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Executive Summary

- The Ageing Better Programme is a Big Lottery Funded (BLF) Programme covering 14 sites in England, which began in April 2015. One of the sites is the Ageing Better in Birmingham (ABIB) Programme. The overall aim of the ABIB Programme is to: facilitate change in the way older people are considered by and within communities; empower citizens to take part in and influence activities in order to reduce social isolation in later life; make changes now as well as tackling the underlying causes of social isolation, to provide sustainable solutions for the longer-term. The ABIB Programme is being evaluated by CFE Research, and a national evaluation is being carried out by Ecorys.

- The first phase of the ABIB Programme (2015-2016) established involvement opportunities for older people to reduce social isolation and loneliness. Five Ageing Better Hubs were set up for the priority geographies and demographics in Birmingham, and one of these is the Tyburn Hub (comprising four estates – Pye Hayes, Birches Green, Castle Vale and Bromford), led by Compass Support since 2016. Hubs promote, support and develop Ageing Better Networks.

- To inform the second phase of the ABIB Programme, consultation was carried out in each priority area led by the Hubs, to understand the causes of isolation. This informed Local Action Plans which were developed in year 3 of the ABIB Programme (during 2017-18), for each of the priority areas led by the Hubs, to create longer-term change and improvement in support and services for older people. Consultation to inform the Tyburn Local Action Plan was carried out in 2016-17 by Compass Support.

- The Tyburn Local Action Plan began operational delivery in 2017-18 and contains five projects designed to tackle social isolation and loneliness amongst older residents aged 50+, four of which we are evaluating (Community Organisers, Good Neighbour Campaign, Walking Maps, Care and Repair Scheme). The Community Organisers Scheme was the first project to come on-stream and is the focus of this first report – at the time of writing, the other three projects had not been commissioned.

- MEL Research was commissioned to concurrently evaluate four of the five projects in the Tyburn Local Action Plan, in December 2017. The evaluation aims for the Community Organisers Scheme were to: assess the effectiveness of delivery; identify lessons learnt; assess the achievement of the project against its key outcomes using Common Measurement Framework (CMF) data; and assess attitudinal change.

- The delivery contract for the Community Organisers Scheme was awarded to Compass Support in early 2018. The Community Organisers Scheme’s aim is to recruit 160 Volunteer Community Organisers to result in 40 trained and active Volunteer Community Organisers. At the time of writing this report, the Castle Vale recruitment is complete - seven Volunteer Community Organisers have been recruited and trained. The strategic aims of the Scheme are to: encourage communities to integrate across the Tyburn ward; enable knowledge about the area to be communicated across the Ward; promote community cohesion; encourage active citizenship; and enable sustainability by helping people become more involved in community action, creating more resilient individuals and communities, and reducing social isolation in the longer-term.

- The main methodology to date has included: design of an Evaluation Framework; documentation review; production of data availability table; review of validated tools used to measure isolation and loneliness to inform survey design; familiarisation and visits to Compass Support, and sitting in on a Volunteer Community Organiser training session; baseline survey of 362 residents across the four estates (n=295 with residents over 50 and n=67 with residents under 50); stakeholder feedback; Volunteer Community Organiser feedback; and BVSC-provided data on Networks and Ageing Better Network Funding in Tyburn.

- In this Executive Summary and first narrative report, we present our emerging findings relating to the Community Organisers Scheme.
1. Effectiveness of overall delivery of the Community Organisers Project – identify any delivery obstacles or failures (formative learning)

- The Community Organisers Scheme was formally scoped out and procured, with a clear ITT. However, the Scheme is largely a non-prescriptive intervention, adopting an experimental ‘test and learn’ approach. Delivery challenges have included:
  - The original Compass Support proposal included another organisation (Spitfire Support Services) as deliverers of the Volunteer Community Organiser training. However, this did not happen meaning that Compass Support have developed and delivered the training themselves but there have been some delays in delivery of the training
  - There were some early delivery delays linked to recruitment of a Community Organiser Coordinator
  - There have been some project resource challenges. Two apprentices have since been appointed and are supporting the Ageing Better project and a new administrative assistant is now in post.

- The mobilisation and set-up phase of the Community Organisers Scheme has taken time, which is often the case with this type of commissioned community-based project. Having a realistic view of the length of time it takes to mobilise this sort of project is an important learning point for the other projects to be commissioned within the Tyburn LAP.

- The length of the mobilisation phase could have a real impact on what it is feasible for shorter and more time-bound projects to deliver

- Engaging with isolated people and encouraging involvement is challenging and it takes time to build a visible presence for the project within local communities.

2. What are the key lessons learned for the Community Organisers Project – what has worked well and what have been the challenges (formative learning):

**What has worked well?**

- The development of the ABIB Tyburn Local Action Plan has been evidence-based and informed by scoping and research, which is an example of good practice.

- What works where varies depending on the existing infrastructure and previous levels of ‘community investment’ in each area. Project delivery has initially focused on Castle Vale to provide early momentum to get the project off the ground and test what works, and the project has amended the order of approach to the other three areas. This is an example of the ‘test and learn’ ethos in action.

- There is added value from the positive interplay and repeat involvement of Compass Support between the Hub, local Ageing Better Networks, Community Organisers Scheme and other local activity. There is synergy between the aim of the Tyburn Hub and the Community Organisers Scheme.

- Recruitment of Volunteer Community Organisers has generally worked well and seven volunteers are in place for Castle Vale who seem committed to the volunteering role. They have a range of experience and already form a powerful and coherent team

- Compiling a volunteer team with the right skills is vital to the success of the Community Organisers Scheme. The pool of volunteers have a very strong sense of being involved as a volunteer as a way to help others in the community, and as a way to use their own experiences of isolation, loneliness and challenging times to help others.
Key elements of recruitment that have worked well include: gaining early momentum by starting in Castle Vale; waiting to recruit until the training programme and content was ready to avoid losing volunteer interest; recruitment has not focused on ‘the usual suspects’ or people already well known to the provider - the main method has been volunteers coming forward in response to advertising; there will be a tailored approach to recruitment in each of the four areas to reflect their differences; Compass Support providing the volunteer training provides the opportunity for the training provider to get to know the volunteers, assess strengths and weaknesses, and help devise their future roles.

Informal weekly sessions are held for Volunteer Community Organisers hosted by Compass Support. This is an example of good practice which should be replicated in the other three areas.

The local focus of the Community Organisers Scheme (six of the seven volunteers live in Castle Vale) is a strength of the Scheme. Local volunteers have local knowledge and insight, are visible locally and more potentially more likely to be trusted by other residents. They can ‘spread the word’ about the project even when they are not ‘officially’ volunteering which helps to build project identity.

All volunteers wear an ABIB Community Organiser branded t-shirt and lanyard, which makes them visible in the local area and should help to build awareness of the project and the Ageing Better brand.

The Compass Support team brings strengths including prior knowledge of the wider ABIB Programme and Tyburn Hub, and good local contacts.

The very localised and tailored approach taken to promotion of the Community Organisers Scheme as a way of identifying community members who are isolated / lonely is an example of good practice.

What have been the challenges?

There is more to do promote the ABIB Tyburn Hub locally.

There is more for the ABIB Programme to do to build awareness amongst the Age of Experience group about what members of part of, and to further explore how Age of Experience members can input into LAP projects.

There have been some challenges with planned data capture mechanisms: operational delivery delays mean that there is no early data from the Common Measurement Framework questionnaires; due to delays with the software Impact App data is not yet being collected by Volunteer Community Organisers; and further training is needed on this software for volunteers.

There is complexity in data capture for the Community Organisers Scheme, as it is an experimental and ‘cascading’ model with different layers of beneficiaries and impact - Volunteer Community Organisers themselves, plus people in the community that the volunteers go on to work with.

The length of the mobilisation phase from commissioning to recruitment getting underway needs to be borne in mind for other projects.

3. Progress against key outcomes for Tyburn ward for older residents for the Community Organisers Project (summative learning):

We summarise seven key outcomes in the Evaluation Framework. It is too early in the Community Organisers Scheme implementation to make any comments about impact.

There is some early anecdotal feedback that the project is starting to have an early impact on people who are isolated and lonely. The project is starting to link individuals in the community to the project and linking up individuals within the community.

There is early feedback from the Volunteer Community Organisers about the positive impact they think being involved in the project is having on them as individuals.
Local isolated and lonely residents are likely to be at very different ‘starting points’ and with varied / complex confidence levels and needs. It can take residents time to engage with a project like this and measuring impact needs to reflect this – it takes time to build the evidence and produce outcomes.

4. **Impact on positive wider attitudinal change – positive change in attitudes amongst residents and communities in Tyburn (via pre and post survey – summative learning):**

   - It is too early in the evaluation (and delivery of the four projects) to talk about impact on wider attitudinal change. We will return to this when we carry out the post-projects survey in 2019. We will then need to make wider evaluative judgements about attribution of the projects as well as judgements about the counterfactual.

5. **To what extent do we assess the plausibility of achieved outcomes being attributable to the projects rather than to other factors – to what extent have the projects ‘made the difference’ (attribution)?**

   - It is too early in the evaluation (and delivery of the four projects) to assess the plausibility of achieved outcomes being attributable to the projects rather than to other factors. We will return to this question later in the evaluation, when more evidence is available.

6. **To what extent do we assess that any identified outcomes would not have happened anyway (the counterfactual)?**

   - It is too early in the evaluation (and delivery of the four projects) to assess whether identified outcomes would not have happened anyway. We will return to the counterfactual question later in the evaluation, when more evidence is available.

7. **Are there any unintended positive or negative outcomes of the Community Organisers Project?**

   **Unintended positive outcomes**

   - An early delivery challenge was that a partner organisation lined up to lead on the training element did not take part in project delivery. However some unintended positive outcomes resulted: Compass Support developed the training materials and delivered the training themselves, meaning that they have more control of the overall process and can incorporate learning into subsequent sessions; Compass Support can deliver the training as and when required rather than working to a pre-agreed schedule; Compass Support can build a relationship of trust with the Volunteer Community Organisers and become familiar with their skills and strengths – this has enabled the volunteers to start delivering their role in the community more quickly.

   - An unintended positive outcome is the strong bond, trust and sense of identity which has developed between the seven volunteers. As well as providing their volunteer role out in the community, the volunteers provide support to each other for the training and volunteering, but also outside of this in everyday life, and get meaning and identity out of volunteering.
Unintended negative outcomes

- The nature of the project means that the volunteer role is varied, fluid and unpredictable. In some instances there may not be a clear ‘right answer’ about how to handle a particular situation. It is difficult for the training to be prescriptive or cover every eventuality.
- How the volunteers will deal with sensitive issues amongst people they come into contact with in the local community that are known to them is a factor which needs consideration as the project continues.

8. To what extent has the Community Organisers Project reached the ‘right’ people (those who are lonely and isolated)?

- The ITT for the provider of the Community Organisers Scheme notes that residents the Volunteer Community Organisers go on to work with will be identified as lonely and / or isolated through the CMF, of which 50% of participants will be identified as lonely and 50% as lonely. A 40% reduction in both isolation and loneliness is anticipated. It is too early to make evaluative judgements on this question, as only a handful of CMFs have been completed for the project.
- The early pool of seven Volunteer Community Organisers appear to have the empathy and desire to work with people in the community who are socially isolated and lonely, and early anecdotal feedback is that the project is starting to make contact with people who are isolated and lonely.

9. To what extent has the Community Organisers Project displayed assets-based approaches – have citizens been empowered to take part in and influence activities to reduce social isolation?

- It is too early in the evaluation (and delivery of the four projects) to assess the extent that assets-based approaches have been displayed.

10. To what extent has each project tackled the underlying causes of isolation to leave a sustainable longer-term legacy / footprint beyond the life of this particular funding stream (summative learning)?

