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1. The puzzle: whose drumbeat?

I. A supply-driven field: making a market?
   • Quality, Performance, Outcomes, Impact, Value
   • Frameworks: PQASSO; Outcomes star; SROI; social accounts
   • Champions: CES, NPC, SROI UK, NEF, SAN and ‘Inspiring Impact’

II. Contested dimensions – what’s the problem?
   • Efficiency and value for money
   • Outcomes and social change
   • Compliance and learning

III. Evidence of organisations struggling with impact…
   • Proportionality
   • Capability and support: why/how to measure; communication
   • Intangibles, measurables, complexity and contribution
2. Insights from ‘Changing Landscapes’

• Origins of impact pressure: sense of increasing competition and funders demand for accountability
  o the ‘race for impact’ amongst funders/organisations
  o sense of external pressure rather than internal organisational need

• Organisations describe a need for a narrative of impact to remain competitive:
  o ‘how do we clarify and package the work that we do in a way that the outside world understands us more?’

• Yet a concern that price trumps quality in service contracts

• Wider added value of the sector, or depth of work, not appreciated by commissioners - some use of own frameworks to articulate/capture ‘added value’; awareness but scepticism of SROI
2. Insights from ‘Changing Landscapes’


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicates role and impact successfully to relevant audiences</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries appropriately involved in activities and development</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit to users is considered and assessed</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes a positive contribution to the Third Sector</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks to maximise impact on social well-being</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average sub-score</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chapman et al 2010: 39

- 2009-12: ‘Thriving and rising’ (31) versus ‘Surviving and declining’ (15)
- 10 critical success factors for organisations, but none of these are ‘impact’ factors
- Collision course between the pragmatic positioning of TSOs and funders: a ‘pipe dream’ to think that TSOs can work to a common impact methodology
### 3. Case studies (‘Real Times’)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Hawthorn’</th>
<th>‘Birch’</th>
<th>‘Fig’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small local organisation</td>
<td>Large local organisation</td>
<td>Large national organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family support</td>
<td>Advice service</td>
<td>Family support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A professionalisation and formalisation project</td>
<td>Advanced activity monitoring</td>
<td>Anticipatory anxiety in 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From identifying unique beneficiaries</td>
<td>Internal tensions on performance</td>
<td>Investing in business development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...to measuring distance travelled</td>
<td>Struggles to capture outcomes</td>
<td>The ‘old guard’ and the new...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal dynamics</td>
<td>Quality assessment – internal and external</td>
<td>Formal evaluation and performance management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External contracting environment</td>
<td>Pressures of a contracting environment</td>
<td>Increasing competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizon threats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Case studies (‘Real Times’)

‘Hawthorn’:
“where I want to be by the end of the year...a completely different organisation, a fresh new start and that kind of professionalism will be seen by our stakeholders...by the end of the following year we really would be in a good position to have the data, have a proven track record of delivering quality services, to go and get more funding”

‘Birch’:
“We can put on a fur coat easily. We can put on a show for anybody, it’s whether we’ve got any knickers on that matters...they’re just checking processes and systems, not really whether it makes a difference to people’s lives”

‘Fig’:
“I think we could position ourselves as being real experts. If you put money on us, we can show you better returns...what we are about is making a difference in society, but also for us to be able to do that, we have to have a viable business and be able to compete successfully for that and therefore we need to think about it in that sort of competitive way”
4. Helping you choose....

Customer Reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Star Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 stars</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 stars</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 stars</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 stars</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 star</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Customer Review: 4.83 stars (57 customer reviews)

Most Helpful Customer Reviews

11 of 23 people found the following review helpful:

***** This is a "Pro" in every sense., March 12, 2008

By J. Shea© (Boston) - See all my reviews

In March 2008, I decided it was time to upgrade from a G4-based lap
top to purchase a Mac, as I was tired of Windows issues. After a bit of
time, I decided to upgrade to the MacBook Pro. I was not disappointed.

Construction quality

The aluminum case of the MacBook Pro reminds me of a product made
in Japan rather than the United States. The MacBook's case, however, is made in

Ports

Compared with the MacBook, the MacBook Pro provides an additional
number of ports. The ExpressCard slot is useful for future expansion and s
4....in the voluntary sector?

Follow the brand?

Go to the prize winners?

Evaluation results?

Quality marks?
4. Judgement devices

‘Singularities’ (Karpik 2010):

• Products and services which are: incommensurable, multi-dimensional and uncertain in terms of quality and results
• e.g. fine wines, lawyers, psychotherapists.....academic work?
• voluntary sector services?

‘Judgement devices’ - equipping the market to enable reasonable choices:

• Networks - involving personal and professional word of mouth
• Cicerones - critics and guides
• Appellations - quality marks, kite-marks, brands
• Rankings - listings, ratings, prizes
• Confluences - visibility, signposting and channelling people to goods and services.
5. For discussion

• Does this resonate with your experience?
• Do you face the same pressures?
• How do you navigate these?
• What scope is there for changing the terms of impact discussions?