

Use of evidence maturity matrix

Introduction

This maturity matrix is a self-assessment tool. Use it to assess the use of evidence in local economic development policymaking in your team or organisation. It helps identify areas for improvement and plan next steps.

Structure

This maturity matrix is separated into nine dimensions — **culture; strategic policies; leadership; skills and knowledge; training; developing and delivering policies, programmes and projects; collecting evidence; accessing evidence; and monitoring and evaluation.**

Within each dimension, there are multiple criteria, one per row. Each criterion has descriptions at four levels of maturity — **basic, early progress, substantial progress, and mature.**

Example of criteria and levels of maturity:

Criteria	Basic level	Early progress	Substantial progress	Mature
1.1 Value of evidence	Evidence is not highly valued; it tends to be used retrospectively OR prompted by a funding application.	Evidence is valued by some teams, BUT other factors often take priority in policy design across the organisation.	Evidence is a priority for economic development, BUT this is not shared by others across the organisation.	The use of evidence is a core value across the organisation and it is prioritised in policy design.

These maturity levels are not part of an accreditation or league table. They are designed to highlight the steps needed for a team or organisation to consistently and effectively make evidence-informed decisions.

At the end of this document, there are definitions for terms used in the maturity matrix.

How to use this maturity matrix

Assess the current position

Assess each criterion separately, finding the best fit in each row where you meet all elements of that criterion. If you feel the best fit is between two maturity levels, select the lower level.

The criteria are interrelated. The level of maturity for each dimension is based on the lowest level within that dimension. For example, three 'substantial progress' and one 'early progress' would mean that the overall level for that dimension is 'early progress'.

At the end of this process, you will have a maturity level for each criterion, and for each of the nine dimensions.

Gather a range of views

We recommend either working through each dimension as a team or having several people complete it individually for discussion as a team. Different people will have different experiences with using evidence, so it is important to gather a range of views. **The main aim is to identify next steps to improve, so disagreements between team members on the level of maturity of a criterion can highlight where more support is needed.**

For example, if the delivery team feels that monitoring data is collated and stored at a 'mature' level, but the evaluation manager reports 'early progress', that is useful to inform next steps.

Don't average answers (e. an 'early progress' and a 'mature' on the same criteria, does not mean 'substantial progress'). Instead, discuss the reasons behind people's assessment, and try to reach an agreement on the most suitable level for that criterion. If many people have completed an assessment, collate the responses and use your judgement to choose a best fit.

Record your assessment

Fill in the blank column on the righthand side of the maturity matrix below or complete the [Excel version](#). You can also use the next steps summary below to summarise your answers and make notes.

Identify areas for improvement

Once you have assessed all criteria in a dimension, identify the criteria that need development to move to the next level of maturity. "What does our team or organisation need to do to progress to the next level of maturity?"

If you prefer, assess all the dimensions first, and then identify those that need development.

Other parts of your organisation may have completed a data maturity assessment, such as [this one from the LGA](#), end-to-end process mapping, reviews of project management processes, or other change or transformation processes. This can feed into the next stage when agreeing next steps.

Agree next steps

For most teams and organisations, there will be room for improvement in almost every criterion, so it's important to prioritise.

Do some dimensions need to be progressed before others? (e.g. You may need to secure leadership buy-in before getting approval for staff training. Or you may need staff to be trained before introducing processes.) Would progress on some criteria be a 'quick win'?

Changing habits and processes in a team or organisation is hard and takes time. Select one or two areas to focus on. Ask 'what can I or my team do now?' to help identify next steps.

An action plan with specific tasks, timelines and who is responsible can help ensure progress. A short next steps summary is available below or as a **separate document**.

Maturity matrix

Use of evidence in economic development maturity matrix

This maturity matrix, a self-assessment tool, covers the use of evidence in economic development. "Use" covers many elements – selecting high quality evidence, ensuring the evidence is a good fit for the questions being asked, and considering evidence at the right time whether developing strategies or individual projects, are all essential to using evidence.