- It is too early in the evaluation (and delivery of the four projects) to assess the extent that the Community Organisers Scheme will leave a sustainable longer-term legacy.
- However, the local focus of the Community Organiser Scheme (led by a local provider who knows the area and history of the Ageing Better Programme and has the interplay with the Hub; locally based volunteers who bring their own knowledge and insight and help to build the visibility of the project) are early positives which maximise a longer-term legacy being left.
- Some of the volunteers who have been involved in running Pop up Cafes want to take this element on themselves, within their own area. Therefore the Pop up Café idea should be able to carry on after the Community Organiser Scheme itself has finished.
- Once the Community Organiser Scheme is further on in delivery, it is likely that Network activity will emerge from the work of the volunteers in the local community.
- There is a need to build-in the sustainability of funded activities (up to £2,000 of funding is available from ABIB to support Network activity for up to six months). Further support is needed from the ABIB Programme to help make funded activities sustainable from the start, to provide longer-term activities for residents and enhance the return on investment from this funding in the longer-term.
11. What are our key conclusions on areas of interplay between the four projects?

- It is too early in the evaluation and delivery of the four projects to provide conclusions on areas of interplay between the four projects. We will return to this later in the evaluation when more evidence for all projects is available.

12. What are the key considerations for ongoing delivery (formative) and impact (summative) of the Community Organisers Project?

Delivery (formative) considerations

1. There is more to do promote the ABIB Tyburn Hub locally
2. There is more for the ABIB Programme to do to build awareness amongst the Age of Experience group membership to build their knowledge and identity about what members of part of, and to further explore how Age of Experience members can input into LAP projects
3. Having a realistic view of the length of time it takes to mobilise this sort of project is an important learning point for the other three projects to be commissioned within the Tyburn LAP
4. What works where varies depending on the existing infrastructure and previous levels of ‘community investment’ in each area. This needs to be borne in mind for the other three projects as they come on-stream
5. The main recruitment approach so far has been volunteers coming forward in response to advertising of the Scheme which has worked well, and this could be rolled-out in the other areas
6. Building trust within local areas via repeat visits, encouraging vulnerable residents to engage with the project, and getting the Community Organiser Scheme (and ABIB brand) recognised and trusted all takes time. Measuring impact needs to reflect this – it will take time for the projects to produce outcomes
7. The informal weekly sessions hosted by Compass Support for volunteers are an example of good practice which should be replicated in the other three areas
8. We recommend that the Community Organiser Coordinator compiles a ‘learning log’ over time - this will provide another source of evidence to support the ‘test and learn’ approach
9. Further consideration needs to be given to how volunteers will be involved in volunteering outside of their ‘own’ estates, and how the pool of volunteers from across Tyburn will come together. There is scope for joint volunteer sessions to take place to build the identity of the whole volunteer group, share learning across the estates and build integration across Tyburn as a whole
10. Promotion of the Community Organisers Scheme as a way of identifying community members who are isolated / lonely is an example of good practice (distributing flyers to a very local patch of the estate saying ‘we will be in this area on X date’, visiting on the date specified with the Pop up Café, and repeating this method at regular intervals). We recommend that this approach continues in the other three areas
11. Volunteer Community Organisers do not feel confident about using the Impact App at this point and further training is needed here
12. The nature of the project means that the volunteer role is varied, fluid and at times unpredictable. At this point we conclude than an effective team has been recruited for Castle Vale, and this approach needs to continue in the other three areas
13. There have been some positive early impacts of the project on the team of volunteers themselves, and it would be ideal if these early benefits could be replicated in the other three areas.

14. The project needs to consider how the volunteers will deal with sensitive issues amongst people they work in the community that are already known to them, and to cover this in future training. We understand that the induction process has been amended to include this since we attended the training in August 2018.

**Impact (summative) considerations**

1. We would like to clarify whether the following data will be collected and available over time: reports prepared by Compass Support linked to outputs and outcomes of the volunteer training; Action Learning Set feedback via Compass Support; training participants’ feedback on the training delivery and content.

2. As the project progresses, there is scope to amend the training evaluation feedback to include some outcomes of changes in individual wellbeing for the Volunteer Community Organisers themselves. This will provide another important source of evidence of impact.

3. We would like to clarify what the following measures relate to / how they are defined (in the Compass Support monthly contract monitoring form): number of active citizens targeted (400 noted in Compass Support’s proposal); number of contacts made (2000 soft contacts).

4. There are no set targets relating to the number of people the volunteers go on to work with in the local community. We recommend that the Community Organisers Scheme gives some thought to this, to see whether a meaningful target can / should be set.

5. There are no set targets relating to the gender of the Volunteer Community Organisers. All seven Volunteer Community Organisers recruited to date are women. Consideration should be given to recruiting some male volunteers which may be particularly important for isolated / lonely older males.

6. We recommend that the Community Organisers Scheme (and the other three projects) collects case studies of good practice over time, to capture impact. Customer Journey Maps are another option – MEL Research could potentially provide some research support here.

7. We would like to clarify whether there will be any scope for MEL Research to consult with people in the community that the Volunteer Community Organisers work with – this could provide powerful evidence of impact.

8. The ABIB Programme should investigate what further support can be provided to local Networks who receive Ageing Better funding, so that funded activities become more sustainable in the longer-term.

9. Survey analysis has indicated a number of variables which the four projects may plausibly be able to influence (e.g. loneliness / emptiness, social contacts / speaking to others, participation in events, trusting others). BVSC and project providers could use this insight to target the four interventions to most effectively impact on isolation, loneliness and broader wellbeing of Tyburn residents. The post-survey in 2019 will help to identify whether the measures improve.

10. Survey analysis has indicated the influence of certain variables on overall wellbeing scores which it is less plausible for the four projects to influence (feeling safe outside after dark and at home alone at night). Other work may be needed locally aside from the four projects in focus, to have a positive impact on older residents’ wellbeing over time.
Introduction and evaluation methodology

1. Introduction

About the Ageing Better in Birmingham Programme

The Ageing Better Programme is a Big Lottery Funded (BLF) Programme covering 14 sites in England, which began in April 2015. The Ageing Better in Birmingham (ABIB) Programme received funding from BLF of £6 million. BVSC (Birmingham Voluntary Service Council) is the accountable organisation. The ABIB Programme is led strategically by the ABIB Core Partnership, which is a cross-City partnership of key organisations who work together to achieve the Programme’s aims. There is an Age of Experience Group, made up of experts-by-experience who help shape the Programme. The overall aim of the ABIB Programme is to:

- Facilitate change in the way older people are considered by and within communities
- Empower citizens to take part in and influence activities in order to reduce social isolation in later life
- Make changes now as well as tackling the underlying causes of social isolation, to provide sustainable solutions for the longer-term.

The Ageing Better approach is focused on assets-based approaches designed to create a new movement for community action on ageing and isolation, with results and impacts lasting in the longer-term (beyond the life of the ABIB Programme). Therefore, longer-term sustainability and legacy is crucial. The Programme as a whole is adopting a ‘test and learn’ approach, reflecting the largely experimental and non-prescriptive design.

The ABIB Programme was originally informed by research carried out by the Aston Research Centre for Healthy Ageing at Aston University, which identified that the risks associated with isolation are significantly greater in some parts of the City and amongst some communities, than others. The first phase of the ABIB Programme aimed to establish and develop involvement opportunities for older people to reduce social isolation and loneliness. Five Ageing Better Hubs were set up for each of the priority geographies and demographics identified via the Aston University research (Tyburn and Sparkbrook; Carers and the LGBT community), in addition to a City-wide Hub. Each Hub is led by a locally-based organisation, with Tyburn Hub being led by Compass Support since 2016. Compass Support is a Community Interest Company with its origins as Castle Vale Community Regeneration Services, becoming Compass Support (the charitable arm of the Pioneer Group) in 2015. Compass Support’s aim is to enable and empower residents to achieve their full potential, by adopting assets-based approaches to enable people in the long-term. This incorporates employability and skills, social
connectivity, health and wellbeing, and family and youth support. Therefore there is a clear overlap between the overarching aims of the ABIB Programme. Hubs are designed to promote, develop and support Ageing Better Networks (autonomous, self-organising groups of community volunteers supporting people who are isolated or at risk of isolation with involvement opportunities - each Network has a Network Lead who leads on a particular activity), with each Hub led by a Network Enabler. Networks can apply to the Ageing Better Fund, which provides funding of up to £2,000 to Networks to fund activities for an initial six months.

The Tyburn area was identified by the Aston University research as an area with additional risk factors for social isolation and loneliness amongst older residents (aged 50+), as it was found to have a very high proportion of the ‘oldest’ old people, poor transport links, and geographical isolation.

To inform the second phase of the ABIB Programme, consultation was carried out in each priority area led by the Hubs, to identify and understand current and potential future causes of isolation. These insights went on to inform the specific content of Local Action Plans which were developed in year 3 of the ABIB Programme (during 2017-18) and designed for each of the priority areas led by the Hubs, to create longer-term change and improvement in support and services for older people. Consultation with 176 residents, staff and stakeholders was carried out in Tyburn in 2016-17 led by Compass Support, and the findings went on to inform the Tyburn Local Action Plan which began operational delivery in 2017-18.

**Projects within the Ageing Better in Birmingham Tyburn Local Action Plan**

The Tyburn Local Action Plan contains five specific projects designed to broadly tackle social isolation and loneliness amongst older residents aged 50+. MEL Research was commissioned to evaluate the effectiveness and impact of four of these five projects in December 2017. Table 1 contains detail on the four projects we are evaluating (note that Table 1 contains the original timescales – some slippage may occur in the commissioning of the other three projects). The timescales for each project are not concurrent but are staggered.

The evaluation of the four projects was designed to be concurrent, namely to run alongside the projects as they operationalise and deliver, therefore allowing a ‘test and learn’ approach to be adopted within the evaluation of the Local Action Plan (reflecting the national Ageing Better ‘test and learn’ approach). The first project to be commissioned by BVSC was the Community Organisers Scheme, with the delivery contract awarded to Compass Support early in 2018. The commissioning of a provider for the second project (Good Neighbour Campaign) is currently out to tender and is planned to be awarded at the end of October 2018. The two further projects will be commissioned to providers after that.
Table 1: Tyburn Local Action Plan projects which are part of this evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>ABIB Delivery Funding Level</th>
<th>Timescales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Organisers Scheme</td>
<td>£100K</td>
<td>• December 2017 – December 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Neighbour Campaign</td>
<td>£59K</td>
<td>• September 2018 – September 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking Maps Project</td>
<td>£10K</td>
<td>• November 2018 – May 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care and Repair Scheme</td>
<td>£50K</td>
<td>• December 2018 – December 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The area covered by operational delivery of the four projects we are evaluating is shown on the map in Appendix B. It is important to note that this area is referred to in all BVSC documentation as ‘Tyburn Ward’. However, the area includes three main estates which lie within Tyburn Ward (Castle Vale, Pype Hayes and Birches Green); Bromford lies outside of the Tyburn Ward boundary but has been included as it has similar attributes, housing and tenure to the other three estates.

**ABIB Programme Evaluation and National Ageing Better Evaluation**

In addition to the evaluation of the projects within the Birmingham Local Action Plans, the ABIB Programme as a whole is being evaluated independently by CFE Research. There is also a national evaluation of the Ageing Better Programme which is being carried out by Ecorys. The main data collection tool for the national evaluation is the Common Measurement Framework (CMF) which collects quantitative data from Ageing Better clients / beneficiaries. The Community Organisers Scheme is the only one of the four projects we are evaluating to feed into this national evaluation.

