

Evaluation Compendium - Covid-19 Schemes

No	Title	Lead Organisation	Status	Date Results Published	Links to evaluation	Theme	High level conclusions, findings or recommendations contained in reports (where published)
1	Evaluation of the Culture Recovery Fund	Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport (DCMS)	Published	21-Apr-23	Link to evaluation	Economic Support	Purpose of Evaluation This research evaluates the impact and delivery of the Culture Recovery Fund (CRF) launched by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport in July 2020 for cultural and heritage organisations adversely impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. Key Findings and/or Recommendations The programme has highlighted lessons for future support funds should a similar crisis ever arise, including the need to be more prepared with more up-to-date data on the cultural sector, and focusing on how different government support schemes interact with each other. The cultural sector is emerging from the pandemic. Overall, cultural organisations tended to report that whilst there were some challenges ahead in their continued recovery, they no longer felt that their futures were at imminent risk (with some exceptions). The findings from this evaluation show that CRF strengthened the financial health of the sector, and it would have been in a worse position without the support from the programme. Based on direct effects in increasing GVA via safeguarding employment and central estimates of user benefits, CRF [Culture Recovery Fund] delivered between £1.98-3.66 of benefits per £1 of public sector spending.

2	Process Evaluation of the Film & TV Production Restart Scheme	Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport (DCMS)	Published	26-Jan-22	Link to evaluation	Purpose of Evaluation The Department for Digital, Culture, Media, and Sport (DCMS) commissioned RSM UK Consulting LLP (RSM) in May 2021 to undertake a process evaluation of the Film and TV Production Restart Scheme (the Scheme). Key Findings and/or Recommendations Sector representatives and industry groups should play a central role in the design, delivery, and promotion of schemes like the Film and TV Production Restart Scheme in the future. Selection of these individuals or organisations must be carefully considered in advance to ensure correct and comprehensive representation across all aspects of the industry. In future, schemes with complex rules and registration requirements should develop a succinct overview document to ensure complete understanding from potential users. This could include an overview of the applicant journey and the application requirements, and the use of examples to ensure practical understanding. It should reflect industry-typical language and naming conventions to support understanding. Future schemes should consider the use of online systems from the outset and weigh up the cost of implementing this against the benefits of a more streamlined and simple process for applicants. The likelihood of extension for emergency response schemes should also be considered in this assessment. The stabilising nature of such emergency responses should be considered in relation to any changes or updates being made during delivery. Any updates or extensions should be communicated to industry with sufficient advance notice, thereby providing certainty about the future and stability. Government should use its weight to influence the return of commercially viable insurance, informing industry of the outcome of those discussions with significant notice to ensure production can continue.
---	---	---	-----------	-----------	------------------------------------	---

3	Sport Survival Package Evaluation	Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS)	Published	17-Nov-23	Link to evaluation	Purpose of Evaluation This report sets out the findings from the evaluation of the Sport Survival Package (SSP), a Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) programme which was designed to respond to emergency needs from sports negatively impacted by spectator restrictions during the COVID-19 pandemic. Key Findings and/or Recommendations The use of a process tracing approach and probability analysis across all sampled clubs receiving grants and loans over £10,000 suggests that as many as 323 clubs (out of the 1,212 supported with funding over £10,000) could have become insolvent without the Sport Survival Package (SSP) funding. Some leagues such as Premiership Rugby (rugby union) and the British Basketball League were likely to have been in danger in the short-term, or at least have taken much longer to resume in their recognised formats, without the SSP loans and grants to clubs. Current analysis indicates that for every £1 spent on the SSP to ensure the survival of clubs, £3.16 of economic and social benefits were generated (based on the current modelling of repayments). The SSP helped many clubs in the longer term to recover and return to play more quickly. The financial position of the majority of supported clubs has improved since before the application for SSP funding and the majority are on a path of recovery. Investments in grassroots and women's sport have been preserved and have generally returned to pre-pandemic levels. Organisations were very positive about the support that they received both from Sport England and secondary model organisations and formed strong working relationships with Sport England staff.
---	-----------------------------------	--	-----------	-----------	------------------------------------	--

Evaluation Compendium - Covid-19 Schemes

4	CJRS Interim Evaluation	HM Treasury (HMT) and HM Revenue and Customs (HMRC)	Published	13-Oct-22	Link to evaluation	Economic Support	Purpose of Evaluation This interim evaluation jointly delivered by HM Treasury and HM Revenue and Customs sets out findings on the delivery and impact of the early stages of the Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme (CJRS), up to the scheme extension from November 2020. Key Findings and/or Recommendations Delivery of the CJRS [Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme] was fast and efficient, from policy creation through to paying grants and reaching employers in need of support. The scheme was easy to understand and use. The design struck a balance between getting support to employers quickly, and the need to mitigate the risk of fraud. The CJRS protected millions of UK jobs and saved many employers from permanent closure. The CJRS had a major role in supporting incomes for many households. Adaptations to the scheme encouraged some employers to reduce their use of the CJRS as COVID-19 restrictions eased.
5	CJRS Final Evaluation	HM Treasury (HMT) and HM Revenue and Customs (HMRC)	Published	17-Jul-23	Link to evaluation	Economic Support	Purpose of Evaluation A joint evaluation by HM Treasury and HM Revenue and Customs of the Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme (CJRS). The CJRS final evaluation covers the impacts across the full duration of the CJRS and also assesses the scheme's value for money (VfM), including a consideration of deadweight and lessons learned. Key Findings and/or Recommendations The CJRS [Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme] was good value for money, with a positive net benefit to society of £50 billion and a social benefit to cost ratio of around 4:1.

Evaluation Compendium - Covid-19 Schemes

						The CJRS was devised and implemented at pace, reaching employers and their employees in need of support and achieving very high levels of satisfaction amongst both businesses and individuals. The CJRS directly protected around 4 million jobs and saved many employers from permanent closure. The CJRS played an important part in supporting the UK economy, in accelerating the labour market's recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic and restrictions on activity, as well as reducing the long-term damage to the economy. Furthermore, the scheme supported household incomes and living standards, and therefore consumption and the macroeconomy. The gradual ending of support by September 2021 mitigated a potential spike in unemployment. The scheme's design achieved an appropriate balance between getting support to employers quickly and managing the risk of error and fraud. The scale and nature of error and fraud changed throughout the different claim periods of the CJRS as scheme design and eligibility rules changed.
6	SEISS Interim Evaluation	HM Treasury (HMT) and HM Revenue and Customs (HMRC)	Published	13-Oct-22	Link to evaluation	Economic Support Purpose of Evaluation A joint evaluation by HM Treasury and HM Revenue and Customs of the Self-Employment Income Support Scheme. This interim evaluation sets out initial impact findings on the first 3 grants of the scheme, alongside an evaluation of the processes by which the scheme was delivered and accessed by claimants, covering the entire lifespan of the scheme. Key Findings and/or Recommendations 1. The SEISS [Self-Employment Income Support Scheme] provided financial support to millions of self-employed individuals during the pandemic. Delivery of the SEISS was implemented swiftly, from the policy design through to payment of grants to individuals 2. Using data from filed Self Assessment tax returns allowed support to be provided quickly to individuals and minimised the risk of error and fraud 3. While the SEISS was implemented swiftly, and delivered financial support to millions of self-employed individuals, a lack of timely and verifiable data about self-employment income and profits constrained the scope of the scheme 4. The scheme was easy to understand, and the claim process was simple

Evaluation Compendium - Covid-19 Schemes

							5. The SEISS succeeded in helping many self-employed people who were most affected by COVID-19. However, there were significant variations in outcomes 6. Early findings show that the SEISS helped support businesses to continue trading
7	SEISS Final Evaluation	HM Treasury (HMT) and HM Revenue and Customs (HMRC)	Published	17-Jul-23	Link to evaluation	Economic Support	Purpose of Evaluation A joint evaluation by HM Treasury (HMT) and HM Revenue and Customs (HMRC) of the Self-Employment Income Support Scheme (SEISS). The final evaluation covers the impacts across all SEISS grants and also assesses the scheme's VfM, including a consideration of deadweight, and lessons learned. Key findings The SEISS [Self-Employment Income Support Scheme] was good VfM, with a positive net benefit to society of £14.2 billion and a social benefit to cost ratio of 3.8: 1. The SEISS was designed and implemented swiftly. The scheme was easy to understand, and the claim process was simple. The SEISS helped support trading profits and incomes for many self-employed people who were most affected by COVID-19. The SEISS helped support businesses to continue trading in the short term, however whether the scheme had a longer-term impact on business survivability is less clear.

