

# Sussex Region Coastal Communities Programme

## Final Evaluation Report

Compiled by Simon Northmore & David Wolff

**Enquiries to:**  
**Community University Partnership Programme**

University of Brighton  
Room 108, Mayfield House  
Falmer  
Brighton, BN1 9PH

Tel.: 01273 643004  
Email: [cupp@brighton.ac.uk](mailto:cupp@brighton.ac.uk)

### ***Acknowledgements***

*Thanks are due to the Communities of Practice (CoP) and project convenors and to those with lead responsibility for evaluation for individual projects for their work in gathering the information and data for this report.*

## Contents

<b>1 Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>2 Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>3 Aims and objectives of the project</b> .....	<b>4</b>
3.1 The Community of Practice approach .....	5
<b>4 Evaluation methodology</b> .....	<b>8</b>
4.1 Use of REAP evaluation framework .....	8
4.2 Evaluation methods .....	8
4.3 Developing metrics for community engagement.....	9
4.4 Photocapture Project .....	10
<b>5 Project summaries</b> .....	<b>11</b>
5.1 Activity Buddies – promoting quality of life for older people .....	11
5.1.1 Outcomes for university partners .....	13
5.1.2 Perceived limitations for university partners .....	14
5.1.3 Outcomes for community partners .....	15
5.2 Bouncing Back – building resilience with disadvantaged children and young people .	17
5.2.1 Key findings .....	18
5.2.2 Outcomes .....	19
5.3 Count Me In Too – promoting health and well-being with LGBT communities.....	21
5.3.1 Partnership relationship .....	21
5.3.2 Project outputs.....	22
5.3.3 Outcomes .....	23
5.4 Lifemusic .....	25
5.4.1 Lifemusic – principles and practice .....	25
5.4.2 Development of partnerships .....	26
5.4.3 The Lifemusic programme .....	27
5.4.4 Outcomes .....	28
5.4.5 Summary .....	30
5.5 Our Space – exploring spaces to bring the Deaf community together .....	30
5.5.1 Aims .....	31
5.5.2 The partnership.....	32
5.5.3 Outcomes for community partners .....	32
5.5.4 Academic Development Outcomes .....	36
5.6 Training Older People as Researchers .....	37
5.6.1 The TOPAR course.....	38
5.6.2 Research projects .....	39
5.6.2 Lessons learned .....	40
<b>6. Hastings Helpdesk and Coastal Regeneration Research Centre</b> .....	<b>41</b>
6.1 Aims of the Coastal Regeneration Research Centre .....	42
6.2 Hastings Helpdesk .....	42
6.3 Case studies .....	42
<b>7. Addressing sustainability</b> .....	<b>44</b>
7.1 Examples of sustainability .....	44
7.2 Future opportunities .....	45
<b>8. Dissemination</b> .....	<b>46</b>
<b>References</b> .....	<b>47</b>
<b>APPENDIX – Summary of key outputs and outcomes</b> .....	<b>i</b>

## 1 Introduction

The purpose of this final report is to bring together the evaluative work across the programme and provide the Local Project Board with an overview of the six Sussex projects and the Hastings Helpdesk. The report follows an interim evaluation conducted in mid 2009. It is mainly based on self-evaluations conducted by the projects, although in one case external observers were used.

## 2 Executive Summary

The achievements of the programme in terms of outputs and outcomes are detailed in the tables in the Appendix. In summary, key outputs for the whole project to the end of 2010 were:

- **Events and teaching**
  - 200+ events
  - 320 hours of teaching/training delivered
  - 500 Lifemusic sessions delivered by trained practitioners
- **Community Involvement**
  - 82 key partner organisations involved
  - Over 3800 community/public participants
- **Hastings Helpdesk**
  - Coastal Regeneration Research Centre established
  - Helpdesk operating since May 2008:
    - 198 new enquiries (64 leading to researcher involvement)
    - 25 projects directly funded/supported
- **Dissemination**
  - 12 publications, with others in preparation
  - 37 conference presentations, including 5 keynotes
  - 26 workshops
  - SECC website and film
  - 3 projects displayed in the Brighton Photo Biennial 2010
- **Match funding**
  - Total £1,252,178 match and in-kind funding against a target of £1.28 million

In Sussex, SECC funds and match funds were used to ensure effective access for community organisations into the universities of Brighton, Sussex and Chichester. The three

universities developed six projects with shared learning and dissemination. It also enabled the Community University Partnership Programme (Cupp) at the University of Brighton to extend its helpdesk to Hastings and Eastbourne and to successfully integrate the University of Sussex into the helpdesk. These projects brought together academics, community practitioners, students, service users and community members to address areas of local and national concern in relation to enhancing health and wellbeing.

Brighton and Sussex focused on developing a 'Communities of Practice' approach (see Section 3.1) in four specific areas of activity:

- Older people [Activity Buddies]
- Young people and families [Bouncing Back]
- Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transsexual (LGBT) communities [Count Me In Too]
- The Deaf community [Our Space]

The University of Chichester developed a 'Hub and Spoke' model of community engagement with Third Sector and Voluntary Organisations with two projects:

- Life Music
- Training Older People as Researchers

The aims of the SECC project were: to develop a collaborative model of funding that might act as a demonstrator to other regions; to promote a model of community knowledge exchange and transfer; and to develop an infrastructure and local relationships that would ensure sustainability for community knowledge exchange and transfer in the longer term.

Underpinning this were a number of success criteria, including the key objective of 'a measurable improvement in the capacity of the third sector, including community and voluntary groups, to meet the health and wellbeing needs of their user-groups'.

Overall, the project achieved considerable positive benefits in relation to capacity building to meet health and well-being needs. Examples include, the application of research findings in policy and practice development to better meet the needs of LGBT Communities (Count Me In Too) and older people (Activity Buddies/Training Older People as Researchers); the development of new kinds of therapeutic approaches to meet the specific needs of disadvantaged and excluded communities (Life Music/Bouncing Back); increasing research capacity to enhance understanding of local health and well-being needs by community organisations and service providers (Hastings Research Helpdesk/Coastal Regeneration Research Centre; integration of the University of Sussex into the Research Helpdesk); and

the creation of new 'spaces' to mobilise knowledge exchange (Our Space). Full summaries of the projects and outcomes can be found in Section 5 and the Appendix.

While the projects adopted different approaches to community – university engagement, a number of key lessons can be drawn from the experience of the programme:

- **Mutual benefit** – both the community and the university partners must benefit from the partnership. While most of the CoPs were not community-led, and had different starting points in terms of their pre-existing relationships, the success of the partnerships was based on the mutuality involved. This included both practical benefits such as reimbursing community partners for their time and expertise and ensuring that the knowledge and experience of community representatives and community members was fully recognised. The added value provided by the universities was mainly through contributing research and development skills. Important benefits for the universities were opportunities for community engaged research and incorporating the learning from the projects into teaching and curriculum development
- **Good relationships** – the community and university partners worked hard to build trust and respect and to recognise and negotiate power differentials. However, it was easier to identify and work with key representatives from larger and more strategic level voluntary sector organisations. Engaging with community partners at a very local level or with individual community members was more limited. This is an area that requires further attention
- **Support for university staff** – some projects experienced problems with involving or sustaining the participation of academic staff. While funding is important to buy out staff time to enable them to engage, equally important was the support of middle and senior management. Staff time, reward and recognition remain significant barriers to community-university engagement but senior managers can affirm its strategic importance and middle managers can support staff to manage their workload flexibly rather than expect them to do engagement 'in their own time'
- **Resources for evaluation** – most of the CoPs identified a member who took responsibility for the project level evaluation and identified resources from their budgets for the time involved. In one project external evaluators were employed. The two SECC Development Managers played an important role in co-ordinating the evaluative work and in writing up the interim and final reports. Early on in the programme, workshops were held with CoP members and evaluators on the REAP evaluation framework. This had some limitations and was adapted in different ways

to suit local project needs (see Section 4). Nevertheless, considerable time and effort was put into data collection and evaluation. Properly resourcing evaluation is essential in order to capture the benefits of community-university engagement work

- **Institutional relationships** - the Sussex Local Project Board brought together senior level representatives from the three universities, together with community representatives. This provided important strategic direction to the Sussex SECC projects. Four of the CoPs involved both Brighton and Sussex universities; although because of geographical separation it proved more difficult to make links across all three. A positive result of the programme has been that at the sub-regional level all three universities have committed themselves to working together in the future
- **Sustainability** - In addressing the long term sustainability of the programme we have identified four key areas: building up the intellectual capital of the universities, including teaching and learning practice and research; developing long-term community partnerships and knowledge exchange; policy impact; and attracting additional funding. There is firm evidence that projects have developed in ways that will become more embedded and sustainable. This includes the development of new and existing networks and partnerships; new mechanisms for information sharing, curriculum development and furthering research interests; and exchange of good practice across the region, as well as nationally and internationally (see Section 7)
- **Dissemination** - A wide range of dissemination activities are already in progress at project and regional level, including participation in conferences and seminars; workshops and public events; journal articles; and interactive media (see Section 8 and Appendix)

### 3 Aims and objectives of the project

The aims of the SECC project are set out in full in the SECC Business Case (2007). In summary these were:

- To develop a *collaborative model of funding* that might act as a demonstrator to other regions
- To promote a *model of community knowledge exchange and transfer*, drawing on the intellectual capital of HEIs to support communities to develop their own capacity to respond to their health and wellbeing needs
- To develop the infrastructure and local relationships that would leverage additional funding and expertise, *ensuring sustainability* for community knowledge exchange and transfer in the longer term

The aims and objectives in the business case were developed for the South East Coastal region as a whole and the project is being externally evaluated at regional level by Step Ahead Research Ltd. This report focuses on the sub-regional level and the specific success criteria set out for the project. These were:

- a. A measurable improvement in the capacity of the third sector, including community and voluntary groups, to meet the health and wellbeing needs of their user-groups as a result of the application of the knowledge assets and intellectual capital of HE
- b. An increase in high quality community knowledge transfer and exchange in each of the participating institutions
- c. Strategic partnerships that leverage additional funding and other resource into the HEI-community projects
- d. A sustainable infrastructure for community knowledge exchange in each sub-region
- e. The effective exchange of good practice and information on HEI-community engagement across the South East coastal region
- f. The enrichment of curricula and teaching and learning practice and the facilitation of new research opportunities and practice
- g. The enhanced status of community knowledge transfer and exchange in the missions of participating HEIs, and in the strategic plans of local Third Sector partners

In addition the business case emphasised the importance of high quality and robust evaluation at both local and programme levels. The evaluation approach within the Sussex sub-region is considered in the Section 4.

### **3.1 The Community of Practice approach**

The Universities of Brighton and Sussex developed four projects based on a *Communities of Practice* approach. These focused on the following specific themes:

- Older people
- Disadvantaged children and young people
- Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transsexual (LGBT) communities
- The Deaf community

The University of Chichester developed a *hub and spoke* model with two projects:

- Life Music
- Older people as researchers

The hub and spoke model is a community involvement approach that shares many of the characteristics of Communities of Practice (for more information see: <http://www.chiuni.ac.uk/secc/HubSpokeMethod.cfm> ). This section, therefore, provides a brief introduction to Communities of Practice.

Communities of Practice are formed by people who engage in a process of collective learning in a shared domain of human endeavour. Etienne Wenger, one of the leading theorists in the field of social learning theory, communities of practice, and their application to organizations, defines Communities of Practice as:

*...groups of people who share a concern or a passion for something they do and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly.*

<http://www.ewenger.com/theory/>

Three characteristics are crucial: a clearly defined shared domain of interest; engagement in joint activities and discussions to help each other learn and share information; the development of a shared practice i.e. a repertoire of resources, experiences, stories, tools, and ways of addressing recurring problems.

Communities of Practice (CoPs) come in many forms. Some are quite small; others may be very large, with a core group and many peripheral members. Some are local and some cover the globe. Some meet mainly face-to-face, some mostly online. Some are within an organization and some include members from various organizations. Some are formally recognized, often supported with a budget; and some are completely informal and even invisible (Wenger 2006).

CoPs start from an emphasis on what people actually do; they do not define some people as experts and some as non-experts - the idea is that everyone can learn from each other; they are fluid and do not have to have start or end points; they focus on working across organisational and discipline boundaries (Hart & Wolff 2007).

CoPs were thus seen as a particularly helpful approach for bringing together academics, community practitioners, students, service users and community members to address issues of local and national concern in relation to enhancing health and wellbeing. In particular, they were seen as having the potential to contribute to a shift in university culture and practice towards types of knowledge that would be more productive in addressing 'real world' issues and in delivering real engagement. Nonetheless, the CoP approach raised some interesting issues about the representation and focus of the different partnerships. In a number of cases, the academics involved with a particular CoP were themselves members of that

community, either through identity of personal experience – for example, as members of the LGBT community, the Deaf community, or as parents of children with special needs. Thus there were some tensions involved in the traditional division of ‘academic’ and ‘non-academic’ expertise, which the CoPs sought to resolve in different ways as they developed a co-enquiry approach.

The project summaries below (Section 5) illustrate the diversity of types of CoP that might develop in community-university partnerships. Some projects adopted a more conscious approach to the development of their CoP than others. However, all demonstrate the mutual benefits and shared learning that have been important outcomes of the SECC project.

**Case Study: Bouncing Back - a Community of Practice interested in building resilience with disadvantaged children and young people**

The Bouncing Back CoP brought together a group of 21 academics, students, voluntary and statutory sector practitioners and parents over two years, to innovate ways of building resilience. It developed:

- A vibrant, inter-disciplinary and inter-agency group of individuals and organizations willing to collaborate for mutual benefit and the transfer of knowledge between sectors
- Eager to improve the health and well being of children and young people having tough times, the Bouncing Back Community of Practice met every month, to critique and develop Resilient Therapy (RT) further
- Members explored how the ‘resilience’ research base and RT might link with their existing work and experimented with different ways of applying RT in their own settings

[http://www.boingboing.org.uk/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=41%3Abb-cop&catid=1&Itemid=23](http://www.boingboing.org.uk/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=41%3Abb-cop&catid=1&Itemid=23)

## 4 Evaluation methodology

### 4.1 Use of REAP evaluation framework

The University of Bradford's *REAP* approach to measuring community engagement (Pearce, Pearson & Cameron 2007) uses a self-assessment framework designed to capture essential inputs, outputs and outcomes for both University and Community partners. The aim of *REAP* is to support and encourage those involved in community engagement activities to critically reflect on and analyse their work.

As such it was felt to have considerable potential to be used to evaluate the Communities of Practice (CoP) approach. The Sussex Coastal Communities Project has developed *REAP* to provide a common outcome evaluation framework for all the CoPs and strengthen the evidence base for community engagement work, building up a dataset for all projects and how each one has added value to both the universities and to local communities.

*REAP* does not pre-determine data collection methods. This has been worked out by the individual Communities of Practice using the *REAP* approach. What *REAP* does provide is an underpinning conceptual framework for the evaluative work, based on a set of common principles: Reciprocity; Externalities; Access; and Partnership. Individual project evaluations were undertaken with due consideration to the *REAP* framework. However, owing to the diversity of projects and evaluation methods this report is not presented within the *REAP* format.