The matrix can be found on the following page.

Please, remember to save the PDF after filling the form.

A. Organisation-wide approach to evidence

This section assesses the use of good quality and relevant evidence at the institutional level. It helps you think about how evidence is used and the culture around using evidence in your organisation.

Depending on the size of the organisation, you may want to assess only your team or Directorate or it may make more sense to assess the whole organisation.

Dimension	Criteria	Basic level	Early progress	Substantial progress	Mature	Assessment
1. Culture Attitudes towards evidence and its uses	1.1 Value of evidence	Evidence is not highly valued; it tends to be used retrospectively OR prompted by a funding application.	Evidence is valued by some teams, BUT other factors often take priority in policy design across the organisation.	Evidence is a priority for economic development, BUT this is not shared by others across the organisation.	The use of evidence is a core value across the organisation and it is prioritised in policy design.	
	1.2 Understanding the role of evidence	The need to use evidence is generally understood.	Officers understand the need to use a range of evidence in identifying issues.	Officers understand the need to use a range of evidence in identifying issues AND considering interventions' effectiveness.	Officers understand the need to use a range of evidence in identifying issues and considering interventions' effectiveness AND they understand their role in generating evidence.	
	1.3 Processes that support a culture of using quality evidence	Evidence is used ad-hoc if required by funders.	Some processes to support collating good quality and relevant evidence are in place BUT there are no processes around the routine use of evidence.	Some processes are in place to support collating, understanding, and using of good quality and relevant evidence BUT these need further development and implementation.	Robust processes and clearly agreed and written evidence standards are in place to support collating, understanding, and using good quality and relevant evidence.	

B. Strategy

This section assesses the use of good quality and relevant evidence at strategic level. It refers to how evidence is embedded in documents and processes. Depending on the size of the organisation and your purpose, you may want to assess only your team or Directorate, or it may make more sense to assess the whole organisation.

Dimension	Criteria	Basic level	Early progress	Substantial progress	Mature	Assessment
2. Strategic policies How evidence is embedded and used in strategies	2.1 Evidence strategy and data framework	The need for a strategy on use of evidence and a data framework has been identified.	A strategy around use of evidence and a data framework are under development BUT there is not one in place yet.	A strategy around use of evidence and a data framework are in place.	A strategy around use of evidence and a data framework are embedded within other policies and a project management framework. These set out expectations and responsibilities for evidence use	
	2.2 Use of an evidence strategy	There is no evidence strategy in place.	A draft or basic evidence strategy is occasionally used to support decisions, strategy development and funding bids.	The evidence strategy is often used to support decisions, strategy development and funding bids.	The evidence strategy is well understood and consistently used to support decisions, strategy development and funding bids.	
	2.3 Processes to underpin use of evidence	Evidence use is ad-hoc only as required by funders, without set processes in place.	Processes to embed use of evidence in policy development and decision making are being developed BUT are not currently in place.	Use of evidence is being embedded through policies, processes and practices following a plan (e.g. templates, project initiation documents, strategic fit checklists, and guidance).	Use of evidence is established and underpinned by organisation-wide policies, processes and practices (e.g. standardised templates, project initiation documents, strategic fit checklists, and guidance).	
	2.4 Quality assurance	Officers occasionally check the quality of the evidence they use.	The quality of evidence is reviewed by officers BUT there is no system or processes for reviewing quality or use of the wider evidence base.	A member of staff is responsible for reviewing the quality and relevance of existing evidence BUT there is no systematic review of how evidence is used.	Use of evidence and evidence quality is audited regularly at both strategic and operational level. This is underpinned by documented processes (e.g. scrutiny meetings, project gateway assessments) AND a senior leader has responsibility for evidence quality assurance.	

C. Leadership

This section assesses the use of good quality and relevant evidence by team or organisation leaders.

Depending on your role and the purpose of this assessment, you may want to assess leaders in your team or Directorate (e.g. Economic Development Manager, Head of Service, Director) or senior leaders (e.g. Executive Directors, CEO).

