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Prepared for the Papworth Trust
This study was undertaken by RAND Europe for the Papworth Trust, a Cambridge-based disability charity providing supported housing, progression services, employment, and day support. The main objective of the study was to create an evaluation framework for the Papworth Trust’s new independent living project, “Foundations for Living” (FfL) and from this to develop performance measures to support learning and accountability.

The Papworth Trust has been providing a variety of services to disabled people from around the UK for nearly 90 years. The services they provide include supported housing, support and, previously, care (before legislation separated the two roles), employment, and progression services. New government policy on residential care has led to the provision of more independent living options and changed requirements for residential accommodation. In light of this policy change, the Papworth Trust were required to refurbish or close their last remaining residential home. This provided an opportunity for the Trust to pioneer a new type of independent living project, Foundations for Living.

FfL aims to create independent living opportunities through individual accessible flats in a town centre location in Huntingdon. These are built in association with flats on sale to the general public, with the aim of creating an inclusive community. They are also co-located with a community learning centre, designed to offer learning opportunities for both disabled people and the wider community. Based within the community learning centre there will be a dedicated community outreach team, providing housing and day support services to disabled people in Huntingdon.

Former Papworth Trust residential clients have been given the choice to move into independent living flats (as mentioned above), supported housing or to relocate to other types of accommodation provided by the Papworth Trust or other organisations. The move of residents to independent living is being staggered as flats are built and opportunities to move arise. Staggering this helps the Papworth Trust to manage the transition. RAND Europe is supporting the evaluation, providing a study that:

---

1 Progression services are training courses run for disabled people in a variety of subjects ranging from independent living training (this encompasses cooking, money management and cleaning amongst other things) to vocational skills training (such as carpentry, pottery, and art).
- Creates logic models of the FfL project as a whole and of individual streams such as housing, community learning centre, community outreach and “back at the ranch” issues.²

- Validates those models using a series of interviews, focus groups and workshops with Papworth clients, managers, staff and external partners (such as local councils, colleges and housing associations)

- Creates a series of performance indicators and measures that fit with the logic models of FfL.

- Will provide both learning and accountability for FfL, allowing the Papworth Trust to provide better services for their clients.

This report may be of wider interest to providers of social care outside of the Papworth Trust, specifically those who may be looking to provide more independent living opportunities. It may also be of interest to those providing education or employment opportunities for disabled people, or local authorities that are interested in understanding the ways in which services can be effectively provided to disabled people.

RAND Europe is an independent not-for-profit policy research organisation that serves the public interest by improving policymaking and informing public debate. Its clients are European governments, institutions, and firms with a need for rigorous, impartial multidisciplinary analysis. This report has been peer-reviewed in accordance with RAND’s quality assurance standards (for more information, see http://www.rand.org/about/standards/) and therefore may be represented as a RAND Europe product.
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² “Back at the ranch” describes those facilities that already exist within the village of Papworth Everard, the village in which the Papworth Trust is based. Understanding the issues within existing accommodation allows an internal benchmarking of the value added by the new FfL project in Huntingdon.
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Executive summary

Background to the project
Foundations for Living (FfL), a new independent living project for disabled people, is a positive response to both national and local factors. At the national level the social model of disability has gained more acceptance in the UK and there has been a wide adoption of policies that facilitate independent living opportunities for disabled people. These include the Community Care Act 1990, which sought to improve the living conditions of those in care; and the Community Care (Direct Payments) Act 1996, which aims to offer disabled people the opportunity to budget their own care and support needs and purchase the services themselves. More recently the government has produced several papers on the future of social care in the UK: *Valuing People* (2001); *Improving the Life Chances of Disabled People* (2005); and *Independence, Well-Being and Choice* (2005). These all put forward the case for an independent living solution to social care issues in Britain. Independent living in this context includes housing choice, tailoring services to needs, opportunities for employment, increased social integration and, predominantly, the three principles of choice, empowerment and control.

At the local level, a number of factors influenced the creation of FfL. There was the local need to change the existing residential accommodation (Robert Ellis House, providing accommodation for 30 people in 2001), as it did not conform to the standards required under the Care Standards Act 1990. This gave the Papworth Trust the option of either building a new residential home or developing a new model of service provision. Coupled with this was the need to address issues of social isolation that the village location of Papworth Everard created. Tenants and residents within the village were feeling isolated from the local towns since transport links are poor from the village. Potential clients for the Papworth Trust were also being put off by the village location and the residential accommodation.

In response to these challenges the Papworth Trust consulted their clients to understand what they wanted from a new service. The responses suggested a clear preference for moving to the nearest town (Huntingdon) that was seen to offer more independent living opportunities. These opportunities were particularly centred on better access to shops and social life. Informed by these preferences, and with sufficient finance and fund-raising capacity, the Papworth Trust embarked on a series of activities that were to lead to the Foundations for Living project.
Foundations for Living is based on the principle of providing a range of services, delivered through an inclusive community-based approach, to address disadvantages experienced by disabled people. The project includes three main elements:

- 24 fully wheelchair accessible flats in a town centre location, with flexible personal care and support arrangements. Eight of these flats are provided alongside a further 20 flats for sale on the open market.
- A Community Learning Centre that provides lifelong learning and accessible meeting facilities for all sections of the community, including disabled people.
- A Community Outreach Service to support disabled people to access community facilities and thereby improve equality for disabled people in the local community.

The Papworth Trust believes the project provides an innovative model for service development. RAND Europe was invited to provide this formal evaluation in the autumn of 2005. Using documentary evidence from government, the Papworth Trust and research in the fields of disability service provision and social care, we identified priority areas to focus the evaluation framework.

Using this background, and the expertise of the Papworth Trust management team, we built a model of the FfL evaluation. This evaluation framework is built around six dimensions of evaluation (relevance; process evaluation; efficiency; effectiveness; utility; sustainability/social acceptance). Within each of these points of evaluation we identified a number of measures (performance indicators) that can show how the FfL project is progressing against its original objectives.

In order to validate the model, we interviewed key stakeholders involved in FfL. This included clients of the Papworth Trust (both those who had moved to Huntingdon already and those involved in the process who were not living in Huntingdon), staff, Papworth Trust management and wider stakeholders, such as organisations that are partners in the FfL process.