**About the Community Organisers Scheme**

Our first narrative report presents the emerging findings of this evaluation to date, focusing on the Community Organisers Scheme as the first project of the four to be commissioned and to have begun delivery.

As noted, Compass Support is delivering the Community Organisers Scheme, which is designed to provide Tyburn Hub with a larger pool of active citizens to engage in the development of local Networks. The provider Invitation to Tender (ITT) notes that the Community Organiser Scheme is designed to:

- Encourage communities to integrate across the Tyburn ward
- Enable knowledge about the area to be communicated across the Ward
- Promote community cohesion
- Encourage active citizenship.
A key aim is that the Community Organisers Scheme is sustainable beyond the immediate funding stream, by providing support, training and tools to help people become more involved in community action and creating more resilient individuals and communities and reducing social isolation in the longer-term. A paid Community Organiser Coordinator was in post by the end of March 2018, with the role taken up by the person that was formerly the Interim Network Enabler for the Tyburn Hub (working for Compass Support). Around the same time, a new Network Enabler for Tyburn Hub was appointed.

The ITT for the provision of the project notes six key outcomes for the Community Organisers Scheme:

- Establish a Community Organisers Scheme to achieve key outcomes (recruiting 160 Volunteer Community Organisers to result in 40 trained and active Volunteer Community Organisers to allow for attrition)
- Reduce social isolation for Tyburn residents by delivering the scheme
- Increase Tyburn residents’ social connections across the wider community
- Increase community cohesion within Tyburn Ward through promotion, increased involvement and awareness
- Improve older Tyburn residents’ sense of wellbeing through participation in the scheme
- Achieve a positive change in attitudes amongst Tyburn residents and communities.

The ITT notes that the Volunteer Community Organisers’ role will be to:

- Build relationships and encourage people to create and develop connections with others in their communities, to encourage them to be more active in their neighbourhood and wider society
- Be part of community capacity-building
- Inspire more residents to take an active role in their area
- Promote and support community cohesion rather than fragmentation
- Encourage inter-generational activity
- Promote opportunities, activities and ideas in active citizenship to reduce isolation.

The first two-day training session for volunteers took place in July 2018 in Castle Vale, with the first of the next package of two-day training also taking place in Castle Vale at the end of August 2018. The first training session focuses on a range of introductory topics (about ABIB; the Volunteer Community Organiser role; benefits of volunteering to the individual and wider community; what prevents someone being an effective Volunteer Community Organiser; responsibilities; role description; boundaries). The second session focuses on safeguarding. At the time of writing this report, seven Volunteer Community Organisers have been recruited and trained in Castle Vale, meaning the Castle Vale recruitment is complete. Six volunteers live in Castle Vale and the other volunteer has links to the local area. One other person has been recruited and will go on to provide support for the Tyburn Hub.
focusing on bereavement. Two Volunteer Community Organisers have been involved in the pop-up café in Birches Green and have made door-to-door calls to identify people who are isolated and lonely.

Social media marketing has taken place via the Compass Support Facebook page, and the Scheme was promoted on Switch radio on 25th July at 3pm.

2. Evaluation aims and objectives

MEL Research was commissioned by BVSC in late 2017 to carry out an independent evaluation of the four projects within the Tyburn LAP. Evaluations of projects within the Local Action Plans are designed to capture the local focus and learning, in line with the ‘test and learn’ approach of Ageing Better. The Birmingham-wide and national Ageing Better Programme evaluations are adopting quantitative approaches, so the evaluation of projects within the Tyburn LAP is designed to complement this with mixed-methods evaluation approaches incorporating qualitative data.

The evaluation ITT noted a number of evaluation aims and objectives for each of the four projects to be evaluated, most of which were common across the projects but with some small differences / additions. Specific to the Community Organisers Scheme, the evaluation ITT noted the following high-level evaluation requirements (comprising both formative and summative elements):

- Assess the overall effectiveness of delivery of the project, including clear insights regarding any perceived delivery obstacles or failures (formative learning)
- Clearly set out lessons learnt from the project (formative learning)
- Through data gathered through the CMF, assess the achievement of the Community Organisers Scheme against its key outcomes of:
  - Increased community connections in Tyburn Ward
  - Increased community cohesion in Tyburn Ward
- Assess attitudinal change when measured against its intended key outcome of ‘a positive change in attitudes amongst residents and communities in the area’.

We have devised an Evaluation Framework (see Appendix A) designed to capture learning across all four projects as they develop and deliver. There is a mini Theory of Change for each of the four projects, and we have reviewed these when designing the Evaluation Framework. We use the key elements of this Evaluation Framework as our reporting framework in this our first narrative report.

3. Evaluation methodology

Our first narrative evaluation report focuses on progress to date of the Community Organisers Scheme (as the only project to have been commissioned and begun delivery). As it is still relatively early days,
the evidence base is still limited and will build over time as the other three projects come on-stream (and as the Community Organisers Scheme makes further progress).

During the evaluation to date, we have been flexible in our approach to reflect some changes in the mobilisation of the Community Organisers Scheme – there have been some initial delays with the project, with the first training session taking place later than planned in July 2018. We moved the baseline survey back to August 2018 and our first narrative report to September 2018. Our key evaluation methodology so far is presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Key evaluation methodology to date

| 1. Contract management and planning: | • Inception meeting with BVSC on 5/1/18  
| | • Progress catch up with BVSC on 19/6/18 to discuss reporting timescales and what evidence the report would include  
| | • Ongoing communication with BVSC by email  
| | • Monthly contract monitoring forms submitted  
| 2. Documentation review: | • Review of documents relating to the projects and wider Programme  
| | • Evidence scan of good practice in measuring the impact of social isolation and loneliness interventions amongst older people  
| | • Compilation and review of validated tools used to measure isolation and loneliness to inform survey design  
| | • Initial reviews of CMF dashboard; queries explored with BVSC  
| | • Overarching working document prepared of all key issues emerging from the documentation review  
| | • Production of Data Availability Table for the Community Organisers Scheme – what data is available, from whom  
| 3. Familiarisation: | • Scoping visit to Compass Support on 7/2/18  
| | • Second scoping visit to Compass Support on 10/5/18 – update on delivery and data capture  
| | • Catch up with Compass Support about delivery on 30/8/18  
| 4. Evaluation Framework: | • Production of an Evaluation Framework of key questions for the evaluation to answer  
| 5. Baseline survey August 2018 – to allow us to measure and track any change in attitudes pre and post the interventions: | • Survey design using Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI) informed by other validated tools and by the key question of ‘what is it plausible that the
projects will influence and how do we measure this?'

- List of priority survey themes produced as part of design
- Survey piloted in Tyburn, 16th / 17th July 2018. Amendments made
- Interviewer briefing held 20/7/18
- Fieldwork arrangements finalised: sampling, quotas, client authorisation letter, MEL authorisation letter, showcards, police notification
- 362 interviews completed across the four estates, n=295 with residents over 50 and n=67 with residents under 50
- Survey analysis complete for sample over 50 and under 50: frequencies, crosstabulations, De Jong, ICECAP-O, regression analysis

6. Stakeholder feedback:

- Stakeholder feedback form designed
- Stakeholder list compiled – 14 stakeholders
- Initial email sent out 28/8/18 plus one reminder sent 10/9/18
- Three feedback forms received
- Informal discussion held with two Age of Experience Group members who are also Volunteer Community Organisers (5/9/18)

7. Volunteer Community Organiser feedback:

- Sat in on afternoon session of Volunteer Community Organiser training in Castle Vale (30/8/18). Three Volunteer Community Organisers participated
- Training materials obtained from Compass Support
- Attended Volunteer Community Organiser informal session on 5/9/18 to gather feedback from the 5 volunteers who attended on the day via a group discussion (Community Organiser Coordinator sat in)

8. Other activities:

- Promotional news item prepared and shared on MEL Research website and on BVSC ABIB website
- Compass Support monthly monitoring forms provided to MEL by BVSC
- BVSC provided data on Networks in Tyburn
- BVSC provided data on Ageing Better Network Funding in Tyburn
Community Organisers Scheme: Data Availability Summary

Within stage 2 (documentation review) as listed in Table 2, we compiled a Data Availability Table for the Community Organisers Scheme listing what data is available and from whom. We can then replicate this approach for the other three projects. The key data sources which are relevant to the Community Organisers Scheme are listed below (note that for some, data is not yet available and will come on-stream at a later point):

- **CMF questionnaire**: Community Organisers Scheme is the only one of the four projects which feeds into the CMF national evaluation data hosted by Ecorys. Baseline and follow up CMF questionnaire with residents in the community who are socially isolated and / or lonely that the Volunteer Community Organisers make contact with (as well as the Volunteer Community Organiser themselves if they are aged 50+). The CMF comprises quantitative nationally validated questions. During September 2018 we understand that there were 3 CMF returns on the dashboard specific to the Community Organisers Scheme.

- **The Impact App**: will be used by the Volunteer Community Organisers on smart phones / tablets to collect mainly qualitative data over time from residents in the community that they work with. There have been some technical issues in getting the Impact App operational, so data is not yet being collected using this software. The evaluators have not seen the final Impact App content but it is probable that we can add some value to this data by theming / analysing it to feed into future narrative reports.

- **Compass Support Community Organiser Scheme monthly contract monitoring forms**: detailing progress on delivery, outputs and outcomes over time.

- **Community Organiser Scheme training evaluation form feedback / data**: focusing on participants’ views about the training delivery, content and whether needs were met.

- **Report(s) to be prepared by Compass Support focusing on outputs and outcomes delivered by the Community Organiser volunteer training over time? To be confirmed if this will happen.**

- **Feedback from Action Learning Sets via Compass Support with Volunteer Community Organisers? To be confirmed if this will happen.**

- **Data on Ageing Better Networks in Tyburn (data from BVSC)**

- **Data on Ageing Better Network Funding (£2,000 per Network for six months) (data from BVSC)**

- **Ecorys baseline survey in Tyburn and Sparkbrook: ran between October 2015-June 2016 to set the baseline for the national evaluation. Interim and post ABIB Programme survey to be administered (may provide wider contextual data but note that the sample was focused on those aged 63+ so different to the 50+ focus in Birmingham).**

- **ABIB Programme-wide evaluation findings**: conducted by CFE Research (may provide wider contextual data).

4. Evaluation reporting

In the next section we present our first narrative report of findings, shaped around the Evaluation Framework (see Appendix A). As it is still relatively early days and the Community Organisers Scheme is the first project to come on-stream, we don’t have final or comprehensive answers to the questions in the
Evaluation Framework. The evidence will build as providers of the other three projects are commissioned and delivery begins.

For the purposes of this report we will present available findings to date based on the evidence sources outlined in Table 2 further above, incorporating:

- Documentation review
- Familiarisation and scoping visits with Compass Support as provider of the Community Organisers Scheme
- Baseline survey findings
- Early stakeholder feedback
- Early feedback from the Volunteer Community Organisers
- Sitting in on the Volunteer Community Organiser training
- Relevant insights on progress, outputs and outcomes from Compass Support’s monthly monitoring forms for the Community Organiser Scheme
- Data from BVSC on ABIB Tyburn Networks and Ageing Better funding allocations.