Dimension	Criteria	Basic level	Early progress	Substantial progress	Mature	Assessment
3. Leadership How evidence is used by senior leaders	3.1 Leaders' value of evidence	Leaders value the use of evidence in few cases.	Leaders sometimes value the use of evidence in decision making and strategy prioritisation.	Leaders value the use of evidence in decision making and strategy prioritisation in most cases. They set an expectation for the use of evidence.	Leaders value and are committed to consistently using good quality relevant evidence in decision making and strategy development AND a senior leader has responsibility for evidence use.	
	3.2 Leaders' understanding of evidence	Few leaders have a basic understanding of evidence presented.	Some leaders have a good understanding of evidence presented, but not its limitations.	Most leaders have a good understanding of evidence presented, its limitations, and what insights to take from it.	All leaders understand the availability, scope, and limitations of evidence presented, and the insights to take from it.	
	3.3 Leaders' confidence in using and challenging evidence	Leaders are confident assessing the relevance of some evidence presented.	Leaders are confident assessing the quality and relevance of some evidence presented.	Leaders are confident assessing the quality and relevance of most evidence presented (e.g. research, data, stakeholders views, practitioner experience) AND they provide challenge if the evidence is not good quality or relevant.	Leaders are confident assessing the quality and relevance of the evidence presented (e.g. research, data, stakeholders views, practitioner experience) AND they are clear on the questions they want answered, provide challenge, and request more evidence as appropriate.	
	3.4 Leaders' use of evidence in decision making	Leaders use good quality and relevant evidence in a limited way when making decisions.	Leaders use good quality and relevant evidence BUT other factors generally take priority when making decisions.	Leaders use good quality and relevant evidence (alongside other factors) when making most decisions AND if the evidence provided is insufficient, they provide feedback for officers to gather better evidence.	Leaders use good quality and relevant evidence when making decisions. They set clear expectations for evidence required for decision making in line with the evidence strategy.	

D. Skills and confidence to use evidence in local economic development

This section assesses the knowledge, skills and confidence of officers to use evidence in local economic development. It refers to the understanding of the evidence available, the assessment of quality and relevance of evidence, and the availability of training and support to use evidence.

‘Officers’ refers to whoever needs to use evidence for a particular task- not all officers need data visualisation skills, but officers who need to visualise and present data should have access to those skills—whether they have the skills themselves or they can access support from colleagues or commissioned.

Dimension	Criteria	Basic level	Early progress	Substantial progress	Mature	Assessment
4. Skills and knowledge Officers’ ability to use evidence	4.1 Officers’ understanding of evidence availability and limitations	Some officers understand what evidence is available and where to find it.	Most officers understand what evidence is available and where to find it.	Most officers understand what evidence is (and isn’t) available, where to find it AND its uses and limitations.	All officers understand what evidence is (and isn’t) available and where to find it AND its uses, and limitations.	
	4.2 Officers’ ability to identify research questions	Officers search for evidence if required by funders.	Some officers can define the questions they want the evidence to answer.	Most officers can define the questions they want the evidence to answer (e.g., context, rationale, effectiveness of interventions).	All officers define and refine the questions they want the evidence to answer (e.g., context, rationale, effectiveness of interventions).	
	4.3 Officers’ ability to find and collate evidence	Some officers know where to find nationally available datasets.	Most officers know where to find datasets available nationally and locally.	Most officers know where to find a range of evidence to inform project design (e.g. datasets, research, stakeholder views, practitioner experience).	All officers know where to find a range of evidence to inform project design (e.g., datasets, research, stakeholders’ views, practitioner experience).	
	4.4 Officers’ ability to assess evidence quality and relevance	Some officers can assess quality or relevance of evidence.	Most officers can assess quality and relevance of evidence or can ask for support.	All officers can assess quality and relevance of evidence or can ask for support.	All officers can assess quality and relevance of evidence AND , where specialist skills are needed, colleagues provide support.	