Evaluation Compendium - Covid-19 Schemes

							Error and fraud were effectively managed throughout the lifetime of the SEISS, even as stricter eligibility criteria were introduced, to successfully target the scheme.
8	Local Growth Fund and Getting Building Fund Feasibility Study	Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (MHCLG)	Inflight	11/01/2024 (evaluation feasibility assessment only)	Link to feasibility assessment	Economic Support	Purpose of Study The Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) commissioned Steer Economic Development (Steer-ED) to examine the feasibility of conducting process, impact, and value for money evaluations for LGF and GBF. This report provides an initial feasibility assessment based on Steer-EDs work. Next steps The Local Growth Fund and Getting Building Fund initial evaluation feasibility assessment was published in January 2024. The Local Growth Fund and Getting Building Fund Process Evaluation is inflight. A final report has been drafted and is due to be published later on in 2024 (possibly Sept / Oct 24). The Local Growth Fund and Getting Building Fund Impact Evaluation – the collection of data from Local Enterprise Partnerships is underway. The external evaluators, Steer-ED, are due to share their recommendations in Sept 24 with a view that a feasibility report will be available later in 2024.
9	Return to Planning Programme Evaluation Report	Government Equalities Office (GEO)	Published	17/03/2022	Link to evaluation	Economic Support	Purpose of Evaluation This report presents the impact and delivery of the Return to Planning programme (RtP), which is part of package of returner programmes managed by the Local Government Association (LGA) on behalf of the Government Equalities Office (GEO.) The pilot programme was due to be the first returner programme to target the public sector planning workforce, providing an opportunity to build on the evidence base of what works for those looking to return to work and for councils who are looking to hire and support returners. Key Findings and/or Recommendations

Evaluation Compendium - Covid-19 Schemes

							Although applications exceeded expectations, participation in the programme was below target with only 28 applicants offered a place. Post-programme evaluation generated positive feedback, with all respondents stating they had at least partially met their goals from the programme and the programme subsequently expanding to cover 34 councils in March 2021. Recommendations included targeting specific employers in areas where demand outstrips employment opportunities.
10	Future Fund	British Business Bank (BBB)	Published - Year 1 and 2 Inflight - Year 3	11 Nov 2022	Link to evaluation	Economic Support	Purpose of Evaluation The British Business Bank commissioned RSM UK Consulting to undertake an evaluation of the Future Fund programme. The Future Fund was established in May 2020 and its main objective was to increase the supply of finance to viable, equity-backed UK companies that would otherwise have had problems raising finance due to adverse market conditions during the Covid-19 pandemic. Key Findings and/or Recommendations The early assessment found that: Pandemic uncertainty reduced the supply of equity finance for early-stage companies. The speed with which finance was supplied was seen as key in supporting companies during the pandemic slump. Companies and lead investors considered the application process and features of the Future Fund to be clear. The key short-term objective of increasing the supply of finance to potentially viable UK equity backed companies was broadly met. R&D was a key focus for recipient firms while revenue rose on average, though broad investment trends are less clear. Early evidence suggests the programme may have met its short-term objectives. This early assessment is part of a multi-year evaluation of the Future Fund, with future stages of the evaluation focusing on measuring the programme's impact in more detail. Year 2: The evaluation reported that there was a mixed picture across indicators over 2021 and 2022, with portfolio firms not outperforming the control group on most measures. However, it is too early to measure the full impact of Future Fund investment. At the time of conducting the research, less than two years had passed since the programme completed all funding activities and further analysis will be undertaken in the year three evaluation.
				Oct-23	Link to evaluation		

11	COVID-19 Loans Schemes Evaluation	British Business Bank (BBB) and Department for Business and Trade (DBT)	Published - Year 1 and 2	24-Jun-22	Link to evaluation	Economic Support	Purpose of Evaluation British Business Bank (BBB) commissioned London Economics and Ipsos to undertake a multi-year evaluation of the three Covid-19 Loan Guarantee Schemes. This evaluation aims to assess whether the objectives of the Covid-19 Loan Guarantee Schemes were satisfied. Key Findings and/or Recommendations Evidence from both this report and the first year report suggests that the short-term objectives of the schemes were achieved – namely to unlock finance at scale and pace such that businesses disrupted as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic still have access to finance, and to offer businesses access to finance schemes complementing other government support and incentives. Findings also suggest that one of the schemes’ two medium-term objectives was achieved – namely to give businesses maximum opportunity to maintain liquidity until lockdown measures were lifted. The remaining medium-term objective and long-term objectives will be assessed in the Year 3 report. Based on businesses’ survey responses this Year 2 report suggests that, by the second year of the pandemic, the Covid-19 Loan Guarantee Schemes prevented business closures among borrowers. The survey responses show no evidence of further impacts on borrowers’ turnover or employment in addition to the survival impacts; however, this will be further assessed in the Year 3 report. Secondary analysis of Inter-Departmental Business Register (IDBR) data was undertaken to assess the findings from the Year 1 early impact evaluation that were based on self-reported data collected through a business survey (and presented in the Year 1 report). This new analysis reaffirms the Year 1 findings that, in the first year of the pandemic, the Covid-19 Loan Guarantee Schemes prevented business closures among borrowers. The survival impacts from this secondary analysis are estimated to be lower than the initial Year 1 survey-based results. Factors that may be driving differences between the Year 1 survey-based results and those based on secondary data are discussed throughout the report (see, for instance, the box “Interpreting differences between Year 1 survey-based analysis and secondary analysis presented in Year 2”).
			Inflight - Year 3	28-Nov-23	Link to evaluation		

Evaluation Compendium - Covid-19 Schemes

							The secondary analysis of Year 1 impacts found that the schemes had a positive impact on borrowers' turnover and employment. It should be noted that this is in addition to survival impacts. This is unlike the Year 1 early impact evaluation which was unable to identify an impact based on survey analysis. The analysis described above aims to isolate the impacts of the Covid-19 Loan Guarantee Schemes from other factors also affecting the outcomes of interest (for example other business support schemes). However, results should be interpreted within the context of other economic shocks (such as the energy crisis) which presented significant and varied challenges to businesses. There were also many different support schemes available to businesses across this period. Hence, the impacts of the Covid-19 Loan Guarantee Schemes are difficult to disentangle from these other factors. Furthermore, the impact of the schemes may take time to materialise – for instance certain business closures may be held back due to temporary insolvency measures or fraud investigations.
12	Recovery Loan Scheme (RLS)	British Business Bank (BBB)	Published	22/03/2024	Link to evaluation	Economic Support	Purpose of Evaluation This report covers the short-term impact of access to business finance from this scheme on borrowers' performance as well as the processes in place as part of the scheme. The evaluation was undertaken by BBB and the then Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS). After the Machinery of Government change in February 2023, responsibility for business finance and BBB moved to the newly created Department for Business and Trade (DBT). Key Findings and/or Recommendations <i>Impact evaluation</i> Recovery Loan Scheme (RLS 1.0) had a positive impact on borrowers' turnover– RLS 1.0 borrowers had an estimated 17% higher turnover than they would have had without the scheme. RLS 1.0 supported business survival– 12% of surviving RLS 1.0 borrowers reported that they “definitely” would have ceased trading and a further 47% said they would have been “very or fairly likely” to have ceased trading without the scheme.