This report does not include evidence from the following sources as it is too early for data to be available – we will re-visit these sources in our future narrative reports:

- CMF data – very little CMF data currently available as it’s too early in terms of delivery of the Community Organisers Scheme
- Impact App data – technology not yet operational and no data currently being collected by the Community Organisers Scheme
- Training evaluation findings – too early in delivery of the Community Organisers Scheme
- Beneficiary / client feedback – too early (but we have gathered some initial feedback from the first pool of Volunteer Community Organisers).
Key evaluation findings

1. Effectiveness of overall delivery of the Community Organisers Project – identify any delivery obstacles or failures (formative learning)

- The Community Organisers Scheme was formally scoped out and procured, with a clear ITT. However, the Scheme is largely a non-prescriptive intervention, adopting an experimental ‘test and learn’ approach. Reflecting this, there have been some challenges for delivery including:
  - The original Compass Support proposal to deliver the Scheme included another organisation (Spitfire Support Services) as deliverers of the Volunteer Community Organiser training. However, this did not happen meaning that Compass Support have developed and delivered the training themselves (there are some positive unexpected outcomes from this – see further below). Because of the change in training provider, there have been some delays in delivery – the first training session was originally planned for April 2018 but in practice took place in July 2018
  - Compass Support originally appointed a Community Organiser Coordinator early in 2018, but that person did not take up the role so the post had to be re-advertised. The current Coordinator was subsequently appointed, but this did cause some early delays to project delivery
  - An administrative assistant took up a post in mid-May 2018 to assist with the creation of marketing materials for the volunteer recruitment process, but we understand that they left Compass Support in September 2018. Since this time, two apprentices have been appointed and are supporting the Ageing Better project and a new administrative assistant is now in post.
  - The mobilisation and set-up phase of the Community Organisers Scheme has taken some time, which is always the case with this type of commissioned community-based project. The provider was commissioned in January 2018 and the first training session took place in July 2018. Having a realistic view of the length of time it takes to mobilise this sort of project is an important learning point for the other three projects to be commissioned within the Tyburn LAP, in particular for the projects with a shorter lifespan (e.g. Walking Maps). The length of the mobilisation phase could have a real impact on what it is feasible for shorter and more time-bound projects to deliver
  - Engaging with isolated people and encouraging involvement is challenging and it takes time to build a visible presence for the project within local communities. Those people who are particularly isolated and lonely can be hard to identify, and reluctant to getting involved, and it takes time to build trust with local communities in this way.

2. What are the key lessons learned for the Community Organisers Project – what has worked well and what have been the challenges (formative learning):

What has worked well?

- The development of the ABIB Tyburn Local Action Plan has been evidence-based, which is an example of good practice. The Tyburn LAP has been informed by scoping research by Aston University, followed by further local research by Compass Support (on behalf of BVSC) to identify the causes of, and reasons for, isolation and loneliness in Tyburn Ward. The Community Organisers Scheme has emerged from this evidence-based approach, and is rooted in local insight and experiences.
▪ A key lesson from early project delivery is that what works where (across the four estates within Tyburn) varies depending on the existing infrastructure and previous levels of ‘community investment’ in each area. As Compass Support is based in Castle Vale (and recognising the considerable investment which Castle Vale has benefitted from in recent years) there has been a strategic early focus on the other three estates which may have less infrastructure and have received less prior investment. Initially however, project delivery has focused on Castle Vale to provide vital early momentum to get the project off the ground and see what works. The project has amended the order of approach to the other three areas, which is an example of the ‘test and learn’ approach adopted. There is quite a lot of community activity taking place in Bromford (largely due to an active Big Local programme) so the project is leaving recruitment and training in that area to last, in the meantime focusing on Birches Green then Pype Hayes

▪ Compass Support leads the ABIB Tyburn Hub, carried out scoping consultation in around 2016, and is now the provider of the Community Organisers Scheme. There is added value here from the positive interplay between the Hub, local Ageing Better Networks, Community Organisers Scheme and other local activity. There is synergy between the aim of the Tyburn Hub (reducing social isolation by increasing community connections, and adopting assets-based approaches) and the Community Organisers Scheme. The Community Organiser Coordinator works in partnership with the Hub’s Network Enabler (whose role is to identify people to become part of the Volunteer Community Organisers team as well to get people to get involved in Network activity) so again there is positive synergy and added value here. In addition, local residents will be encouraged by the Volunteer Community Organisers to start their own Networks, which will in turn benefit the Tyburn Hub

▪ Two positive examples of good practice whereby the Community Organisers Scheme is linking with the Tyburn Hub and other local partners as a result of the project being led by a local, community-based organisation like Compass Support which is multi-disciplinary in focus, are:
  ▪ The Independent Living Team for Castle Vale has referrals to make to the Community Organisers Project, so that isolated older people can be linked up with each other (a befriending system)
  ▪ The database from the Community Organiser Scheme will add to the local ‘Nobody Without’ work

▪ Recruitment of Volunteer Community Organisers has generally worked well (despite the initial project delivery delays). The first phase of recruitment has resulted in seven volunteers who seem committed to, and have considerable empathy for, the volunteering role. They have a range of experience and already form a powerful and coherent team

▪ Getting a volunteer team with the right skills is absolutely vital to the success of the Community Organisers Scheme. The pool of volunteers recruited so far all have a very strong sense of being involved as a volunteer as a way to help others in the community, and as a way to use their own experiences of isolation, loneliness and challenging times to help others. Most of the volunteers have previously been involved in formal / informal caring work. Being involved in the project enables the volunteers to help themselves (by building their own confidence and sense of purpose) and help individuals in the community. The volunteers’ own experiences provide them with insight and empathy, and place them in a very strong position to fulfil the volunteering role to help other people by tackling isolation and loneliness. One volunteer commented. ‘I know what it’s like to be isolated so it helps me and it helps them’. We note elsewhere that a key unintended positive outcome of the project so far is the strong bond and identity that has built between the group of volunteers

▪ The volunteers want to be involved in something but it has to be manageable and fit around their lives (and not make them feel too pressured / overwhelmed) so the part-time voluntary model suits them well

▪ Key elements of recruitment that have worked well include:
▪ Recruitment gained vital early momentum by starting in Castle Vale, where Compass Support is based

▪ Compass Support waited to recruit until the training programme and content was ready, to avoid early recruitment then losing the interest of volunteers whilst the training was finalised

▪ Recruitment to date has not focused on ‘the usual suspects’ or people already well known to the provider; volunteers have been recruited in a variety of ways including: leaflet in a GP surgery; given leaflet by family member; handing out leaflets to others and a friend suggested the individual volunteered themselves; personal contact with Compass Support; via a leaflet in a Church. Therefore the main method has been volunteers coming forward in response to advertising of the Scheme

▪ We understand that there will be a tailored approach to recruitment in each of the four areas to reflect their differences

▪ As noted, Compass Support providing the volunteer training provides the opportunity for the training provider to get to know the volunteers, assess strengths and weaknesses, and help devise their future roles.

▪ All of the volunteers who have been involved in the Community Organiser Scheme training to date are positive about the training, look forward to their sessions (formal or informal) and are keen to get involved as volunteers out and about with the community

▪ Whilst six out of seven volunteers recruited so far live in Castle Vale, the volunteers have been working in other areas of Tyburn to assist with promotion of the project (such as Birches Green)

▪ To support the learning from the Volunteer Community Organiser training, provide informal support to volunteers in putting training into practice, and to build the identity of the volunteer group, the informal weekly sessions hosted by Compass Support for volunteers at the Sanctuary are an example of good practice which should be replicated in the other three areas. As the project evolves, it will be interesting to see how the volunteers from across the four estates come together - we think there is scope for joint volunteer sessions to take place to build the identity of the whole group of volunteers, share learning across the estates and build integration across the Tyburn area as a whole – we return to this in our recommendations

▪ There is a What’s App group that the Community Organiser Coordinator has set up and uses to communicate with the Volunteer Community Organisers – this helps with communication and also helps build the identity of the group

▪ The local focus of the Community Organisers Scheme brings some considerable advantages for this type of community-based intervention. Having a very local focus can help build trust and get the Community Organiser Scheme (and ABIB brand) recognised and trusted:
  ▪ Six of the seven Volunteer Community Organisers live in Castle Vale (and one has links with the area). Recruiting locally-based volunteers means they have excellent local knowledge and insight, are visible locally and more potentially more likely to be trusted by other residents. They can ‘spread the word’ about the project even when they are not ‘officially’ volunteering and this local focus helps to build the identity of the project
  ▪ All volunteers wear an ABIB Community Organiser branded t-shirt and lanyard, which makes them visible in the local area and should help to build awareness of both the project and Ageing Better brand. These are becoming recognised in the community and get people interested in what the volunteers are doing
  ▪ Training is going to be provided in the four local areas, in known community venues
  ▪ The Volunteer Community Organisers share their local knowledge with Compass Support for instance about how and where to promote the project, where to hold Pop up Cafes,
what areas to focus on to target certain groups who may be particularly isolated or vulnerable, or resistant to getting involved

- The Compass Support team, as a local community-based provider, brings a number of strengths:
  - The Community Organiser Coordinator had been involved in the ABIB Tyburn Hub for some time prior to taking up the role, so brings prior knowledge of the Programme and Hub
  - The current Network Enabler has good local contacts, highlighting the value of locally-recruited staff who know the area and people that live there
  - Compass Support has been involved in the ABIB Programme since its early days (both in operational ways and strategically), so bring this prior knowledge of the wider Programme to project delivery.

- The approach taken to promotion of the Community Organisers Scheme as a way of identifying community members who are isolated / lonely is an example of good practice. The project distributes flyers to a very local patch of the estate (a few streets) saying ‘we will be in this area on X date’, visiting on the date specified with the Pop up Café, and repeating this method at regular intervals. This builds a visible presence for the project, and helps build confidence and trust amongst local residents who may be isolated and lonely (and reluctant to engage). It can take a few weeks before somebody comes out for a chat. This approach is combined with door-to-door work around the area of the Pop up Café (to reach those who may be housebound or very reluctant to come out of their house). Stakeholders think this is an effective way of identifying isolated people for the volunteers to work with but as noted, this does take time

- There is synergy and added value between how Compass Support promote the Ageing Better Networks (via pop up activities, community centres, churches, flyers, GP surgeries) and how they promote the Community Organisers Scheme

- There are some incentives built-in to the training for volunteers:
  - Volunteers receive a minimum of one hour of life coaching with the Compass Life Coach
  - Volunteers who want to and have the skills can progress to being a Local Area Team Leader, mentoring and coaching other volunteers.

**What have been the challenges?**

- A wider lesson which emerged from early discussions with delivery stakeholders was that there is more to do promote the ABIB Tyburn Hub locally

- Another wider lesson is that we think there is more for the ABIB Programme to do to build awareness amongst the Age of Experience group about what members of part of, and to further explore how Age of Experience members can input into LAP projects

- We outlined the main planned data capture mechanisms for the Community Organisers Scheme in the first section of this report. There have been some challenges here:
  - Due to delays in operational delivery, just a handful of CMF questionnaires have started to be gathered meaning there is no early data from the CMFs
  - Due to delays in operational delivery, data from Compass Support via the monthly contract monitoring forms (outputs, outcomes, learning points) started to come through from June 2018, meaning data for this first narrative report is more limited
  - There have been delays in developing the Impact App software for us on tablets / smartphones by the Volunteer Community Organisers to gather ongoing, qualitative feedback from people the volunteers work with in the community
• Volunteer Community Organisers do not feel confident about using the Impact App at this point – we understand that a further training session will be held once the Impact App design and software is complete

• We think that as the project progresses, there is scope to improve the training evaluation feedback to include not just views about training delivery and content, but to also include some outcomes of changes in individual wellbeing for the Volunteer Community Organisers themselves – we return to this in our recommendations

• We would like to clarify whether reports will be prepared by Compass Support linked to outputs and outcomes of the volunteer training, and confirm whether Action Learning Set feedback will be gathered.

