

Focus:

To examine how well the team collects, uses, and learns from data to improve services and evidence impact.

#### **Key elements:**

- Use of demographic and participation data (e.g., postcode, age, need)
- Integration of qualitative insight (surveys, stories, consultation)
- Demonstration of impact (e.g., outcomes, behaviour change, SROI)
- Responsiveness to evidence and learning culture.

#### **General Guidance for Organisations**

- Develop an insight plan that includes both hard data and human stories
- Disaggregate participation data by postcode, age, ethnicity, disability, etc., to identify who is not engaging
- Use outcome frameworks such as Sport England's Evaluation Framework or the COM-B Behaviour Change model
- Adopt digital tools (like DataHub, Views, Upshot or Power BI) for monitoring and visualising data
- Embed regular learning reviews at the team and leadership levels
- Share evaluation findings with stakeholders and the community.

### **Best Practice Examples**

- Sport England's Learning about What Works and Evaluation Guidance
- Use of the Most Significant Change technique for storytelling
- Community insight platforms (e.g. Local Insight, ONS, Active Lives)
- Participatory research methods to co-produce the evaluation
- Publish learning briefs or impact reports annually.









PLAN		
Challenge: How do you use local and national insight to understand need, inequality, and opportunity?		
Unsatisfactory	<ul> <li>Little or no use of local or national insight</li> <li>Needs and inequalities are poorly understood</li> <li>Insight is outdated or irrelevant.</li> </ul>	
Satisfactory	<ul> <li>Some local or national insight considered</li> <li>Basic understanding of needs and inequalities</li> <li>Use of insight is inconsistent.</li> </ul>	
Good	<ul> <li>Organisation uses a mix of local and national data sources (e.g., Moving Communities, Public Health data, JSNA) to identify need and inequality</li> <li>Insight informs understanding of needs and inequalities</li> <li>Data sources are credible and appropriate.</li> </ul>	
Very Good	<ul> <li>Comprehensive use of diverse insight (quantitative and qualitative)</li> <li>Insight is refreshed regularly and shared across teams</li> <li>National platforms such as Moving Communities are integrated with local insight to provide a comprehensive picture of need</li> <li>Insight includes lived experience and community feedback</li> <li>Used to identify opportunities and gaps.</li> </ul>	
Excellent	<ul> <li>Insight is deeply embedded in decision-making</li> <li>Uses advanced analytics and predictive tools</li> <li>Insight drives innovation and strategic targeting</li> <li>Data shared transparently with partners and communities</li> <li>Insight from sources like Moving Communities is triangulated with lived experience and other datasets to shape strategic priorities and influence system-level planning</li> <li>Regularly evaluates and updates insight sources for relevance.</li> </ul>	

October 2025 Issue 1

Quest - Insight, Data and Evaluation



Page 2 of 9





DO DO		
Challenge: How do yo	ou prioritise population groups and geographical areas based on insight?	
Unsatisfactory	<ul> <li>No clear prioritisation process</li> <li>Priority groups or places not identified or documented</li> <li>Decisions appear arbitrary.</li> </ul>	
Satisfactory	<ul> <li>Some priority groups and areas identified</li> <li>Prioritisation is informal and inconsistently applied</li> <li>Limited evidence of rationale based on insight.</li> </ul>	
Good	<ul> <li>Clear prioritisation of population groups and areas</li> <li>Priorities are documented and communicated</li> <li>Insight informs prioritisation decisions.</li> </ul>	
Very Good	<ul> <li>Prioritisation is regularly reviewed and adapted</li> <li>Multiple data sources triangulated for robust prioritisation</li> <li>Engages communities in prioritisation decisions</li> <li>Priorities aligned with local and system-wide goals.</li> </ul>	
Excellent	<ul> <li>Prioritisation is dynamic and evidence-led</li> <li>Priorities are co-developed with partners and communities</li> <li>Transparent criteria and processes used</li> <li>Prioritisation drives resource allocation and innovation</li> <li>Demonstrable impact on reducing inequalities.</li> </ul>	

October 2025 Issue 1





DO	
Challenge: How are to	argeted approaches developed for specific groups or places?
Unsatisfactory	<ul> <li>No targeted approaches developed</li> <li>Activities are generic and not tailored</li> <li>Lack of understanding of specific group needs.</li> </ul>
Satisfactory	<ul> <li>Some targeted activities exist</li> <li>Limited tailoring or adaptation to groups or places</li> <li>Targeting is inconsistent.</li> </ul>
Good	<ul> <li>Targeted approaches developed with some tailoring</li> <li>Based on insight and local knowledge</li> <li>Activities designed to address specific barriers.</li> </ul>
Very Good	<ul> <li>Co-designed targeted approaches with communities</li> <li>Interventions are adapted dynamically based on feedback</li> <li>Consideration of cultural, social, and environmental factors</li> <li>Evidence of effectiveness for specific groups.</li> </ul>
Excellent	<ul> <li>Targeting is innovative and highly responsive</li> <li>Deep community partnerships drive design</li> <li>Approaches address intersectional barriers</li> <li>Tailoring includes multiple modalities (digital, physical, outreach)</li> <li>Recognised as best practice in targeting specific groups.</li> </ul>