Evaluation Compendium - Covid-19 Schemes

							Finance was additional– the majority of finance extended under RLS 1.0 would not have been provided without the scheme, with an estimated economic additionally rate of 83%. Scheme finance was used for a variety of reasons– the most common use of RLS 1.0 finance was for day-to-day expenses and purchasing goods and materials. There was also evidence to suggest it enabled borrowers to undertake innovative activities such as developing new products and processes, research & development and reducing carbon emissions. <i>Process evaluation</i> Learnings from the Coronavirus Business Interruption Loan Scheme (CBILS) were used in scheme set-up– learnings taken from the delivery of CBILS include data collection and data sharing which supported the implementation of RLS 1.0. This appears to have positively impacted lenders’ ability to deliver the scheme alongside commercial lending. Accreditation was relatively quick– the accreditation process for RLS 1.0 was much quicker than CBILS. Anecdotal evidence from interviews with accredited lenders suggested the process could be completed in under a month. Scheme design supported objectives– RLS 1.0 provided just under £2.8bn in guaranteed lending facilities to c.10,000 businesses. This was lower than expected. However, some of the sectors which were more impacted by pandemic restrictions, for example retail and accommodation and food, had slightly higher proportions of businesses supported.
13	The Local Authority COVID-19 Business Support Grant Schemes	Department for Business and Trade (DBT)	Inflight	Report(s) not yet published	Report(s) not yet published	Economic Support	Report(s) not yet published

Evaluation Compendium - Covid-19 Schemes

14	Overarching Evaluation of BEIS' Covid-19 Response	Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS), Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ), Department for Business and Trade (DBT) and Department for Science, Innovation and Technology (DSIT)	Inflight	Report(s) not yet published	Report(s) not yet published	Economic Support	Report(s) not yet published
15	Kickstart Scheme: process evaluation	Department for Work and Pensions (DWP)	Published	21/07/2023	Link to evaluation	Economic Support	Purpose of Evaluation This evaluation on the effectiveness of the Kickstart Scheme as a means of supporting young people during the pandemic and preventing them from becoming long-term unemployed was carried out by IFF Research on behalf of the Department for Work and Pensions Key Findings and/or Recommendations As with many employment programmes and policies, particularly those that are reactive to a sudden contextual change (such as the Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic), the rollout of Kickstart happened quickly. This created many teething issues, many of which were resolved. A key learning, however, was the importance of minimising lags between stages. There were various points in the Kickstart process where lags were created (and still existed to some extent until the end of the scheme), which could be avoided.
16	Green Recovery Challenge Fund	Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA)	Published	21/12/2023	Link to evaluation	Economic Support	Purpose of Evaluation These evaluation reports examine the delivery of the Green Recovery Challenge Fund which aimed to kick-start environmental renewal in England, while creating and retaining a range of jobs. They present findings on the impact of funded projects which were developed as a direct response to the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic.

						Key Findings and/or Recommendations Over both rounds: projects have directly supported 1,529 jobs (1,053 full time equivalent) through the project costs spent on goods and services, it is estimated GRCF [Green Recovery Challenge Fund] has supported an additional 1,101 full-time indirect jobs. In Round 1: Participants and stakeholders generally agreed the programme met the needs of the organisations working in the land and nature sector. It balanced immediate financial needs resulting from the pandemic with funding for longer term environmental objectives. The GRCF was the primary funding source accessible to the land and nature sector when it was launched. It was significantly over-subscribed and could usefully have been a larger fund. The quick roll-out of the GRCF was generally commended by participants and stakeholders. However, for some it still launched too late after the pandemic and the short application window was challenging. In Round 2: The GRCF has delivered positive impacts on biodiversity, habitat quality and ecosystem health across England. Funded organisations have strengthened working relationships with a range of partners, resulting in longer-term engagement in local nature activities. The GRCF has had a positive impact on funded organisations' capacity and resilience, including through recruitment of new staff and retaining staff at risk of redundancy. Funded projects have diversified their service offer, secured funding via other funding streams and accessed new markets.
17	Corporate Insolvency and Governance Act (CIGA)	Insolvency Service	Published	Interim report: March 2022 Final report: November 2022 Post Implementation Review: February 2023	Link to evaluation	Economic Support Purpose of Evaluation This report provides a review of the operation of CIGA's three permanent measures undertaken by the University of Wolverhampton on behalf of the Insolvency Service. Key Findings and/or Recommendations There has been a broadly positive reaction to the CIGA [Corporate Insolvency and Governance Act] measures There are aspects of the measures that are proving difficult to understand by lawyers and IPs [insolvency practitioners] alike The official guidance is helpful in aiding understanding of the measures, but more specific guidance might be needed

18	Trade Credit Reinsurance scheme (TCR)	Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) and Department for Business and Trade (DBT)	Published	12/07/2023	Link to evaluation	Economic Support	Purpose of Evaluation The process evaluation assesses the effectiveness of the scheme and the processes used to deliver and operate the TCR scheme. The interim impact evaluation is an indicative Value-for-Money (VfM) assessment and a measurement of the required quantitative data for any future assessment. Key Findings and/or Recommendations <i>Process evaluation</i> The overall structure of the scheme was the best way to maintain cover in the TCI [Trade Credit Insurance] market. Targeting insurers meant that the intervention was widespread, and policyholders encountered little change to their day-to-day operations; Retaining the learning of the TCI market within government and maintaining the relationships with insurers could maximise preparedness for future economic shocks and reduce the time needed to set up future interventions in the TCI market. BEIS' communication was considered to be exemplary by most stakeholders. Early bilateral communications with insurers could help to create a better understanding of the stakeholders' different business models, internal structures and business needs. Providing information in a more timely manner might help to reduce uncertainty and maximise the effect of government interventions, e.g. the extension of the scheme was only announced in December 2020 the same month that it was originally scheduled to end in. Raising awareness beyond the public announcements and providing more targeted information to policyholders might have reassured them about the stability of the TCI market. <i>Interim impact evaluation:</i> The TCR Scheme prevented the withdrawal of TCI cover, which would have led some suppliers to discontinue trade which would have resulted in direct and indirect economic impacts (an estimated direct impact of £0.9 bn on lost trade and an indirect impact of £1.6 billion).
----	---------------------------------------	--	-----------	------------	------------------------------------	------------------	--

Evaluation Compendium - Covid-19 Schemes

							Indicative Value-for-Money assessment showed that from April 2020 to June 2021, the scheme has generated a positive economic impact of more than £2.5 billion. In addition, the TCR Scheme generated unquantified benefits, including the prevention of business failures, business' continued access to finance, lower insurance costs to businesses, and spillover effects to non-participating insurers. Instead of a cost, the scheme generated a net surplus for the government of £212.6 million (as of March 2022). The figures are not final yet, as policyholders and insurers can still file claims and because additional administrative burden will incur. However, it can be assumed that the TCR Scheme is likely to generate a surplus for the government. Overall, the TCR Scheme achieved a good Value-for-Money, as it generated a high positive impact without any financial costs.
19	UKRI and BEIS stabilisation interventions to mitigate against the negative impact of COVID-19 on the research sector	Department for Science, Innovation and Technology (DSIT)	Inflight	Report(s) not yet published	Report(s) not yet published	Economic Support	Report(s) not yet published

Evaluation Compendium - Covid-19 Schemes

20	Impact evaluation of the Film & TV Production Restart Scheme	Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS)	Published	23/04/2024	Link to evaluation	Economic Support	Purpose of Evaluation This research evaluates the impact and delivery of the Film and Television Production Restart Scheme commissioned by the British Film Institute for the Department for Culture, Media and Sport for film and television production organisations adversely impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. Key Findings and/or Recommendations The research suggests that the Scheme successfully met most of its objectives in terms of impact and economic impact in particular. Producers who participated in the evaluation research were virtually unanimous that they would not have been able to restart or start production without the Scheme, thereby putting their businesses in clear jeopardy of financial failure. Evidence also showed that the Scheme helped to restore business confidence; two-thirds of producers reported that the Scheme had a positive impact on their innovation although their ability to take risks was less. From a value-for-money perspective, the Scheme was also very economic for the Government. Without the Scheme enabling a large swathe of film and TV production to restart, the Government would have likely faced an additional fiscal cost to support unemployed film and TV production workers via the CJRS, SEISS or Universal Credit. The government was able to design and launch the Scheme at pace because there was deep knowledge of how the production business worked residing directly within Pact, BFI and DCMS.
21	Life Events Reinsurance Scheme	Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS)	Inflight	Report(s) not yet published	Report(s) not yet published	Economic support	Report(s) not yet published
22	Art Council's evaluation of the Emergency Response Fund	Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS)	Published	22/06/2024	Link to evaluation	Economic support	Purpose of Evaluation This report evaluates the Emergency Response Fund's application process, delivery, and the effects of funding on job and business protection, creative practice, and communities during the early stages of the pandemic. Key Findings and/or Recommendations The research found that recipients spent their ERF [Emergency Response Fund] awards in various ways including: Day to day living expenses and overheads, such as rent/mortgages, food and insurance.