• There is some complexity in data capture for the Community Organisers Scheme, as it is an experimental and ‘cascading’ model:
  
  The project has different layers of beneficiaries and impact - Volunteer Community Organisers themselves, plus people in the community that the volunteers go on to work with

  The Community Organisers Scheme is the only project of the four we are evaluating which feeds into the CMF

  The original plan was the Volunteer Community Organisers themselves would be aged 50+, but early learning from the project is that involving people in their 50’s up to retirement age could be difficult due to work commitments. Residents aged 65+ may not want to be involved long-term, which poses challenges for the longer-term involvement / legacy of the volunteers. Therefore a decision was made to expand the ages of volunteers to include people aged younger than 50, who can be involved in the long-term. This is an example of learning into action, emerging from the ‘test and learn’ approach. The evaluators have met five out of the seven Volunteer Community Organisers recruited so far, of which we estimate that two are over the age of 50 and three are under the age of 50

  The Volunteer Community Organisers will mainly go on to work with isolated and lonely local residents aged 50+; however volunteers will signpost younger people to support and services as appropriate (but anyone under 50 will not be asked to fill in a CMF)

  Whilst the main focus of the Community Organisers Scheme is the four estates within Tyburn, there is ‘resident flow’ across these areas meaning that some people from outside the Tyburn area will use Hub and Network activities – Compass Support as provider of the Community Organiser Scheme, is flexible here and won’t exclude people on this basis. But it does add another layer of complexity to assessing outputs and outcomes

  We note that there are no targets relating to the number of people the volunteers go on to work with in the local community - we return to this in our recommendations

  We note that there is no specific time requirement / commitment for the Volunteer Community Organisers – as we note elsewhere this flexibility is a key reason for the volunteers recruited so far getting involved in the project. It will however be interesting to see how this works in practice, as the project beds-in.

• Whilst we assess so far that overall recruitment in the first area has gone well, there are a couple of challenges to note:

  Recruitment began in June 2018, so there was a mobilisation phase between the provider being commissioned (January 2018) and recruitment beginning (June 2018). Operational delays with the change in training provider will have played a part here. The length of the mobilisation phase from commissioning to recruitment starting needs to be borne in mind
for the other areas and for other similar projects of this type. Data is first provided by Compass Support on the number of effective volunteers recruited in the August 2018 return

- We note that there are no specific targets set for the gender of the Volunteer Community Organisers. All seven Volunteer Community Organisers recruited to date are women – as the project continues, a consideration may be how to recruit some male volunteers – this may be particularly important for isolated / lonely older males in the community.

3. Progress against key outcomes for Tyburn ward for older residents for the Community Organisers Project (summative learning):

   a. Increased community connections
   b. Increased community cohesion
   c. Increased sense of belonging / sense of community
   d. Reduced social isolation and loneliness
   e. Enable residents to play a more active role in the local community (active citizenship)
   f. Increased sense of neighbourliness
   g. Increased integration across Tyburn Ward

- It is too early in the Community Organisers Scheme implementation to make any comments about impact – some of these measures will be populated via CMF data and some via the findings of the baseline and post survey of residents (post survey to happen in 2019)

- A further challenge when measuring progress against outcomes over time is that all of the four projects we are evaluating within the Tyburn LAP are different – the Community Organiser Scheme is more clearly about enabling and building community capacity, as is the Good Neighbour Campaign to a lesser extent. The other two projects (Care and Repair and Walking Maps) are more about the built environment

- As noted, there is some early anecdotal feedback from Volunteer Community Organisers and Compass Support that the project is starting to make contact with and have an early impact on people who are isolated and lonely. The project is starting to link individuals in the community to the project itself, as well as linking up individuals within the community. Early examples include:

  ▪ One older lady who is housebound
  ▪ There has been engagement with an elderly woman who is isolated due to disability
  ▪ Engagement with elderly gentleman who has been recently bereaved
  ▪ Connection of older person with a younger neighbour who was feeling isolated because she is new to the area and has no family or friends
  ▪ Via an August Pop up Café in Birches Green. the volunteers connected with three very isolated individuals. Volunteers visited one lady who was unable to get out to the Pop up Café and had a 30 minute chat with her in her home. The only people she had been in contact with, for as far as she could remember, were the carers who attended her home each day.

- The pool of seven Volunteer Community Organisers have the empathy and desire to work with people in the community who are socially isolated and lonely

- There is early feedback from the Volunteer Community Organisers about the positive impact they think being involved in the project is having on them as individuals. All the volunteers think being involved in the Scheme has had a positive impact on them, which is a positive finding. Benefits the volunteers reported include:
▪ Feeling happier
▪ Feeling less isolated / being out and about more
▪ Being able to chat to others about their involvement in the project
▪ Having a sense of purpose – a reason to get out of the house
▪ Feeling positive from helping others
▪ Increased self-esteem
▪ One volunteer commented, ‘Build our confidence and build others’ confidence’

We have noted that the local focus of the Community Organisers Scheme brings some considerable advantages for this type of community-based intervention, along with the time it can take from repeat visits to local areas to build trust and get the Community Organiser Scheme (and ABIB brand) recognised and trusted. Local residents are likely to be at very different ‘starting points’ and with varied / complex confidence levels and needs, particularly given the project’s focus on those residents who are isolated and lonely. It can take residents time to engage with a project like this. Measuring impact needs to reflect this – it takes time to build the evidence and produce outcomes.

We note that the monthly monitoring forms for the projects are outputs-driven, but the approach of the Community Organisers Scheme is that there needs to be a focus on quality vs quantity – so having a smaller, dedicated and effective team of Volunteer Community Organisers will probably be more effective in the long-term than a larger pool of less committed and able volunteers.

We have noted that we think there is scope to improve the training evaluation feedback to include not just views about training delivery and content, but to also include some outcomes of changes in individual wellbeing for the Volunteer Community Organisers themselves.

A number of stakeholders we approached for feedback to feed into this first report said it was too early for them to feel they could contribute – we will re-visit the stakeholder list in subsequent phases of the evaluation.

4. Impact on positive wider attitudinal change – positive change in attitudes amongst residents and communities in Tyburn (via pre and post survey – summative learning):

▪ It is too early in the evaluation (and delivery of the four projects) to talk about impact on wider attitudinal change. We will return to this when we run the post-projects survey in 2019, to explore what impact the projects have had on wider attitudinal change.

▪ In this section we present the findings of the baseline survey of 362 residents carried out in August and September 2018, largely using visual infographics. In our first survey, we have created a baseline position within Tyburn. We will repeat the survey later in 2019 once the projects have been up and running, to see whether attitudes, perceptions and measures improve. We will then need to make wider evaluative judgements about attribution of the projects as well as judgements about the counterfactual.

▪ A challenge for showing an impact on positive wider attitudinal change over time is that the population will naturally age over time, so social isolation and loneliness levels may increase despite the projects. This may pose challenges for our judgements about attribution and the counterfactual.

▪ In addition, there is a very wide age-range amongst those aged 50+. The needs and challenges for someone in their 50s will be very different to those experienced by someone in their late 80s.
Key Survey Findings Comparing Results for Respondents aged over 50 and under 50

1. Awareness of the Ageing Better Programme

Please note that due to the rounding of data, the results will not always add up to exactly 100%

Have you heard of the Ageing Better in Birmingham Programme?

**UNDER 50**

- **91%** of those under the age of 50 had not heard of the Ageing Better in Birmingham Programme.
- **4%** of those under the age of 50 had heard of the Ageing Better in Birmingham programme.
- **4%** of those under the age of 50 were unsure if they had heard of the Ageing Better in Birmingham Programme.

**OVER 50**

- **84%** of those over the age of 50 had not heard of the Ageing Better in Birmingham Programme.
- **9%** of those over the age of 50 had heard of the Ageing Better in Birmingham programme.
- **7%** of those over the age of 50 were unsure if they had heard of the Ageing Better in Birmingham Programme.
### How strongly do you feel you belong to your immediate neighbourhood?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Strongly Feel</th>
<th>Not Strongly Feel</th>
<th>Don’t Feel Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 50</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Thinking about the people who live in this neighbourhood, to what extent do you believe they can be trusted?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Many People</th>
<th>Some People</th>
<th>A Few People</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Just Moved Here</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 50</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Over 50’s base: 295)
(Under 50’s base: 67)

### Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your local area as a place to live?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 50’s</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50’s</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Generally, how satisfied are you with the local services and amenities in your local area?

- Under 50’s: 71% Satisfied, 13% Dissatisfied
- Over 50’s: 67% Satisfied, 18% Dissatisfied
- Under 50’s: 15% Neither
- Over 50’s: 15% Neither

Do you think that over the past two years your area has...

- Got Better: Under 50’s 21%, Over 50’s 11%
- Got Worse: Under 50’s 30%, Over 50’s 35%
- Nothing’s Changed: Under 50’s 39%, Over 50’s 51%
- Not Lived Here Long Enough: Under 50’s 10%, Over 50’s 3%

How safe or unsafe do you feel when...

- Outside after dark:
  - Under 50’s: 68% Safe, 25% Unsafe, 6% Neither
  - Over 50’s: 48% Safe, 31% Unsafe, 17% Neither
- Outside during the day:
  - Under 50’s: 91% Safe, 7% Unsafe, 1% Neither
  - Over 50’s: 88% Safe, 6% Unsafe, 6% Neither
- Home alone at night:
  - Under 50’s: 82% Safe, 11% Unsafe, 6% Neither
  - Over 50’s: 84% Safe, 8% Unsafe, 7% Neither
How important is it for you personally to feel that you can influence decisions in your local area?

To what extent do you agree or disagree that you personally can influence decisions affecting your local area?

- **Under 50's**
  - 67% agree that they can influence decisions in their local area.
  - 50% disagree that they can influence decisions in their local area.
  - 12% don't know if they can influence decisions in their local area.

- **Over 50's**
  - 67% agree that they can influence decisions in their local area.
  - 60% disagree that they can influence decisions in their local area.
  - 5% don't know if they can influence decisions in their local area.
To what extent would you agree or disagree that people in your neighbourhood pull together to improve the neighbourhood?

**AGREE**

- **UNDER 50'S**: 52%
- **OVER 50'S**: 53%

**DISAGREE**

- **UNDER 50'S**: 48%
- **OVER 50'S**: 46%

**NOTHING NEEDS IMPROVING**

- **UNDER 50'S**: 0%
- **OVER 50'S**: 1%
### Social Contacts

Thinking about people in your local area, how often do you speak to anyone who isn't a family member?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Under 50's</th>
<th>Over 50's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everyday or almost every day</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or more times a week</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once or twice a week</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times a month</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once every two months</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every few months</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once or twice a year</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than once a year</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Not counting the people you live with, how often do you do any of the following with children, family or friends?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEET IN PERSON</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>EMAIL/WRITE</th>
<th>TEXT MESSAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNDER 50'S</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 times a week or more</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or 2 times a week</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or 2 times a month</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every few months</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or 2 times a year</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than once a year or never</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEET IN PERSON</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>EMAIL/WRITE</th>
<th>TEXT MESSAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVER 50'S</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 times a week or more</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or 2 times a week</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or 2 times a month</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every few months</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or 2 times a year</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than once a year or never</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the past twelve months, have you done any volunteer work for any groups, clubs or organisations?