**Key findings**

The majority of those clients who had already moved to Huntingdon as part of the FfL project, report a marked increase in both their independence and in their own quality of life. In some cases, this could even be said to have been a life-changing experience. For clients the main drive for independence was easier access to shops, work and a social life.

One main tension was identified between client choice and the organisation’s aim of optimal utilisation of resources, appropriateness and fairness. Specifically, this was between the need for person centred planning3 and the organisation’s aim to produce a service that can be used by any client wishing to access it in the future. Later, the tension was also seen, with some clients wanting higher levels of support than others to help them make choices and live independently. However, the Trust was only able to resource a certain level of support.

---

3 Person centred planning is providing services that are tailored to the needs of individual clients.
Those staff who remained after the closure of the Robert Ellis House residential home in Papworth Everard, adjusted well to the new demands of a different working style, sometimes even surprising themselves by finding new ways of working. Often the staff’s tacit knowledge on how to provide support within the new system was passed from one to another. However, the emergent nature of the FfL project\(^4\) meant that training needs were difficult to identify prior to the start of the project. In these early stages, informal communication and improvement processes compensated for weaker formal change management. More recently, formal processes have been put in place.

Wider stakeholders (those organisations with which the Papworth Trust has entered into partnerships as part of FfL) reported the need for clear communication between organisations associated with FfL, particularly a single point of contact with whom an organisation could work. The main problems experienced by wider stakeholders were also to do with the emergent nature of the FfL project and the changing commissioning context (especially regarding the funding under “Supporting People”\(^5\)). There was a tension between the need for clarity of purpose at the outset and the unfolding nature of FfL restricting clarity early on.

However, the deliberately emergent nature of the FfL strategy has contributed greatly to the success of the initial stages of the project. Interviews with the senior management team make it clear that without the opportunistic approach to the project, the chance to purchase land, enter into partnerships and manage client expectations would have been missed. This could be described as structured opportunism, allowing the project to maximise opportunities as they have arisen. This emergent strategy also allowed navigation of FfL in a continually evolving external policy environment, where statutory organisations and funding streams change regularly.

A further tension existed over the reallocation of responsibility for individuals’ support costs. As clients of the Papworth Trust have moved from residential to independent living accommodation, responsibility for their support costs has switched from their commissioning authority (their home county council’s budget) to the authority within which they are resident. Therefore, despite independent living accommodation providing a lower cost per individual than residential care, those costs have all come to rest on the local council (Cambridgeshire County Council), increasing the cost to them specifically. This is a wider issue beyond the FfL Project, arising as more individuals move from residential care to independent living.

FfL project outputs so far are mainly infrastructural. These include the first housing development in Huntingdon that conforms to the appropriate standards for fully wheelchair accessible housing. The buildings for the other two housing developments and the community learning centre, although not complete, represent significant outputs. Aside from buildings, Papworth Trust staff’s level of satisfaction within their new role is also a positive output.

\(^4\) Allowing the Papworth Trust to steer the project according to the opportunities arising, rather than sticking to a rigid business plan.

\(^5\) The Supporting People programme provides housing related support services to over 1.2 million vulnerable people in the way of local authority funding. See http://tinyurl.com/ogsqj for more details.
FfL has addressed several key elements of national policy. In terms of addressing the barriers to independent living identified in *Disablist Britain: Barriers to independent living for disabled people in 2006*, the project allows disabled people a number of routes to greater independence (see Table 1 for examples).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier to independent living</th>
<th>How FfL addresses the barrier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education and training</td>
<td>Co-location with the new community learning centre allows easy access to a variety of courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Courses offered in association with Huntingdon Regional College – both academic and vocational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Partnership with the local college offers training opportunities in employment focused skills (e.g. IT skills)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community support team liaise with local employers to facilitate employment opportunities for disabled people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community support team will liaise with local employers to help them understand disabled people’s needs in the workplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and social care</td>
<td>Flats are fitted with appropriate equipment to facilitate independence for specific clients – decisions made in association with the tenant themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent living training provided for staff and tenants to make home life easier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support staff in the nearby community learning centre on call if needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>Housing in the town centre makes travel simpler and cheaper if taxis are needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town centre location means is served by regular public transport from a variety of locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and social life</td>
<td>Town centre base means easy access to shops and leisure facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interspersing accessible supported housing with for-sale flats makes forming relationships with non-disabled neighbours easier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides the opportunity to partake in community groups in the community learning centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town centre location means that there are more people around to socialise with and it is easier to get to them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic participation</td>
<td>Town centre placement means that there is an opportunity to be actively involved in local political issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community support team can advise on democratic process and how individuals fit into it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations**

The Papworth Trust is committed to identifying performance indicators (PIs) that are focused on its core aims and objectives, appropriate to the needs of its decision-makers and stakeholders, balanced across its broad priorities, robust despite staff changes, integrated into its planning processes, and cost effective to collect. This process of identifying PIs is

---

precisely aligned with best practice as described by HM Treasury and others. This evaluation report supports and reinforces these aims and identifies ways of delivering them.

Integration of PIs into wider performance management processes
Using logic models to map the delivery of FfL provides a basis for achieving this integration. The PIs should be integrated into the wider performance management processes of the organisation, and the logic models must therefore be shared with, and if necessary amended by, management to provide a shared template of aims, resources, processes, outputs and outcomes. We recommend the further use of logic models in this way.

Logic models should not be applied too rigidly
Care should be taken to ensure that the logic models promote flexibility and organisational learning. The clients and partner organisations of the Papworth Trust have benefited from the flexibility, responsiveness and opportunism of the Trust’s management during the development and delivery of FfL. This argues against too rigid an application of the logic models: they should be used to provide a basis for learning what has happened and changing what happens in the future.

PIs should support learning and accountability
The approach recommended here is for PIs to support learning. However, this must be balanced with the need to have stable, longer-term performance indicators to support the accountability of management and staff to funders, the wider community and to clients. We recommend that, in finalising its list of PIs, the Trust should have a requisite variety of indicators that satisfy the need both for organisational learning and for accountability.

Maintenance and improvement of communication with stakeholders
Wherever the balance between learning and accountability is drawn, there is a need to communicate plans more clearly than in the past to clients, staff, partners and management. The Trust has been willing to engage these groups in its decision-making but a lack of clarity may have limited the effectiveness of these processes in the early stages of FfL. We recommend a continuing commitment to improving communications within the Trust and with strategic partners.