	4.5 Officers' ability to identify insights from evidence	Some officers can interpret insights and analysis from evidence BUT struggle to explain caveats.	Some officers can interpret insights and analysis from evidence AND explain caveats.	Most officers can interpret insights and analysis from evidence BUT only some can explain caveats.	Officers can interpret and present insights and analysis from evidence AND clearly explain caveats.
	4.6 Specialist skills around evidence use available to the organisation (e.g., evaluation methods, data visualisation, statistics, R, GIS, etc.)	Officers access to specialist skills is limited and not always available in-house or externally.	Officers have access to some specialist skills needed for using evidence in-house, BUT they have difficulties outsourcing skills not available.	Officers have access to specialist skills needed to use evidence (e.g., within their team, a central team, commissioned).	Officers have access to specialist skills needed to use evidence (e.g., within their team, a central team, commissioned) AND these skills are reviewed regularly in line with the evidence strategy.
5. Training Officers access to improving skills and knowledge around data and evidence use	5.1 Availability of evidence training to officers	The need for training on the use of evidence has been identified.	Training on the use of evidence is sometimes available for officers.	Training on the use of evidence is regularly available for officers AND leaders.	Use of evidence is a core element of officer development in the organisation. Training on the use of evidence is embedded in officer induction AND further development (e.g. periodic refresher training or training on policy updates).
	5.2 Availability of specialist training to officers (e.g., evaluation methods, data visualisation, statistics, R, GIS, etc.)	The need for specialist training on the use of data and databases has been identified.	Some basic training on use of data evidence, databases and data analysis is available to some officers.	Some specific training on use of evidence, methodologies, databases, data analysis and tools is available to some officers.	Specific training in the use of evidence and a range of different methodologies, datasets, data analysis and tools is provided to all officers who require it.

E. Use of evidence in local economic policy development and implementation

This section assesses the use of evidence in policy development. It refers to how evidence is embedded in developing and delivering policies, programmes, and projects in local economic development, including business cases, logic models, bid applications and commissioning suppliers.

Officers refers to whoever needs to use evidence for a particular task. e.g., officers writing a bid for economic development, regardless of what team they are in or if they are commissioned suppliers, need to consistently use evidence when developing the business case and choosing interventions.

Dimension	Criteria	Basic level	Early progress	Substantial progress	Mature	Assessment
6. Developing and delivering policies, programmes and projects How evidence is used to inform decisions, planning and delivery	6.1 Evidence base	Evidence base exists for individual funding applications BUT not overall.	An evidence base exists for individual funding and for individual strategies.	An overarching evidence base exists for policy development, BUT is not regularly updated.	A good quality and relevant overarching evidence base exists for policy development AND maintenance and regular use is supported by an agreed approach and processes.	
	6.2 Use of evidence	Officers use evidence to develop policy if required by funders.	Officers use evidence at some stages to develop policy beyond the requirements of funders.	Officers consistently use good quality and relevant evidence to develop policy, usually from inception.	Officers consistently use a range of good quality and relevant evidence from inception of developing policy.	
	6.3 Use of processes to embed evidence	The need for processes and tools to prompt the routine use of evidence has been identified.	Officers sometimes use processes and tools to prompt the routine use of evidence in policy development.	Officers usually use standard processes, templates and checklists that prompt the routine use of evidence in policy development.	Officers consistently use standard processes, templates and checklists that prompt the routine use of evidence in policy development.	
	6.4 Use of logic models in policy development	Officers use logic models if required by funders.	Officers usually use logic models that include an evidence-informed need but not to inform other steps.	Officers usually use logic models in which each step is informed by evidence.	Officers consistently use logic models in which each step is informed by evidence.	
	6.5 Feedback loop of previous monitoring and evaluation (M&E)	M&E results of prior and current work are collected BUT they are rarely used to inform decisions.	Officers occasionally use M&E results of prior or current work to inform policy development.	Officers usually use M&E results of prior or current work when deciding to continue, adjust, scale up, or develop policies.	Officers consistently use M&E results of prior or current work when deciding to continue, adjust, scale up, or develop policies. This is built into policy design processes.	