- **UNDER 50'S**
  - Yes: 7%
  - No: 93%

- **OVER 50'S**
  - Yes: 4%
  - No: 96%
**Do you intend to volunteer in the future?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDER 50'S</th>
<th>OVER 50'S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10% said yes</td>
<td>6% said yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79% said no</td>
<td>85% said no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9% said maybe</td>
<td>7% said maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% said that they did not know</td>
<td>2% said that they did not know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Compared to other people of your own age, how often would you say you take part in social activities?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDER 50'S</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVER 50'S</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Perceptions of Getting Older

Thinking of old age and your own ageing experience, to what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>UNDER 50'S</th>
<th>OVER 50'S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We can learn a lot from old people</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As I get older, I expect to become more lonely</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old age is a time of ill health</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As I grow older, I become more tolerant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old age is a time of loneliness</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As I get older I expect to be able to do things I've always done</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I think of old people, I think of them as generally grumpy and miserable</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I worry that my health will get worse as I grow older</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't think of myself as old</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old people don't get respect in society</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement is a time of leisure</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growing older doesn't bother me</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Key Demographic Profile of Respondents

**Gender**

- Male:
  - Under 50's: 39%
  - Over 50's: 53%
- Female:
  - Under 50's: 61%
  - Over 50's: 47%

**Ethnicity**

- **White**:
  - Under 50's: 66%
  - Over 50's: 89%
- **Asian/Asian British**:
  - Under 50's: 14%
  - Over 50's: 2%
- **Mixed**:
  - Under 50's: 9%
  - Over 50's: 1%
- **Black/Black British**:
  - Under 50's: 4%
  - Over 50's: 7%
- **Other**:
  - Under 50's: 3%
  - Over 50's: 0%
- **Prefer not to say**:
  - Under 50's: 1%
  - Over 50's: 1%
### Who do you live with?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNDER 50'S</th>
<th>OVER 50'S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Live with Spouse</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Alone</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live with Family</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer Not to Say</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### What is your marital status?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNDER 50'S</th>
<th>OVER 50'S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SINGLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/Civil Partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer Not to Say</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer Not to Say</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you have any caring responsibilities for a member of your immediate family, or a close relative outside of your household, who has any long-standing illness, disability or infirmity?

Roughly how many years you have lived in your current neighbourhood?

(Under 50’s base: 57)  (Over 50’s base: 281)

- UNDER 50's
  - 5 Years or Less 39%
  - 6-10 Years 32%
  - 11-20 Years 14%
  - 20 Years+ 16%
- OVER 50's
  - 5 Years or Less 10%
  - 6-10 Years 16%
  - 11-20 Years 22%
  - 20 Years+ 51%
About Your Health

How is your health in general?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNDER 50'S</th>
<th>OVER 50'S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY GOOD</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIR</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAD</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY BAD</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you have any physical or mental health conditions or illnesses lasting or expected to last for 12 months or more?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNDER 50'S</th>
<th>OVER 50'S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Does your condition or illness/do any of your conditions or illnesses reduce your ability to carry out day-to-day activities?

- **YES - A LOT**
  - **UNDER 50'S**: 33%
  - **OVER 50'S**: 57%

- **YES - A LITTLE**
  - **UNDER 50'S**: 58%
  - **OVER 50'S**: 39%

- **NO**
  - **UNDER 50'S**: 8%
  - **OVER 50'S**: 4%
Key findings from the De Jong Giervald 6 item Loneliness Scale

We included in the baseline survey the De Jong Giervald Loneliness Scale, which is a validated question to measure levels of loneliness. This academically rigorous tool distinguishes between the different causes of loneliness (emotional loneliness and social loneliness) and was designed for use with older people. It can be found at question 25 in our survey (see Appendix C).

The question contains three statements about emotional loneliness (when an individual misses an intimate relationship) and three about social loneliness (when someone is missing a wider social network). There is a specified methodology for the analysis of the responses to this question, and we have followed this to produce our analysis. Further detail about the analysis can be found in Appendix F.

Analysis of the baseline data produces:

- An emotional loneliness score ranging from 0 (not emotionally lonely) to 3 (intensely emotionally lonely)
- A social loneliness score also ranging from 0 (not socially lonely) to 3 (intensely socially lonely)
- An overall analysis from 0 (least lonely) to 6 (most lonely).

The main value in this data will be once we have both the baseline and post survey data later in 2019, so we can identify whether the measures improve. We will then need to make wider evaluative judgements about attribution of the projects to any changes in measures, as well as judgements about the counterfactual.

Key findings from our analysis of the baseline De Jong survey data indicate that:

- For respondents under 50 the mean emotional loneliness score is 2.32; the mean social loneliness score is 1.91; and the mean overall loneliness score is 4.23
- For respondents over 50 the mean emotional loneliness score is 2.32; the mean social loneliness score is 2.08; and the mean overall loneliness score is 4.40
- By age: survey respondents over 50 are more socially lonely than those under 50
- By gender: women under 50 are more emotionally lonely and lonely overall than men under 50. Women over 50 are more emotionally lonely than men over 50
- By marital status: those over 50 who are married or living with a partner are less socially lonely than those over 50 who are widowed
- Caring: those over 50 without caring responsibilities are more socially lonely and lonely overall than those over 50 with caring responsibilities
- By area: those over 50 from Birches Green are more socially lonely than those over 50 from Castle Vale, Pype Hayes and Bromford.
Key findings from analysis of ICECAP-O data

We also included in the baseline survey the ICECAP-O (ICEpop CAPability measure for Older people), which is a validated measure of wellbeing and capability in older people that was designed and tested by the University of Birmingham (we have registered our use of the tool with the University and gained their approval to use it in this survey). The measure focuses on wellbeing defined in a broad sense and it incorporates the attributes of wellbeing that were found to be important to older people in the UK. ICECAP-O comprises five attributes (the lay terms are in brackets):

- Attachment (love and friendship)
- Security (thinking about the future without concern)
- Role (doing things that make you feel valued)
- Enjoyment (enjoyment and pleasure)
- Control (independence).

The ICECAP-O questions can be found at questions 20-24 in our survey (see Appendix C). There is a specified methodology for the analysis of the responses to these questions, and we have followed this to produce our analysis - further detail can be found in Appendix F. Analysis of the ICECAP-O baseline data produces an overall tariff score which ranges from 0 to 1. The higher the tariff, the better an individual’s wellbeing.

The main value in this data will be once we have both the baseline and post survey data later in 2019, so we can identify whether the ICECAP-O measures improve and move further towards 1. We will then need to make wider evaluative judgements about attribution of the projects to any changes in measures, as well as judgements about the counterfactual.

As the ICECAP-O questions are specifically designed for older people, we have only produced an analysis of ICECAP-O data for survey respondents aged 50+. Findings from our analysis of the baseline survey ICECAP-O data indicate that:

- The mean ICECAP-O tariff score for respondents aged 50+ is 0.85
- Respondents aged 50+ who have a physical or mental health condition have lower ICECAP-O scores than those who do not have such a condition
- There is no significant difference in ICECAP-O scores between men and women
- Respondents over 50 who are living with a spouse or partner, and those living with family, have higher ICECAP-O scores than those who are living alone
- Respondents over 50 who are divorced and those who are widowed have lower ICECAP-O scores than those who are married / in a domestic partnership
- There are no differences in ICECAP-O scores by area.
Key findings from regression analysis on ICECAP-O data

We have carried out regression analysis to identify which variables most influence wellbeing as measured via the ICECAP-O tariff, as captured by the ICECAP-O tool. Further detail about the analysis methodology can be found in Appendix F. Key findings from the regression analysis indicate that:

- Variables which appear to have a prominent effect on the overall ICECAP-O wellbeing score (after controlling for 'fixed' characteristics such as age, health, gender and ethnicity) were:
  - Feeling safe outside after dark (those who felt less safe had a lower overall wellbeing score than those who felt very safe)
  - Feeling safe home alone at night (those who felt less safe had a lower overall wellbeing score than those who felt very safe)
  - Speaking to others (speaking to others less frequently was associated with a lower overall wellbeing score)
  - Participating in social events (participating less frequently was associated with a lower overall wellbeing score)
  - Feeling emptiness (experiencing a sense of emptiness was associated with a lower overall wellbeing score)
  - Feeling you can rely on others (feelings of not having many people to rely on was associated with a lower overall wellbeing score)
  - Feeling you can trust others (feelings of not having many people to trust was associated with a lower overall wellbeing score)
  - Feeling rejected (was associated with a lower overall wellbeing score).

- These results are interesting as some variables emerge (in particular feeling safe outside after dark and at home alone at night) which influence the overall wellbeing of older residents, but these variables are not a particular focus of the four projects within the Tyburn LAP. Therefore, whilst the four projects may plausibly be able to influence some of these variables (e.g. loneliness / emptiness, social contacts / speaking to others, participation in events, trusting others) there are variables which emerge in this analysis which it is less plausible the four projects will influence. Therefore, other work may be needed locally in Tyburn to have a positive influence and impact on older residents’ wellbeing, aside from the four projects in focus (or put another way, there may be some limits to the impact the four projects can have in achieving a positive uplift in overall wellbeing scores over time).
5. To what extent do we assess the plausibility of achieved outcomes being attributable to the projects rather than to other factors – to what extent have the projects ‘made the difference’ (attribution)?

- It is too early in the evaluation (and delivery of the four projects) to assess the plausibility of achieved outcomes being attributable to the projects rather than to other factors. We will return to this question later in the evaluation, when more evidence is available.

6. To what extent do we assess that any identified outcomes would not have happened anyway (the counterfactual)?

- It is too early in the evaluation (and delivery of the four projects) to assess whether identified outcomes would not have happened anyway. We will return to the counterfactual question later in the evaluation, when more evidence is available.

7. Are there any unintended positive or negative outcomes of the Community Organisers Project?

**Unintended positive outcomes**

- As noted earlier, an early delivery challenge for the project was that a partner organisation lined up to lead on the training element did not take part in project delivery. This posed some early challenges but in addition, some unintended positive outcomes resulted:
  - Compass Support developed the training materials and delivered the training themselves, meaning that they have more control of the overall process and can more easily incorporate any learning from what works and key challenges from the training into subsequent sessions (reflecting the ‘test and learn’ approach)
  - As the hands-on training provider, Compass Support can control the training content and bring in partners / other stakeholders to the training where relevant. In addition, Compass Support have the flexibility and capacity to deliver the training as and when required, rather than working to a pre-agreed schedule
  - Compass Support as the training provider can build a relationship of trust with the Volunteer Community Organisers and become more familiar with the respective skills, strengths and worries of the volunteers – this would be more difficult if a third party was providing the training. This has enabled the volunteers to start delivering their role within the community more quickly
  - There is acknowledgement that there will be fluidity amongst the volunteer pool, and that ‘one size won’t fit all’ – some volunteers may drop out, some may not be suitable, some will go on to use their skills in different ways. This has already been seen, with one of the early volunteers going on to carry out some specific work with the Hub around bereavement. Compass Support can gain an early picture of the respective skills and strengths of the volunteers from a very early point
  - Compass Support can more easily identify additional training needs than they would have been able to do if a partner was providing the training. One example of this is the additional training required for volunteers on the Impact App.
  - Another unintended positive outcome is the strong bond, trust and sense of identity which has developed between the seven volunteers at this early point. The volunteers did not know each other
before the training. As well as providing their volunteer role out in the community, it is clear that the volunteers (who bring empathy and insight to the volunteer role from their own experiences of mental health and wellbeing challenges, isolation and loneliness) provide support to each other for the training and volunteering role, but also outside of this in everyday life, and get meaning and identity out of volunteering – it gives them something vital for themselves. Building these local connections and support network is a real added value of this type of community-based project. One of the volunteers commented, ‘We develop friendships in the group and friendships in the community’.

Unintended negative outcomes

▪ The nature of the project means that the volunteer role is varied, fluid and unpredictable. In some instances there may not be a clear ‘right answer’ about how to handle a particular situation, as each volunteer will have their own preferences, ways of responding, and different feelings about what is ‘comfortable’ for them. To some extent, the volunteers will have to use their own judgement in situations as they arise, and it is hard for the training to be prescriptive here. This was one of our observations when we sat in on the Volunteer Community Organiser training scenarios.

▪ One issue we think may need more consideration as the project continues is how the volunteers will deal with sensitive issues amongst people they come into contact with in the local community that are known to them e.g. hoarding, disclosure of a mental health issue, disclosure of addiction. This is the flipside to the benefits of volunteers being based in the communities they also live in, and the project may need to think proactively about how these issues are handled.