Evaluation Compendium - Covid-19 Schemes

							• Paying staff salaries, in order to retain staff skills and experience within organisations, and/or hiring sub-contractors or freelancers to support creative or digital activity. • Purchasing IT and other equipment to allow for the transition or addition of digital activities, or to allow for working from home. • Investing in training for themselves or their staff, to upskill on new technology being used or allow for the creation of new content or activities.
23	Historic England's evaluation of the Heritage Stimulus Fund	Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS)	Published	23/03/2024	Link to evaluation	Economic support	Purpose of Evaluation This report evaluates the Heritage Stimulus Fund's (HSF) effectiveness and impacts on heritage, heritage construction sectors and heritage repairs during the pandemic. Key Findings and/or Recommendations Addressing Covid crisis head-on - Covid-19 presented England's heritage sites with a crisis as lockdown and the catastrophic loss of income meant that scheduled repairs were stalled and deterioration of buildings could not be addressed. The Heritage Stimulus Fund was part of the Government's £1.57bn Culture Recovery Fund, aimed to address this challenge. 991 projects, to the value of £90.3m - As a result, the HSF successfully addressed the threat of the pandemic and achieved its aim to protect the nation's heritage at a time of financial crisis for heritage organisations. Broad reach and impact - The HSF helped retain specialised skills and supported many specialist companies to survive the pandemic, which might have been lost. Moreover, the distribution of the Fund was representative across a range of recipients, types of suppliers, and regions. Intrinsic value of heritage repairs - The HSF mainly funded repair projects that were structural in nature and therefore less visible, and so the main impact of the Fund is in the intrinsic value of heritage repairs: avoiding further deterioration, protecting heritage, and saving money.

24	National Lottery Heritage Emergency Fund Evaluation	Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS)	Published	21/02/2024	Link to evaluation	Purpose of Evaluation This report evaluates the National Lottery Heritage Emergency Fund's ("the Fund") effectiveness during the pandemic to met the needs of organisations working in the heritage sector and, in doing so, how it delivered against the Fund's three stated outcomes: economy, inclusion and wellbeing. Key Findings and/or Recommendations This evaluation has highlighted a number of recommendations, arising from reflections shared by staff at the Fund, ROSS Consultants and organisations working in heritage, where further action is required to understand the required next steps in more detail: • Further research is needed to explore alternative funding mechanisms, beyond project funding and funding for core costs, as the evaluation was framed to enquire about the need for project funding rather than alternatives. Therefore, whilst a clear demand for project funding was expressed, it isn't necessarily the only funding mechanism that would address the need. • Further research is required on the specific topics for The Fund to provide advice and support on, given the needs of organisations working in heritage and what the Fund already has developed. • The Fund will need to consider how it will lead on the opportunities for heritage to build back better, including opportunities for organisations to become more inclusive and to consider how they can keep pace with wider societal changes and support their resilience. Additionally, organisations working in heritage shared reflections on how the Fund could reduce the burden on applicants where possible and to support those with limited capacity to apply: • Information requirements should be reduced where possible and The Fund should not request information that it already has. • Investment Teams should conduct pre-application discussions with organisations, particularly those with limited capacity, to understand their context and discuss eligibility. • Applicants should be able to submit photos, videos or other media to bring their application, and the context in which they are operating, to life.
----	---	--	-----------	------------	------------------------------------	---

Evaluation Compendium - Covid-19 Schemes

25	COVID-19 Funding Response programme evaluation	Innovate UK	Published	01/09/2021	Link to evaluation	Economic support	Purpose of Evaluation Ipsos MORI (in association with the Carbon Trust and George Barrett) was commissioned by Innovate UK in January 2021 to deliver an evaluation of its COVID-19 Funding Response programme, exploring its social, economic, and sustainability and clean growth outcomes. Key Findings and/or Recommendations This report on Innovate UK's pandemic response demonstrates that the support package provided has contributed to fast-tracking clean innovation by supporting a range of projects with disruptive innovation ambitions. UK clean innovation capability was therefore both safeguarded and strengthened in new ways – the directions in technological accumulation we will see post-pandemic will be distinguishable from the pre-pandemic foci.
26	Kickstart - impact / wider evaluation	Department for Work and Pensions (DWP)	Inflight	Report(s) not yet published	Report(s) not yet published	Economic Support	Report(s) not yet published
27	Plan for Jobs Cross-cutting Evaluation	Department for Work and Pensions (DWP)	Published	23/05/2024	Link to evaluation	Economic Support	Purpose of Evaluation The report is a system-level evaluation of key elements of the DWP's part of the Plan for Jobs package. It considers five strands of DWP provision under the Plan for Jobs (PfJ): Kickstart scheme, Job Finding Support (JFS), the Youth Employment Programme, Job Entry Targeted Support (JETS) and increased capacity on the Sector-based Work Academy Programmes (SWAPs). Key Findings and/or Recommendations At wave 1, two thirds or more of participants on each strand knew what to expect and found the provision useful. Nearly seven in ten participants reported being satisfied with the support received through each strand. Youth Offer and JETS [Job Entry Targeted Support] participants were most satisfied, whilst JFS [Job Finding Service] participants were least satisfied. Across the case study research, common barriers to work entry that were not easily resolved included language barriers and health (particularly mental health conditions). Further training and guidance may be required to ensure that Work Coaches feel equipped to support customers with these needs.

Evaluation Compendium - Covid-19 Schemes

							At a systems level, DWP provision is part of complex and varied local employment support landscapes. In commissioning new provisions, there is therefore a need to ensure that new programmes add value to this existing support offer, and do not undermine or duplicate existing successful programmes through the introduction of competing targets, for example.
28	Restart	Department for Work and Pensions (DWP)	Inflight	Report(s) not yet published	Report(s) not yet published	Economic Support	Report(s) not yet published
29	New Youth Offer	Department for Work and Pensions (DWP)	Inflight	Report(s) not yet published	Report(s) not yet published	Economic Support	Report(s) not yet published
30	Expansion of sector-based work academy programme delivery	Department for Work and Pensions (DWP)	Inflight	Report(s) not yet published	Report(s) not yet published	Economic Support	Report(s) not yet published
31	Job Entry Targetted Support (JETS)	Department for Work and Pensions (DWP)	Inflight	Report(s) not yet published	Report(s) not yet published	Economic Support	Report(s) not yet published
32	Access to debt advice during Covid-19 pandemic	Money & Pensions Service	Published	24/03/2022	Link to evaluation	Economic Support	Purpose of Evaluation This research evaluates the effect the closure of in-person services during the pandemic had on the accessibility and delivery of debt advice in the UK. Key Findings and/or Recommendations Based on an analysis of our own data and data shared with us by our funded agencies, we tentatively conclude that, at a macro level, the closure and reduction of in-person services does not appear to have disproportionately excluded any particular client group. In-person debt advice services delivered in community settings will continue to best meet the needs of some clients, particularly for those dealing with more complex problems. Although identifying who these clients are will require further research. There is an opportunity for greater collaboration between advice providers to meet clients' needs. Related to this is the importance of recognising and adapting to the wider ecosystem in which debt advice sits.