Use development of PIs to include clients in FfL decision processes
FfL aims to support choice for the clients of the Trust. Developing performance indicators should be seen as an opportunity to extend and deepen participation in the decision-making of the organisation rather than as a challenge to its commitment to client involvement.

Recommended PIs
We recommend that PIs should be adopted in the six dimensions of evaluation (relevance; process evaluation; efficiency; effectiveness; utility; sustainability and social acceptance);
these are detailed in the body of the report. Many of these data can be collected as part of the routine management and supervision by the Trust. Other data will be needed as part of existing accountability arrangements. Any new data collection might be infrequent; consequently collection of this new data need not be unnecessarily costly.

**Relevance** – Taken from trustee and strategic management group reports

A qualitative judgement about the fit between the aims and objectives of FfL and the wider goals of the Papworth Trust.

**Process Evaluation** - Service user involvement index

This is an innovative way of summarising a basket of characteristics in a figure, collecting a spread of person centre data on the level of involvement in FfL service users feel they have. These can assess the strengths and weaknesses of FfL and compare them across years and sections of the project.

**Process Evaluation** - Staff review, performance and development

The ongoing appraisal of staff should be used to provide anonymised data on staff progress towards delivering the goals of FfL. An annual questionnaire should provide more data on how staff understand what facilitates and inhibits their contribution to delivering the aims of FfL.

**Process Evaluation** - Questionnaire for partner organisations

An annual survey of partner organisations should identify levels of satisfaction with the processes implemented in FfL (including such issues as transparency, communication, and timeliness).

**Efficiency** - Staff support (training offered, development plans)

The cost of delivering training and other staff support to allow the efficient delivery of FfL.

**Efficiency** - Use of facilities

Data on the use of facilities such as housing (occupancy rates), community learning centre (numbers participating in courses), community support team and day support services.

**Efficiency** - Cost of facilities

The cost of providing and maintaining facilities. This could be benchmarked against costs in comparable organisations.

**Effectiveness** – Indices of independent living

We propose an innovative basket of indices allowing the Papworth Trust to summarise the effectiveness of its work with clients. These allow a spread of person centred data to be collected with which to assess the strengths and weaknesses of FfL and to compare those both across years and across sections of the project.

**Effectiveness** – Reduced support costs
As individuals become more independent, their support needs are likely to fall. This can be measured in terms of financial support costs. This is a strong proxy for greater independence. However, if an individual’s physical or mental condition deteriorates, they require additional support irrespective of the actions of the Trust.

**Effectiveness** – Individual progress towards independent living

Each individual’s progress can be charted over time in all the dimensions where FfL hopes to have an effect.

**Utility** - Improved results from inspections

As a proxy for assessing how ‘fit for purpose’ FfL is, there should be an analysis of inspection reports, and the documentation of responses, as a part of the existing reporting system.

**Sustainability and Social Acceptance** - Financial

Information on the financial implications of FfL for the Trust’s sustainability, and the financial impact on partner local authorities are part of the existing reporting system.

**Sustainability and Social Acceptance** - Rising client expectations and achievement

Measuring improved client expectations and achievements is not easy and requires either additional questioning during the process of information gathering for the indices, or the use of a proxy such as clients’ requests to move into different accommodation, or clients’ progression through the labour market.

**Sustainability and Social Acceptance** - Improved stakeholder engagement

An annual survey of partner organisations should identify levels of awareness of, commitment to, and incentives for supporting the aims of FfL. This could be managed as a simple telephone survey, a web-based survey, or as written document.

**Sustainability and Social Acceptance** - More staff recruited and retained with appropriate training and qualifications

This acts as a proxy for the success and acceptability of the project in terms of staff satisfaction reflecting the sort of project that some care and support staff want to be involved in. The quality of staff recruited can be measured by qualifications of applicants.

**Sustainability and Social Acceptance** - Wider and deeper life choices

Life choices include working and volunteering opportunities, choices over service provision, shopping and so forth. These would be measured through the indices previously mentioned and through data on employment and volunteering.

**Conclusions**

Papworth Trust embarked on the Foundations for Living project as a result of needing to provide accommodation for 30 disabled people living in residential care. In consultation
with the residents, and in response to emerging policy and practice in the field of independent living, the project evolved to include a number of elements (accessible housing, a community learning centre and community outreach) based on the principles of inclusion and independent living.

The project is distinctive in providing an integrated approach to addressing many of the barriers experienced by disabled people wanting to live independently in the community. The location of employment, housing and day support services in the community learning centre increases the opportunities for a single point of entry to a “joined up” seamless service for disabled people in the community.

The evaluation strategy identified in this document has set out a model for formally identifying and monitoring the outcomes from the project, and has identified some emergent findings.

Subsequent stages of the research will compare the FfL project to others that aim to achieve similar outcomes, so that best practice can be identified and shared. It will also monitor the outcomes from the project over the longer term to see if levels of independence and inclusion continue to increase, and to identify factors for success in future projects.
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Chapter Summary

FFL is a positive response to both national and local factors. At the national level, the social model of disability has gained more acceptance in the UK and there has been a wide adoption of policies that facilitate independent living opportunities for disabled people. At the local level, there was a need for the Papworth Trust to change the existing residential accommodation; to address social isolation issues; and to engage potential clients for the Papworth Trust with a new style of service provision. FFL is split into three constituent parts, with an accessible housing development, a community learning centre and a community support team. Each of these addresses in different ways, the barriers to independent living that exist for disabled people in the UK.

1.1 Context

In the last 15 years there have been significant changes in how people perceive disability and in the provision of adult social care. These changes stem from the growing permeation of the social model of disability, in which it is understood that society rather than individual medical (or other) conditions that disables, prevents people from participating in everyday activities and reducing their opportunities. The social model of disability has been championed by disabled people themselves, and it has been influencing central government policy in recent years. Starting with the Community Care Act and the Direct Payment Acts, policy has shifted away from residential care for disabled people and towards independent living supported by direct payments. Uptake of direct payments is still very small amongst those eligible. In Scotland, fewer than 1,500 people had taken up direct payments in 2005, even though there are an estimated 1 million people considered disabled under the Disability Discrimination Act.