8. To what extent has the Community Organisers Project reached the ‘right’ people (those who are lonely and isolated)?

▪ The ITT for the provider of the Community Organisers Scheme notes that residents that the Volunteer Community Organisers go on to work with will be identified as lonely and / or isolated through the CMF, of which 50% of participants will be identified as lonely and 50% as lonely. The aim as specified in the ITT is that a 40% reduction in isolation is anticipated (measured by the De Jong Scale) and a 40% reduction in loneliness is anticipated (measured by the UCLA measure).

▪ It is too early to make evaluative judgements on this question, as only a handful of CMFs have started to be complete for the project. Our post-survey findings will provide further insight into any attitudinal changes amongst the wider community.

▪ What we can say at this point is that the early pool of seven Volunteer Community Organisers appear to have the empathy and desire to work with people in the community who are socially isolated and lonely, and some early anecdotal feedback from Volunteer Community Organisers and Compass Support is that the project is starting to make contact with people who are isolated and lonely.

▪ Discussions with the Volunteer Community Organisers highlighted that will always be some people who are isolated and lonely and could really benefit from a project like the Community Organisers Scheme, but resist getting involved despite repeated attempts.

▪ It would be helpful to clarify how key measures within the Compass Support monthly contract monitoring forms are defined, including:
  ▪ Number of active citizens targeted (400 noted in Compass Support’s proposal).
  ▪ Number of contacts made (2000 soft contacts).

▪ Compass Support’s monthly contract monitoring data for August 2018 indicates that:
  ▪ 17 Volunteer Community Organisers have been recruited out of 160 (the overall recruitment target).
▪ 3 effective Volunteer Community Organisers have been recruited (out of 40)
▪ 1,415 contacts made (2000 soft contacts were noted as the target in the Compass proposal).

9. To what extent has the Community Organisers Project displayed assets-based approaches – have citizens been empowered to take part in and influence activities to reduce social isolation?

▪ It is too early in the evaluation (and delivery of the four projects) to assess the extent that assets-based approaches have been displayed. Our early findings are that the pool of seven volunteers have been empowered to take part in the training, and are beginning their work in the community to reduce social isolation.

10. To what extent has each project tackled the underlying causes of isolation to leave a sustainable longer-term legacy / footprint beyond the life of this particular funding stream (summative learning)?

▪ It is too early in the evaluation (and delivery of the four projects) to assess the extent that the Community Organisers Scheme will leave a sustainable longer-term legacy

▪ Our early findings are that:
  ▪ The pool of seven volunteers has the empathy and desire to make a difference in their local community
  ▪ The local focus of the Community Organiser Scheme (led by a local provider who knows the area and history of the Ageing Better Programme and has the interplay with the Hub; locally based volunteers who bring their own knowledge and insight and help to build the visibility of the project) are early positives which maximise a longer-term legacy being left
  ▪ Some of the volunteers who have been involved in running Pop up Cafes want to take this element on themselves, within their own area. Therefore the Pop up Café idea should be able to carry on after the Community Organiser Scheme itself has finished
  ▪ As noted, a decision was made by the project to expand the ages of volunteers to also include people younger than 50, who can be involved in the project in the longer-term.

▪ Once the Community Organiser Scheme is further on in delivery, it is likely that Network activity will emerge from the work of the volunteers in the local community. At the time of writing, data on general Networks within the Tyburn Hub from BVSC (not specific to the Community Organisers Scheme) indicates that:
  ▪ 50 Ageing Better Networks were created by Tyburn Hub up to March 2018, and a further 5 have been created from April 2018 onwards
  ▪ 26 Ageing Better funding applications were submitted for Tyburn Hub up to March 2018, and a further 6 submitted from April 2018 onwards
  ▪ 10 Ageing Better funding applications were awarded for Tyburn Hub up to March 2018 (totalling £13,332) and a further 3 awarded from April 2018 onwards (totalling £4550).

▪ The discussion with the Age of Experience members (who are also now involved as Volunteer Community Organisers) highlighted a wider learning point about the need to build-in the sustainability of funded activities. There is up to £2000 of funding available from ABIB to support Network activity for up to six months, and the volunteers may go on to support Networks in their applications for this
funding. A learning point is that further support is needed from the ABIB Programme to help make the activity sustainable from the start (looking ahead to when the initial funding is spent e.g. by setting a feasible ‘charge’ for individuals to pay to attend, pursuing no or low-cost room hire options). There has been funded activity locally which has had to cease once the funding has been spent. Having successfully got people involved and gained their trust, activities closing down disappoints the local community, can make it much more difficult to re-engage the community in future, and does not provide a good return on investment for the funding in the long-term.

11. What are our key conclusions on areas of interplay between the four projects?

▪ It is too early in the evaluation and delivery of the four projects to provide conclusions on areas of interplay between the four projects. We will return to this later in the evaluation when more evidence for all projects is available.

12. What are the key considerations for ongoing delivery (formative) and impact (summative) of the Community Organisers Project?

Delivery (formative) considerations

1. A wider lesson which emerged from early discussions with delivery stakeholders is that there is more to do promote the ABIB Tyburn Hub locally. This may be particularly the case in Birches Green, Pype Hayes and Bromford (given that the Hub is led by a Castle Vale-based organisation)

2. We recommend that there is more for the ABIB Programme to do to build awareness amongst the Age of Experience group membership to build their knowledge and identity about what members of part of, and to further explore how Age of Experience members can input into LAP projects.

3. Having a realistic view of the length of time it takes to mobilise this sort of project is an important learning point for the other three projects to be commissioned within the Tyburn LAP, in particular for the projects with a shorter lifespan (e.g. Walking Maps). The length of the mobilisation phase could have a real impact on what it is feasible for shorter and more time-bound projects to deliver.

4. A key lesson from early project delivery is that what works where (across the four estates within Tyburn) varies depending on the existing infrastructure and previous levels of ‘community investment’ in each area. This needs to be borne in mind for the other three projects as they come on-stream.

5. We understand that there will be a tailored approach to recruitment in each of the remaining three areas, to reflect local differences. The main recruitment approach used so far has been volunteers coming forward in response to advertising of the Scheme which has worked well, and could be rolled-out in the other areas. It will be interesting to see how recruitment and delivery progresses, as Compass Support is less well-established in the other three areas.

6. Building trust within local areas via repeat visits, encouraging vulnerable residents to engage with the project, and getting the Community Organiser Scheme (and ABIB brand) recognised and trusted all takes time. Measuring impact needs to reflect this – it will take time to build the evaluation evidence and for the projects to produce outcomes.

7. The informal weekly sessions hosted by Compass Support for volunteers are an example of good practice which we recommend be replicated in the other three areas.

8. Linking in with these sessions, we recommend that the Community Organiser Coordinator compiles a ‘learning log’ over time e.g. of issues and successes raised by the volunteers in the training, from
volunteers in the weekly informal sessions and from feedback on the volunteers’ work in the community. This will provide another source of evidence to support the ‘test and learn’ approach.

9. Further consideration needs to be given to how volunteers will be involved in volunteering outside of their ‘own estates’, and how the pool of volunteers from across Tyburn will come together. We think there is scope for joint volunteer sessions to take place to build the identity of the whole group of volunteers, share learning across the estates and build integration across the Tyburn area as a whole.

10. The approach taken to promotion of the Community Organisers Scheme as a way of identifying community members who are isolated / lonely is an example of good practice (distributing flyers to a very local patch of the estate saying ‘we will be in this area on X date’, visiting on the date specified with the Pop up Café, and repeating this method at regular intervals). We recommend that this approach continues in the other three estates (we note that it has already started in Birches Green).

11. Volunteer Community Organisers do not feel confident about using the Impact App at this point. It will be important for a further training session to be run once the design and software is complete.

12. It is easy to underestimate how vital it is for a project like this to recruit an effective team of volunteers. The nature of the project means that the volunteer role is varied, fluid and at times unpredictable. To an extent, the volunteers will have to use their own judgement in situations as they arise. At this point we conclude than an effective team has been recruited for Castle Vale, and this approach needs to continue in the other three areas.

13. There have been some positive early impacts of the project on the team of volunteers themselves. Building these local connections and support network is another area of impact of the project, and it would be ideal if these early benefits could be replicated in the other three estates.

14. We think the project needs to consider how the volunteers will deal with sensitive issues amongst people they work in the community that are already known to them, and to cover this in future training. We understand that the induction process has been amended since we attended the training in August 2018, and that more detail on this has been added.

Impact (summative) considerations

1. We would like to clarify whether the following data will be collected and available over time:
   - Reports prepared by Compass Support linked to outputs and outcomes of the volunteer training
   - Action Learning Set feedback via Compass Support
   - Training participants’ feedback on the training delivery and content.

2. We think that as the project progresses, there is scope to improve the training evaluation feedback to include not just volunteer views about training delivery and content, but to include some outcomes of changes in individual wellbeing for the Volunteer Community Organisers themselves. This will provide another important source of evidence of impact of the project as it continues to deliver.

3. We would like to clarify what the following measures relate to / how they are defined (in the Compass Support monthly contract monitoring form):
   - Number of active citizens targeted (400 noted in Compass Support’s proposal)
   - Number of contacts made (2000 soft contacts)

4. There are no set targets relating to the number of people the volunteers go on to work with in the local community. We recommend that the Community Organisers Scheme gives some thought to this, to see whether a meaningful target can / should be set.

5. There are no set targets relating to the gender of the Volunteer Community Organisers. All seven Volunteer Community Organisers recruited to date are women. We recommend that as the project progresses, there is scope to think about how these targets could be set.

---

Measurement Evaluation Learning: Using evidence to shape better services
continues, consideration is given to recruiting some male volunteers. This may be particularly important for isolated / lonely older males in the community

6. We recommend that the Community Organisers Scheme (and the other three projects) collects case studies of good practice over time, to capture impact. Customer Journey Maps are another option – MEL Research could potentially provide some research support here

7. We would like to clarify whether there will be any scope for MEL Research to consult with people in the community that the Volunteer Community Organisers work with – this could provide powerful evidence of impact (providing consent and logistics could be organised)

8. We recommend that the ABIB Programme investigates what further support can be provided to local Networks who receive Ageing Better funding, so that funded activities become more sustainable in the longer-term and to increase return on investment (and to avoid disappointing the local community, making it more difficult to re-engage them in future)

9. The analysis of ICECAP-O data has indicated a number of variables which the four projects may plausibly be able to influence (e.g. loneliness / emptiness, social contacts / speaking to others, participation in events, trusting others). We recommend that BVSC and project providers use this insight to target the four interventions to most effectively impact on isolation, loneliness and broader wellbeing of Tyburn residents. The post-survey in 2019 will help to identify whether the measures improve. At that point we will need to make wider evaluative judgements about attribution of the projects to any changes in measures, as well as about the counterfactual

10. The analysis of ICECAP-O data has indicated the influence of certain variables on overall wellbeing scores which it is less plausible for the four projects to influence (feeling safe outside after dark and at home alone at night). Therefore, other work may be needed locally in Tyburn to have a positive influence and impact on older residents’ wellbeing over time, aside from the four projects in focus.
Methodological limitations of the evaluation

- To follow in later reports.
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Appendix A : Evaluation Framework

Tyburn LAP Evaluation: Evaluation Framework

1. **Effectiveness of overall delivery of each project** – identify any delivery obstacles or failures (formative learning):
   a. Community Organisers Project
   b. Good Neighbour Project
   c. Walking Maps Project
   d. Care and Repair Project

2. **What are the key lessons learned for each project** – what has worked well and what have been the challenges (formative learning):
   a. Community Organisers Project
   b. Good Neighbour Project
   c. Walking Maps Project
   d. Care and Repair Project