Evaluation Compendium - Covid-19 Schemes

							Technology will play a greater role in building resilience and enabling more flexibility in the way debt advice services are delivered in the future. It is critical that services are modelled around retaining some elements of end-to-end remote advice for the foreseeable future. A sector-wide approach to supporting workforce wellbeing should be developed, particularly as we move towards more hybrid forms of working.
33	16-19 Tuition Fund Evaluation	Department for Education (DfE)	Inflight	Report(s) not yet published	Report(s) not yet published	Education	Report(s) not yet published
34	Evaluation of Early Years Covid Recovery – Mentors and Experts Programme Delivery November 2021	Department for Education (DfE)	Inflight	Report(s) not yet published	Report(s) not yet published	Education	Report(s) not yet published
35	Evaluation of the Early Years Covid Recovery: Experts and Mentors Programme	Department for Education (DfE)	Inflight	Report(s) not yet published	Report(s) not yet published	Education	Report(s) not yet published
36	Early Years Education Recovery Programme - Overarching Evaluation	Department for Education (DfE)	Inflight	Report(s) not yet published	Report(s) not yet published	Education	Report(s) not yet published
37	FE Covid-19 Learner and Apprentices Experience Survey	Department for Education (DfE)	Published	28-Apr-22	Link to evaluation	Education	Purpose of Evaluation This survey was undertaken to survey was to understand the experiences of Further Education (FE) learners during the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic. Key Findings and/or Recommendations Overall satisfaction with teaching, training and support was high. Higher level learners and apprentices were less satisfied than other learners.

Evaluation Compendium - Covid-19 Schemes

							Most learners and apprentices thought that they were on track with their learning. Learners and apprentices preferred onsite teaching to online learning. Lack of motivation was the key barrier for home working for all learners and apprentices. Learners and apprentices with a disability or learning difficulty were less satisfied than other learners. Health and wellbeing issues were reported by many learners and apprentices.
38	Pupil & Recovery Premium Process Evaluation	Department for Education (DfE)	Inflight	Report(s) not yet published	Report(s) not yet published	Education	Report(s) not yet published
39	16-19 Additional Hours Evaluation	Department for Education (DfE)	Inflight	Report(s) not yet published	Report(s) not yet published	Education	Report(s) not yet published
40	Independent Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme Year 2: Implementation and Process Evaluation	Department for Education (DfE)	Published	26-Oct-22	Link to evaluation	Education	Purpose of Evaluation This research evaluates the National Tutoring Programme (NTP) that supported schools to respond to the disruption to learning caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. The report also examined what school leaders think about the NTP and their experiences using it. Key Findings and/or Recommendations School leaders wanted control and autonomy over the delivery of tutoring, supporting the Government's planned direction of the NTP [National Tutoring Programme] in 2022-23. On 31 March 2022, DfE announced plans to provide £349 million of core tutoring funding directly to schools and give them the freedom to decide how best to provide tutoring for their pupils. All three NTP routes were perceived to have a positive impact on pupils' attainment, self-confidence and them catching up with their peers, but SLT [School-Led Tutoring] was thought to have most impact. The availability and quality of external tutors and mentors is fundamental – not all schools have the capacity to use internal staff as tutors. There is an important role for the NTP contractors who will be responsible for recruitment and quality assurance in 2022-23.

Evaluation Compendium - Covid-19 Schemes

						The availability of high-quality training for tutors is important to ensure the quality of provision, but senior leaders wanted more autonomy over whether it should be essential for all potential tutors. The contractor responsible for providing training in 2022-23 should review the existing training and assess the most appropriate way forward in terms of content and approach, taking into account tutors' prior skills and experience. The effect of reduced NTP subsidies in 2022-23 on the take-up and impact of tutoring will need to be monitored and reviewed. Participating in the NTP had resulted in increased workload for senior leaders – schools would benefit from a proportion of NTP funding being available for management and administration.
41	Independent Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme Year 2: Impact Evaluation	Department for Education (DfE)	Published	01/10/2023	Link to evaluation	Purpose of Evaluation This research evaluates impact of the second year of the National Tutoring Programme (NTP) on educational attainment. Key Findings and/or Recommendations SLT [School-Led Tutoring] was found to have up to +1 month progress KS2 and KS4 English and maths outcomes. This is likely to be an underestimate of the true effect. AM [Academic Mentors]/TP [Tuition Partners] tutoring resulted in improved outcomes at a school level, and we found some evidence to suggest that participation in the AM/TP route was associated with slightly worse outcomes in English (KS2 and KS4) and maths (KS4). The effects of tutoring on KS2 and KS4 maths and English outcomes were similar for all pupils regardless of PP [Pupil Premium] and/or PLA [Prior Low Attainment] status. Future research on tutoring should collect data on tutoring routes and subject, to allow for continued monitoring of effectiveness by route and subject to further develop our understanding of 'what works'.

Evaluation Compendium - Covid-19 Schemes

42	Independent Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme Year 3: Implementation and Process Evaluation	Department for Education (DfE)	Published	01/10/2023	Link to evaluation	Education	Purpose of Evaluation This research evaluates impact of year three of the National Tutoring Programme (NTP) on schools provided with funding for targeted academic support for pupils who need additional help with their learning. Key Findings and/or Recommendations Most schools (85%) were delivering tutoring through the School-Led Tutoring (SLT) route. Smaller proportions were using the Tuition Partners, (TP, 24%) and Academic Mentors (AM, 12%) routes. Most school leaders agreed that receiving NTP [National Tutoring Programme] funding as one grant in the 2022/23 academic year made it easier to manage the programme compared to previous years. Most school leaders reported they were using qualified teachers to deliver the NTP. The reasons for doing so included subject knowledge/specialism, school awareness and understanding of the curriculum. Across all regions, school staff felt their school could access high-quality tutors. Most tutoring was in English (85%) or maths (83%), and the majority of school staff were satisfied with the alignment of tutoring with the school curriculum. Almost all schools stayed within the group sizes and hours of tutoring recommended in the DfE guidance. Schools' satisfaction with the NTP was high overall (76%), and with specific elements such as tutors' relationships with pupils and the quality of provision, was high across all routes. Most school leaders felt that tutoring was embedded as a fixture in their school, and that NTP funding had made this possible.
43	Independent Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme Year 3: Impact Evaluation	Department for Education (DfE)	Inflight	Report(s) not yet published	Report(s) not yet published	Education	Report(s) not yet published

Evaluation Compendium - Covid-19 Schemes

44	National Tutoring Programme – Evaluation and Reflections	Department for Education (DfE)	Inflight	Report(s) not yet published	Report(s) not yet published	Education	Report(s) not yet published
45	Professional Development Programme (PDP) Third Phase Evaluation	Department for Education (DfE)	Inflight	Report(s) not yet published	Report(s) not yet published	Education	Report(s) not yet published
46	Early Years Initial Teacher Training Evaluation	Department for Education (DfE)	Inflight	Report(s) not yet published	Report(s) not yet published	Education	Report(s) not yet published
47	Evaluation of The Early Years SENCO Training Programme	Department for Education (DfE)	Inflight	Report(s) not yet published	Report(s) not yet published	Education	Report(s) not yet published
48	Nuffield Early Language Intervention	Education Endowment Foundation	Published	01/09/2023	Link to evaluation	Education	Purpose of Evaluation This research evaluates the scaling process in a COVID-19 affected environment of NELI aimed to improve the language and ability of young children with relatively poor spoken language skills. Key Findings and/or Recommendations Children who took part in NELI [Nuffield Early Language Intervention] made on average 4 months’ additional progress in their language skills, compared to children who didn’t receive the intervention. Children eligible for Free School Meals (FSM) made on average 7 months’ additional progress. The Year One Report reflects on wider learnings about delivering educational programmes at scale, including the importance of utilising existing school networks in recruitment, having clarity and consistency in terms of the expected scale of delivery and putting in place efficient communication and data management systems. The Year Two Report recommends for future scale-ups of educational interventions, including an earlier recruitment window to give schools time and flexibility, setting-up mechanisms with regular and continuous monitoring to understand how programmes are implemented in schools, and streamlining support for programmes where possible.