---

8 National Health Service and Community Care Act 1990 (c. 19) HM stationery office.
9 Community Care (Direct Payments) Act 1996, HM stationery office.
Since 2001, this policy shift has become more established, with further government policies addressing the need for a more person centred approach to providing care and support for disabled people. The government White Paper *Valuing People*\(^{12}\) provided a new strategy for a learning disability policy that addressed key issues associated with social exclusion as a consequence of being disabled. These included limited housing choice, little control over one's own life, day services not tailored to individual needs, limited opportunities for employment and few examples of consultation and partnership working involving people with disabilities. In 2005 the government produced two papers, *Improving the Life Chances of Disabled People*\(^{13}\) and *Independence, Well-Being and Choice*,\(^{14}\) both of which looked towards the future of adult care in the UK. At the centre of the “Improving life chances” policy is Independent Living, aimed at improving choice, empowerment and freedom. There are also specific aims within both papers to create joined-up policies on support and care, covering health, social care, housing, education, employment and other public policy areas in order to meet the needs and wants of disabled people. There are several other streams of government policy that touch on these issues, ranging from the ODPM *Five Year Plan for Sustainable Communities*\(^{15}\) (which suggests all should have a chance to live and work in a place of their choice, and to get actively involved in their communities), to the Learning and Skills Council priorities and reports\(^{16}\) (covering the monetary provision for disabled learners, targets for skills acquisition and the views of employers on disabled people as employees).

These initiatives begin with and echo the views put forward by disabled people themselves, with the Disability Rights Commission strategic plan\(^{17}\) identifying education, employment, goods and services, health and independent living and implementing and promoting rights as the main areas in which disabled people want stronger policy. Also, the DWP report *Disabled for Life*\(^{18}\) consulted disabled people and the wider community on employment and training issues, identifying improvements to the system, but also a need for more social inclusion of disabled people. Across the UK, disabled groups have been setting up Centres for Independent Living (CILs), interest groups that put the case for

---


\(^{16}\) Including *Getting on in business, getting on at work; LSC Strategic area review; LSC Transforming learning and skills annual statement of priorities 2006/07; New deal for disabled people: survey of employers* (research report no. 301); all available through http://www.lsc.gov.uk

\(^{17}\) DRC Strategic plan 2004-07 available at http://www.drc-gb.org/whatwedo/oppdetails.asp?id=34

adopting the social model of disability and its implications. The 12 pillars of independent living\(^{19}\) puts forward 12 factors required by disabled people to achieve independent lives.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Full access to the environment in which they live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>A fully accessible transport system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Technical aids – such as equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Accessible/adapted housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Personal assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Inclusive education and training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>An adequate income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Equal opportunities for employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Appropriate and accessible information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Advocacy (working towards self-advocacy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Counselling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Appropriate and accessible healthcare provision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Box 1. The 12 pillars of independent living

Source: Southampton CIL; available at http://www.southamptoncil.co.uk/basic_needs.htm

These 12 pillars of independent living have formed the basis of several further pieces of work looking at the barriers that disabled people have to overcome to achieve an independent life. One of the most recent of these is the report by Miller et al (2006)\(^{20}\) that compacts the 12 pillars into six key barriers to independent living that must be overcome for disabled people to experience equality in the UK. These barriers exist in education and training; employment; housing and social care; transport; leisure and social life; and democratic participation. The Papworth Trust Foundations for Living (FFL) initiative is a response to precisely these challenges.

There is a need to define exactly what independent living constitutes. It is not about performing all tasks in life for oneself. This is not the case for anyone in society. Independent living is about being free to make choices and to have control over one’s own life. In terms of disability, independent living is therefore about having the same opportunities as the rest of society, and this can be through additional support or technology.

\(^{19}\) www.southamptoncil.co.uk/index.htm

\(^{20}\) Miller, P. Gillinson S and Huber J (2006)
The subject of choice and control has been a central point of the Labour government since its inception in 1997, with the choice agenda for all being pushed by the Prime Minister himself.21

1.2 Aims and values of FfL

The Papworth Trust’s FfL initiative is a way to address these multiple issues within social care in a joined up fashion. The Papworth Trust, along with other social care service providers who were providing mainly residential care, found that as government policy has changed and direct payments are becoming more common, both the demand for and suitability of residential care was decreasing. Thus there is need on the ground for a more innovative way to provide services for disabled people wishing to lead independent lives.

FfL has three aspects to its vision that address the policy issues set out above:

- The freedom to live independently;
- The freedom to gain new skills;
- The freedom to play an active part in the community.

Although there has been a vision in place from the very start, the FfL project strategy has evolved during the process of making the project a reality. It has been an emergent strategy that has responded to the timing and opportunities presented to the Trust during the project (this will be expanded upon in Chapter 5 - the lessons that are being learnt through FfL).

Using the experience gained in housing, care, progression22 and employment through years of provision for disabled people, the Papworth Trust’s new project utilises a town centre location in Huntingdon. It has engaged multiple partners, including housing associations, developers and local authorities, to provide a unique joined-up provision for service users. This project addresses the needs of disabled people through three streams:

- Housing and Independent Living
- Community Learning Centre
- Community Support Team

Each of these three streams encompasses several of the “pillars of independent living”. Housing and independent living covers accessible housing, technical aids and personal assistance; community learning centre covers inclusive education and training, equal opportunities for employment, appropriate and accessible information and to some extent advocacy and counselling; community support team will provide support and work with external groups to improve opportunities and access to services and employment.

21 Tony Blair, in his speech on public service reform in 2002, advocated four principles of reform to bring opportunity and security for everyone, putting people at the centre of public services. See http://www.pm.gov.uk/output/Page3008.asp

22 Progression services are training courses run for disabled people in a variety of subjects ranging from independent living training (this encompasses cooking, money management and cleaning amongst other things) to skills training (such as carpentry, pottery, and art).
These issues will be addressed in detail below, identifying where they answer specific policy issues and build on research and service user views on each issue.

1.3 Streams of FfL

1.3.1 Housing and Independent Living

Foundations for living will … enable disabled people to live independently as part of the community through the provision of wheelchair accessible homes.23

The Foundations for Living project involves building wheelchair accessible flats in central Huntingdon. The interiors of these flats were designed with the help of the person who is due to move into the flat. The aim of this inclusive design process is to include as far as is practicable, the aspects of a flat that tenants might need. In one of the three developments, the wheelchair accessible flats are interspersed with flats that will be for sale on the general housing market, with the aim of helping to create an integrated community.