### 4.2 Evaluation methods

Support for evaluation was provided through two seminars held in July 2008 and March 2009 focused on the *REAP* approach. An evaluation working group was established comprising the individuals with lead responsibility for evaluation in each of the CoPs/projects. Projects used a variety of data collection methods appropriate to the activities undertaken and the needs of their community partners and community members.

The multi-method data collection approach included:

- Recording quantifiable outputs (numbers of meetings and events; attendance; publications and dissemination activities; additional income generated)
- External evaluators acting as independent observers of CoP meetings
- Individual interviews with community and academic partners and students
- Focus groups and other structured discussions with community participants
- Individual questionnaires for community participants (e.g. at activity sessions)

- Responses to evaluation questions at consultation events
- Feedback exercises at CoP meetings
- Reflective diaries

Some limitations should be noted. Firstly, it has been difficult to establish baseline data for both new and existing projects. New projects have taken time to develop and have not necessarily had the capacity or resources to build in systematic baseline data collection. Some existing projects, where SECC funding supported the extension of existing work, and included existing partnerships, felt that baseline data collected at the beginning of the programme would not offer an authentic portrait of the expectations and assumptions that the universities or the community partners brought to the project.

Second, some CoPs felt that the binary framework of ‘community’ and ‘university’ partners suggested by *REAP* did not match the realities of their project. Some academics also identify as members of a particular community (e.g. LGBT, Deaf, Older People, etc). This can create fruitful relationships that are difficult to encapsulate within the *REAP* framework. One CoP evaluation report also commented that *REAP* did not allow them to highlight the benefits to individuals and groups in terms of personal empowerment, especially those on the periphery who were not formal project ‘partners’, although we hope that the qualitative data included in this report goes some way to address this. Others felt that the language employed by *REAP* was over complex for community partners and individual service users. In practice, each project adopted the framework flexibly. Nonetheless, the core concepts underpinning the *REAP* approach have enabled evaluations to focus on the inter-relationships and mutual benefits for all partners as well as on the more measurable achievements.

Finally, one of the areas that proved most difficult was measuring “*improvement in the capacity of the universities and third sector organisations to meet the health and well-being needs of user-groups*” (SECC success criteria). As a number of project reports note, there is limited data available for improved individual or community health/well-being and the effectiveness of capacity building to meet health and well-being needs is not easy to demonstrate in a tangible way. However, the project evaluations do provide some positive indicators of achievement in this area.

### **4.3 Developing metrics for community engagement**

An important aspect of the evaluation was to identify the extra activity that had been made possible through match funding (see Section 2 above and Appendix). As part of this, a programme of work was undertaken to develop systematic metrics that would capture the outcome or impact of public, community and civic engagement activities by HEIs. This

presents an enormous challenge both at a practical and theoretical level (see Hart, Northmore & Gerhardt 2009; Hart & Northmore 2011). However, the experience of the SECC project confirmed that there was a need to develop indicators at the individual project level that could present an easily comprehensible metric of the value generated by university-community engagement activities.

The University of Brighton, working with colleagues at the Universities of Sussex and Chichester, began developing an approach to describing the outcomes of university-community engagement in terms of a financial multiplier, based on an analysis of six SECC projects in Sussex.

The metric that was developed represents *a measure of the leveraged activity and resources resulting from an initial investment*. Thus we were seeking to measure the typical 'outcome' that is sought from development work – how much activity can be generated from an initial resource. A discussion paper was submitted to Hefce in September 2010 (Cupp 2010).

It is important to note that such metrics should be seen as only one component of an evaluation strategy. They are not a substitute for detailed impact evaluation of a project. It is also very much work in progress. Over time, we expect it would be possible to establish a baseline expectation of leveraged activity in relation to an initial financial investment. However, our work also highlighted the reality that there is no automatic link between these leveraged outputs and the outcomes of the intervention so a range of evaluative approaches are needed. Furthermore, establishing the monetised value of the outcomes, i.e. Social Return On Investment (SROI), would require detailed evaluation of the work of any partnership project on an individual basis.

Cupp is now piloting the metric with three small-scale partnership projects involved in the University of Brighton's newly launched 'On Our Doorsteps' programme (see [www.brighton.ac.uk/cupp](http://www.brighton.ac.uk/cupp)), with a view to refining the model and devising a set of agreed accounting rules.

#### **4.4 Photocapture Project**

As a complement to the formal evaluation, the University of Brighton's Community University Partnership Programme (Cupp) commissioned Brighton Photo Biennial (BPB) to work in partnership with the Communities of Practice to provide a visual record of their work and to form part of the dissemination process. BPB has a unique identity, positioned within the region as an independent arts organisation that works in partnership with all of the key visual

arts venues in Brighton and across the South East. The Biennial is hosted by the University of Brighton.

A further aim of the Photocapture Project was to provide students with direct knowledge, skills and hands on experience of engaging with communities through contemporary photographic practice. A cohort of 2<sup>nd</sup>/3<sup>rd</sup> year undergraduates, and postgraduate students was recruited from across the School of Arts & Communication with support and input from Active Student (the University’s volunteering support service) and course leaders. The students were formally interviewed to ensure that their specific skills matched the needs of the project and to make sure that they were fully aware of the project, its expectations and their commitment.

Some of the difficulties experienced with recruiting and matching students and in managing expectations of all parties, and the lessons learned for future such collaborations, have been documented in the Photocapture Project final report (Buss 2010). Ultimately, 10 students worked with three of the CoPs (Our Space; Bouncing Back; and Activity Buddies). In October 2010 an exhibition of the outcomes from the Photocapture Project was presented in the café foyer at the University of Brighton (Grand Parade) to a professional standard as part of Brighton Photo Biennial 2010. The private view tied in with the launch event for the Biennial as a whole. The exhibition showcased two photo essays and two films produced during the project, along with accompanying texts giving a context to the work. The platform afforded by the Biennial introduced the projects to a wide and diverse audience beyond the academic community.

## 5 Project summaries

### 5.1 Activity Buddies – promoting quality of life for older people

Convenor: Prof Ann Moore, University of Brighton

The universities of Brighton and Sussex, together with Age Concern, Help the Aged and older people’s forums aimed to tackle the unmet needs of older people living mainly in Eastbourne but also in parts of Brighton & Hove and Hastings. It provided an opportunity for students from different disciplines to ‘buddy’ with older people and engage in six strands of activities. These are summarised in the table below:

	<b>Strand name and aims</b>	<b>University Participants</b>	<b>Community Participants</b>
1	<b>Fitness and mobility for health</b>	Dr Raija Kuisma, leader Mainly physiotherapy students,	People living in the community who responded to a newspaper article (year 1) and

	Aim: to increase older people's fitness and mobility through exercise	plus sports science student and photography students documenting the project over the 2 years	those living in sheltered accommodation (year 2)
2	<b>Dispensing with the mystery</b>  Aim: to empower older people in relation to their use of prescribed medicine	Dr Mike Ellis-Martin, leader  Pharmacy students,  Laboratory assistants (Year 1) and photography student in Year 1	Mainly people living in residential accommodation (Year 1) and sheltered accommodation and day centres (Year 2), inc. people with English as a 2 <sup>nd</sup> language
3	<b>Learning together</b>  Aim: to involve older community members in creative activity sessions which are part of the curriculum for OT students, promoting intergenerational learning	Prof Gaynor Sadlo, leader  3 Occupational therapy lecturers  Occupational therapy students	People recruited from Age Concern, Eastbourne
4	<b>Reduced Horizons</b>  Aim: to encourage older people's use of computer technology through a self help group	Dr Elizabeth Harrison, leader  Dave Harley. IT tutor  Social Work student (Year 1)	People living in the community recruited partly through the Meridian Centre
5	<b>Health Education Programme</b>  Aim: to enable older people to maintain their own foot care	Dr Paula Riley, leader  Podiatry students	People living in the community recruited through Age Concern, Hastings (Year 1) and sheltered accommodation, Eastbourne
6	<b>Lifelines</b>  Part of larger 'Lifelines' initiative to encourage volunteering and managed by Age Concern, Brighton	Dr Juliet Millican, leader  Social Science student as part of Community Participation & Development module (Year 1)	Finola Brophy, Age Concern, Brighton  Older people recruited through Age Concern

### *Evaluation*

The evaluative work was co-ordinated by Dr Marion Martin. Strands were evaluated over the two years of the project through a series of focus groups and interviews with community participants, academics and students.

## 5.1.1 Outcomes for university partners

### a. Intergenerational Benefits

*Students learn to enjoy being with older people*

Strand leaders felt that it was good for students to meet older people in a non-clinical environment, and to see 'healthy' older people, as it changes their assumptions. Most students thoroughly enjoyed their interaction with older people in the community, which could be used to enhance their future practice:

...when I've been working with elderly people I always find they've got so much character, and I really enjoy working with them and you know they've got so much to tell and just, you know, it's great. (Strand 1 student, year 1)

*Students overcome their stereotypes*

Some students admitted to having had previous pre-conceptions about older people, but getting to know them during their activity sessions had helped them to overcome these stereotypes:

Well for me it was, it wasn't so much being keen on older people, because I didn't like them before I went on placement. Like (another student)'s always had a passion for them and I always preferred kids. Um, but I did find them really interesting. (Strand 1 student year 1)

*Students learn about the interests and needs of older people in the community, and about barriers to health*

Students learned more about the experience of growing old, and the fears older people in association with this:

I understand on a deeper level that older people have fears about growing old worrying about hurting themselves, like fear of falling, not knowing what ways are best to stay healthy, fit. (Strand 1 student year 2)

For strand 2 students learned that some older people have difficulties with memory, and this interferes with adherence to medication regimes. This became very apparent on their second visit when the older participants did not remember their first visit. In strand 5, podiatry students learned that the very old do not want to learn how to take care of their own feet. They now direct their attention regarding health education to the 'younger' group of older people, and volunteer in the nail cutting service provided for the older group.

*Students learn to enable older people in the community rather than 'treating' them*

Strand leaders felt that it was very important for students to meet older people in the community, as this changed their relationship with them from treatment, to enablement and empowerment. This was particularly stressed by strand leaders 2, 4 and 5. Students also appreciated the different relationship whilst interacting with older people in community settings:

...it was more like being friends with them more than in a clinical setting.....maybe in a clinical setting you'd kind of lead more.....the environment was nicer really, in terms of it was more relaxed. (Strand 1 student Year 1)

#### **b. Students increase their confidence, and enhance their job opportunities**

Many students reported that the opportunity to work in a less structured community setting allowed them to develop self-confidence. The experience could also be used to enhance their personal statements and CVs. A podiatry student reported that she was asked about her experiences in the Activity Buddies scheme in a successful job interview.

#### **c. Students and staff benefit from opportunities for research in the community**

In strands 3, 4 and 5 students used their experiences of access to community participants to collect data for projects related to their course, for example the health promotion DVD produced by podiatry students. In other cases their experiences were used to inform the research project required to gain their degree, for example the Social Science student in the Reduced Horizons project who studied older people's social contacts, and Podiatry students who studied older peoples' foot care needs. In strand 4 a university tutor has used his involvement with the IT group for his research in project design. Students and staff in all strands will benefit from future opportunities for research in community/ university projects, for example the 'On Our Doorsteps' funded scheme for community allotments.

#### **d. The university becomes more widely acknowledged in the community**

Strand 1 published an article in local paper about fitness and mobility for health, and through this recruited a large number of participants. On completion of the second year of this project an article was again published, raising awareness in the local community of partnership activity. All strands the have been in contact with community groups such as AgeUK (branches in Brighton, Eastbourne, Lewes, Hastings), Alexandra Cottage Homes, St.John's Home, the YMCA, Brighton and Hove Sheltered Housing, Meridian Citizens forum, and the Hillcrest Centre, which has raised awareness with these groups, and encouraged the development of other projects.

### **5.1.2 Perceived limitations for university partners**

The overwhelming majority of feedback was positive, but the following limitations were cited:

- Some strand leaders found it difficult to recruit student volunteers. Strand 4 used Active Student successfully and this could be a model for other strands. A few students said they already interact with older people in the community, namely their grandparents
- University staff involved in these projects had to be very committed, as their time was usually voluntary. They are normally involved in all stages of the project including planning meetings, organisation, recruitment, running sessions and evaluating activities. In one case the leader received no support at all from colleagues who were more focussed on delivering the curriculum
- Some strand leaders commented on the challenge of managing the different needs of community participants and students

### **5.1.3 Outcomes for community partners**

#### **a. Intergenerational benefits**

##### *Enjoyment of being with younger people*

In all groups participants reported that they enjoyed being with the students, despite the age gap. They found students to be fun, yet caring:

Well, they made it fun didn't they?...It was serious but it was fun at the same time. A lovely group of young people.... Charming..... Quite lovely. ...they were constantly telling us don't do more than you feel you can because everyone's different... (Strand 1 community participant, Year 2).

##### *More insight into young people's problems*

In strand 1, older participants expressed appreciation of some of the struggles that younger people have to deal with:

They're all away from home aren't they....and they've got a problem in, you know, careers and that are going to be difficult for them aren't they? Their futures are very iffy, um, so they must have their minds on that as well I think (Strand 1 community participant, year 2)

##### *Feeling good about changing students' stereotypes of older people*

Older participants in the Fitness and Mobility for Health project assumed that young people would have pre-conceptions about older people, and seemed pleased to have been given the opportunity to change these stereotypes:

I wondered what they thought they were coming to. I wondered whether they thought they were coming to a group of people who were going to sit round the edge with their shawls and go to sleep. And I don't know, I think they found us quite a lively group. Um, I thought it was quite good.... (Strand 1 community participant, year 2)

#### **b. Learning from university staff and students**

##### *Gaining more awareness of their own aging process*

The community participants in all strands appreciated what they had learnt from university staff and students. In strand 1 they became more aware of how their bodies and minds changed with the ageing process:

I couldn't believe how bad I was on that (memory) test because I've got a very good memory and yet when it came to that I only got two out of ten....I was dreadful! (Strand 1 community participant, year 2)

##### *Gaining more knowledge and understanding about how to manage their own health*

In strands 1, 2, and 5 older people said they felt they had learned a great deal about health and how to maintain it. In the Fitness and Mobility for Health programme they learned about different ways of exercising; in Dispensing with the Mystery they understood more about medication, and the importance of taking it; and in the Health Education Programme they learned more about foot care by watching the DVD which students had prepared:

I didn't realise there was so much that could help you with your feet. I liked learning about the different shoes I could wear....yeah it's um, it's important for me. I want to keep moving, but my feet, um are sore sometimes. I see how it can be avoided. (Strand 5 community participant, year 2)

### *Gaining more knowledge and skills in leisure activities*

In strand 3, Learning Together, older participants learned the skills of ceramics, cooking, and gardening, and said that they had learned a lot. In strand 4, Reduced Horizons, community participants learned IT skills, and have gained so much confidence in this now that it is a self-sustaining group. In most strands participants said that they had gained self-confidence which would influence their further participation in leisure activities.