DO	
Challenge: How do yo	ou engage with communities to shape the offer based on what matters to them?
Unsatisfactory	<ul> <li>Minimal or no community engagement</li> <li>Services are designed without community input</li> <li>Feedback mechanisms are absent or tokenistic.</li> </ul>
Satisfactory	<ul> <li>Occasional engagement with communities</li> <li>Feedback collected but not consistently acted on</li> <li>Engagement is passive or one-way.</li> </ul>
Good	<ul> <li>Regular community engagement informs service design</li> <li>Feedback is used to adapt offers</li> <li>Communities feel consulted and heard.</li> </ul>
Very Good	<ul> <li>Co-production is embedded in shaping the offer</li> <li>Diverse voices and lived experiences are included</li> <li>Two-way, ongoing engagement mechanisms</li> <li>Community leadership is supported and valued.</li> </ul>
Excellent	<ul> <li>Communities lead design and decision-making</li> <li>Engagement empowers and builds capacity</li> <li>Mechanisms ensure representation of priority and marginalised groups</li> <li>Feedback is transparent, and outcomes are communicated</li> <li>Community engagement is recognised as central to organisational identity.</li> </ul>

October 2025 Issue 1





DO	
Challenge: How do your staff apply insight in practice to ensure targeted delivery?	
Unsatisfactory	<ul> <li>Staff unaware or untrained in the use of insight</li> <li>Insight rarely informs delivery decisions</li> <li>Delivery is generic.</li> </ul>
Satisfactory	<ul> <li>Some staff use insight in planning and delivery</li> <li>Training or guidance on insight use is limited</li> <li>The Insight application is inconsistent.</li> </ul>
Good	<ul> <li>Staff routinely use insight to shape delivery</li> <li>Training supports understanding and application</li> <li>Delivery reflects targeted priorities and needs.</li> </ul>
Very Good	<ul> <li>Insight is integral to staff practice</li> <li>Staff contribute to data collection and interpretation</li> <li>Feedback loops enable real-time adaptation</li> <li>Insight use is supported by leadership and embedded in culture.</li> </ul>
Excellent	<ul> <li>Staff lead insight-driven innovation</li> <li>Cross-team sharing of insight enhances delivery</li> <li>Insight informs personalised approaches</li> <li>Staff demonstrate expertise in community data</li> <li>Insight application leads to measurable improvements in access and outcomes.</li> </ul>

Moving ...







DO:		
Challenge: How do you collaborate with other services or partners to maximise reach and relevance?		
Unsatisfactory	<ul> <li>Little or no collaboration on targeting</li> <li>Activities duplicated or fragmented</li> <li>Partners are unaware of targeting priorities.</li> </ul>	
Satisfactory	<ul> <li>Some collaboration exists, but limited scope</li> <li>Partners occasionally share information</li> <li>Coordination is informal or ad hoc.</li> </ul>	
Good	<ul> <li>Active collaboration with relevant partners</li> <li>Shared targeting priorities</li> <li>Coordination improves reach and reduces duplication.</li> </ul>	
Very Good	<ul> <li>Formalised collaboration mechanisms in place</li> <li>Partners co-design and co-deliver targeted activities</li> <li>Data and insight are shared openly</li> <li>Joint monitoring of reach and impact.</li> </ul>	
Excellent	<ul> <li>Strategic partnerships embedded across systems</li> <li>Collaboration drives innovation and efficiency</li> <li>Partners jointly secure resources and funding</li> <li>Exemplary shared governance and accountability</li> <li>Collaboration is recognised as transformational by the system.</li> </ul>	









MEASURE, MONITOR AND REVIEW		
Challenge: How do you track whether you are reaching the people and places you intended to?		
Unsatisfactory	No tracking or monitoring of reach	
	Data is incomplete or unreliable	
	No evidence of reaching target populations.	
	Basic tracking systems are in place	
Satisfactory	Reach data collected but not routinely analysed	
	Limited corrective action based on findings.	
	Reach is regularly monitored using appropriate data	
Const	Data disaggregated by key demographics and locations	
Good	<ul> <li>Organisation tracks reach and participation using reliable datasets, including Moving Communities where relevant.</li> </ul>	
	Findings inform delivery adjustments.	
	Robust and comprehensive tracking systems	
	Community and partner input validates data	
Very Good	Real-time monitoring supports rapid response	
	<ul> <li>Moving Communities data is used alongside local insight to monitor inequalities and assess whether priority groups are engaged</li> </ul>	
	Reach data is integrated into reporting and planning.	
	Innovative use of technology and insight to track reach	
	Tracking includes qualitative measures	
	Transparent reporting to communities and partners	
Excellent	Data drives strategic resource allocation	
	<ul> <li>Organisation uses Moving Communities and other datasets to monitor reach in real time, benchmark performance, and adapt</li> </ul>	
	delivery	
	<ul> <li>Insight is shared transparently with stakeholders to drive system-level improvements</li> </ul>	
	Tracking process recognised as exemplary.	

October 2025 Issue 1







IMPACT	
Challenge: What diffe	rence is your targeted work making, and how do you evidence this?
Unsatisfactory	<ul> <li>No evidence of impact</li> <li>Outcomes unknown or unmeasured</li> <li>Impact not linked to targeted work.</li> </ul>
Satisfactory	<ul> <li>Some evidence of positive outcomes</li> <li>Impact measured inconsistently</li> <li>Limited connection to targeting rationale.</li> </ul>
Good	<ul> <li>Clear evidence of outcomes linked to targeting</li> <li>Quantitative and qualitative data used</li> <li>Outcomes communicated to stakeholders.</li> </ul>
Very Good	<ul> <li>Sustained and meaningful impact demonstrated</li> <li>Reductions in inequalities are evidenced</li> <li>Learning from impact informs ongoing work</li> <li>Impact recognised by partners and communities.</li> </ul>
Excellent	<ul> <li>Impact is transformative and system-wide</li> <li>Evidence includes longitudinal and case study data</li> <li>Community voices strongly support impact claims</li> <li>Impact drives policy and practice change</li> <li>Work acknowledged as sector leading.</li> </ul>

October 2025 Issue 1

