local resident / tenancy associations
- Horticultural groups / societies
- Other (Please state) .....

20. Think about the way you have responded to the questions in this section on community life.

If overall you have seen an improvement, how much of this change is down to Growing Greenwich?

| Not at all (0%) | A little (25%) | Some (50%) | Quite a lot (75%) | A great deal (100%) |
|-----------------|----------------|------------|-------------------|---------------------|
|                 |                |            |                   |                     |



**21. How has your overall sense of happiness and life satisfaction changed since your involvement in Growing Greenwich?**

Please indicate on the scale from 0-10 (where 0 = Low and 10 = High), under both a) and b).

| a) Before your involvement in growing Greenwich | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| Overall, how satisfied were you with your life? |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |

| b) Since your involvement in growing Greenwich          | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| Overall, how satisfied are you with your life nowadays? |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |

**22. Imagine if you hadn't become involved with Growing Greenwich. What would your life be like?  
Do you think you would feel the same as you do now? Would you spend your time doing different things?  
Or do you think you would be doing similar things?**

Please write a couple of sentences to explain.

.....

.....

.....

Are there any other comments you like to make about Growing Greenwich, or this survey?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

**Thank you once again for taking the time to complete this all important survey.  
Your input into the process is extremely valuable and is much appreciated.**

## APPENDIX 3: SECONDARY DATA TO INFORM CALCULATION OF DEADWEIGHT

| Outcome Group                   | Variable  | Source / URL  |
|---------------------------------|---|---|
|                                 | Population Change   | <a href="http://www.hscic.gov.uk/catalogue/PUB09302/HSE2011-Pop-no-est-tbls.xls">http://www.hscic.gov.uk/catalogue/PUB09302/HSE2011-Pop-no-est-tbls.xls</a>   |
|                                 | Change in Food prices (Food and non-alcoholic beverages)  | CPI Detailed annual changes: 1998 to 2012   |
| Health and well-being           | Overweight  |   |
| Health and well-being           | Very good/good health   | Health Survey for England 2011  |
| Food eating and buying          | 5 portions or more  | Health Survey for England 2011  |
| Food eating and buying          | Fresh green vegetables  | defra-stats-foodfarm-food-familyfood-datasets-uk-cons-house-121213.xls  |
| Health and well-being           | One session a week (4 to 7 sessions of at least moderate intensity for at least 30 minutes in the previous 28 days) | Source: Sport England's Active People Survey  |
| Health and well-being           | Non-admitted  |   |
| Community life                  | Most people can be trusted  | Community Life Survey   |
| Community life                  | Satisfied with local area (fairly or very)  | Community Life Survey   |
| Community life                  | All responding strongly   | Community Life Survey   |
| Community life                  | Any volunteering  | Community Life Survey   |
| Social and community enterprise | Change in Market share of independents/ non-multiples (and internet) in food sector                                 | Defra food statistics pocket book 2008 and 2013 <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/food-statistics-pocketbook-2013">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/food-statistics-pocketbook-2013</a> |
| Skills and employment           | ENGLAND % with NVQ2+ - aged 16-64   | NOMISWEB - Labour Market Stats  |
| Skills and employment           | ENGLAND % with NVQ4+ - aged 16-64   | NOMISWEB - Labour Market Stats  |
| Environment                     | Net CO2 emissions (emissions minus removals)  | Department of Energy and Climate Change   |
| Environment                     | Terrestrial protected areas - M Ha  | Measuring National Well-being - Review of domains and measures, 2013  |

| Percentage Change | Period of comparison                             | Notes   |
|-------------------|--|---|
| 2.11%             | 2009-11  | ONS mid-year/census population estimates for adults aged 16 and over living in private households |
| 12.58%            | 2009-2012  |   |
| -1.52%            | 2009-11  |   |
| 2.05%             | 2009-11  | Self-reported health - Note population changes  |
| 3.67%             | 2009-11  |   |
| -5.96%            | 2009-11  |   |
| -5.28%            | (Oct 2008 - Oct 2009) -<br>(Oct 2011 - Oct 2012) |   |
| 6.60%             | 2008-09 - 2010-11                                | Number of people using NHS mental health services   |
| 7.41%             | 2008-09 - Aug 2012/Jan 2013                      |   |
| 8.47%             | 2008-09 - Aug 2012/Jan 2013                      |   |
| 11.64%            | 2008-09 - Aug 2012/Jan 2013                      |   |
| 10.11%            | 2008-09 - Aug 2012/Jan 2013                      |   |
| +4.5%             | 2008-2013  | Relevant to local economic containment via food purchasing in supermarkets                        |
| 10.35%            | 2009-2012  |   |
| 14.17%            | 2009-2012  |   |
| -0.33%            | 2009-2013  | 2012 Figures are provisional  |
| 14.49%            | 2009-2011  | No 2012 data located  |