### *Feeling empowered to take action*

Older participants from strand 1 reported doing things differently to promote their own health, such as 'taking the stairs a lot more than the lift', and 'standing upright a good deal more'. In strand 2, one older participant described how she had been trying to get the right medication for 15 years, but it was only after taking part in this project that she had finally managed to get the correct prescription from her doctor. Another participant in the Dispensing with the Mystery project said:

I would never ask about my medications, didn't think I could do. I always thought it was something you had to just get on with. When I came along to see the students and talk about my medications it made me realise how much I didn't know. It also made me realise that I had a right to know and I had a voice....I'm less hesitant and more confident about asking about what I'm taking and what it does. I think I should do, and the discussion with the students has made me realise this. (Strand 2 community participant, year 2)

The older people in strand 4, Reduced Horizons, have taken control of the group themselves now. They run a self-help IT group, which meets monthly in a community centre, allowing them to use the internet and email for social interaction.

### **c. Older people passing on skills to the younger generation**

In one strand, Learning Together, older people expressed the view that they had the ability to pass skills on to the younger generation, which are no longer taught:

There are a generation growing up that don't have the knowledge or skills that we had when we were at school....craft skills, carpentry or others like that...you know, knitting and sewing. These aren't taught by parents or schools are they? (Strand 3 community participant, year 2)

However, none of the strands made use of the opportunity for older people to teach the younger age group skills. This was a missed opportunity according to one community organiser.

## **5.2 Bouncing Back – building resilience with disadvantaged children and young people**

Convenor: Kim Aumann, Director of Research & Training - Amaze

The Bouncing Back Community of Practice was brought together to create a learning partnership between parents, professionals and academics whose focus was offering resilient therapy (RT) to children with 'constellations of disadvantage'. The aim of the group was to provide an opportunity to learn from one another drawing on personal, professional, theoretical and experiential expertise to inform the further development of RT. The specific aim of this CoP was to facilitate shared learning about the application of the theoretical principles of RT into diverse areas of practice at work and at home, and provide evidence of the impact this might have on caring for children and adolescents with disadvantage.

The expressed aims of the group were to:

- establish a CoP to critique and develop RT
- undertake research projects
- create an interdisciplinary interagency collaboration that enabled knowledge transfer between sectors
- test whether a CoP is a useful mechanism for knowledge exchange
- model funding for sustainable development of RT

The CoP met monthly for a period of two years and was facilitated by two professionals from the lead community partner - Amaze.

### *Evaluation*

An evaluation was commissioned to assess the extent to which the ambitions of the project were fulfilled. It was undertaken by Prof Julie Scholes and Dr Hannah Frith, both from the University of Brighton, Faculty of Health & Social Science. The evaluators were from the same Faculty and/or department as some members of the CoP. This meant that the evaluators held multiple roles and different working relationships inside and outside the CoP.

21 CoP meetings were observed by the two evaluators and 28 interviews were undertaken.

## **5.2.1 Key findings**

### **a. The Community of Practice mechanism**

The CoP mechanism created a cohesive group that inspired the majority of members to learn about and use RT. This learning also enabled members to apply resilient strategies to help them cope with their personal as well as working lives. People joined the CoP because they were excited by the opportunity to learn beside and from a group made up of people from the various sectors. Multi-professional, cross boundary working and valuing experiential wisdom as much as theoretical know-how inspired people to remain in the CoP.

The facilitators used a range of creative approaches to enable learning about RT. These approaches were favoured over traditional pedagogic delivery. Some members suggested that more traditional learning strategies and possibly fewer activities per session would have allowed for greater confidence in the members' understanding of RT. This outcome might have been affected by different cultural expectations and experiences of learning and could have been addressed by more explicit and detailed attention to the CoP mechanism from the outset.

### **b. Disseminating Resilient Therapy practice: generating new knowledge about RT**

Disseminating RT practice through new work-place settings was challenging and was normally done through working alongside like-minded professionals or with volunteers. Delays in starting some projects, or under confidence in the knowledge of RT or project management/research, meant that some members did not necessarily have as much to report back into the CoP to promote shared learning as others.

### **c. Boundary issues**

The CoP was formed of people who had a complex nexus of relationships. This meant the power relationships in the room (e.g. manager/manager; supervisor/ supervisee; service user and service provider) had to be constantly addressed by the facilitators and given due attention by the CoP members. This contributed to individuals feeling risk averse and shy to engage in critique and debate.

### **d. Facilitation**

The facilitators created a safe and enjoyable learning space for the majority of the members of the CoP. The facilitators had significant expertise in handling group dynamics, dealing with sensitive subjects and managing diversity within the group. The CoP also had to produce outputs to meet a complex set of audiences with different agendas. The scale,

scope and range of these agendas placed additional pressure on the facilitators to ensure the CoP kept on task, whilst attending to the nexus of relationships within the group.

The learning intention associated with certain activities and how that related to RT, could sometimes be quite subtle and hard to recognise. The take home message (applying RT terminology and phrases to presentations and or activities) was sometimes clearer to the facilitators than possibly the other members of the CoP

#### **e. Learning milieu**

Most direct questions about RT technique were answered by the academic experts and facilitators (CoP member and invited guests) in the room. Parents and practitioners were more likely to engage in discussion in small group activity.

Reflexive response to potential learning opportunities could have been sharpened, relying less on pre determined time plans in favour of addressing emergent learning opportunities.

Factors that contributed to this outcome included:

- Under confidence in the members' RT knowledge to enter into debate
- Reliance on experts' experiential and theoretical knowledge
- Reticence by members to engage in debate critically (possibly related to fields of practice).
- Lack of role models demonstrating constructively critical exploration of issues
- The complex group dynamic
- The facilitators concern not to prioritise any single form of knowledge over another, notably academic ways of knowing.
- The sub-cultural expectation of being in a shared learning group.

#### **5.2.2 Outcomes**

Given the range of complexities, the number and scope of projects undertaken was impressive. The CoP members were involved in generating and delivering the following:

- A research project exploring RT with kinship carers
- Family Case Studies for training purposes
- An example of adding resilience to an organisation's Strategic Plan
- RT added to parent workshop on bullying
- Exploration of using the RT frame to evaluate telephone helpline

- RT applied to developing a resilient staff supervision model
- Module for student Social Workers on the Common Assessment Framework & RT
- Research project with learning disabled young people completed
- An example of cascading the learning about RT to whole staff teams
- Printed manual accompanying a support course for refugee women
- Inclusive Art methods demonstrated to group
- RT frame added to a one module of an existing parent support course
- RT frame applied to LGBTU group work
- A training module for RT and professionals further developed
- Conference presentations on RT designed and tested
- RT ideas added to Secondary school transition support course for parents
- A tool kit of resilient tunes created to make Musical Bingo
- A film about the CoP and Resilient Badges
- Export of model to Hastings supported by new funding

It is not possible to gauge whether the Bouncing Back CoP has achieved increased health and well being for children and young adults and/or the extent to which this has been achieved as a direct result of this project. Too many variables are at stake to isolate this project as a single intervention with such a broad reaching outcome. However, self reported evidence indicates that certainly some children have benefitted from participating in events related to CoP projects. Parents in the CoP gave examples of the way in which this had improved the quality of their experience with their own children. Similarly, it is not possible to isolate a variable to suggest this CoP has improved the effectiveness of services for children and their families. Nonetheless, there is reported evidence that Bouncing Back has increased individuals' ability to support their own children.

## **5.3 Count Me In Too – promoting health and well-being with LGBT communities**

Convenor: Dr Kath Browne – University of Brighton

Count Me In Too has built on earlier work to continue to progress positive social change for LGBT people in the south east coastal area. The Universities of Brighton and Sussex have worked with Spectrum (an LGBT Community Forum that promotes partnership work, community engagement and community development) as the primary community partner in this project. Other community partners included Mind Out; LGBT Switchboard; Clare Project; Brighton Bothways; Allsorts; A Place at the Table and Pride.

### *Evaluation*

The evaluation was co-ordinated by Dr Sharif Mowlabocus, a member of the Count Me In Too (CMIT) research team. Measures included monitoring attendance at research events; collecting citations and requests for CMIT information usage; and reports on individual events and exhibitions.

### **5.3.1 Partnership relationship**

Count Me In Too has a strong research and policy influencing focus. Three new research reports were produced through the SECC project, as well as a wide range of dissemination activity. The research team consisted of Dr Kath Browne (Principal Investigator, University of Brighton); Dr Sharif Mowlabocus (Co-Investigator, University of Sussex); Nick McGlynn (Research Assistant, University of Brighton); Arthur Law (Spectrum Co-ordinator); Leela Bakshi (Spectrum Trustee - to February 2010) and Aiden McGarry (Spectrum Trustee – from February 2010).

The partnership relationship has changed and developed over the period of the project. Kath Browne describes her changing expectations:

*My expectation of community research with Spectrum was one of a benevolent 'helper'. This view was contested almost immediately when it became clear that communities can and should be empowered in the research process such that they can question and ensure that research serves their needs. A researcher 'helping communities' is a problematic paradigm.*

Leela Bakshi has written:

*Since the summer of 2008 when SECC funding came on stream I feel that community and university partners in Count Me In Too have continued to work together negotiating differences in terminology, working practices and sometimes aspirations. We have now been working together for nearly four years, and I think we have got quite good at this- we have*

*found effective ways of working with the tensions, which I think are underpinned by understanding and appreciating each other's perspectives and priorities.*

### **5.3.2 Project outputs**

The full range of CMIT outputs is included in the table in the Appendix. In summary these include:

#### ***a. A series of project exhibitions and consultation events from June 2009 – June 2010***

These exhibitions were a direct response to feedback generated at the Community Consultation event (*With Us, By Us, For Us*) in April 2009, where participants asked that the research findings be made available, in an accessible format, at a range of sites spanning LGBT and non-LGBT spaces. It was felt that the work on marginalised LGBT identities and communities needed to be made visible to those who do not occupy these marginalised positions. It was also felt that this information should be made available, in a suitable format, to educators and students. The following exhibitions responded to these requests:

- Brighton Pride including LGBT Research Tent
- National LGBT History Week – British Museum
- LGBT History Month – Brighton Jubilee Library
- Brighton's Golden handbag Awards

#### ***b. A new set of project resources***

Building on the success of the community summary sheets and reports already published by CMIT, the last twelve months have seen the development of a raft of new resources. These have all been designed with a view to disseminating key research findings to a range of end-users:

- Community Summary Resource Pack - This new resource took the form of an 18-page Community Summary Resource Pack, which collated the current Community Research Summaries and framed them within an appropriate and contemporary pedagogic context. This 'framing' involved providing detailed information on how Count Me In Too's work might be used within the national curriculum. A DVD with copies of all of the project's reports and a powerpoint presentation of some of the key findings was included in this pack. The pack was distributed at the LGBT History Month pre-launch event and was targeted at teachers and educators.
- A newly designed website which went live in February 2010

#### ***c. Research Information Desk***

In response to the feedback provided by community users at the April 2009 community consultation event, the Research Information Desk (RID) was set up in the summer of 2009.

The RID provides a mechanism that facilitates use of the university as a first point of contact. The primary objectives of the RID can be summarised as follows:

- To provide a portal for community researchers and organisations who are seeking information on relevant LGBT research
- To provide community researchers and organisations (not academic researchers or statutory services) with an opportunity to access CMIT's research data for additional learning and research

Through the RID, CMIT has been able to 'democratise' its data, providing a new means for the LGBT community (many of whom contributed to the original research design and data collection) to access this information in a supported fashion that ensures that any findings are accurate and have been collated and analysed using appropriate methods.

#### ***d. Presentations, publishing activity and dissemination***

CMIT has presented its research findings through a range of conference and publications (for full details see Appendix). Dr Kath Browne won the first prize for staff research at the Beepurple Research Innovation Awards in May 2010.

Count Me In Too and the Brighton and Sussex Sexualities Network (BSSN) co-hosted the *Transforming Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Trans Lives* conference on 15th September 2010 at Jurys Inn, Brighton. This conference involved over 120 people from across Sussex and the rest of the UK and focused on ways forward in transforming LGBT lives. In keeping with the spirit of Count Me In Too, the event brought together activists, interested LGBT people, academics, policy makers and services.

Details at: <http://www.countmeintoo.co.uk/conference.php>

### **5.3.3 Outcomes**

The research carried out by Count Me In Too has been used by a wide range of organisations, statutory services and community groups to promote positive social change for LGBT people in Brighton and Hove. Below are some examples how the findings of Count Me In Too have been helped to support such change:

#### **RISE**

As a result of Count Me In Too, the LGBT Domestic Violence Working Group got funding to recruit an LGBT development worker, and a GBT Independent Domestic Violence Advocate (IDVA). Both posts are hosted by RISE and employed by Broken Rainbow. The LGBT development worker will produce an action plan to ensure domestic violence services are

accessible and meet the needs of LGBT people, and that local LGBT services can respond effectively to domestic abuse. They will also develop an LGBT Domestic Violence training resource for all services.

*'The posts are quite ground breaking, and a really exciting opportunity for Brighton & Hove to begin providing specialist support for LGBT people experiencing DV.'*

#### **Sussex Partnership NHS Foundation Trust**

*'As a result of the findings within Count Me In Too, the Trust has decided to respond proactively in reaching out to LGBT and T people to raise awareness of mental health issues. There is a desire to show key mental health routes and that we are listening to what local LGB and T people want and showing how we provide it by demonstrating our services are LGBT affirmative.'*

#### **Allsorts Youth Project**

Count Me In Too is used in training for adults, to show that LGBT people (especially bi and trans people) in Brighton & Hove have additional needs and specific experiences.

#### **Sussex Partnership NHS Foundation Trust**

Count Me In Too's reports (particularly the Trans People, Bi People and Drugs & Alcohol reports) will inform the Trust's internal Equality & Human Rights Impact Assessment.

#### **Brighton & Hove NHS**

A planned City Wide Trans Strategy brings together statutory bodies with members of the local trans community. Count Me In Too's findings will contribute directly to the issues and services addressed.

#### **Terrence Higgins Trust**

The Terrence Higgins Trust received funding from the Brighton & Hove Primary Care Trust to employ British Sign Language interpreters for an HIV testing initiative targeting deaf or hard of hearing gay or bisexual men.

*'This would not have happened had it not been for the data captured by Count Me In Too'*

## 5.4 Lifemusic

Convenor: Dr Rod Paton – University of Chichester

The concept of community music (CM) has been relatively slow to gain a foothold in UK higher education. The concept of community arts in general as a “good of its kind” form of activity has not helped; neither has the entrenched emphasis on musicology and canonic values within university music programmes; or the absence of a defined discipline in the national benchmarks. The University of Chichester, through its music department and its long tradition of broadly defined, creative and egalitarian cross-arts development was well placed to contribute to the SECC programme. Building on approaches which have their roots in progressive educational practice, the music department has been active in the provision of programmes which place emphasis on music as an applied art with no barriers of style or genre and an understanding of the role music can play in the well-being of the whole person. It is within this context that the Lifemusic project proposal was drawn up for inclusion in the South East Coastal Communities programme.