49	Covid-19 self-isolation: Early release using LFD tests	UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA)	Published	27-Apr-23	Link to evaluation	Non-pharmaceutical interventions	Purpose of Evaluation This report provides the results of the policy to minimise time spent in self-isolation after a positive SARS-CoV-2 test result. Key Findings and/or Recommendations The introduction of this policy kept the effectiveness of self-isolation in breaking chains of transmission while reducing the burden of isolation on the general public. Due to this policy, 717,722 individuals were able to leave self-isolation at some point from day 6 onwards after 2 negative LFD [Lateral Flow Device] tests instead of observing a full 10 days of self-isolation. [Based on the assumptions in the report, this generated the following benefits...]: • Each individual released early reduced their self-isolation period by 3.3 days. In total, this equates to 2,346,781 days saved from self-isolation. • It is possible that 1.4 million work days and 579,000 school days were saved in this way. • Individuals had the potential to earn £375 each from early release (see Average weekly earnings in Great Britain from the Office of National Statistics). • A missed day of school leads to a permanent education loss of a little under one day, which is likely to reduce lifetime earnings by around 0.05%... . This equates to a potential loss in future earnings of between £300 to £700 per day of school missed using plausible ranges for lifetime earnings... . Enabling early release from isolation by using LFDs potentially averted this loss of earnings for 193,294 young people. • The result presented here of 717,722 people who were eligible for early release from self-isolation is likely to be an under-estimate... . Therefore, the potential impact of this policy is higher than that stated in this report.
50	Impact of a COVID-19 outreach programme delivered by Voluntary and Community Sector Organisations (VCSOs) for	UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA)	Published	03-Nov-22	Link to evaluation	Non-pharmaceutical interventions	Purpose of Evaluation This research evaluates the impact of communication guidance on COVID-19 testing, self-isolation and vaccination to migrant worker communities to improve understanding and encourage uptake, and the role of the VCSOs (voluntary and community sector organisations) in delivering public health information. Key Findings and/or Recommendations

Evaluation Compendium - Covid-19 Schemes

	migrant worker communities						Our evidence supports the utility of involving VCSOs [Voluntary and community sector organisations] in the dissemination of public health messaging to migrant communities. The VCSO Migrant Worker programme elicited positive feedback and acceptability from migrant worker service users. Our evidence outlines important and key factors in the successful delivery of health messaging (language and the culturally sensitive delivery) and that VCSOs are well equipped to support these needs. Our findings contribute to learnings from the COVID-19 pandemic regarding public health messaging (for example, continuous review of communications and messaging for underrepresented groups, as well as the use of imagery or diagrams).
51	Evaluation of Daily Testing for Contacts of COVID-19 Cases (DTCC)	UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA)	Published	05-Dec-22	Link to evaluation	Non-pharmaceutical interventions	Purpose of Evaluation This research evaluates the daily testing of contacts of COVID-19 (DTCC) programme and provides a longer-term investigation into its effectiveness. Key Findings and/or Recommendations ... this work can be used to demonstrate what can be achieved with voluntary testing and help inform future decision making. The findings presented here suggest that, under the right circumstances, voluntary interventions can achieve a 50 to 60% uptake and a substantial impact on transmission. However, DTCC [Daily Testing for Contacts of Covid-19 Cases] took place at a time when availability of testing was high, people were in the habit of using lateral flow tests, and there was considerable concern about the spread of the Omicron variant at a time when families were meeting for Christmas. These factors all contributed to the uptake. To achieve this level of uptake in future scenarios, careful consideration would need to be given to the widespread availability of tests and the accompanying messaging. The widespread use of point-of-care, unsupervised LFD tests brings advantages of convenience and speed but means that public health authorities are incompletely sighted on how tests are being used and what the results are. DTCC was implemented as an additional risk reduction measure – it was not an alternative to self-isolation. This means that the importance of more complete data was less than, for example, daily contact testing as an alternative to

Evaluation Compendium - Covid-19 Schemes

							mandatory self-isolation. For policies that replace (rather than are additional to) other risk reduction measures, it is essential to know that the adherence is such that the public health impact is comparable to the measures that it is replacing. Much better data would be required to make this judgment. This point is crucial for the future consideration of any similar policy.
52	Liverpool Coronavirus (COVID-19) Community Testing Pilot: Full Evaluation Report Summary	Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC)	Published	07-Jul-21	Link to evaluation	Non-pharmaceutical interventions	Purpose of Evaluation This research evaluates the pilot of community open-access testing among people without coronavirus (COVID-19) symptoms. Key Findings and/or Recommendations The evaluation found that a low-cost, rapid, no-lab test of likely infectiousness saves time and extends the reach of health protection measures. The data showed that lateral flow rapid antigen testing meets this need when coordinated by an effective local public health service. The end-to-end testing service was found valuable and has been continued beyond the pilot as a core part of Liverpool's Covid-19 response.
53	NHS Covid-19 app: Isle of Wight pilot evaluation report NHS Test and Trace Programme	Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC)	Published	08-Apr-21	Link to evaluation	Non-pharmaceutical interventions	Purpose of Evaluation This research evaluates the NHS COVID-19 app to ascertain perceptions of the app and (intended) usage of its features during the early adopter phase. The evaluation of the Isle of Wight pilot of NHS Test and Trace focused on the user journey and attitudes to and experiences of the service, including the first version of the NHS COVID-19 app. Key Findings and/or Recommendations Uptake of the first version of the app on the Isle of Wight was encouraging with over 56,000 downloads registered to users on the Isle of Wight, which equated to around 40% of the population. Over 40,000 of these downloads occurred within the first 2 days after the app was launched.

Evaluation Compendium - Covid-19 Schemes

						Older people were less likely to download the app than younger people. Survey data revealed that among those who owned a smartphone, privacy and phone compatibility were among the reasons for not downloading the app. Most users found the app easy to use: 82% of people found the app very easy to download and 84% found it very easy to enter their details. Additionally, 84% of people rated their support for rolling out the app across the UK as being 4 or 5 out of 5. While it is difficult to measure future behaviour, 81% of people with a smartphone said they would definitely report their symptoms in the app, with a further 12% saying they would probably do so. Only 97 people experienced a new continuous cough and/or high temperature during the evaluation period, but of these, 71% reported their symptoms in the app. Excluding complex cases referred to local health protection teams, 76% of people who tested positive successfully had details of their known contacts collected through CTAS [Contact Tracing and Advice Service]. Each person had an average of 2 contacts. Of those contacts, 61% were successfully contacted by health protection. Although 1,592 people reported symptoms via the app, only 309 home test kits were ordered. This discrepancy may be because people were using the drive-in test centres instead or they were entering symptoms to test the app to see what happens. Most people only left their homes for permitted reasons, with just 8% saying they met family or friends (which may be permitted under some circumstances). Most people (94%) washed their hands with soap after most or every time they went outside, while 64% kept more than 2m apart from others all the time and a further 34% did so most of the time.
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

Evaluation Compendium - Covid-19 Schemes

54	Full Report: COVID-19 Behavioural Studies for the Department for Transport: A Behavioural Approach to Supporting Public Confidence, Wearing of Face Coverings and Completion of Self-Isolation During the COVID-19 Pandemic	Department for Transport (DfT)	Published	03-Feb-22	Link to evaluation	Non- pharmaceutical interventions	Purpose of Evaluation This research evaluates three COVID-19 behavioural science messaging reports conducted by the Department of Transport and Kantar Public. The report covers confidence in public transport, encouraging the wearing of face coverings while travelling on public transport and boosting compliance with self-isolation after travel abroad. Summary This report provides findings from three projects combining quantitative and qualitative research with insights from academic literature and experts from across government. Each project produced and tested options for policy interventions that DfT could consider, in relation to public confidence in public transport; wearing of face coverings whilst travelling on public transport; and self-isolation after international travel. All projects provided rigorous evidence for the potential impact of interventions on behaviour using online randomised controlled trials (RCTs).
55	Impact of temporary traffic regulation orders during COVID-19	Department for Transport (DfT)	Published	01/03/2022	Link to evaluation	Non- pharmaceutical interventions	Purpose of Evaluation This research evaluates the impact of making temporary traffic regulation orders (TROs) during the COVID-19 pandemic. Key Findings and/or Recommendations The Temporary Traffic Regulation Order impact evaluation was commissioned to examine the effects of the Traffic Orders Procedure (Coronavirus Amendment) Regulations of May 2020 and network management duty guidance which were introduced to enable local authorities to make temporary Traffic Regulation Orders to deal with the effects of COVID-19 and enable social distancing. The evaluation involved an online survey of local authorities and in-depth interviews with local authorities and groups representing road users. It explored experiences of the measures and the planned greater use of digital communication methods to announce them. The evaluation provided evidence about reactions to emergency measures which included some concerns about the nature of measures and the reduced