3. **Progress against key outcomes for Tyburn ward for older residents** (summative learning) (for each project):
   a. Increased community connections
   b. Increased community cohesion
   c. Increased sense of belonging / sense of community
   d. Reduced social isolation and loneliness
   e. Enable residents to play a more active role in the local community (active citizenship)
   f. Increased sense of neighbourliness
   g. Increased integration across Tyburn Ward
      a. Community Organisers Project – including CMF data for CO project
      b. Good Neighbour Project
      c. Walking Maps Project
      d. Care and Repair Project

4. **Impact on positive wider attitudinal change** – positive change in attitudes amongst residents and communities in Tyburn (via pre and post survey – summative learning):
   a. Community Organisers Project – including CMF data for CO project
   b. Good Neighbour Project
   c. Walking Maps Project
   d. Care and Repair Project – less for this project on this one

5. **To what extent do we assess the plausibility of achieved outcomes being attributable to the projects rather than to other factors – to what extent have the projects ‘made the difference’ (attribution)?**

6. **To what extent do we assess that any identified outcomes would not have happened anyway (the counterfactual)?**

7. **Are there any unintended positive or negative outcomes of each project?**
   a. Community Organisers Project
   b. Good Neighbour Project
   c. Walking Maps Project
   d. Care and Repair Project
8. To what extent do we conclude that each project has reached the ‘right’ people (those who are lonely and isolated)?
   a. Community Organisers Project
   b. Good Neighbour Project
   c. Walking Maps Project
   d. Care and Repair Project

9. To what extent do we conclude that each project has displayed assets-based approaches – have citizens been empowered to take part in and influence activities to reduce social isolation?
   a. Community Organisers Project
   b. Good Neighbour Project
   c. Walking Maps Project
   d. Care and Repair Project

10. To what extent do we conclude that each project has tackled the underlying causes of isolation to leave a sustainable longer-term legacy / footprint beyond the life of this particular funding stream (summative learning)?
    a. Community Organisers Project
    b. Good Neighbour Project
    c. Walking Maps Project
    d. Care and Repair Project

11. What are our key conclusions on areas of interplay between the four projects?

12. What are the key considerations for ongoing delivery (formative) and impact (summative)?

Plus project-specific elements to weave in:
   a. Community Organisers Project: include CMF data for CO project
   b. Good Neighbour Project: impact on neighbourliness; reach / scale / effectiveness of different campaign elements
   c. Walking Maps Project: uptake of walking maps / number of participants / number reporting improved levels of physical activity
   d. Care and Repair Project: positive long-term improvement in physical environment / increased age-friendly environment / fewer falls and injuries / number, type, of problems identified and resolved and not resolved / sustainability of solutions
Appendix B: Map of area covered by the projects

The four projects we are evaluating all focus on the area covered by the map shown here. There are three main estates within Tyburn Ward: Castle Vale, Pype Hayes and Birches Green. Bromford was also included as the fourth estate even though it lies outside of the Tyburn Ward boundary. Bromford was included as it has similar attributes, housing and tenure to the other three estates.
Appendix C: Baseline Survey
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Appendix D: First stakeholder feedback form (August / September 2018)

Ageing Better in Birmingham Tyburn Local Action Plan: Evaluation of Community Organisers Project - Stakeholder Feedback Form

This short feedback form is designed to gather stakeholders’ views about the Community Organisers Project, the first of four projects within the Tyburn Local Action Plan to have started delivery which M·E·L Research is evaluating (focusing on effectiveness and impact), commissioned by BVSC.

Findings from the feedback forms will feed into our first evaluation report in September 2018. All the information you provide will only be used for analysis and evaluation of the project. Direct quotations made by you may be used in reports that result from this study; we will not link data to you or your organisation and you will not be personally identifiable in any shared results.

Please email your completed form directly to Anne Forshaw at M·E·L Research, an independent research company operating in accordance with the Market Research Society’s Code of Conduct. All information will be held securely and strictly in accordance with UK Data Protection legislation including the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), in line with our privacy policy. Data will be held securely by M·E·L Research for three months after completion of the evaluation, after which time any personal information will be securely deleted.

Q1. To begin, please tell us your name, job title and organisation:
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..

Q2. Please provide a one sentence summary explaining your involvement with the Community Organisers Project:
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..

Q3. Thinking about the Community Organisers Project overall to date:

Q3a. What has worked well?
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..

Q3b. What have been the main challenges?
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..

Q4. Thinking about the mobilisation / set-up phase for the Community Organisers Project:

Q4a. What has worked well?
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..

Q4b. What have been the main challenges?
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..

Q5. Thinking about recruitment for the Community Organisers Project to date:

Q5a. What has worked well?
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..

Q5b. What have been the main challenges?
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..


Q6. Thinking about training delivered so far as part of the Community Organisers Project:

Q6a. What has worked well?

Q6b. What have been the main challenges?

Q7. How effective do you think the Community Organisers Project has been so far in delivery across the four estates (Castle Vale, Pype Hayes, Birches Green, Bromford)?

Q8. The Community Organisers Project is designed to deliver a range of outcomes in Tyburn ward including: reducing social isolation, increasing community connections and increasing community cohesion. Can you provide any early evidence of the Community Organisers Project having an impact on these outcomes?

Q9. Thinking about the Community Organisers Project to date, have there been any:

Q9a. Unintended / unexpected positive outcomes:

Q9b. Unintended / unexpected negative outcomes:

Q10. A key aim of the Community Organisers Project is that it is sustainable in the longer-term by helping people become involved in community action and creating stronger individuals and communities. Are there any early lessons about the potential longer-term sustainability of the Community Organisers Project to emerge so far?

Q11. In your view what has been the main learning from the Community Organisers Project so far, to inform future delivery?

Q12. Finally, do you have any other comments to make?

Thank you very much for answering these questions. Please return your completed form by email to Anne Forshaw, Evaluation Lead at M·E·L Research by Friday 7th September 2018: anne.forshaw@melresearch.co.uk
Appendix E: Questions for Volunteer Community Organisers September 2018

Ageing Better in Birmingham Tyburn Local Action Plan: Evaluation of Community Organisers Project – Community Organiser Volunteer Feedback Form

This short feedback form is designed to gather the views of the Community Organiser Volunteers about the Community Organisers Project, the first of four projects within the Tyburn Local Action Plan to have started delivery which M·E·L Research is evaluating (focusing on effectiveness and impact), commissioned by BVSC.

Findings from the feedback forms will feed into our first evaluation report in September 2018. All the information you provide will only be used for analysis and evaluation of the project. Direct quotations made by you may be used in reports that result from this study; we will not link data to you or your organisation and you will not be personally identifiable in any shared results.

The evaluation is being carried out by M·E·L Research, an independent research company operating in accordance with the Market Research Society's Code of Conduct. All information will be held securely and strictly in accordance with UK Data Protection legislation including the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), in line with our privacy policy. Data will be held securely by M·E·L Research for three months after completion of the evaluation, after which time any personal information will be securely deleted.

Q1. To begin, can you tell me a bit about your involvement in the Community Organiser Project so far?

Q2. Why did you decide to get involved in the Project?

Q3. Have you done anything like this before?

Q4. How were you recruited to get involved in the Project?

Q5. What are you hoping to go on to do as a result of the training?

Q6. Thinking about the training delivered so far as part of the Community Organisers Project:

Q6a. What has been good / what has worked well?

Q6b. Was anything missing or did anything need improving?

Q7. Has being involved in the Community Organiser Project made any difference / had any impact on you so far?

Q8. Have you started to get involved in using the training to go out into the community to work with other residents?

Q9. If yes at Q8, what has been your experience so far (good, challenges etc)?
Q10. The Community Organisers Project is designed to deliver a range of outcomes in Tyburn ward including: reducing social isolation, increasing community connections and increasing community cohesion. Have you seen anything which makes you think the Community Organisers Project is having an **impact in these areas**?

Q11. Thinking about the Community Organisers Project to date, have there been any:

Q11a. Anything good that has resulted which you weren’t expecting:

Q11b. Any challenges that have resulted which you weren’t expecting:

Q12. A key aim of the Community Organisers Project is that it is sustainable in the longer-term by helping people become involved in community action and creating stronger individuals and communities. Do you have any thoughts about how likely the Project is likely to make a difference in the longer-term to the local area? Any challenges / anything that would help here?

Q13. Finally, do you have any other comments to make?
Appendix F: Methodological detail on survey analysis

**De Jong Giervald 6 item Loneliness Scale**

To score the answers to the scale, the neutral and positive answers are scored as 1 on the negatively worded items. On the positively worded items, neutral and negative answers are scored as 1. This produces an emotional loneliness score, ranging from 0 (not emotionally lonely) to 3 (intensely emotionally lonely), and a social loneliness score also ranging from 0 (not socially lonely) to 3 (intensely socially lonely). This gives a possible range of scores from 0 (least lonely) to 6 (most lonely).

**ICECAP-O**

ICECAP-O (ICEpop CAPability measure for Older people) data responses for the five individual questions are translated into a total overall score called a ‘tariff’ which ranges from 0 to 1. The higher the tariff, the better an individual’s wellbeing. We have analysed the tariff variable by some key demographics.

**Analysis techniques used for the De Jong Giervald 6 item Loneliness Scale and ICECAP-O**

A distribution is normal when most values gather in the middle of the range and the rest taper-off symmetrically toward either extreme. This was not the case for the overall wellbeing score measured with the ICECAP-O, and the loneliness scores measured with the De Jong scale. Therefore, in order to explore the impact that different attitudes, beliefs and characteristics have on overall wellbeing scores and the loneliness scores, non-parametric tests were used (the Kruskal-Wallis H Test and Mann-Whitney Test). The Mann-Whitney Test is a rank-based test that was used to determine if there are statistically significant differences in the wellbeing / the loneliness score between people who are over 50 years of age and those who are under 50 years of age for example. Because this test can be used only if we look at the differences between two groups, the Kruskal-Wallis H Test was used to determine the differences between three or more groups. The Kruskal-Wallis H Test is also a rank-based test that was used to determine if there are statistically significant differences in the wellbeing / the loneliness score between people with different marital status for example.

**Regression analysis of ICECAP-O data**

We have carried out regression analysis to identify which variables most influence wellbeing as measured via the ICECAP-O tariff, as captured by the ICECAP-O tool. A statistical model was developed to explore the impact of different attitudes, beliefs and characteristics (i.e. the explanatory variables) on the overall wellbeing score (i.e. ICECAP-O tariff) produced by a widely used, validated instrument for the general population (ICECAP-O - the outcome variable).
Explanatory variables for the model were selected through an iterative approach. First, variables which were considered to have a plausible relationship with individuals’ wellbeing were selected and shortlisted for further analyses. Variables which were considered to have weaker or no effect on the individual’s current wellbeing status (e.g. intention to volunteer future) as well as variables which overlapped with, or were captured by, a more informative variable (e.g. ‘do you suffer from any conditions’ overlapped with and was largely covered by ‘how is your health in general?’). Next, the degree of correlation between each ‘shortlisted’ variable and the outcome variable was considered, in order to rule out variables that did not appear to be related to the overall wellbeing score, and different model configurations were considered by using goodness of fit tests for nested models.

A model is a set of beliefs (‘feeling safe’) and characteristics (‘not having a disability’) which are considered to have a plausible relationship with the outcome variable (‘better individual wellbeing’). A nested model is, in a way, more general. For example a nested model could be the belief of feeling safe and the characteristic of being generally healthy. For it to be a nested model, being generally healthy should overlap with not having a disability. A goodness of fit test analyses how well the model (the set of beliefs and characteristics) explains the scores of the outcome variable (ICECAP-O wellbeing score).