### *Evaluation*

The Lifemusic evaluation was co-ordinated by Diane Sherlock – SECC Development Manager, University of Chichester – and Dr Rod Paton. It included reflective feedback from trainees; a well-being self evaluation questionnaire distributed to participants in various contexts; a practitioners feedback form; interviews with host partners and spontaneous or emailed comments from end-users.

### 5.4.1 Lifemusic – principles and practice

The theory and practice of Lifemusic is centred upon the following principles which are seen as essential to musical and emotional well-being. These are: *Everyone is musical; there are no wrong notes in music; every sound has a meaning; making music is an act of trust.* The four key ingredients of the Lifemusic method are: *improvisation; participation; communication and well-being.* The sense of well-being which Lifemusic aims to promote made it suitable for inclusion in the SECC programme. It was the only community arts based project within the programme and therefore provided an ideal opportunity to examine the benefits of the arts in community engagement.

When the proposal was first drawn up, the intentions were relatively modest and centred upon three areas of activity and three partnerships:

*The Migrant Band.* Partner - Roots Around the World. This idea was based on the highly successful Arts Council and Youth Music funded ‘Dialog’ project which was already up and

running in West Sussex. The migrant band would be formed from local musicians from the migrant community and then act as a stimulus for further development.

*Intergenerational music.* Partner – Age Concern, West Sussex. Age Concern West Sussex expressed considerable interest in developing music making activity in residential homes and activity centres such as the Tamarisk Centre in Littlehampton.

*Sound Company.* Partner – to be decided. The Lifemusic method had already been “road-tested” as a vehicle for team development and well-being in the workplace with T-mobile and the idea was to expand this into working communities in the region.

It was intended that the Lifemusic training would also generate further workshops with some of the other 40 or so partners on the original University of Chichester Knowledge Exchange partnership register.

#### **5.4.2 Development of partnerships**

It became apparent very early in the project that whilst the basic principles, the training programme and the research methodology could remain fairly stable, the actual delivery of workshops was naturally flexible since it depended upon the responses of community partners, those already established and those yet to appear. The original threefold aim to set up specific workshops within three categories, intergenerational, migrant workers and business community was rapidly absorbed into a much more diverse and pragmatic range of partnerships. The partnerships that have developed within the Lifemusic project to date are:

*Roots Around the World* – facilitated contact with the Chichester Festival Theatre and with the migrant community.

*Chichester Festival Theatre, Bridge Arts* – ran joint workshops with SECC pairing music with drama for international client groups.

*Littlehampton Academy* – hosted Lifemusic workshops for young people.

*Wrenford Centre* – a day centre for people with learning disabilities. The centre includes its own arts centre “Starburst” which was the venue for a series of Lifemusic sessions.

*St. Richards Hospital Neuro-rehabilitation Centre* – Donald Wilson House hosted and funded 20 sessions, bought a stock of instruments and supplied staff for training.

*St. James Hospital, Portsmouth* – Fairoak (mental health) provided the venue and the funding for 10 sessions and three members of the staff attended the training programme. The sessions have since continued run by the staff.

*Tree House Childrens' Centre, Bognor Regis, Billingshurst Childrens' Centre, Selsey Childrens' Centre, Aldwick Childrens' Centre, Southbourne Childrens' Centre -*

Lifemusic practitioner Chris North ran a series of sessions in children's' centres across the county. One of the organisers commented, *"because of this fantastic experience, our relationship with pre-school toddler groups, children and their families has gone from strength to strength in their rural communities which so often get overlooked."*

*(Hove YMCA and Brighton and Hove WRVS)*

*The New Forest Small School Lyndhurst, Hampshire Partnership Foundation Trust (NHS) Wellness Recovery Action Plan Teams (WRAP), Bedford House Mental Health Centre, Southampton -* Lifemusic practitioner Richard Parker set up these sessions for older people in Brighton and Hove.

*South East Cancer Help Centre, Purley –* Catherine Pestano heads up the Active Arts initiative in Southampton and undertook the Lifemusic training in the autumn of 2009. She then set up and ran a series of sessions with children and two groups of mental health patients in Southampton.

### **5.4.3 The Lifemusic programme**

#### *Training of Lifemusic practitioners*

This began in September 2008 and initially ran for three hours one evening per week for 12 weeks. Further cohorts ran on the same delivery pattern through 2009/2010. The fourth cohort which ran in autumn 2010 was organised to be delivered over three weekends at monthly intervals (6 days) in order to draw students from further afield. Training was delivered by the Lifemusic team headed by the project convenor plus a community musician with expertise in music technology and disability and a voice therapist and composer. The training programme is regarded as the core of the project and an essential means through which the project will achieve sustainability. The Lifemusic training runs parallel to, and has fed into the development of, a minor route in community music which has been established in the BA music programme at the University of Chichester. In practice, some students who have already completed such modules as undergraduates have since been on the Lifemusic training programme as a stepping stone to their career development.

#### *Workshops*

The workshops generated by the training have been numerous and diverse. A summary of the main workshop activity undertaken is presented separately in the table in the Appendix.

## Research

The SECC programme has developed a platform for research into the value and function of community music. The training and the workshops have generated a significant amount of feedback which is providing valuable data about a form of music making which in some respects is in its infancy. The practice and development of community music is a significant factor in cultural renewal and this action research will contribute to defining community music practice, with the intended outcome of making it more audible, more visible and more sustainable.

### 5.4.4 Outcomes

Responses from trainees demonstrate that most of those who undertook training are using Lifemusic regularly in their work, either in dedicated sessions or as part of their professional activity:

A lot	23
A little	15
Not at all	4

Some comments from trainees:

*“Attending the Lifemusic training was so enjoyable, enriching, relaxing, exciting, experiential and moving. It was what real learning is and should be...It is wonderful to be able to make music with people in such a dynamic interactive and engaging way and to observe people enjoying themselves and their music but also not always enjoying themselves and to see them challenged and taken out of their comfort zone.”* (Heather)

*“Coming into this Lifemusic experience for the first time has been for me like stumbling across water in the desert ...I'm aware Lifemusic isn't 'music therapy', but the sense of wellbeing and group cohesion it can generate seems to have the potential to be pretty darn powerful, liberating and even transformative. I expect once we're facilitators, we'll find people in our groups similarly profoundly affected.”* (Lindsay)

The main limitation of the training was the time constraints on a single 36 hour programme. It left insufficient time for students to practice their own delivery skills with the rest of the group, let alone be observed in outreach situations or produce their own evaluative reports. There is certainly sufficient interest for a level 2 module to make this part of the development plan for the future. Such a programme would be in a strong position to gain accreditation from a

national body such as the Institute for complementary therapies and create a certificated programme.

The well-being questionnaire was undertaken with five different types of client group:

- Young people (14-16)
- Mental health patients
- Administrative staff (team building)
- Vocal Lifemusic group
- Day workshops (tasters)

The vast majority of respondents (about 98%) reported feeling more relaxed, alert and energised by the sessions. None reported a drop in these levels of well-being and a few (about 2%) reported no change.

The following is a selection of feedback from practitioners and clients:

*(The trainer's) lively enthusiasm was infectious and everyone thoroughly enjoyed the session. One member of the group said she wasn't going to come to the training and that she was so glad she did because she loved it and it was a fantastic beginning to the school year. Chris was able to show us all how life music can be incorporated into the early years foundation stage curriculum. (B.E. Children's' Centre Manager)*

*Can I just tell you the story of the child called E? She has been coming to me to help her with the jump between primary and secondary school and with anger and unrest at home...E began to play my Vietnamese xylophone and I picked up a drum and repeated the beat, she came back with a variation and I repeated that on the drum. We must have kept this up for ten minutes or so and she was looking at me and grinning. I was also smiling in the way I do in Life music sessions, feeling the delight as the music becomes mutual. It was mutual and I had discovered another way to listen to this child who speaks little but thinks deeply. I am hoping to use Life Music in the next Play Team training at the end of November where we teach people to listen reflectively. I feel the experience with E has increased my confidence in how best to introduce it. (Anna, LM Practitioner)*

*From a medical point of view, using the lifemusic method has been a valuable addition to my everyday practice at work, adding diagnostic (e.g. assessing the understanding of verbal and non verbal information, initiative, possible perseveration i.e. inability to shift to a new task, coordination) and therapeutic (e.g. interaction with patients in a non threatening, less hierarchical, non traditional way) aspects". (Veronika, Assistant Specialist in Neuropsychiatry)*

### **5.4.5 Summary**

The evaluative feedback present an overall picture of the contribution participatory music can make to the well-being of groups and communities. The output of the Lifemusic project is extensive and inevitably only a part of the total can be included here. It is always difficult to analyse musical activity in words, the truth of music is in the sound it makes, but some conclusions can be summarised:

- The majority of participants found the experience beneficial
- The music-making brought people together in unique ways
- The music itself, as form, as knowledge, created valuable bridges between the university and diverse communities
- The forms within the music represented the identities and feelings of specific groups
- The music-making created a sense of well-being - emotional, physical and mental
- The output from the project forms a resource of musical material which is original, fascinating and may reveal much about the nature of musical form and the structure of the imagination
- The project as a whole provides a valuable and sustainable resource of knowledge about music and communities

## **5.5 Our Space – exploring spaces to bring the Deaf community together**

Convenor: John Walker – Centre for Deaf Studies, University of Sussex

The Our Space project was initially set up by members of the Deaf community and various partners as a Community of Practice (CoP) following a successful bid for the ‘Disability’ strand of the Sussex coastal communities project. ‘Our Space’ was facilitated by John Walker, both convenor of Deaf Studies at the University of Sussex and Deaf community member.

Prior to establishing the CoP, a focus group (consisting of community members, partner organisations and university staff) was convened to identify how best the SECC funding could benefit the Deaf community. It was discovered that there were concerns for Deaf people, young or old as well as future generations, who may still require a Deaf space to support their needs for healthy living – something that was felt to be currently lacking at a local level due to the demise of previous spaces such as Deaf clubs.

## *Evaluation*

The evaluation report was written by Rob Kirkwood, a professional doctorate student at the University of Brighton who was part of an affiliated project and a member of the CoP management team. The author attended a number of community of practice open meetings and management meetings; had access to relevant documents generated by the CoP; and assisted in the capturing of feedback from CoP and community members. It must be acknowledged that the author does not have a hearing loss and so does not share the internalised experiences of deafness or Deaf culture of other project members.

### **5.5.1 Aims**

The original project aims were to research and develop 'spaces', either virtual or physical, for deaf and hard of hearing people, working with the Universities of Brighton and Sussex, local deaf services providers, and advocacy groups. Two key research questions were: 'How do deaf people meet?' and 'How can members of the Deaf community who do not have contact with current information/consultation mechanisms better access community services?' The project interim report submitted in July 2009, included a 12 month review of the original project aims and set out a revised list consisting of 10 specific work objectives as follows:

1. The establishment of a CoP to facilitate strategic development of Deaf people living in coastal areas of Sussex.
2. To review, through literature and examples of best practice, how the health and wellbeing of Deaf people could be best served.
3. Engaging the community to develop their 'research' skills and engage with University academics.
4. An exploration of the current situation within the Deaf community on how they maintain their health and wellbeing.
5. Reviewing the use of written material to provide health and community health information.
6. Exploration of community activity promoting Deaf people's health and wellbeing through workshop or visual art activity.
7. Trialling a one-off festival activity celebrating the lives of Deaf people in Sussex to engage the community, and its observers, in a positive way.
8. The development of an on-line concept that allows Deaf people, whose first language is BSL, to communicate and liaise in an on-line space.
9. A conference reporting on the notion of space and how it has affected Deaf people in the coastal areas.
10. A visual representation and evaluation of the project as a whole.

The above revisions reflect the developments within the community of practice, signifying a shift from the project's initial pre-engagement position which was inevitably largely theoretical, to the complex reality of community engagement.

### **5.5.2 The partnership**

The CoP included academic representatives from the universities of Brighton and Sussex, third sector organisations, statutory services and Deaf community members. Academic representation included an occupational therapy senior lecturer, an occupational therapy doctoral student, an education researcher and the convener of Deaf Studies. Additionally, two occupational therapy pre-registration students became involved through their own Masters level research. Third sector organisation representation included: Royal Association for Deaf people (RAD), Action for Deafness and Sussex Deaf Association. Representation from statutory services came from social care, interpreting services and audiology. The community representation came from individuals who decided to commit to the Our Space project's activities at varying levels.

In April 2009, it was decided to relocate CoP meetings from the university-based venue to a community venue. This signalled a shift in atmosphere at the meetings from a formal business protocol to a more informal social networking approach. With a greater push in publicity for what were termed the 'public events' this saw an increase in attendance by Deaf community members. However, because of the venue move, the university lost the ability to change attitudes about its accessibility as a physical entity and challenge public 'fears' about how intimidating universities can be for some.

### **5.5.3 Outcomes for community partners**

In the first year, Deaf health and well being was reconceptualised from an 'access to services' perspective to one more akin to the 'health promotion' model, in which the salutogenic qualities (i.e. factors that support health and well-being, rather than factors that cause disease) of CoP members' occupations, activities and interests became the focus. Recognising meaningful social interaction and community building as a strong indicator of well-being led to a re-visioning of participation in the CoP as beneficial to health and well-being in its own right. An exploration of the notion of 'spaces' led to the categorisation of five main spaces with and within which the project planned to engage with the community. These spaces were identified as:

- The Our Space community of practice public meetings
- A programme of small community events led by a workshop facilitator

- An annual festival type event associated with the Brighton Festival (held in May 2010)
- An on-line virtual space for interaction amongst community members (now available at: [www.sussexdeafhistories.org.uk](http://www.sussexdeafhistories.org.uk))
- Deaf Sussex Today magazine highlighting community activities and promoting health and wellbeing
- An end of Project Conference to disseminate the project's learning

The activities carried out within these spaces were responsive to the new focus upon Deaf histories and the link between reminiscence and well-being.

The progress in the first year represented a significant development in the philosophical approach taken towards health and well-being and the methods used for community engagement. Central to both these are the ideas that have emerged from the community of practice regarding 'space' drawing on both its historical and cultural significance within the Deaf community and the way in which such spaces support health and well-being. This was built on in Year 2:

#### **a. Our Space Public Meetings**

The project's public meetings began in April 2009, publicised as a space for 'sharing passions and for learning' and continue to be held for 2 hours between 6pm and 8pm once a month on a Tuesday evening at the Friends Meeting House, a community venue in Brighton. The evenings are made up of a presentation followed by a discussion regarding the topic. Topics have been based upon the interests/concerns generated by the group and have served as a platform to explore issues pertaining to health, skills, cultural histories, research processes and politics. Further information on the sessions can be found at: [http://www.sussexdeafhistory.org.uk/category\\_id\\_37\\_path\\_0p4p.aspx](http://www.sussexdeafhistory.org.uk/category_id_37_path_0p4p.aspx) (see also Appendix)

The excerpts below are drawn from transcripts (translated from BSL) of video recorded conversations; the first between three Our Space meeting attendees and the second between two attendees, in response to open questions posed by the evaluator about their views on the Our Space project meetings.