The choice of Huntingdon came about through listening to the desires of the Papworth Trust service users in a consultation period prior to the inception of the FfL project. During this consultation period, service users were asked individually and in groups what they would want from a place to live and where they would prefer to live. The consultation found that the majority of residents wanted to live in supported housing, either in Papworth or in Huntingdon. Most people wanted to have access to health services and to community facilities such as shops and public transport, and to have the opportunity for training and paid employment. All of these aspects suggested Huntingdon as the site for development. It should be noted that the use of Huntingdon as a location for the project provides a distinct set of opportunities and challenges that would be different in other locations. For example, the compact town centre of Huntingdon with its pedestrianised main street provides an opportunity for disabled people to access the town particularly easily. In a larger city, this access to the city centre and its amenities might be harder and the FfL project blueprint would have to be adapted to local circumstances.

This solution addresses the requirements of recent White Papers for person centred planning and also the “engaged communities” aspects of the ODPM Five Year Plan for Sustainable Communities.24 It also addresses aspects of the regional strategies put in place by the East of England Regional Assembly (EERA),25 the Housing Corporation Corporate Plan 2005-200826 and the Cambridgeshire Health Authority Health Improvement and

23 All the boxed quotes in section 1.3 are taken from the 2004 Papworth Trust document, Foundations for living: a new and innovative approach to inclusive community living.

24 Available at http://www.odpm.gov.uk/index.asp?id=1122899


Modification Plan (including specific objectives for Huntingdon), by the creation of inclusive communities, accessible housing, viable alternatives to long term care and promoting mixed housing tenure.

Research in social care, funded by the Social Care Institute for Excellence (SCIE) and the Joseph Rowntree Foundation (JRF) has identified previous good practice and areas for improvement in housing and independent living. The SCIE report on developing social care (2005) identifies the health and community benefits of independent living and creation of communities of attachment. JRF research has included work on independent living training, supported living, moving into the community after long-stay residential care and housing issues for various disabilities. Their conclusions identify the need to increase person centred planning of housing and independent living, and joining up services so users experience a seamless package of care and support, as well as increasing community links to decrease social exclusion.

1.3.2 Community Learning Centre

Foundations for Living will … open up opportunities for disabled people to develop skills, confidence and self-esteem, through the creation of an inclusive community learning centre.

In a move away from the traditional progression centre or day centres that have been associated with care for disabled people, FfL includes the creation of a community learning centre. The concept of the community learning centre has changed over its lifespan to date. It was originally conceived as a progression centre providing adult training for disabled people in a town centre location. However, as opportunities arose to form a partnership with the local college and with developers, the vision shifted towards the formation of an integrated accessible centre, available to anyone in the community. This is in response to the wishes of the service users identified during the consultation period, who


29 Communities of attachment are communities where people with a disability and non-disabled people live together outside of professionalized care arrangements or family obligation. They can demonstrate a very different approach to meeting the needs and aspirations of disabled people.


34 Traditionally, progression centres for disabled people have not included any courses for non-disabled people and were therefore naturally exclusive rather than inclusive learning centres.
expressed a desire for a variety of activities and training to be available to them, as well as opportunities for inclusive learning. This is the principle of inclusive provision. The courses offered will be decided in association with service users in order to provide the most useful and desirable learning opportunities. By creating a community centre in association with the local authority and community college (who will place their community IT courses there), FfL is also addressing the government policy agenda on creating inclusive communities and decreasing social exclusion.

Local government policy puts forward the need for increased learning and skills opportunities and employment opportunities. It also advocates an increased community leadership role in projects, and more partnership between local authorities and private companies. These policies come through the Regional Social Strategy and the Investing in Communities Initiative from the East of England Regional Development Agency (EERDA), East of England Development Agency (EEDA) and the East of England Regional Assembly (EERA).

SCIE research in this area points towards creating more social inclusion, focusing on community initiatives to do so, matching services to needs and increasing collaboration between the voluntary sector and service providers – in this case the local authorities and college.35 JRF research also supports this, with research on employment and training arguing that there should be a focus on academic qualifications as well as skills training, engagement of service users in creating programmes of education and skills, and equality of treatment for disabled and non-disabled learners.36

---


1.3.3 **Community Support Team**

Foundations for living will … increase understanding of disability issues, reduce prejudice and support the involvement of disabled people in the community, through the development of a skilled community outreach team.

The Papworth Trust has run a pilot project in Huntingdon for 18 months, enabling tenants to test out the services and facilities available there. Following on from this, there will be a community support team in Huntingdon that will work with tenants and the community at large (although initially their work will be restricted to tenants). The aims of this group are to increase social inclusion for disabled people in Huntingdon, get the community involved with tenants (by increasing understanding and inclusion amongst the community), advise on independent living and help with employment (both for employees and employers). This agenda reflects the desires expressed by Papworth clients during the consultation, where there was a general consensus that people were interested in getting paid and voluntary employment and gaining access to a variety of community services.

*Valuing People; Independence, Well-Being and Choice; DWP Five Year Strategy and Improving Life Chances* all advocate partnership approaches to employment and increasing the employability of disabled people. The community support team will help tenants understand the needs of employers, creating closer links between the employment sector and disabled people. This follows on from the wishes of disability groups, addressing the employment issues brought up in the Disability Rights Commission Strategic Plan and the DWP report *Disabled for Life* by engaging employers in the process of recruiting the right person for the job, irrespective of disability. The Learning and Skills Council (LSC) Strategic Area Review highlights the need for employers and the community to be involved in understanding the training and skill requirements of learners. The LSC research report on the New Deal for Disabled People shows that employers want more information on the needs of, and support required for, disabled employees.

In terms of local policy on the areas covered by the community support team, there is extensive policy aimed at increasing skill development for adults, to improve access to services for people (in the EERDA regional strategies), increasing employment rates for disabled people, increasing community participation in projects (EEDA, *Investing in Communities*) and to improve joined up working between organisations to allow greater independence for disabled people (Cambridgeshire Health Authority Health Improvement and Modification Plan).