## APPENDIX 4: FINANCIAL PROXIES USED TO VALUE OUTCOMES

| Outcome                                     | Proxy   | Value (£) | Unit           | Source   | Year | Rationale   |
|---|---|-----------|----------------|--|------|---|
| Increased food affordability                | Average annual household spend on food and non-alcoholic drinks                         | 2,766     | p.a            | ONS Family Spending, Edition 2011. <a href="http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/family-spending/family-spending-2011-edition/index.html">http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/family-spending/family-spending-2011-edition/index.html</a>                         | 2010 | SROI survey asks for change in weekly expenditure on food as a result of the project  |
| Increased employability                     | Employment Incentive costs  | 3,800     | p.p            | SROI Wiki Vois Database - The Work programme, DWP. <a href="http://www.dwp.gov.uk/docs/the-work-programme.pdf">http://www.dwp.gov.uk/docs/the-work-programme.pdf</a>   | 2012 | Direct participation and volunteering should produce comparable outcomes to the Work Programme in terms of preparation for employment.  |
| Improved competence, engagement and purpose | Cost of personal development course on 'Delivering Beyond Yourself'                     | 660       | p.p            | REED Learning <a href="http://www.reedlearning.com/training-courses/personal-development/delivering-beyond-yourself">http://www.reedlearning.com/training-courses/personal-development/delivering-beyond-yourself</a>                                | 2013 | The personal development course is likely to achieve a similar set of outcomes for the individual in terms of competence, engagement and general self-improvement                     |
| Improved mental health                      | Mental health service costs per individual (anxiety and depression)                     | 941.88    | per person p.a | SROI Wiki Vois Database - The Troubled Families Cost Database <a href="http://neweconomymanchester.com/stories/1336-evaluation_and_costbenefit_analysis">http://neweconomymanchester.com/stories/1336-evaluation_and_costbenefit_analysis</a>        | 2010 | Represents a cost saving to the NHS through improved mental health as a result of the project.  |
| Improved physical health                    | Economic benefits associated with preventing premature death due to physical inactivity | 34,818    | p.p            | SROI Wiki Vois Database - Scottish Executive 'Let's make Scotland more active: A Strategy for Physical Activity' <a href="http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/47032/0017726.pdf">http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/47032/0017726.pdf</a> . | 2003 | A key outcome is the promotion of physical activity through food growing, so considered a relevant proxy for physical health benefits arising from the project.                       |
| Improved physical health (Children)         | Cost of 3 lesson course on healthy eating   | 225       | p.p            | SROI Wiki Vois Database - SROI Report, Gardening in Mind, Coventry and Warwickshire Mind, 2013 - unpublished.  | 2013 | Benefits to physical health in children come largely through potential improvements, which could arise through attending a course to increase awareness of healthy eating             |
| Increased resilience and self esteem        | Cost of CBT to build psychological resilience and self esteem                           | 1,240     | p.p            | Personal Social Services Research Unit (PSSRU)   | 2010 | Used in an SROI report on Growing Social Capital by Kirklees Council and nef (Wright and Schifferes, 2012). Considered an appropriate proxy as CBT could achieve equivalent outcomes. |
| Increased sense of trust and belonging      | Annual value attributed to talking to neighbours more frequently                        | 15,666    | p.p            | BHPS Data 1997-2003, from Powdthavee (2008) Putting a Price tag on friends, relatives and neighbours, Journal of Socio-Economics 37(4), 1459-1580  | 2008 | Used in an SROI report on Growing Social Capital by Kirklees Council and nef (Wright and Schifferes, 2012). Considered an appropriate proxy as CBT could achieve equivalent outcomes. |