### **Transcript 1**

*Woman1) I went with an interpreter who asked me to go along...and found it very interesting. It was nice to do something different than usual, meet others and share views, thoughts and feelings.*

*Woman2) It is not only about getting information but also about socialising, to see old and new faces, sharing knowledge and receiving information. It is also difficult to go straight after work as I finish at 5pm and usually like to have a rest.*

*Woman1) It feels separate from University, it didn't feel like an university related project in my experience.*

*Woman2) I initially went as it had physiotherapy, something that is related to my work. I wanted to see how communication worked in that area. Interesting. John said something about this being linked with the university – I agree that there is a segregation here, the university world and our world. I did think there were some links between us both on occasion.*

*Man1) They may write essays, get information from books and do research.*

*Woman2) I realised that hearing people are interested too, not just us. They usually are interested in medical issues, something that we don't identify ourselves with. I think they realise that now.*

*Woman1) It would be nice to have more grassroots deaf people to attend as they would provide us with a unique perspective.*

*Woman2) We need to encourage local people to come. If more grassroots came, that would be a big achievement...I think they are the key to improving things. I am sure a lot of them don't have access to this information.*

### **Transcript 2**

*Woman 1) It is interesting for people to see what the local history is all about, it is part of the Brighton history. It is good for people to join in and learn what it's all about.*

*Woman 2) I think the purpose of the meetings are for people to meet up. Here at this event, we are all equals and everyone contributes, which is a good thing. They put their views, comments forward...These Our Space meetings are important as deaf clubs are closing down and this gives the local deaf community the opportunity to meet up, share things, their experiences and enjoy themselves socially...It's important to carry this on. I see the value in Universities working with the community – the university does the research, learning from grassroots.*

*Woman1) This gives people a chance to be more confident to get on with life, those who leave school don't know where to go.*

*Woman 2) I know that at deaf clubs, everything is left to the committee and people just go to enjoy themselves and do nothing. Here everybody was happy to contribute and work together as a team...I feel strongly that the link with the university is important...You have to think what's there and to continue these meetings with themes and topics. Something that the university might benefit from.*

The above comments highlight a clear recognition of the project as a positive space for socialising, sharing knowledge and receiving information that is important in view of deaf club closures. Although the comments suggest similarities with historical 'topic' based Deaf gatherings, there is also a suggestion that Our Space enables increased participation, imbued with a sense of equality amongst members. This need for equality appears to be

reinforced by the call for more 'grassroots' members. There are two distinct perspectives upon the collaborative role of the University. In the first comments, the university's role is apparently not recognised whereas in the second it is. This encapsulates the dilemma faced by the academic bodies involved who, on the one hand are seeking demonstrable opportunities for collaborative knowledge exchange, yet on the other hand seek to avoid taking a dominant position within the project.

## **b. Deaf Culture Day**

The Deaf Culture Day was held as part of the Brighton Festival at a local school for deaf children bringing together over 300 participants from Sussex and the South East, mostly from the Deaf community. It was supported, and largely organised, by the community partners. Many hearing people with an interest in the lives of Deaf people or who had Deaf relatives also attended the event. Coinciding with the event, a local historian coordinated the unveiling of a heritage plaque, broadcast on BBC South Today, to mark the original location of the first school for the deaf in Brighton, the Brighton Institution for the Deaf and Dumb (est. 1841). The day was also used as a platform for the official launch of the Deaf Sussex Histories website.

Feedback from the day was captured through filming of conversations between attendees; videoing individuals responding to open questions; messages received by text to project organisers and subsequent messages left on the website:

*I feel that the event today is very similar to the olden days, where deaf people would gather together and socialise in one big group rather than separately. It is fantastic, the atmosphere is really good! The stage, stalls and talks throughout the day, people were encouraged to contribute and get involved and seemed to enjoy it – just like in the past, a part of our culture that I thought was lost. We have all come from far off places and enjoy being together; I missed that part of the deaf community in the past. I am delighted to learn that this may be an annual event, I am definitely coming again. Fantastic!*

*Today I got some useful information about deaf culture, sign language on such a beautiful day. This is the first time and is a good idea. It should happen again, it is good to talk to old friends. I told my friends who live nearby to come along too and they thanked us, it was worth it.*

*I am disappointed that there were not enough stalls, I wanted more... Such as deaf led professionals, advertising themselves...*

*It was good to see old friends, really lovely and I enjoyed it. I want the same every year as hearing people have similar events, festivals which I am not able to participate in fully. Deaf festivals where everyone can sign and enjoy themselves, lovely! I want the same every year. The council should provide us with this...*

*I am still gobsmacked at the fact that 300 people turned up! I had expected a maximum of 100 or perhaps 150 people. Where did these 300 come from!?*

*A father of a recently-born deaf daughter had attended the event and was surprised to see that deaf people had such a powerful community and culture, their way of life and traits. He had never expected*

*anything like that. He also realised that deaf people have a lot to offer, this is something that makes me proud. To show that to hearing people and acknowledging that we are here and have our place in society is really positive.*

*In this exhibition, it was the other way round! Hearing people were the ones who needed interpreters! It was all in BSL and deaf people could feel relaxed all day conversing in their own language.*

The comments above highlight the positive reaction to a structured space where people had opportunities to reconnect with old friends and felt significantly more relaxed within a predominantly signed environment; something that was clear articulated as lacking in current times. Its impact upon members of the hearing community is also noteworthy.

### **c. Sussex Deaf History Website**

The Sussex Deaf History website ([www.sussexdeafhistory.org.uk](http://www.sussexdeafhistory.org.uk)) has served as a virtual space to support the activity of Our Space. This platform has been used to report on activities, capture and display local deaf history, disseminate information to the wider community and provide a forum for responses and discussion. The website's soft launch in March 2010 and official launch in May 2010 came after considerable development work with the community partners to maximise the participatory nature of the site. However, it is recognised that the website's high dependency upon written English may limit its ability to fulfil the revised project aim describing: the development of an on-line concept that allows Deaf people, whose first language is BSL, to communicate and liaise in an on-line space.

### **d. Our Space Conference**

The conference was held in October 2010. The theme, 'The changing landscape of Deaf spaces to facilitate Health and Wellbeing', aimed to explore the changing and developing Deaf Landscape and its impact on Deaf people's spaces and their health and wellbeing and drew much from the inquiry threads that have emerged from the Our Space project including real and virtual spaces, spaces of the past and present and spaces known and yet to be realised. A more detailed report of the day is in preparation.

## **5.5.4 Academic Development Outcomes**

### **a. Literature Review**

A literature review was undertaken by Josh Cameron (University of Brighton). The review posed the question "How do Deaf people's participation in different community based environments and activities influence their well-being?" The findings presented literature in the following categories: health and social care; education; work; leisure; and, community and culture. The relevance of these categories to the Our Space project methods and

achievements are discussed in relation to the research process, the concept of space, and the influence of differing conceptualisations of D/deafness. The review concludes that an understanding of Deafness from a culturally based perspective (as opposed to disability related model) is best placed to support individual and collective expressions of Deaf identity that can promote Deaf people's well-being. Subsequently, the review has formed the basis for an article for which publication is being sought and has been drawn upon as a resource for numerous presentations regarding the theoretical basis of the project.

#### **b. Enhanced Occupational Therapy Curriculum**

One outcome of the dissemination activities was to develop university curricula that address the needs of Deaf community. With a Senior Occupational Therapy lecturer involved with Our Space as an academic partner, channels were developed for the project to directly inform the curriculum of the occupational therapy pre registration MSc program at the University of Brighton. In addition, two occupational therapy students have conducted their MSc research projects under the project's umbrella. One project was successful in receiving funding from the College of Occupational Therapy through a student award.

#### **c. See Yourself Project**

Through a separate funding stream a CoP member was invited to submit a proposal to Brighton Sussex Community Knowledge Exchange (BSCKE) for funding of 'See Yourself' a participatory action research project with Deaf and hearing impaired young people in the area being undertaken as part of a professional doctorate in occupational therapy. The bid was successful and the subsequent research project remained affiliated to Our Space for the duration of the project. This affiliation resulted in the building of relationships that led to a substantial increase in the researcher's understanding of the deaf community and exchanges in knowledge that brought about significant developments within the 'See Yourself' project including the creation of a project advisory panel consisting of Our Space members, links made with the local Sensory Needs Service and the extension of the project to a local specialist school for the deaf.

### **5.6 Training Older People as Researchers**

Convenors: Dr Heather Clark (to Nov 2009), Dr John Gammon (from December 2009) – University of Chichester

Training Older People as Researchers (TOPAR) had its genesis in the recognition that the West Sussex coastal region has a very high proportion of its population aged over 65. This is the result of older people from many regions of the UK coming to settle in an area that they

perceive as benign in its climate and relatively settled in its general life. Despite this there is a chronic lack of gerontology consultants who specialise in this age group. In addition, some care homes have been targeted for the apparent lack of care that they provide for old people. Local authorities have closed some of their own care homes in order to make necessary financial savings. Public transport for older people is not always sensitive to their needs.

However, there is often a lack of hard evidence to support the needs of older people. They do not always like to be open about what they regard as personal aspects of life; they are sometimes hard of hearing or need to have questions and words explained to them; they can be forgetful about crucial incidents in their lives; they frequently express the opinion that what they have to say about important matters will probably not carry any weight.

Conversely, many workers in gerontology have noticed how older people are far freer to express their experiences and feelings to peers of their own age. Recognition of this tendency prompted the initial researcher, a Reader in Gerontology at the University of Chichester, to make the proposal for the university provide a course over an academic year to train older people as researchers. In reality, 'older' was taken to imply over 65 years although the majority of people on the courses were well over that age and had a mean age in the late seventies.

As well as her role as Reader in Gerontology, Dr Heather Clark was a member of several networks of people, agencies and the general community in the area. Her contacts were vital to the initial success of the project. She was able to show that the University was not an ivory tower establishment whose portals should not be crossed by ordinary people.

### *Evaluation*

The TOPAR evaluation was co-ordinated by Diane Sherlock – SECC Development Manager, University of Chichester – and Dr John Gammon. It included reflective feedback from course participants and comments from partner organisations.

#### **5.6.1 The TOPAR course**

The first course began in September 2008 with a cohort of 12 students, all aged over 65. During the first few weeks of the course it was arranged for a mature volunteer student to act as a mentor for the group in showing people the various social and educational provisions that they were able to use. The group was made aware that all facilities made available to main stream students were also available to them, including the use of the library, computing

equipment and support, the University shop, the use banking facilities and first aid and health advice should the need arise.

The TOPAR course comprised training in social research methods and a computer training course. It also made provision for a number of visiting lecturers from guest lecturers, some of whom were already engaged professionally by the University. These included lecturers who specialised in English Literature and also in Sociology. The aim was to provide a well rounded experience that contributed to an increased awareness of how contributions from these two disciplines would help in the research applications that would occur later in the course. In November 2009, Heather Clark became seriously ill. Since that time her illness has prevented her return to the university. John Gammon did practically all of the course tutoring for the students

Through the university's Knowledge Exchange and Health and Wellbeing Committees, contacts were extended to groups in the community, who became very interested in this new team of older, trained researchers, who might be able to conduct research with their own concerns. . Three such proposals came in quick succession during the early part of January 2010. Two were related proposals from the LINK organisation of the local NHS. The LINK represents the voice of the patient and is a nation wide organisation that has government funding to support its objectives.

A third proposal came from Stage Coach, the national bus company. The local manager for the Chichester area had received complaints from several older users of his buses and was keen to have a survey that would provide evidence for the most effective changes that could be made to improve services.

### **5.6.2 Research projects**

The Stage 1 LINK proposal was to evaluate the discharge process of short stay patients at two large NHS hospital situated respectively in Chichester and Worthing. One to one telephone interviews were conducted by TOPAR students during May – June 2010. Patients selected by LINK volunteers were provided with information about the project, and 106 patients indicated their willingness to participate in a telephone interview within a few weeks of their discharge. These patients were each duly contacted and a telephone interview conducted by one of the TOPAR former students who had completed their course successfully. Additional information was also elicited by the two tutors concerned that also proved to be interesting to the LINK Stewardship Committee.

The completion of the first stage of the LINK project with two NHS partners at St. Richards Hospital and Worthing Hospitals is a major boost to inform managers and senior NHS staff of the experiences and feelings of patients before, during and after their discharge from hospital. The LINK Stewardship Committee has accepted the findings of the research, mainly conducted by the older people researchers who were trained on the TOPAR course. These findings have been conveyed to Hospital management teams with recommendations from the Stewardship Committee that action is taken to ameliorate the problems that are caused to patients during their discharge process. Face to face qualitative interviews with ten patients were revealing in the findings that they produced. Although most patients had a good discharge experience there was a much smaller proportion that complained of their treatment in quite negative terms. Third sector organisations have shown continuous interest in progress, but no findings have yet been released for public

A planned further stage of this investigation will be similar to Stage 1, except that the discharge procedures to be evaluated will be focused on three smaller West Sussex hospitals and will omit face to face interviews.

The research project demonstrates a tangible partnership between the major two NHS hospitals in the region and the University. In its modest way, the TOPAR project points to one way in which an increasingly ageing population could help to provide at least some of its own answers to the problems associated with ageing. With the findings provided in this project it is shown that probably the best people to elicit information from the over 65s are trained people from the same age group.

### **5.6.2 Lessons learned**

Mature adults of 70+ are able learn how to conduct qualitative research with their peer group participants in a manner that maximises the richness of data and to elicit valuable information that is probably not obtainable by other research approaches. The value of such knowledge and understanding is particularly necessary as the age profile of the UK shows an increasing proportion of over 65s, especially in the geographical area covered by the coastal communities project.

Experience of qualitative research strongly suggests that in order to obtain good research data both the interviewer and interviewee in face to face interviews should quickly establish a rapport between themselves. They should be able to create a mutual empathy with each other – one to provide questions that elicit revealing responses and the other to give such answers based on experience and feelings. Empathy in this case was helped by similar

aged questioners and respondents who had personal histories that demonstrated to each other that they were likely to know about events that may be shared in common.

The TOPAR students had an impressive capacity to learn skills that some academic colleagues had doubts that they would be able to manage. These included word processing; introductory statistical skills; interview techniques; maintaining anonymity and confidentiality; transcription; and content analysis. In addition, while they were conducting research they were also asked to notify the County authorities if they had good reason to suspect that any of their respondents appeared to be in need of medical or mental help and support.

Evaluative feedback from students made it clear that they thought that the course was tough but that they realised that if they were to become researchers they would need to possess high level skills. Students appreciated the relevance of the course content and its application to their specific needs and experience.

## **6. Hastings Helpdesk and Coastal Regeneration Research Centre**

Director of the Coastal Regeneration Research Centre: Prof Peter Ambrose

Hastings Helpdesk Manager: Polly Rodriguez

Launched in 2004, the Cupp Helpdesk is an established, user-friendly point of entry to the University of Brighton for local community, voluntary and statutory organisations enquiring about research, access to university resources and other collaborative opportunities. As part of the SECC project, the research helpdesk was extended to Hastings, with drop-in sessions also held in Eastbourne.