The SCIE response to the *Independence, Well-Being and Choice* consultation highlights the need for a community approach to disability issues. This response also highlights that users views need to be included in decision making, something that the community outreach team is in a position to facilitate. JRF research suggests there is a need for independent living training for people moving into the community and that community

---

involvement can facilitate independent living. It also suggests that there is still a need to address access to leisure activities for disabled people (as much in terms of support to use the facilities as physical access issues) and that authorities and private groups are eager to be involved in projects to enable more independent living for people if they are bought in at an early stage.

Table 2 shows how the different streams of FfL address the six challenges laid out in the DEMOS and Scope report, *Disablist Britain*.

---


Table 2. How the four different aspects of FfL address the six barriers to independent living identified in *Disablist Britain: Barriers to independent living for disabled people in 2006*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier to independent living</th>
<th>Foundations for Living Element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Learning Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Support Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Back at the Ranch” <em>(4)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and training</td>
<td>Co-location with the new community learning centre allows easy access to a variety of courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flats can be set up for internet access for online learning and self-taught IT skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Co-location within the town centre allows access to a variety of job opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing is opposite the job centre in town – making it easier to access vacancy information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and social care</td>
<td>All client flats are fully accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support staff in place within the nearby community learning centre on call if needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing has individual front doors and key fobs allowing greater independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARRIER TO INDEPENDENT LIVING</td>
<td>Housing project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Transport**                 | • Placement of housing within the town centre makes travel simpler and cheaper if taxis are needed  
• Huntingdon has a “dial a ride” service making taxi travel cheaper | • Co-location with housing means transport costs for tenants are not an issue  
• Town centre location means that it is serviced by regular public transport from a variety of destinations | • Provide independent living training in money management so budgeting for travel and use of transport will be easier  
• Will have access to local transport providers to lobby for improved accessibility | • Subsidised accessible transport to local towns increases independence and employment opportunities  
• Tenants seeking to improve local bus services |
| **Leisure and social life**   | • Town centre base means easy access to shops and leisure facilities  
• Key fob entry system and own front doors on flats mean that leisure activity can be accessed on a person’s own time scale  
• Fully wheelchair accessible flats with appropriate space standards allows entertaining within the home  
• Town centre location means that there are more people around to socialise with and it is easier to get to them  
• Interspersing accessible supported housing with for-sale flats will make it easier to make relationships with non-disabled neighbours  
• One set of flats currently has shared gardens with BBQ facilities for socialising | • Opportunity to meet a variety of people through the centre  
• Opportunity to partake in community groups within the centre  
• Centre will provide courses in the creative and performing arts – giving people the opportunity to explore new leisure activities: This should also build social confidence | • Group will have knowledge of leisure activities on offer in Huntingdon to impart to clients  
• Group has a role in advocating disabled access to community groups  
• Aim to build self-confidence within social situations to help in independent social life  
• Can help to bring together like minded individuals to facilitate social interaction and to help people find other people to join social groups with | • Some social activities in the village  
• Taxi costs do inhibit social opportunities  
• Communal areas in some housing supports social integration and peer support |
| **Democratic participation**  | • Town centre placement means that there is an opportunity to be actively involved in local political issues | • Use of the community centre by community groups should facilitate the inclusion of disabled people in local politics | • Group can advise on democratic process and how individuals fit into it | • Not applicable |

[^4]: The information on “Back at the Ranch” reflects the services in Papworth Everard following re-structuring [see section 1.4]
1.4 **Reasons behind FfL structure**

FfL has arisen not only out of a complex situation encompassing the policy drivers from government and research mentioned above, but also from an internal response to the situations and opportunities that arose during the time prior to the inception of FfL. This process started nearly 15 years ago. In 1992, independent auditors McKinsey produced a report on the position the Papworth Trust would find itself in subsequent years if it continued to offer services in the existing way. At that point it was a village settlement predominantly for disabled people and included a sheltered workshop, residential accommodation and a range of support services. The McKinsey report concluded that there was a need for the Trust to rethink how it provided services if it were to survive within the market for service provision. With more disabled people training at college and then moving on to independent living the Trust’s service provision was seen as an unattractive option. The introduction of the Care Standards Act in 2000[^42] meant that by 2007 all residential care homes had to conform to a national standard that included en-suite bathrooms for all rooms. The Act also split care and support roles for staff, with individual staff fulfilling one or the other role. By 1999 the only Papworth Trust residential home remaining was Robert Ellis House (REH) in the village of Papworth Everard.

Changes had to be made to REH in order to comply with legislation. Several options were assessed for financial and social benefits. Updating REH so that it conformed to standards was too expensive and impractical. This need to comply was seen as an opportunity to move towards a more independent living service provision with support as the main focus. This addressed wider policy issues by creating more empowered clients with more choice and independence. It also addressed the internal issues of the Papworth Trust. These included the need to provide a different type of service if they were to be able to compete successfully in the care and support market (and attract new clients who did not want to live in a village), and the need to address the changing attitudes of their own staff and clients towards how care and progression are provided. There was the opportunity to create an entirely new residential home in Papworth Everard, although this was rejected as it did not address the social isolation or new market demands issues mentioned above.

The Papworth Trust then consulted their clients over what sort of new service should be replace the residential home. Clients were clear that any new housing should be in a town centre to avoid the social isolation issues of living in a village. From this basis, the Trust considered development opportunities in surrounding towns (Cambridge, St Ives, St Neots and Huntingdon). Land was too expensive in Cambridge, whereas Huntingdon was not only less expensive, but also well known to current clients, who went shopping there once a week. It took 18 months to find an appropriate site to develop for housing and a progression centre in Huntingdon. The progression centre evolved into a community learning centre through discussion with Huntingdon Regional College (who chose to relocate their IT training centre into the community learning centre). After discussion with

[^42]: Care Standards Act 2000, London, HMSO.
the developers, who were working as partners on FfL, it was decided to integrate general sale flats for the public amongst the accessible supported housing.

The Foundations for Living project consists of three housing elements and the Saxongate Community Learning Centre, all built within close proximity to Huntingdon Town centre.