F. Producing, storing and accessing evidence in local economic development

This section assesses how evidence in local economic development is produced and stored. (e.g., baseline data from projects, monitoring reports, stakeholder feedback, evaluation results, consultation responses, commissioned research, national datasets used in strategic cases.)

Officers refers to whoever uses evidence for a particular task. For example, delivery officers may be responsible for monitoring data (whether in-house or commissioned), while a central bid writing team may collate research used in strategic cases of bids.

Dimension	Criteria	Basic level	Early progress	Substantial progress	Mature	Assessment
7. Collecting evidence	7.1 Storage and management of evidence	Officers collect and store evidence to inform individual projects if required.	Officers collect, collate and store evidence across their team or programme. This supports wider policy development.	Officers systematically collect, collate and store in-house and commissioned evidence to make evidence easier to access.	Officers systematically collect, collate and store in-house and commissioned evidence AND an officer is responsible for regularly reviewing and updating the evidence.	How evidence is collected, systematised and stored
	7.2 Collection of M&E evidence from project delivery	For project delivery, officers collect interim and final monitoring data if required by funders.	For project delivery, officers collect monitoring data as required by funders AND usually collect baseline information on outcomes.	In line with the project monitoring and evaluation plan, officers collect good quality and relevant qualitative and quantitative evidence.	In line with an overarching M&E strategy and project M&E plan, officers collect good quality and relevant evidence qualitative and quantitative to feed into evaluation.	
8. Accessing evidence	8.1 Sharing of evidence	Officers responsible for collating evidence share findings when asked BUT there is no requirement or standard process OR this process is under-resourced.	Officers responsible for collating evidence usually make findings accessible to colleagues BUT there is no requirement or standard process OR this process is under-resourced.	Officers responsible for collating evidence usually make finding accessible to colleagues AND there is a process for this.	Officers responsible for collating evidence consistently make findings accessible to colleagues to inform future work, archiving and updating information. This includes a systematic approach for how evidence is stored and accessed.	Whether evidence is available to officers and easy to access

	8.2 Data analysis capacity and capability	Data analysis is sometimes available to provide additional evidence and insights to officers when requested.	Data analysis is usually available to provide additional evidence and insights to officers when requested.	Data analysts are in post and usually available to provide access to additional evidence and insights to officers proactively and when requested. (e.g. bulletins, dashboards, request process).	Data analysts are consistently available to provide additional evidence and insights to officers, proactively and when requested. (e.g. bulletins, dashboards, request process).
	8.3 Access to datasets	Officers can access some data via a member of the data or research team BUT the data is provided depending on availability.	Officers can access some datasets via a 'self-service' method, and requests for additional data is sometimes met.	Officers can access many datasets, analysis, and insights via a 'self-service' method. Additional specialist data is sometimes available by request to a data or research team.	Officers can access a wide range of datasets, analysis and insights via a 'self-service' method. The information is systematised and prioritised according to the evidence strategy AND additional specialist data is usually available by request to a data or research team.
9. Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) How monitoring and evaluation is embedded in the policy making process.	9.1 M&E culture	Most officers recognise the need for M&E reporting but many do not.	Officers recognise the need for M&E BUT there is no culture to feed learning into policymaking.	M&E is part of the project management process. There is a culture to share lessons learnt from individual projects.	M&E is embedded within the project management and policymaking processes. Feeding learning back is firmly routine.
	9.2 M&E strategy development and implementation	The need for an M&E strategy has been identified.	There is a brief M&E strategy BUT it is not well communicated or promoted.	An M&E strategy sets out an approach for individual projects, policymaking, and project management framework. This is implemented by most officers.	An M&E strategy sets out how M&E fits within individual projects, the wider policy making process and project management framework AND this is embedded in ways of working.