Evaluation Compendium - Covid-19 Schemes

							time for consultation. The increased use of digital communication methods was welcomed by both by authorities and groups representing road users. However, potential costs savings from digital methods did not fully materialise as many local authorities felt that they needed to continue with use of print advertising.
56	One year of digital contact tracing: Who was more likely to install the NHS COVID-19 app? Results from a tracker survey	Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC), NIHR Policy Innovation and Evaluation Research Unit	Published	01/02/2023	Link to evaluation	Non-pharmaceutical interventions	Purpose of Evaluation This research evaluates examine changes in the uptake of the National Health Service (NHS) COVID-19 proximity (contact) tracing application ('app') over one year, amongst smartphone users in England and Wales. Key Findings and/or Recommendations Results: Around 50% of respondents had the app installed at each time point. The majority of installations took place soon after its launch. The key reason for installing at launch was 'civic, public or social responsibility'. Amongst those who installed the app later, it was 'needed to scan NHS QR code'. Uptake was higher amongst individuals who considered themselves vulnerable to COVID-19 or were concerned about the risk COVID-19 posed, were more highly educated, of White ethnicity, and who reported higher levels of trust in government information. Factors associated with installing the app over time included becoming more concerned about the risk COVID-19 poses to the country, or perceiving that the crisis in their local area had worsened. Conclusions: Despite changes in pandemic response and case numbers, app installation in England and Wales remained relatively stable after launch. If governments wish to increase app installation and use rates in future pandemics, they need to highlight those app features that encourage engagement, and take related action to allay privacy concerns and improve trust in government information sharing.
57	An evaluation of the national testing response during the COVID-19 pandemic in England: a multistage mixed-methods study protocol	UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA)	Inflight	Report(s) not yet published	Report(s) not yet published	Non-pharmaceutical interventions	Report(s) not yet published

Evaluation Compendium - Covid-19 Schemes

58	Daily use of lateral flow devices by contacts of confirmed COVID-19 cases to enable exemption from isolation compared with standard self-isolation to reduce onward transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in England: a randomised, controlled, non-inferiority trial	UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA)	Published	01/11/2022	Link to evaluation	Non-pharmaceutical interventions	Purpose of Evaluation This study evaluates whether daily use of lateral flow devices (LFDs) to test for SARS-CoV-2, with removal of self-isolation for 24 h if negative, could be a safe alternative to self-isolation as a means to minimise onward transmission of the virus. Key Findings and/or Recommendations DCT [Daily Contact Tracing] with 24 hour exemption from self-isolation for essential activities appears to be non-inferior to self-isolation. This study, which provided evidence for the UK Government's daily lateral flow testing policy for vaccinated contacts of COVID-19 cases, indicated that daily testing with LFDs could allow individuals to reduce the risk of onward transmission while minimising the adverse effects of self-isolation. Although contacts in England are no longer required to isolate, the findings will be relevant for future policy decisions around COVID-19 or other communicable infections.
59	Stronger Practice Hubs Evaluation	Department for Education (DfE)	Inflight	Report(s) not yet published	Report(s) not yet published	Health and Social Impacts	Report(s) not yet published
60	Covid-19 Loneliness Fund: A Process Evaluation	Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport (DCMS)	Published	12-Aug-21	Link to evaluation	Health and Social Impacts	Purpose of Evaluation This research evaluates the Covid-19 Loneliness Fund launched in May 2020 to support 9 national organisations working to tackle loneliness and build social connections to help them to continue and adapt their critical work during the pandemic. Key Findings and/or Recommendations Allowing more time for project set up and considering closely when funding is originally planned to end. Facilitating additional consultation with funded organisations on what is required regarding any evaluation activities. Ensuring service users are able to use the digital devices supplied and, if they are not, to provide assistance.

Evaluation Compendium - Covid-19 Schemes

61	Evaluation of the Voluntary and Community Sector Emergencies Partnership: Transition from COVID-19 Response to Wider Emergency Preparedness	Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport (DCMS)	Published	13-Jan-23	Link to evaluation	Health and Social Impacts	Purpose of Evaluation This research evaluates the Voluntary and Community Sector Emergencies Partnership's transition from COVID-19 emergency response to an emergency preparedness model. Key Findings and/or Recommendations The two most significant areas... which the evaluation suggests should be prioritised for action are: • Tackling the next level of building relationships with the Local Resilience Forum. • Addressing the challenge of increasing reach to disproportionately impacted groups and achieving more inclusive response in emergencies.
62	Evaluation of the Coronavirus Community Support Fund Value for Money Report	Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport (DCMS)	Published	06-Dec-21	Link to evaluation	Health and Social Impacts	Purpose of Evaluation This research evaluates the Value for Money (VfM) of the Coronavirus Community Support Fund (CCSF) that provided increased support for vulnerable people affected by the crisis, and to reduce closures of essential organisations that provided services for vulnerable people. Key Findings and/or Recommendations The VfM analysis is exploratory and results are tentative... . However, our overall conclusions are: • We cautiously conclude that the value of the benefits of the CCSF [Coronavirus Community Support Fund] programme exceeded the costs (cost-benefit analysis). • We cautiously conclude that the funding of the CCSF programme was economic and not excessive (assessment of economy). • We are confident the CCSF grants were used efficiently (assessment of efficiency).

Evaluation Compendium - Covid-19 Schemes

63	Impact Evaluation of the Coronavirus Community Support Fund	Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport (DCMS)	Published	06-Dec-21	Link to evaluation	Health and Social Impacts	Purpose of Evaluation This research evaluates the impact of the Coronavirus Community Support Fund (CCSF) that provided increased support for vulnerable people affected by the crisis, and to reduce closures of essential organisations that provided services for vulnerable people. Key Findings and/or Recommendations Given the novel circumstances, there were a number of key lessons learned in relation to designing and delivering an impact evaluation of a large-scale emergency funding programme. The findings of the evaluation demonstrate that the CCSF successfully reached organisations who engaged and supported people and communities disproportionately affected by COVID-19, and that the CCSF contributed to the financial health, capacity and capability of grant holders. Furthermore, it helped develop an evidence base for evaluating emergency funding programmes.
64	Process Evaluation of the Coronavirus Community Support Fund (CCSF)	Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport (DCMS)	Published	06-Dec-21	Link to evaluation	Health and Social Impacts	Purpose of Evaluation This research evaluates the process of the Coronavirus Community Support Fund (CCSF) that provided increased support for vulnerable people affected by the crisis, and to reduce closures of essential organisations that provided services for vulnerable people. Key Findings and/or Recommendations This evidence suggests that CCSF [Coronavirus Community Support Fund] was successful in reaching the organisations as set out in the funding criteria. CCSF appears to have been successful in reaching those people and communities in need. The targeted outreach work delivered at the regional level was successful in broadening the reach of the CCSF beyond the usual customer base of The Fund. Most grant applicants were satisfied with the speed at which award decisions were made.