**Picture 2. Map of Huntingdon showing locations of FfL developments**

**Freshfields**

Freshfields is a group of eight wheelchair flats built as a housing scheme. There are six one-bedroom flats and two two-bedroom flats. There is also a staff flat although this may not be required in the longer term as people become more independent.
**Hartford Road**

There are eight wheelchair accessible flats built as part of an overall development of 30 flats, with the remainder being sold on the open market.

**Montagu Road development**

The housing on Montagu Road is similar to Freshfields although the design has been modified so that there are four two-bedroom flats and four one-bedroom flats, offering greater flexibility for tenants in the future who may have families or require live-in carers.

**Housing design**

All the wheelchair accessible flats have the following features:

- A bedroom that can be used by an individual or a couple;
- A bathroom (accessible from the hallway or bedroom) with a level access shower or bath;
- A kitchen and dining area: The kitchen has height adjustable surfaces and a hob;
- Level access throughout and wide corridors/interior spaces; and
- Equipment such as a hoist or automatic doors are fitted according to need.

Tenants have housing support (according to their assessed need) to help them live more independently. They may also have individual personal care arrangements.
Picture 4. Typical wheelchair accessible flat design present in Huntingdon development
**Saxongate Community Learning Centre**
The Community Learning Centre is a public building promoting adult learning and community development. It offers:

- Seven flexible and fully accessible meeting/training rooms, including a training kitchen, an arts room and an IT suite.
- A range of adult education courses run by a range of providers, including all IT courses run by Hunts Regional College.
- A number of support services for disabled people living in the community including independent living support, community support and employment support.

![Floor plan of Saxongate learning centre and Hartford road flats](image)

**Picture 5. Floor plan of Saxongate learning centre and Hartford road flats**

**Funding**
The funding required for the Foundations for Living project has been substantial. The total cost for the three housing elements and the Community Learning Centre will be about £7.7m, met through a £2m fundraising campaign, £1.2m from the sale of the Robert Ellis House site and associated land, and the balance of £4.5m coming from the Papworth Trust's own reserves and from borrowing. The land costs of £1.8m reflect the premium paid for town centre sites, felt to be a key factor in increasing community inclusion and enabling easy access to shops, leisure facilities and employment opportunities. Table 3 shows the costs and funding for the housing elements and the community learning centre.
Table 3. FfL costs: Split into specific expenses and who meets what costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense</th>
<th>Community Learning Centre (£)</th>
<th>Housing (£)</th>
<th>Total (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land costs</td>
<td>565,101</td>
<td>1,309,899</td>
<td>1,875,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site preparation and build costs</td>
<td>2,224,000</td>
<td>3,065,343</td>
<td>5,289,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees and other costs</td>
<td>67,000</td>
<td>223,675</td>
<td>290,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and fittings</td>
<td>228,998</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>268,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,085,099</td>
<td>4,638,917</td>
<td>7,724,016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where funding comes from:
- Papworth reserve funding: 4,524,016
- Sale of land (i): 1,200,000
- Fundraising: 2,000,000

(i) To be realised from the sale of Robert Ellis House site upon redevelopment

As mentioned earlier, the project plan has been adapted throughout the lifespan of FfL. This adaptability has been particularly evident in the transition of clients themselves. The original idea behind the project was to re-house those 30 residents who were living in REH within the Huntingdon development. This dictated the number (30) of accessible supported flats that were built on the site. However, the movement of clients has been more complex, with some REH residents moving back to their commissioning authority, and some moving into other Papworth housing. This other housing in Papworth Everard is either warden controlled bungalows or MacFarlane Grieve House (MGH), a collection of independent flatlets within the village. Only a small proportion has actually made the move to Huntingdon. Of those former REH residents now in MGH, four are expected to move to Huntingdon when the new accommodation becomes available. Figure 1 shows the actual and expected movement in January 2006 of clients from REH to different locations. Solid arrows show moves already made and dotted arrows show those moves that will occur in the future.
At the time of writing (June 2006) the services for tenants remaining in Papworth Everard were undergoing re-structuring, so the ‘Back at the Ranch’ scenario has in itself changed as a result of the Foundations for Living project.

FfL has led to 20 people moving to live in Huntingdon (from both Robert Ellis House and the Macfarlane Grieve flats). It has therefore been necessary to review and re-structure the remaining services in Papworth to reflect the reduced funding available for services in the village, and at the same time to provide more flexible and integrated support (similar to that being provided by the new service in Huntingdon).

Services in Papworth Everard have consisted of three services; housing support, progression (day service) and a warden service. In addition personal care is commissioned separately for individuals through an external agency. The new structure in Papworth Everard will have a single service manager, and staff working arrangements will be changed so that support can be during the day, evenings and at weekends.

1.5 The Need for Evaluation and Research

Evaluation of social interventions is a growth area in academia, however, this is less true in the field of social care in general and disability research in particular. Therefore lessons are often not learnt effectively from initiatives elsewhere in the UK, and there is a poor research base on the current situation for disabled people in the UK. One of the key aspects of the FfL project is the explicit desire for ongoing evaluation and dissemination of findings. This was decided at the beginning of the project to allow learning throughout the life of the project both for future projects and for the process of FfL itself. This again ties in with the recommendations of national policy, with performance indicators in place for
Valuing People and Improving Life Chances. SCIE, JRF and MASC research all support the conclusion that in order to make changes to disability policy work for all, initiatives have to be effectively evaluated and the results of these evaluations disseminated. This report covers the first stage of the FfL project, including the initial move and the hopes and aspirations of users, and builds an evaluation framework for the project using a logic model methodology.
CHAPTER 2  Methodologies

Chapter Summary
RAND Europe has created an evaluation framework for FfL using a logic modelling approach. Other approaches were considered for creation of the framework, and logic modelling was deemed the most appropriate for the needs of FfL due to the previous successful use of logic models in social care evaluations, and their contribution to learning as well as audit. Logic modelling builds upon the tacit and explicit knowledge of the Papworth Trust and its clients, partners and staff. Data was assimilated through document reviews, interviews and focus groups, and then integrated into the logic modelling process. In partnership with the Papworth Trust, performance indicators were identified and agreed during a management workshop in which the logic models were used.