<p>9.3</p> <p>Individual project M&E plans</p>	<p>M&E plans are created for some individual projects BUT often not until delivery is underway.</p>	<p>M&E plans are in place for some individual projects before delivery starts.</p>	<p>Proportionate M&E plans are part of the development of most individual projects. Individual M&E plans reflect the wider M&E strategy.</p>	<p>Proportionate M&E plans are embedded in the development of all projects and reflect the wider M&E strategy AND individual M&E plans support strategic outcomes.</p>
<p>9.4</p> <p>Approach to evaluation</p>	<p>Projects have monitoring data collected for funder requirements BUT are rarely evaluated.</p>	<p>Projects sometimes have proportionate evaluation BUT there is no set process.</p>	<p>Projects are usually considered for whether evaluation is appropriate, including a range of factors.</p>	<p>All projects go through a process to consider proportionate evaluation AND this is supported by processes and templates as part of an M&E strategy.</p>
<p>9.5</p> <p>Budgetary provision for M&E in project</p>	<p>M&E costs are rarely included in project budgets.</p>	<p>M&E costs are sometimes included early on in developing budgets for bids or project inception.</p>	<p>M&E budgets are usually included early on in developing budgets for bid submission or project inception, and ringfenced.</p>	<p>M&E are consistently included in budgets for bid submission, ringfenced AND there is core funding consistently allocated to collate and analyse evidence beyond project specific funds.</p>
<p>9.6</p> <p>Evaluation stairway and suitable evaluation design</p>	<p>Evaluation is sometimes considered in project planning.</p>	<p>Process evaluation is included in most projects, but impact evaluation and value for money (VfM) evaluation are rarely considered.</p>	<p>Process, VfM and impact evaluation are all considered in project planning. However, appropriate impact evaluation is rarely pursued.</p>	<p>Process, VfM, and impact evaluation are consistently discussed early in project development. AND there is a strategic focus to understanding effectiveness. Impact evaluation is pursued when appropriate.</p>

Next steps worksheet

For each dimension and criterion, identify which are the statements that describe your team or organisation. The maturity level for each dimension corresponds to the lower maturity level achieved in the criteria on that dimension.

For example, if in Culture 1.1 is 'mature', 1.2 is 'mature', and 1.3 is 'early progress', the maturity level for Culture as a whole is 'early progress'.

Next, identify the criteria that need development in order to move to the next level of maturity in each dimension - What is missing? What part of the next level statement is not fulfilled?

Using the example above, to move from 'early progress' to 'substantial progress' in Culture, criteria 1.3 shows that the team needs to put into place processes around the routine use of evidence (i.e. processes to support understanding and using good quality and relevant evidence).

Making progress may require a series of actions that should be clearly laid out in a more detailed action plan.

Continuing the example, implementing processes requires understanding existing processes in place, securing agreement on changes, communicating the new way of working, etc.

Dimension	Criteria	Assessment		
		Criteria's level of maturity	Dimension's level of maturity	What is needed to achieve the next maturity level?
1. Culture	1.1			
	1.2			
	1.3			
2. Strategic policies	2.1			
	2.2			
	2.3			
	2.4			

3. Leadership	3.1	
	3.2	
	3.3	
	3.4	
4. Skills and knowledge	4.1	
	4.2	
	4.3	
	4.4	
	4.5	
	4.6	
5. Training	5.1	
	5.2	
6. Developing and delivering	6.1	
	6.2	
	6.3	
	6.4	
	6.5	

7. Collecting evidence	7.1	
	7.2	
8. Accessing evidence	8.1	
	8.2	
	8.3	
9. Monitoring and evaluation	9.1	
	9.2	
	9.3	
	9.4	
	9.5	
	9.6	

Please, remember to save the PDF after filling the form

Definitions

This section defines terms used within the matrix. Please keep in mind these definitions when assessing each criterion.