Evaluation Compendium - Covid-19 Schemes

						Grant applicants were also found to be generally satisfied with the application process and the level of clarity provided by The Fund in relation to their application. The consensus was that the right balance was achieved between getting the funding out at pace and managing risk. Overall, the processes for distributing the funding were considered effective in enabling distribution of the funding within the required timescales. The CCSF has contributed to keeping some small and medium sized charities operating during the pandemic. Despite the rapidly changing context, including the periods of local and national lockdown restrictions, the majority of grant holders were able to use the grant in the way they had intended. CCSF was found to have facilitated increased partnership working amongst organisations in the sector. Grant management processes were intentionally light touch for the CCSF given the short term and emergency nature of the funding. CCSF was found to be an effective route to distributing emergency response funding.
65	Evaluation of the Youth COVID-19 Support Fund	Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport (DCMS)	Published	01-Feb-22	Link to evaluation	Purpose of Evaluation This research evaluates the set up and delivery of the Youth COVID-19 Support Fund. Key Findings and/or Recommendations One area of improvement suggested for similar future funds, was to have different length application forms for larger and smaller (e.g. under £10,000) application amounts. One limitation of the study that it is important to acknowledge, is that evidence was not collected on the reasons why some organisations were unsuccessful in their application for funding, or on the effects this was perceived to have on their financial viability or continuity. DCMS may want to

Evaluation Compendium - Covid-19 Schemes

							consider this a part of a future evaluation design in order to give as rounded and balanced view as possible.
66	Community Vaccine Champions: Research and Evaluation Reports	Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC)	Published	01/07/2023	Link to evaluation	Health and Social Impacts	Purpose of Evaluation This research evaluates the Community Vaccine Champions (CVC) to provide insights into the elements of funded activity that added the most value, and to identify transferable lessons learned for future similar initiatives. Key Findings and/or Recommendations The Community Vaccine Champions research and evaluation reports focused on measuring the relative impact of community-based interventions to increase COVID vaccine take up among hard-to-reach communities compared with take up levels in similar areas where the intervention was not rolled out. Empowering community led design and delivery supported more effective public health messaging and supported vaccine uptake. In Community Vaccine Champions (CVC) funded areas, religious minority groups were more likely to have received booster vaccinations than in the comparison areas. The study estimates a 14.7% boost in vaccine uptake (net impact) as a result. The champions scheme delivered an estimated £5.7m (net) in social value from 10 case study sites; equivalent to an ROI of £1.44 for each pound spent. Were this representative of the whole scheme the net benefit could have been £26.1m.
67	A review of the Vaccine Taskforce	Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS)	Published	29/08/2023	Link to evaluation	Health and Social Impacts	Purpose of Evaluation This research evaluates the Vaccine Taskforce's performance against its objectives, from establishment in April 2020 until closure in September 2022. Key Findings and/or Recommendations Review assesses the VTF's [Vaccine Taskforce] success against its first 2 objectives. Objective 1 - The VTF procured a portfolio of safe and effective vaccines, enabling the UK to start its deployment programme in 2020. In doing so, the UK became the first country in the world to secure key deals and to deploy a regulated COVID-19 vaccine outside of clinical trials with the Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine. This was followed shortly after by the UK becoming the first country to deploy the Oxford-AstraZeneca vaccine. The original vaccination programme

Evaluation Compendium - Covid-19 Schemes

						and the first (and subsequent) booster campaign in autumn to winter 2021 were further strengthened by the availability of the Moderna vaccine, which the UK placed its first order for in late 2020. The VTF's proactive approach to its strategy for revaccination, including through its investment in the world-leading COV-BOOST study, and its further purchases of the Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine in April and August 2021, ensured that the NHS's booster programme began on time in September 2021, and that all adults were able to be offered a booster dose in line with JCVI advice. Objective 2 - The UK played a leading role in championing the establishment of COVAX as a global initiative to support both higher and lower income countries secure equitable access to safe and effective COVID-19 vaccines as quickly as possible. The UK was also a strong advocate, including in the G7, for the donation of surplus COVID-19 vaccines as a short-term response to global supply constraints with intention of improving vaccine access particularly in low and middle income countries around the world. The VTF was able to identify sufficient surplus vaccine doses to be able to offer to donate 100 million doses in line with the UK's G7 commitment.	
68	UKRI – Research & Innovation support	UK Research and Innovation (UKRI)	Published	15/09/2022	Link to evaluation	Cross-cutting	Purpose of Evaluation This research evaluates the impact of UK Research and Innovation's (UKRI) research and innovation (R&I) funding response to COVID-19. Key Findings and/or Recommendations The JeS/Siebel system be replaced as a matter of urgency. Future UKRI-wide Research & Innovation responses (whether in emergencies or not) could benefit from a governance structure broadly of the type used in the COVID-19 response. Where interface with government or other key stakeholders is necessary, funding activities should seek to engage in what may be termed 'systematic convening'. UKRI should design and maintain on-system a multi-purpose and rapid-response programme, and potentially use it even on a small scale some what regularly. To avoid budgetary problems of the type seen in its COVID-19 response, a modification is needed to how UKRI's strategic budget is organised.
				14/09/2023	Link to evaluation		

Evaluation Compendium - Covid-19 Schemes

							UKRI should continue to ensure staff have high levels of scientific knowledge and knowledge of the wider context, enabling them where appropriate (e.g. for very small-sized awards for especially urgent questions) to take short-term decisions. UKRI continue at a general level to cultivate a high-risk/high-reward ethos.
69	Innovation and Lessons Learned from the Government's response to COVID-19	Cabinet Office (CO)	Published	09/06/2022	Link to evaluation	Cross-cutting	Purpose of Evaluation This report identifies changes in the civil service approach due to the pandemic that have the potential to improve productivity or service delivery outside of crises, and at scale. It was commissioned by the then Cabinet Office Permanent Secretary to focus on delivering against the Declaration on Government Reform to make the Civil Service more connected, impact focused, adaptable, strategic and efficient. Key Findings and/or Recommendations Having common systems to track and register skills across the Civil Service. Using flexible working to increase the number of Civil Servants outside London. Looking harder at broader applications of simplifications made to digital processes. Improving data sharing arrangements across Government. Developing routes to quickly bring experts into Government.
70	Independent Boardman Review into lessons learnt from COVID-19 related procurements	Cabinet Office (CO)	Published	07/05/2021	Link to evaluation	Procurement	Purpose of Independent Review This independent report on procurement during the pandemic seeks to highlight the lessons the Government can learn to be better equipped to meet any future similar challenge. It is limited to procurement of PPE, ventilators, vaccines, test and trace and food parcels for the clinically extremely vulnerable in the period March to December 2020. Key Findings and/or Recommendations The Boardman review makes 28 recommendations for improvements to procurement processes across government, covering five broad themes -

Evaluation Compendium - Covid-19 Schemes

						procurement of PPE, ventilators, vaccines, test and trace and food parcels for the clinically extremely vulnerable.
						Next steps In May 2021 the government accepted all 28 recommendations.
71	Independent Boardman Review into comms procurement	Cabinet Office (CO)	Published	07/05/2021	Link to evaluation	Purpose of Independent Review This independent report on the award of contracts for COVID-19 communications services made by the Cabinet Office in March 2020, to identify any areas for improvement. Key Findings and/or Recommendations Three main areas of improvement were noted: - Existing procurement law and policy for contracting in a time of crisis. - CO's own process and governance in relation to this. - The management of actual or perceived conflicts of interest in a procurement context. Recommendations included: - Clear issuing of guidance to ensure clear and consistent application. - Assessments of training and capacity. - Strengthening of existing processes for managing, preventing and rectifying risks including potential conflicts of interest.
72	Hunger Safety Net Programme (HSNP Phase 3)	Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office (FCDO)	Published	Nov-21	Link to evaluation	Purpose of Evaluation This research evaluates the COVID-19 Cash Transfer (CT) to assess the impact of the cash on vulnerable people residing in urban informal settlements, as well as to learn lessons for future shock-responsive CTs. Key Findings and/or Recommendations Determine a single government institutional mechanism to coordinate shock-responsive social protection. Develop guidance detailing response options for different kinds of shock. Negotiate agreements with mobile money service providers on the use and sharing of data in the event of shocks.

Evaluation Compendium - Covid-19 Schemes

						Explore options for building government capacity to utilise mobile technology in routine social protection delivery systems. Support NGOs [Non-governmental organisations] to improve data quality and utilise the HTT [Harmonised Targeting Tool] through KCWG [Kenya Cash Working Group]. Explore options for including mobile money providers in routine social protection payment services. Conduct research to better understand who is excluded from mobile money services and how best to support their inclusion. Develop functional protocols and processes to improve the quality and accessibility of the Single Registry.
--	--	--	--	--	--	--