The Hastings Helpdesk was launched in May 2008. Alongside this, SECC funds were used to support the development of the Coastal Regeneration Research Centre (CRRRC) based at the University Centre Hastings (UCH), the home of the University of Brighton in Hastings. A management group was set up including the Director of UCH, the Director of CRRRC, the UCH Seminar Series Convenor, the Director of Cupp, the Helpdesk Manager, the Development Manager for REASE, the Town Planning Course Leader, a Graduate Student Representative, and appropriate co-optees. A Senior Researchers Group was established at UCH to respond to approaches from the community and voluntary sector concerning their research advice needs.

## **6.1 Aims of the Coastal Regeneration Research Centre**

- i. To build up research activity based at University Centre Hastings (UCH) focussing on Hastings, St Leonards and Area (HSLA) with particular emphasis on social and economic regeneration
- ii. Specifically to seek funding to develop at least two further UCH-based research projects of a size that requires the appointment of a Research Fellow
- iii. To work closely in partnership with CUPP and local community and voluntary organisations in furthering their research activity
- iv. To work closely with local Councils, other statutory organisations and other stakeholders with a research interest in HSLA
- v. To foster research activity among the staff at UCH, to seek any necessary continuation funding for the doctoral work already being undertaken and to attract new funding for further doctoral research
- vi. To connect emerging research needs in HSLA with research agendas in the University so that the work is embedded in research areas of strategic significance across the Faculties and Schools of the University
- vii. To encourage students on relevant undergraduate and postgraduate programmes to consider HSLA when choosing areas for their projects

## **6.2 Hastings Helpdesk**

Through the Helpdesk Manager and the Senior Researchers Group, the Hastings Helpdesk offers:

- A telephone help-line service
- One-to-one research guidance
- Research drop-in service
- Research training and seminars
- Access to research related information
- Community research forums

## **6.3 Case studies**

Research projects supported by the CRRC have examined key issues facing Hastings and Bexhill such as: changing aspirations towards education; migration into Hastings; the role of cultural and creative industries and sustainability in the regeneration process.

## Case Study 1 – Research Drop-in Enquiry

Organisation	Description of enquiry	Outcome
Hastings Voluntary Action – infrastructure support group (2009)	<p><i>We would like to discuss research ideas:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>An economic analysis of the retirement resort (Bexhill Case Study) and options for the future/analysis of economic linkages between Hastings and Rural Rother</i></li> <li>• <i>In depth analysis of the nature of deprivation in Bexhill and Rother</i></li> <li>• <i>Employment opportunities in Rother</i></li> <li>• <i>Study of Rother Local Action</i></li> <li>• <i>Nature and make up of Rother's voluntary sector and recommendations for the future</i></li> <li>• <i>Do communities in Rother access services in Hastings?</i></li> <li>• <i>Assessment of social enterprise in Hastings and Rother</i></li> </ul>	<p>Following discussion with CRRC researchers, a first stage research project was funded (£1050) into the characteristics of the Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS) workforce and employment practices in East Sussex. The two elements were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) An exploratory study of the characteristics of the VCS workforce</li> <li>b) To test the accuracy of the anecdotal perception that the sector is a supportive employer and to evidence what enables and prohibits them from achieving fully supportive employment practices</li> </ol>

## Case Study 2 - Rotherfield St Martin: research into a community group in an English rural village

This research report was commissioned by the CRRC for Rotherfield St Martin, a Church-in-Community group delivering services to older residents in the village of Rotherfield and surrounding areas. It comprised a quantitative element of survey questionnaires followed up by qualitative interviews.

The research is set against a background of Government cuts in the field of health and social care and increased numbers of older people. At the same time, older people are being encouraged to remain in their own homes both in policy terms as well as the preferred choice of the older people themselves.

Rotherfield St Martin (RSM) launched in September of 2005 with six people at a tea and cakes afternoon and today is made up of 110 volunteers and 271 members. The gross core costs are around £43,000 per annum and net core costs approximately £33,000. Currently the volunteer hours average 250 per week.

RSM offers a wide range of services including water therapy and time in the gym, outings, a diverse number of therapies, refreshments and activities such as bridge, yoga and commuter assistance as well as a volunteer driving scheme.

This research found that volunteers continued primarily because of the ethos of the village, deemed to be kind and not at all snobby, as well as the support of the project manager. What motivated the volunteers to volunteer was primarily social, the desire to help others; other reasons could be grouped under self-esteem and satisfaction as well as retirement as a reason to volunteer. The other important motivation was faith where people feeling that helping is a way of life would perhaps reject the concept of 'volunteering'. Many had volunteered for their whole lives.

Supporting the volunteers was an essential component in the success of RSM. Volunteers felt supported, in particular by the project manager. The manager of RSM is a full-time salaried post. This management system created an infrastructure that could focus on volunteers and support their work.

Valued and effective services included exercise, falls prevention and transport.

The research also set out to assess whether the RSM model could be developed in other

## 7. Addressing sustainability

In addressing the long term sustainability of the programme we have identified four key areas: building up the intellectual capital of the universities, including teaching and learning practice and research; developing long-term community partnerships and knowledge exchange; policy impact; and attracting additional funding.

There is firm evidence that projects have developed in ways that will become more embedded and sustainable. This includes the development of new and existing networks and partnerships; new mechanisms for information sharing, curriculum development and furthering research interests; and exchange of good practice across the region, as well as nationally and internationally. There are also several examples of ways in which the SECC programme is enriching teaching and learning practice in both undergraduate and postgraduate programmes and facilitating new research opportunities. Count Me In Too has already had a distinct policy influence.

### 7.1 Examples of sustainability

- Teaching and learning practice
  - Input into Social Work, Physiotherapy and OT BSc/MSc modules: enhances competency to meet community needs
  - Students report increased understanding of ageing issues
  - Development of community music modules within BA in community music
- Research
  - Doctoral project with Brighton & Hove Sensory Needs Service
  - MSc student researching deaf access to services
  - New research partnerships (see Appendix)
  - Coastal Regeneration Research Centre programme; 4 PhD students
  - Access to academic networks (national and international)
- Community partnerships/knowledge exchange
  - New older people's partnerships (Activity Buddies; Older People as Researchers)
  - 3<sup>rd</sup> sector organisations building resilience working into strategic plans (Bouncing Back)

- Life Music practitioners forum
- Master classes; training; presentations involving community and university partners; community research summaries
- Community partners more aware of role of research in developing projects and services (e.g. LGBT Community Research Information Desk; Hastings Helpdesk)
- Policy impact
  - Brighton & Hove Trans Gender Community Strategy (Count Me In Too)
  - LGBT-focused Domestic Violence & Abuse worker created in Brighton & Hove Council
  - Enhanced knowledge of health and well-being needs of local communities by community organisations and service providers
- Funding
  - Research funding
  - Locally commissioned research and development activity

## 7.2 Future opportunities

The three universities in the Sussex sub-region are already developing future strategies for continuing their partnership work at both project level and institutional level. Examples at project level include: developing a Centre of Excellence for healthy ageing in Eastbourne with community partners; developing the Count Me In Too research model with other community and statutory agencies; the development of a social enterprise development plan for Lifemusic; and supporting the development of new Resilient Therapy Communities of Practice in East Sussex and Hastings.

Examples at institutional level include: the University of Brighton's emerging 'On Our Doorsteps' programme <http://www.brighton.ac.uk/cupp/whatwedo/community-knowledge-exchange/on-our-doorsteps.html> and continuation of the Coastal Communities Research Centre at the University Centre Hastings funded by independent research commissions; continuation of Deaf Community of Practice activities within the Centre for Community Engagement at the University of Sussex; and support by the University of Chichester's School of Enterprise Management & Leadership to develop SECC projects as social enterprise businesses.

## 8. Dissemination

A wide range of dissemination activities are already in progress at project level, including participation in conferences and seminars - locally, nationally and internationally; workshops and public events; journal articles; and interactive media (see Appendix).

The SECC Regional Board has approved a programme of regional dissemination activities to be overseen by the Community University Partnership Programme at the University of Brighton. This will include:

- An initial internal scoping paper including market assessment; funding and policy environment
- A series of briefing papers on aspects of policy and practice in community – university partnership working
- Dissemination activities i.e. involvement in appropriate events and seminars
- Publicity and promotional materials i.e. themed press briefings, web-based materials
- A short film that will communicate the value of university community partnerships to policy makers, funders and potential participants in future projects and add to the knowledge base of ‘what works’ in community university partnerships (available end of February 2011)

## References

Buss, J. (2010) *The Photocapture Project: A Brighton Photo Biennial Project documenting Cupp's South East Coastal Communities Programme – Final Report* (unpublished)

Cupp (2010) *Developing a metric for community engagement: the experience of the Sussex Coastal Communities region* (unpublished discussion paper)

Hart, A. and Northmore, S. (2011) 'Auditing and evaluating university community engagement: lessons from a UK case study', *Higher Education Quarterly* 65 (1) 34–58

Hart, A., Northmore, S. and Gerhardt, C. (2009) *Auditing, Benchmarking and Evaluating Public Engagement*, Bristol: National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement

Hart, A. and Wolff, D. (2006) 'Developing local "Communities of Practice" through local Community-University Partnerships', *Planning Practice & Research* 21 (1) 121-138

Pearce, J., Pearson, M. and Cameron, S. (2007) *The Ivory Tower and Beyond: the University of Bradford at the Heart of its Communities – the University of Bradford's REAP Approach to Measuring its Community Engagement*, Bradford: ICPS-University of Bradford

SECC (2007) South East Coastal Communities Project Business Case

## APPENDIX – Summary of key outputs and outcomes

Outputs	Measurable achievements to end of December 2010		
	<i>Activities and events</i>	<i>People</i>	<i>Publications and dissemination</i>
<b>Activity Buddies</b>  Six strands: 1. Fitness and mobility for health 2. Dispensing with the mystery 3. Learning together (Year 2 only) 4. Reduced Horizons 5. Health Education Programme 6. LifeLines	87 individual Activity Buddies events (Strands 1 – 5) <i>[19 events in Year 1; 68 events in Year 2]</i>  Social Networking Group set up	114 students and 130 community participants (older people) recruited (Strands 1 - 5)  50 hours student placement (Strand 6)  9 members  10 key community partner organisations  <i>[Baseline(July 2008)12 students and 35 community participants]</i>	CUPP conference presentation  Photo capture through Cupp/ Brighton Photo Biennial project  Final dissemination conference (June 2010)  Planned book publication (2011)

	<b>Activities and events</b>	<b>People</b>	<b>Publications and dissemination</b>
<b>Bouncing Back</b>	<p>11 lectures/conference presentations</p> <p>15 workshops (community partner and parent co-delivered training, including international resilience conference)</p> <p>Masterclass (June 2009)</p> <p>20+ examples of CoP members producing art exhibition/written materials/training resources etc</p> <p>Bouncing Back Community of Practice (CoP)</p> <p>East Sussex Resilient Therapy CoP</p>	<p>Over 1400 attendees at lectures</p> <p>296 workshop participants</p> <p>100 participants</p> <p>21 members</p> <p>15 members</p> <p>9 key partner organisations 3 parent partners</p>	<p><i>Helping Children with Complex Needs Bounce Back</i> (Jessica Kingsley 2009). Co-produced book for parents and professionals</p> <p>Blinchow, D., Thomas, H., Gage, H., &amp; Hart, A. (2009) Armed against adversity. <i>Professional Social Work</i>, 22-24</p> <p>Forthcoming: Hart, A. &amp; Aumann, K. (2011) 'Holding universities to account: Building articulate community partners'. In P. Benneworth (Ed.), <i>University engagement with socially excluded communities: Towards the idea of 'the engaged university'</i>. Dordrecht: Springer.</p> <p>Workshop: <i>Health Inequalities among children and adolescents</i> ' Berlin (May 2009)</p> <p>Workshop for East Sussex Parenting Support programme (June 2009)</p> <p>Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS) East Surrey Forum, Conference Keynote address: <i>What makes disadvantaged children and families resilient?</i> (July 2009) Cupp conference Brighton (2009) presentation: <i>Working well with our differences</i>; workshop: <i>Bouncing Back: Building Resilience with Children and Young People having tough times</i></p> <p>Coping and Resilience International Conference, Dubrovnik (October 2009) presentation: <i>Ordinary Magic: Helping children bounce up through Resilient Therapy</i></p>

		60 participants	<p>Youth Partnership Conference, Eastbourne. Keynote address: <i>Resilience and aspirations</i>, East Sussex (October 2010)</p> <p>Team of academics and community partners attended an international conference 'Pathways to Resilience II: The Social Ecology of Resilience' in Halifax, Canada (June 2010). Poster and workshop titles: <i>Resilient Therapy: A strategic approach to addressing the needs of disadvantaged children and families; Developing Resilient Therapy through a community of practice; Developing Resilient Therapy in adult mental health; Implementing Resilient Therapy: A Collaborative Inquiry Group with Grandparents/Aunts/Friends who are Kinship Carers</i></p> <p>Community-University Collaborations Conference Durham (Sept 2010) plenary presentation <i>Using the CoP Approach</i></p> <p>INVOLVE Conference Nottingham (Nov 2010) presentation: <i>Crash, collide and bang? Using a community of practice approach to engage service users and develop resilience research and practice</i></p> <p>Manchester Beacon for Public Engagement Annual Summit, Manchester Metropolitan University. <i>Bouncebackability: Resilience in Communities in association with the Community University Partnership Project at Brighton University</i>, (Nov 2010)</p>
--	--	-----------------	---



	<b>Activities and events</b>	<b>People</b>	<b>Publications and dissemination</b>
<b>Count Me In Too</b>	<p>3 research report launch events</p> <p>LGBT Community Consultation Event (April 2009):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poster exhibition of research findings</li> <li>• 8 community summary sheets of findings and recommendations since 2006</li> <li>• Digital recording of community discussion</li> <li>• 49 feedback/ monitoring forms</li> </ul> <p>Brighton Pride (July 2009):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poster exhibition</li> <li>• LGBT research tent</li> </ul> <p>National LGBT History Week exhibition at the British Museum (November 2009)</p> <p>LGBT History Month exhibition at Jubilee Library (Feb 2010)</p> <p>Golden Handbag Awards (June 2010)</p>	<p>c75 attendees at launch events</p> <p>50+ participants at consultation event</p> <p>No formal monitoring. Event reports available at: <a href="http://www.countmeintoo.co.uk">www.countmeintoo.co.uk</a></p> <p>c200 visitors</p>	<p>4 research reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bi People</li> <li>• Trans People (Dec 2008)</li> <li>• Drugs &amp; Alcohol (June 2009)</li> <li>• Older People (July 2010)</li> </ul> <p>Papers presented at: ESRC Seminar Series <i>LGBT lives: sexual/gender dissidence over the life course</i> (May 2009)</p> <p><i>Sexy Spaces: Intersectionalities between Geography and Leisure Studies</i> (May 2009)</p> <p>Critical Tourism Conference (June 2009).</p> <p>Royal Geographical Society/Institute of British Geographers Annual Conference (August 2008)</p> <p>Intersections Conference (July 2008)</p> <p>Lesbian Lives conference (Feb 2010)</p> <p>CHAPS conference (March 2010)</p> <p>Swedish School workshop (April 2010)</p> <p>University of Canterbury research seminar (March 2010)</p>