- **Data framework:** A set of guidelines, policies, and procedures on how data is managed and used.
- **Economic development:** This can include any policy area or project that aims to improve the economy (e.g., skills, regeneration, business support, planning, tourism, transport).
- **Embedded:** Inserted or ingrained in the document or process.
- **Evaluation:**
 - **Impact evaluation:** Examines whether a policy had an impact on specific outcomes (i.e. 'causal impact' or '**causality**') by using a similar comparison group (i.e. counterfactual). A similar comparison group isolates the effects of the intervention – the only difference between treatment group and comparison group is the intervention itself. Any difference in outcome can be directly attributed to the intervention.
 - **Process evaluation:** Examines the way an intervention has been implemented and helps to understand the challenges. Methods vary but usually involve interviews, surveys, and collection of monitoring data on key immediate outcomes. If it includes good monitoring data, process evaluation can also give a rough idea of how well the implementation and initial effects of an intervention are going in real time.
 - **Value for money (VfM) evaluation:** Compares the costs and benefits achieved through the programme to establish cost effectiveness, usually compared against the original expectations outlined before the programme commenced.
- **Evidence:** All the available (primary and secondary) information about a problem, policy area or intervention. It includes data (e.g., local datasets, demographic information, outputs from project monitoring), research and evaluation on 'what works' (e.g., findings from impact evaluations, evidence reviews), stakeholder preferences and values (e.g., sentiment surveys, participant feedback, focus groups), and practitioner experience (e.g., lessons learnt, process evaluation reports).
 - **Good quality evidence:** Reliable, credible and objective information presented clearly, accurately and precisely. Good quality evidence states how it was collected, the assumptions made, and its limitations. It is usually provided by a recognised authority or a well-known and reliable source. NB: Not all good quality evidence is relevant for a particular purpose.
 - **Relevant evidence:** Information that is valid for the context, group of people and topic, and answers the questions asked by the policymaker. NB: Relevant evidence is not always of good quality.
- **Evidence base:** A collection of information (i.e. evidence) used to understand a specific policy area or problem.
- **Frequency:**
 - **Systematically:** Frequently and according to a fixed plan or system.
 - **Consistently:** In every case, with no or few exceptions.
 - **Usually:** Under normal conditions.
 - **Occasionally:** Sometimes but not often.

- **People:**
 - **Officers:** A blanket term for whoever needs to use evidence for a particular task (e.g., member of senior leadership, communications officer, project manager).
 - **Data analysts:** Officers in charge of data analysis (e.g. insights officers, analysts).
 - **Policymakers:** Policy officers and leaders (i.e. more senior staff) involved in the development of policies, projects and bids.
 - **Leaders:** Leaders in a team or Directorate (e.g. Economic Development Manager, Head of Service, Director), or senior leaders (e.g. Executive Directors).
 - **In-house:** People within the organisation.
 - **Externally:** People from a third party (e.g., from a commissioned consultant or think tank, university, delivery supplier, partner, or another organisation).

- **Strategy:**
 - **Evidence strategy:** A strategy that sets out the aims, approaches and guidance on how evidence is used effectively and prioritised within the organisation.
 - **Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) strategy:** A strategy for improving the generation of good quality monitoring and evaluation evidence. It sets out how monitoring and evaluation is used to support policy delivery and inform decisions, and the main principles and commitments that guide monitoring and evaluation work.

This work is published by the What Works Centre for Local Economic Growth, which is funded by a grant from the Economic and Social Research Council, the Department for Business and Trade, the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, and the Department for Transport. The support of the Funders is acknowledged. The views expressed are those of What Works Growth and do not represent the views of the Funders.

Every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the report, but no legal responsibility is accepted for any errors omissions or misleading statements.

The report includes reference to research and publications of third parties; What Works Growth is not responsible for, and cannot guarantee the accuracy of, those third party materials or any related material.

July 2024

What Works Centre for Local
Economic Growth

info@whatworksgrowth.org
@whatworksgrowth

www.whatworksgrowth.org

© What Works Centre for Local
Economic Growth 2024



HM Government



Economic
and Social
Research Council