| Outcome   | Proxy  | Value (£) | Unit                                | Source  | Year    | Rationale   |
|---|--|-----------|-------------------------------------|---|---------|---|
| Increased sense of trust and belonging (Children)               | Valuation for improved emotional well-being arising through the Common Assessment Framework                    | 1,493     | p.p                                 | Troubled Families Cost Database (New Economy)   | 2010    | More suitable proxy sought from a credible source for trust and belonging in children   |
| Increased community membership and participation                | Value that frequent volunteers place on volunteering   | 13,500    | p.p                                 | SROI Network VOIS Database - Fujiwara and Campbell (2011)   | 2011    | A proxy for the value to society for an increase in the level of volunteering as a result of the project  |
| Increased vibrancy and efficiency of VCS                        | dFT estimation of business time savings  | 6,394     | Cost per year saved by organisation | SROI Network VOIS Database - Department for Transport   | 2002    | A proxy for efficiency savings arising through more substantive links between organisations.  |
| Closer integration of schools with local community              | Cost of equality/disability awareness training   | 798       | Per school                          | SROI Network VOIS Database - Sense-Ability <a href="http://sense-ability.co.uk/disability.htm">http://sense-ability.co.uk/disability.htm</a>  | 2010    | Raising awareness of equality issues is used as a proxy for increasing empathy with others through widening links with parents and others in the community. Increasing understanding which has an indirect benefit to the school and its staff.   |
| Increased job satisfaction for teachers                         | Cost of Professional Development course for teachers and TAs   | 299       | Per teacher                         | Creative Education Primary School Training courses 2012/13  | 2012/13 | The indirect outcome of improved job satisfaction would otherwise require further specialist training   |
| Reduced income leakage through increased local food expenditure | Average annual income generated for the local economy from household food spend, assuming a multiplier of 1.47 | 4,066     | Per household p.a                   | ONS Family Spending, Edition 2011 and Courtney, P, Hill, G and Roberts, D. (2006) The role of natural heritage in rural development: An analysis of economic linages in Scotland  | 2009/13 | Multiplier that takes account of household expenditure patterns of 1.47 is applied to the average annual household spend on food of £2766 in order to estimate the total amount of income generated for the local economy through direct, indirect and induced effects. Courtney et al study has a rural focus and the lowest of the range from South West Scotland where geography and settlement patterns are similar to North West England is used here. |
| Generation of local income through contracting                  | Average annual income generated for the local economy from contracting spend, assuming a multiplier of 1.37    | 18,693    | Per project p.a                     | Growing Well Annual Reports 2011-2013 and Lobley, M., Butler, A., Courtney, P., Ilbery, B., Kirwan, J., Maye, D., Potter, C. and Winter, M. (2009) Analysis of socio-economic aspects of local and national organic farming markets. Final report to Defra, with the Centre for Rural Research, University of Exeter. | 2009/13 | Farm based multiplier of 1.37 is applied to the average annual spend on contracting of £13,645 in order to estimate the total amount of income generated for the local economy through direct, indirect and induced effects. Lobley et al study on organic farming provides a realistic approximation to the activities of Growing Well.  |

## References

<sup>1</sup> Displacement is a third measure, although it was evident from the Theory of Change work that the extent to which the project had displaced other activities or benefits in the local area was negligible. It is therefore unlikely that displacement was relevant in this case, but to adhere to the principle of not over claiming, and in the interests of producing a conservative estimate, displacement of impacts

<sup>2</sup> Rolph's (2010) Essex PDC Project evaluation was consulted which showed that drop-off estimates of between 25% and 50% for benefit periods of over a year had been derived from survey data. Given that the majority of outcomes in this study had benefit periods of one year only, the lower end of this range was deemed suitable as an estimate.

<sup>3</sup> An alternative calculation is the net SROI ratio, which divides the Net Present Value (NPV) by the value of the inputs. The NPV is the PV minus the total value of inputs. In this case it was deemed acceptable to only report the SROI ratio rather than the net SROI ratio

<sup>4</sup> For example, Coellen's (2011) forecast SROI evaluation of Food Connect Sydney produced a ratio of 7.96. [www.thesroinetwork.org/...food-connect-sydney-forecast-sroi-report](http://www.thesroinetwork.org/...food-connect-sydney-forecast-sroi-report)

<sup>5</sup> Kirwan, J., Ilbery, B., Maye, D. and Carey, J. (2012) More than just veg: growing community capacity through Local Food projects, as part of the evaluation of 'Local Food' for the Royal Society of Wildlife Trusts. Available from the Local Food website: <http://www.localfoodgrants.org/>

## Author

Professor Paul Courtney, Countryside and Community Research Institute (CCRI), University of Gloucestershire