	<p>Research Information Desk (from mid 2009) 2 reports for community organisations published</p>	<p>120 participants</p> <p><i>[Difficulty in establishing baseline data for SECC programme as project was extension of existing work ]</i></p>	<p>Sexuality, Equality and Local Governance conference, University of Newcastle (March 2010) Browne keynote speaker Women and Children First conference (May 2010)</p> <p>Count Me In Too and the Brighton and Sussex Sexualities Network (BSSN) co-hosted the <b><i>Transforming Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Trans Lives</i></b> conference on 15th September 2010 at Jurys Inn, Brighton</p> <p>Publications: Lim, J. and Browne K. (2009) Senses of Gender <i>Sociological Research Online</i> 14 (1) <a href="http://www.socresonline.org.uk/14/1/6.html">http://www.socresonline.org.uk/14/1/6.html</a></p> <p>In press: Browne, K, Cull, M. and Hubbard, P. The diverse vulnerabilities of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Trans sex workers in the UK, <i>Sociologies of Sex Work</i>, (Ashgate, London)</p> <p>Browne, K. and Bakshi, L. 'We are here to Party?: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Trans Leisurescapes' <i>Leisure Studies</i></p> <p>Browne, K. and Lim, J. Trans in the Gay City <i>Gender, Place and Culture</i></p> <p>Community Resource Pack (summary of CMIT research findings)</p> <p>New website: <a href="http://www.countmeintoo.co.uk">www.countmeintoo.co.uk</a></p>
--	--	--	--

	<b>Activities and events</b>	<b>People</b>	<b>Publications and dissemination</b>
<b>Lifemusic</b>	<p>4 x 36 hours training workshops</p> <p>500 Lifemusic workshops delivered across a wide range of community groups</p> <p>10 taster days</p> <p>4 support group meetings (2010)</p>	<p>56 Life Music Practitioners completed training</p> <p>Over 300 community/public participants</p> <p>10 key community partner organisations; 36 partner organisations involved</p>	<p>Article for Sound Sense journal "<i>LifeMusic Method – Expanding University-Community Engagement</i>" (March 2009)</p> <p>Submitted to International Journal of Community Music: <i>Lifemusic – Sounding out university community engagement</i></p> <p>Presentations:          "Artbeat" conference (September 2009)          Cupp conference (May 2009)          'Inspiring Transformations' conference, University of Northampton (Sep 2009)          'Community Music in HE and inclusion in Community Music' conference, University of Winchester (April 2010)</p> <p>Workshops:          Lifemusic workshops at Janacek Music Academy, Masaryk University and Waldorf School, Brno, Czech Republic. 6 weeks spread over 18 months funded by ERASMUS</p> <p>Book:  <i>Lifemusic – Connecting People to Time</i> (300pp. Publisher: Archive Books, Dorset. Spring 2011)</p> <p>Film and recorded material:          2 hours of filmed material and 20 hours of audio recording. Film submitted to UN International Council for Caring Communities          Available on You Tube:  <a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oH-x5KC9Bty">www.youtube.com/watch?v=oH-x5KC9Bty</a></p> <p>Two appearances on Czech radio and TV</p>

	<b>Activities and events</b>	<b>People</b>	<b>Publications and dissemination</b>
<b>Our Space</b>	<p>10 open meetings at community venue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Positive Action and Action Research (April 2009)</li> <li>• Deaf People as Historians (May 2009)</li> <li>• Deaf Arts/Artists in mainstream arts (June 2009)</li> <li>• Deaf LGBT people (July 2009)</li> <li>• Review session (Sept 2009)</li> <li>• Health &amp; the Environment (Oct 2009)</li> <li>• BSL Broadcasting Trust (Nov 2009)</li> <li>• Deaf Ethnicity, Deafhood and Deaf Ethnosexuality (Dec 2009)</li> <li>• Deaf People's Narratives (Jan 2010)</li> <li>• Political parties (April 2010)</li> </ul> <p>2 health and well-being workshops in Eastbourne and Brighton</p> <p>Deaf Culture Day in Brighton Festival event (May 2010) and unveiling of heritage plaque for Brighton Institute for the Deaf &amp; Dumb (est. 1841)</p> <p>Launch of Sussex Deaf Histories website: <a href="http://www.sussexdeafhistory.org.uk">www.sussexdeafhistory.org.uk</a></p>	<p>Total 193 participants</p> <p>20 participants</p> <p>75 participants</p> <p>300+ participants</p> <p>6 key community partner organisations</p> <p>2,537 individual visitors in first six months (May- Sept 2010)</p>	<p>Literature review completed (June 2010)</p> <p>Cupp conference presentation</p> <p><a href="http://www.deafsussexhistory.org.uk">www.deafsussexhistory.org.uk</a> website</p> <p>Increasing coverage in Deaf Sussex Today magazine</p> <p>Video capture through CUPP/ Brighton Photo Biennial project</p> <p>Deaf Culture Day broadcast on BBC South Today</p> <p>Our Space conference (October 2010)</p>

	<b><i>Activities and events</i></b>	<b><i>People</i></b>	<b><i>Publications and dissemination</i></b>
<b><i>Training Older People as Researchers</i></b>	<p>48 university based research methods teaching sessions x 2 hrs</p> <p>40 community based ICT training sessions x 2hrs</p> <p>LINK hospital discharge research completed</p>	<p>14 older people have received research methods training</p> <p>106 patients interviewed</p>	<p>Keynote speech at 'Research with a local flavour' conference, University of Chichester, 23 June 2009</p>

	<b>Activities and events</b>	<b>People</b>	<b>Publications and dissemination</b>
<b>Hastings Research Helpdesk and Coastal Regeneration Research Centre</b>	<p>Launch of Helpdesk (May 2008) More information at: <a href="http://www.brighton.ac.uk/cupp/whatwedo/research-helpdesk.html">www.brighton.ac.uk/cupp/whatwedo/research-helpdesk.html</a></p> <p>Launch of Coastal Regeneration Research Centre(CRRC) (April 2009)</p> <p>8 Helpdesk drop-in events</p> <p>198 new enquiries (Hastings &amp; Eastbourne) 64 leading to researcher involvement</p> <p>25 projects directly funded/supported (small 'pump priming' grants)</p> <p>Other events:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eastbourne launch (Oct 2009)</li> <li>• Young People Diversity &amp; Cohesion (Dec 2009)</li> <li>• LGBT conference (Feb 2010)</li> <li>• CCRC AGM (March 2010)</li> <li>• Social Mentoring Network</li> <li>• BME Business Network</li> <li>• Diversity &amp; Cohesion event (Dec 2010)</li> <li>• Black History Month seminar</li> </ul>	<p>90 participants at Helpdesk launch</p> <p>100 participants at CRRC launch</p> <p>4 PhD students in CRRC</p> <p>55 participants</p> <p>60 participants</p> <p>100+ participants</p> <p>70+ participants</p> <p>35+ participants</p> <p>50+ participants</p> <p>40+ participants</p>	<p><b>CRRC seminar series:</b></p> <p><b>Autumn term 2009</b> 21st Oct - <i>The changing world of non-traditional learners in UCH</i> 4th Nov- <i>Media Studies research</i> 18th Nov -<i>Educational research in Hastings and Ore</i> 2nd Dec - <i>Media Studies research topic</i> 16th Dec - <i>An educational research project</i></p> <p><b>Autumn term 2010</b> 20 Oct - <i>Passport2success. A case study of student mentoring in secondary schools</i> 10 - Nov <i>Young people and youth work in Hastings</i></p> <p><b>Spring term 2011</b> 19 Jan - <i>Social theory, social change</i> 9 Feb - <i>Browne Review</i> 16 Feb - <i>Education and regeneration, at the chalk face in an FE college</i> 28 Feb – <i>Education research in Sheffield</i> 2 March <i>Work of the Horizons adult education centre</i> 16 March – <i>Education and working class communities</i></p> <p><b>CRRC conference and AGM :</b> <i>Beside the Seaside</i> (March 2010)</p>

	<b>Activities and events</b>	<b>People</b>	<b>Publications and dissemination</b>
<b>Central</b>	<p>2 evaluation seminars for CoPs</p> <p>1 Regional Networking Event s</p> <p>NING Social Networking website  <a href="http://cuppcop.ning.com/group/coastalcommunities">http://cuppcop.ning.com/group/coastalcommunities</a></p> <p>Sussex Coastal Communities website  <a href="http://www.coastalcommunities.org.uk">www.coastalcommunities.org.uk</a>  including SECC film:  <i>Exploring Community University Partnerships: Learning from the South East Coastal Communities Programme</i></p> <p>Cupp Academic Director is member of Advisory Board for Centre for Social Justice and Community Action at Durham University Malardalen University, Sweden; Canadian Social Science and Humanities Research Council's committee for community university partnership grants</p> <p>Cupp Director is member of HEFCE working group on community engagement; member NCCPE Advisory Board Student Volunteering Project</p>	<p>50 participants</p> <p>37 participants</p> <p>Coastal Communities Group - 35 members;  REAP Evaluation Group - 32 members</p>	<p>Hart, A., Northmore, S., &amp; Gerhardt, C. (2009) <i>Auditing, Benchmarking and Evaluating Public Engagement</i>, Bristol: NCCPE</p> <p>Hart, A., Northmore, S., Gerhardt, C. &amp; Rodriguez, P. (2009)'Developing access between universities and local community groups: A university helpdesk in action' <i>Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement</i> Volume 13, Number 3, p. 45 (2009)</p> <p>Hart, A. (2010)' Early promise?' in D. Wolff &amp; C Davies (Eds.) <i>Working in community university partnerships: Academic experiences</i> (pp. 32-41). Brighton: Cupp, University of Brighton</p> <p>Hart, A &amp; Northmore, S. (2011)' <i>Auditing and evaluating university community engagement: lessons from a UK case study</i>' <i>Higher Education Quarterly</i> Volume 65, No. 1, pp 34–58</p> <p>Keynote address at Excellence in University-Community Engagement conference, Newcastle University (June 2009)</p> <p>Forthcoming:  Hart, A., &amp; Church, A. Research leadership for the community-engaged university: Key challenges. <i>Metropolitan Universities Journal Special Issue</i></p> <p>Millican, J., &amp; Hart, A. Community university partnership research in practice at the University of Brighton, England: Processes and Pitfalls. Submitted for publication in English and Spanish in</p>

			<p>a special edition of <i>Rhizoma Freiano</i> on Global Knowledge Movements (Editor: Budd Hall)</p> <p>Mulvihill, N., Hart, A., Northmore, S., Wolff, D. &amp; Pratt, J. <i>SECC Dissemination Papers:</i></p> <p><i>1 The Future of University-Community Engagement</i></p> <p><i>2 Models of Partnership Working</i></p> <p><i>3 Geographies of Collaboration</i></p> <p><i>4 Embedding University-Community Partnership Working</i></p> <p><i>5 Measuring the Impact of University-Community Engagement</i></p> <p>Brighton: University of Brighton</p> <p>Presentations at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Campus Engage conference, Dublin (June 2009)</li> <li>• Knowledge Mobilisation Annual Conference, Toronto</li> <li>• Eden Project</li> <li>• Work Foundation (2 – inc. keynote presentation)</li> <li>• National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement conference (Dec 2010)</li> <li>• Regional Networking Events</li> <li>• Cupp conference (3)</li> <li>• Making the Invisible Visible Conference University of Brighton (2)</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---

Outcomes	Economic and social impacts of the projects in relation to SECC success criteria						
<b>Activity Buddies</b>	Improvement in capacity to meet health and well-being needs	Sustainable infrastructure for community knowledge exchange	Exchange of good practice and information across SE coastal region	Enrichment of teaching and learning practice and facilitation of new research	Increased cross-community practice through partnership working	Enhanced status of community knowledge exchange in the mission statements of universities and 3rd sector partners	Leveraging of additional funding
	<p>All strands have developed relationships with local community groups: Age UK (Brighton, Eastbourne, Lewes and Hastings); YMCA; sheltered housing and older people's homes; Meridian Citizens Forum; Hillcrest Centre</p> <p>Further partnership projects planned</p> <p>Students report increased self confidence and improved employment prospects; strand leaders observed</p>	<p>Sustainable infrastructure being developed through planned Healthy Ageing Centre for Excellence (HACE) in Eastbourne, with voluntary, statutory and university partners</p> <p>Educational materials developed by the Health Education strand is a model that could be more widely developed</p>	<p>Articles in local paper on fitness and mobility for health and raised awareness of partnership activity in local community</p> <p>Dissemination conference in Eastbourne (June 2010)</p> <p>Book publication planned (early 2011)</p>	<p>Strand leaders report benefits of students meeting older people in a non-clinical environment - increases knowledge and understanding of barriers to health and overcomes stereotypes</p> <p>Undergraduate research projects developed (Health Promotion and Podiatry)</p> <p>University tutor developed research in IT project design</p> <p>Future opportunities for research in community/university projects e.g. 'On Our Doorsteps' project</p>	<p>Large increase in the numbers of students and community volunteers taking part in the 2nd year of the project indicates growing momentum and popularity of partnership working</p>	<p>See Count Me In Too (above). No explicit change in university policy</p> <p>Raised awareness of community knowledge exchange among community partners</p> <p>Increased intergenerational understanding</p>	<p>Additional funding from Brighton &amp; Sussex Community Knowledge Exchange</p> <p>Gardening project developed with support from 'On Our Doorsteps' scheme</p> <p>Current development of Healthy Ageing Centre for Excellence</p>

	changed relationship in students from 'treatment' to enablement and empowerment of older people; older people better able to manage own health			for community allotments			
--	--	--	--	--------------------------	--	--	--

<b>Bouncing Back</b>	<i>Improvement in capacity to meet health and well-being needs</i>	<i>Sustainable infrastructure for community knowledge exchange</i>	<i>Exchange of good practice and information across SE coastal region</i>	<i>Enrichment of teaching and learning practice and facilitation of new research</i>	<i>Increased cross-community practice through partnership working</i>	<i>Enhanced status of community knowledge exchange in the mission statements of universities and 3<sup>rd</sup> sector partners</i>	<i>Leveraging of additional funding</i>
	<p>Development of competence using resilience approach in work with children and families</p> <p>CoP identifies additional features of resilience to be investigated further</p> <p>Work with parent groups increases parenting skill-base to promote health and well-being of children and young people facing adversity</p> <p>The CoP has increased the number of trained practitioners and parents in the application of RT with children and families</p>	<p>RT Learning Network established including non-CoP members</p> <p>Establishing the CIC and the website provide new mechanisms for information sharing and exchange: <a href="http://www.boingboing.org.uk">www.boingboing.org.uk</a></p> <p>Training of parents and community partners to co-deliver sessions to varied audiences</p>	<p>East Sussex Social Services commissioned Bouncing Back to develop RT model with practitioners</p> <p>One third sector worker has delivered training sessions on RT to her staff team</p> <p>Three CoP members are providing information sessions on RT to their respective staff teams</p> <p>Presentations made to: East Sussex Children's Mental Health Commissioners; East Sussex</p>	<p>Work with a local Sixth Form College for disabled young people to deliver inclusive arts sessions to build resilience. The placement opportunity will continue to be used for the MA in Inclusive Arts</p> <p>Self financing 'Resilience Practice Group' established for practitioners wishing to develop their resilience knowledge and skill base further (9 attendees)</p> <p>'Resilience' to be incorporated into undergraduate nursing and</p>	<p>New partnerships between the University of Brighton and community organisations are now well established</p> <p>Additional partnerships with East Sussex County Council address the health and well-being challenges of children and families living with adversity</p> <p>Staff teams from two voluntary organisations have cascaded training</p> <p>CoP members now regularly facilitate</p>	<p>See Count Me In Too (above). No explicit change in university policy</p> <p>Commitment of statutory sector/health managers evidenced through permission for staff to participate in the CoP</p> <p>One third sector organisation has included developing resilience and working with UoB in their five year strategic plan</p> <p>Community organisations are more aware</p>	<p>Additional funding from: Research Innovation Award; ESRC Follow on Fund; BSCKE; East Sussex PCT &amp; Children's Services</p> <p>Current development of Community Interest Company (CIC)</p>

	<p>New requests for training and information about resilience and RT received</p>		<p>Voluntary Sector Practitioner Group; National Involve Conference</p>	<p>social work modules          'Resilience' MA Module for OTs being presented to board for approval (Jan11)</p> <p>Parents and community practitioners now contribute life and practice experience to nurse and social work U/G and P/G teaching modules which students and academics report enrich and informs the learning. Students report increased understanding of resilience</p>	<p>teaching modules on various UoB courses</p>	<p>of complexity of measuring resilience outcomes and collaboration with the University of Brighton to develop tools continues</p>	
--	---	--	---	--	--	--	--

<b>Count Me In Too</b>	<i>Improvement in capacity to meet health and well-being needs</i>	<i>Sustainable infrastructure for community knowledge exchange</i>	<i>Exchange of good practice and information across SE coastal region</i>	<i>Enrichment of teaching and learning practice and facilitation of new research</i>	<i>Increased cross-community practice through partnership working</i>	<i>Enhanced status of community knowledge exchange in the mission statements of universities and 3<sup>rd</sup> sector partners</i>	<i>Leveraging of additional funding</i>
	<p>Organisations that have used CMIT research findings in policy and practice development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Brighton &amp; Hove City Council</b> - 'Equalities and Health Impact Assessment'; Inequalities Review</li> <li>• <b>Sussex Partnership Trust</b> – use of CMIT resources; Equality &amp; Human Rights Impact Assessment</li> <li>• <b>Equalities &amp; Human Rights Commission</b> Triennial Review</li> <li>• <b>Crime Reduction Initiatives South</b> – drug and alcohol dependency issues</li> <li>• <b>Samaritans Brighton, Hove &amp; District</b> – improved awareness</li> <li>• <b>RISE</b> – LGBT Development Worker; GBT</li> </ul>	<p>LGBT Research Information Desk</p> <p>Creation of website archive for information exchange: <a href="http://www.countmeintoo.co.uk">www.countmeintoo.co.uk</a></p> <p>Strengthening relationships between universities and third sector/public sector agencies</p> <p>Supporting access to academic networks including Brighton &amp; Sussex Sexualities Network, Spaces; the Sexualities and Queer working group and the Critical Tourism network.</p>	<p>LGBT Research Information Desk</p> <p>Relationships developed with University College Hastings – LGBT project now funded through UoB 'On Our Doorsteps' programme</p> <p>CMIT findings used by Sussex police</p> <p>Presentation of drug and alcohol findings to SE practitioners (July 2009)</p>	<p>Students on PG Diploma in Cognitive Behavioural Therapy (UoB) requested permission of use CMIT reports in their work</p> <p>Student police officers (UoB) use CMIT data and findings</p> <p>Multiple requests to reference CMIT sources and data</p> <p>Department of Justice Queensland, Australia sought use of data and advice on methodology for research project</p> <p>CMIT won the first prize for staff</p>	<p>Stonewall Cymru used Mental Health report as basis for research into the mental health needs of LGBT people in Wales</p> <p>Spectrum supports LGBT working group model bringing together community, voluntary and statutory stakeholders to review and implement plans</p>	<p>The University of Brighton Corporate Plan commits the university, by 2012, to become recognised as a leading UK university for the quality and range of its work in economic and social engagement and productive partnerships. No explicit changes in university policy</p> <p>Spectrum has developed from this partnership to work with local services and planners in implementing an LGBT community strategy, and to provide infrastructure and</p>	<p>Additional funding from: Drug &amp; Alcohol team; Brighton &amp; Hove PCT; Brighton Pride Trust; Brighton &amp; Sussex Community Knowledge Exchange</p>

	<p>Independent Domestic Violence Advocate; domestic violence training</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Allsorts Youth Project</b> – CMIT training materials</li><li>• <b>Brighton &amp; Hove NHS Trust</b> – city-wide trans strategy</li><li>• <b>GPs</b> – GP Access Officer</li><li>• <b>Terrence Higgins Trust</b> – BSL interpreters for deaf/hard of hearing gay and bisexual men</li><li>• <b>Be Active, Be Healthy</b> – CMIT findings used in government initiative</li><li>• <b>UK Drug Policy Commission</b> – CMIT lead is member of diversity advisory group</li></ul>			<p>research at the Beepurple Research Innovation Awards in May 2010</p>		<p>community development support for the LGBT community. See <a href="http://www.spectrum-lgbt.org/">www.spectrum-lgbt.org/</a></p>	
--	---	--	--	---	--	---	--

<b>Life Music</b>	<i>Improvement in capacity to meet health and well-being needs</i>	<i>Sustainable infrastructure for community knowledge exchange</i>	<i>Exchange of good practice and information across SE coastal region</i>	<i>Enrichment of teaching and learning practice and facilitation of new research</i>	<i>Increased cross-community practice through partnership working</i>	<i>Enhanced status of community knowledge exchange in the mission statements of universities and 3<sup>rd</sup> sector partners</i>	<i>Leveraging of additional funding</i>
	<p>Insight into health problems as experienced by community members. e.g. Life Music works with special health needs groups (mental health, neuro disability, children at risk)</p> <p>Deepened awareness of the benefits of participatory music</p>	<p>Range and number of practitioners trained and people involved</p> <p>Value added competencies of practitioners</p> <p>Sustainable activity through current development of social enterprise business plan</p>	<p>Exchange and development of good practice in Life Music training amongst voluntary and community groups and University</p> <p>Creation of new academic and community engagement products and events</p> <p>Presentations at: Cupp conference University of Brighton (2009); 'Artbeat' conference, (2009); Community Music in HE, University of Winchester (2010); conference planned for 2011</p>	<p>Establishment of new community music route in Music BA programme</p> <p>Development of Life Music training into an accredited Post Graduate diploma proposed</p> <p>Some instrumental/vocal teachers have done Life Music training</p> <p>Arts research seminars and 'Artbeat' meetings</p> <p>Practitioners learn from working with partners and feedback knowledge gained to the university. Informs the next group of trainees</p>	<p>Integration of voluntary and community groups onto university campuses and into campus life through good practice and event sharing</p> <p>Lead academic and community practitioners made regular visits to community partners' venues and workshops were presented in context (e.g. hospital wards)</p>	<p><b>The University of Chichester</b> has developed a 'Hub and Spoke' method of community engagement with Third Sector and Voluntary Organisations Community partners collaborated in hosting Life Music activity</p> <p>Success in attracting students beyond the academic institution; community music minor yet to recruit fully</p>	<p>Current development of social enterprise plan</p>

<b>Our Space</b>	<i>Improvement in capacity to meet health and well-being needs</i>	<i>Sustainable infrastructure for community knowledge exchange</i>	<i>Exchange of good practice and information across SE coastal region</i>	<i>Enrichment of teaching and learning practice and facilitation of new research</i>	<i>Increased cross-community practice through partnership working</i>	<i>Enhanced status of community knowledge exchange in the mission statements of universities and 3<sup>rd</sup> sector partners</i>	<i>Leveraging of additional funding</i>
	<p>Literature review providing evidence base for practice and knowledge development</p> <p>Developing spaces to mobilise knowledge exchanges within Deaf community:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ongoing Community meetings</li> <li>• 2 pilot health and well-being events</li> <li>• Deaf Cultural Day established as part of Brighton Fringe Festival</li> </ul> <p>Salutogenic benefits of</p>	<p>Regular community meetings beyond seed funding</p> <p>Strengthening relationships between universities and third sector agencies</p> <p>Developments of researcher post</p> <p>Creating website for information exchange between CoP members and knowledge development: <a href="http://www.sussexdeafhistory.org.uk/">www.sussexdeafhistory.org.uk/</a></p> <p>Expansion of Deaf practitioner meeting membership</p>	<p>Dissemination at CUPP conference (April 2009)</p> <p>Deaf Culture Day (May 2010)</p> <p>Our Space Conference (October 2010)</p> <p>Attending Deaf Practitioner Meetings</p> <p>Partnering and influencing local Third sector services</p> <p>Informal networks of community members</p>	<p>Deaf awareness in BSc/MSc OT course to enhance competency of OTs to meet Deaf people's needs</p> <p>Support to MSc student researching deaf access to health services</p> <p>Literature Review as a knowledge resource</p> <p>Development of University posts</p> <p>Exposing community members to 'inquiry' processes</p> <p>Building database of</p>	<p>CoP knowledge generation being taken into community practice by CoP community members</p> <p>Establishing links throughout Deaf community in the local area</p> <p>Community based dissemination strategies</p>	<p>The University of Sussex is committed to building and maintaining networks and partnerships with local, regional, national and international communities. The Centre for Community Engagement <a href="http://www.sussex.ac.uk/cce/community">www.sussex.ac.uk/cce/community</a> has worked closely with Cupp in developing the SECC programme Changes in third sector agencies' aims and practice due to Our Space partnership</p>	<p>BSCKE funding for associated doctoral project enhancing links with BHCC Sensory Needs Service</p> <p>Use of Brighton and Hove Equality and Access Forum funding for further community meetings</p> <p>Supported a successful European bid for the Mass Observation Online archive and exhibition of 'hidden histories'</p>

	community meetings confirmed by participants			culturally relevant histories			
--	--	--	--	-------------------------------	--	--	--

<b>Training Older People as Researchers</b>	<i>Improvement in capacity to meet health and well-being needs</i>	<i>Sustainable infrastructure for community knowledge exchange</i>	<i>Exchange of good practice and information across SE coastal region</i>	<i>Enrichment of teaching and learning practice and facilitation of new research</i>	<i>Increased cross-community practice through partnership working</i>	<i>Enhanced status of community knowledge exchange in the mission statements of universities and 3<sup>rd</sup> sector partners</i>	<i>Leveraging of additional funding</i>
	<p>Completion of LINK project with St Richards Hospital and Worthing Hospitals will inform managers and senior NHS staff of the experiences and feelings of patients before, during and after discharge from hospital</p> <p>Stage 2 will focus on three smaller West Sussex hospitals</p> <p>Trained older researchers will be able to conduct future research projects</p>	<p>Knowledge Exchange Group (later Health &amp; Wellbeing Group) established by University of Chichester to maintain links with community partners</p> <p>Support to VCACD to develop older community forum discussion area. The Forum is now live: <a href="http://theoldervoice.org/">http://theoldervoice.org/</a></p>	<p>Health &amp; Well-being Group supported public events and presentations with local firms and voluntary agencies</p>	<p>New research opportunities stem from the recognition that older people feel more able to express their experiences and feelings to peers of their own age</p>	<p>New relationships developed with: West Sussex County Council; Chichester District Council; Adult Education; LINK (NHS); Stage Coach; Chichester and District Senior Forum; Martlet Homes Housing Association; Age Concern; Voluntary Organisations Liaison Group (VOLG); Voluntary &amp; Community Action Chichester District (VCACD)</p>	<p>The University of Chichester has developed a 'Hub and Spoke' method of community engagement with Third Sector and Voluntary Organisations. See: <a href="http://www.chiuni.ac.uk/secc/HubSpokeMethod.cfm">www.chiuni.ac.uk/secc/HubSpokeMethod.cfm</a></p> <p>Community partners actively supported recruitment to TOPAR course</p>	

<b>Hastings Research Helpdesk and Coastal Regeneration Research Centre</b>	<i>Improvement in capacity to meet health and well-being needs</i>	<i>Sustainable infrastructure for community knowledge exchange</i>	<i>Exchange of good practice and information across SE coastal region</i>	<i>Enrichment of teaching and learning practice and facilitation of new research</i>	<i>Increased cross-community practice through partnership working</i>	<i>Enhanced status of community knowledge exchange in the mission statements of universities and 3<sup>rd</sup> sector partners</i>	<i>Leveraging of additional funding</i>
	<p>Access to the University Centre Hastings (UCH) by community organisations has improved community information and raised aspirations</p> <p>The Coastal Regeneration Research Centre (CRRC) has increased research capacity</p> <p>Enhanced knowledge of health and well-being needs of local communities by community organisations and service providers</p>	<p>Improved relationship between UCH and community partners</p> <p>The Helpdesk will continue to facilitate relationships and support ongoing networks e.g. LGBT Equalities Forum; Community Research Forum; occasional seminars and Helpdesk drop-in sessions</p>	<p>Regular community research forums e.g. <i>Diversity Cohesion &amp; Young People; Community Town Planning</i></p> <p>CRRC conference (March 2010) <i>Beside the Seaside</i></p>	<p>Development of volunteering opportunities for undergraduate modules in Media &amp; Broadcasting, Occupational Therapy, and Community Participation &amp; Development</p> <p>CRRC is the focal point for UoB research activity in Hastings, including funded research projects and supporting 4 PhD students</p>	<p>Academic staff have joined trustee Boards and worked as volunteers in local organisations</p> <p>Increased student volunteering</p> <p>Community organisations more involved in university activities e.g. inter-faith seminar with religious and community leaders</p>	<p>See Count Me In Too (above). No explicit change in university policy</p> <p>Community organisations have included knowledge exchange in strategic plans e.g. Hastings Women's Voice; RESPOND Academy; The Links Project (works with migrants, refugees and asylum seekers)</p>	<p>New funding from Cupp 'On Our Doorsteps' programme supports LGBT Equalities in Hastings &amp; Rother (£5000); Hastings Community Town Planning Resource (£5000); Creativity &amp; Stroke Rehabilitation (£5092)</p> <p>Funds sought by UoB researcher from Cupp sabbatical fund to work with The Links Project</p>