2.1 Issues to address
RAND Europe proposed supporting an evaluation strategy that can identify the successes of the FfL project, strengthen accountability arrangements, and provide lessons which can then be applied to other services run by the Papworth Trust, and other provider organisations elsewhere. RAND Europe worked with the Papworth management team in the development and implementation of their self-evaluation plans, supporting the collection of reliable and valid data. RAND Europe proposes to help the Trust overcome the practical and methodological difficulties associated with measuring outcomes, to include in the workstream measurement of improvements, users’ views, and process improvements. This set of measures will be consolidated in an evaluation framework reflecting the diversity of FfL’s aims and its range of activities.

2.2 Logic modelling to create an evaluation framework
In order to address these issues, RAND Europe created logic models of the FfL project to visualise the different streams that make up the project. Logic models are commonly used evaluative techniques that allow a graphic representation of the “theory of action” – what is

43 NICE et al. (2002) “Principles for Best Practice in Clinical Audit”, pp 142-3 argues that both process improvement and users’ views of the care they receive may be appropriate measures of evaluation.
invested, what is done, and what are the outcomes. Logic models are one potential method of evaluation, and one that provides an opportunity in the accountability era to measure results and therefore correct problems and praise successes. The visual representation of the “theory of action” is easy to understand for all stakeholders, not just those with experience in evaluation. This allows a shared understanding of the project between all the stakeholders involved in the project and can surface unspoken disagreements and confusions. Thus, they can benefit organisations well beyond the production of a standard evaluation framework that may be complex to visualise and understand although likely to be equally as valid for a professional evaluator. Logic models therefore, can transfer ownership of an evaluation from the evaluator to the organisation being studied itself.

Logic models have the same inherent limitation as any evaluation in the real world: an inability to capture the counterfactual - what would have happened without the intervention in place, or if another intervention had been implemented. Furthermore, FfL’s impact upon independent living depends on the decisions and actions of many others, therefore attributing any particular outcome to FfL is difficult. This problem is compounded by the recognition that the relationship between short-term outcomes and longer-term impacts may not follow the anticipated path. One solution to this complexity that is possible using logic models is to introduce a quasi-experimental model allowing researchers to investigate a ‘real life’ counterfactual. This would provide a basis for establishing what would have happened in the absence of FfL. However, this is not possible in this case as there is no observable counterfactual state. Under these circumstances, we can instead identify the causal relationships linking FfL inputs to longer-term outputs, and to evaluate these against a body of evidence and alternative explanations. Although this does not capture the counterfactual, it does allow us to identify which inputs to FfL cause which outputs and outcomes.

In order to create the logic models for FfL we used several methods to ‘triangulate’ the evidence. This allows different types of evidence to be incorporated into the models, capturing explicit and tacit knowledge, and strengthening the power of the conclusions reached. The methods used were:

- Document review;
- Interviews;
- Focus groups; and
- Workshop.

Each of these methods will be addressed in turn, highlighting how they were used, the reasons they were chosen, the value they add and some details on who was consulted (if relevant). After outlining the methods used, we will also address other options for evaluating FfL, highlighting why we believe they are less appropriate than the chosen methodology. The findings from the chosen methods will be discussed in detail in Chapter 4.

---


45 Triangulation is the validation of evidence streams by the use of multiple methods for any given issue.
2.2.1 **Document review**

Document review provides evidence within which the whole project can be set. It allows an understanding of the background policy, research and thinking on independent living and the surrounding issues. By combining this document review with the knowledge of the Papworth Trust management team, we can cover both the explicit knowledge apparent within the documents and the tacit knowledge of those working within the boundaries of the legislation. Combining the two types of knowledge validates conclusions and helps direct lines of enquiry.

The document review built on the initial work of the Papworth Trust, using their own documentation and the policy documents that they cite as being instrumental in the ideas and values that shaped the evolution of the Foundations project. Associated policy documents were then identified using a snowballing technique. In terms of research documents and identification of relevant studies, documents were located through the websites of the Social Care Institute for Excellence (SCIE), Joseph Rowntree Foundation (JRF) and the Modernising Adult Social Care group (MASC). In the case of SCIE, it is important to note that their role is one of improving standards in social care; therefore their research and guidelines should be seen as setting standards in social care. These three groups both sponsor and produce relevant research and the most appropriate studies were found using key word searching on the sites for specific research associated with “Independent Living”, “Supported Housing”, and “Inclusive Communities”.

2.2.2 **Interviews**

We interviewed clients of the Papworth Trust. These interviews included people who had already moved to Huntingdon as part of the first wave of clients involved in FfL, people who are due to move as part of the second and third waves of the project, and those who had decided not to move out of Papworth Everard village. Interviews explored the role of the client in the processes of FfL and allowed us to understand what would be appropriate outcomes from the client point of view. We also interviewed staff members from the Papworth Trust and from outside partner organisations explicitly involved in FfL. Table 4 shows the number of interviewees in each category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Number of interviewees</th>
<th>Face-to-face or phone interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clients</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>A mixture of phone and face-to-face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner organisations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We used a semi-structured interviewing technique to allow us to explore interesting issues in more detail during the interview. Interviewing clients, some of whom have learning

---

46 Snowballing is a technique where one document is identified and then references within that document are investigated, creating a larger dataset. This process can continue with each subsequent document identified through the technique.
difficulties, is easier and more effective when done one-on-one, rather than in focus
groups, which is why we performed a larger number of interviews with clients than with
staff. Interviews were recorded as MP3 files and/or as text notes taken during the interview.
Any recordings of the interviews were used only to aid the research team in a clear
understanding of the content of the interview. Comments made by individuals in
interviews are anonymised, but do represent the views of particular stakeholders.

**Interviews with clients**
The Papworth Trust provided a list of clients that included all the people who had already
moved to the new site in Huntingdon as well as clients who had chosen to move soon, or
not to move at all. We finalised questions in collaboration with the Papworth Trust in
order to use their expertise in communication with their clients. Clients were offered the
opportunity to have advocates present at their interview, although no one requested an
advocate. All interviews were performed following the ethical guidelines of the Disability
Rights Commission and the Social Research Association. The interview protocol for clients
is shown in Appendix B1.

We spoke to 17 clients who are involved in FfL, of whom nine were tenants who had
already moved from Papworth Everard to Huntingdon; four were not moving and four
were due to move in the future. The names of interviewees are shown in Appendix C1.

**Interviews with Papworth Trust management**
We interviewed five members of the Papworth Trust management. Interviewees were: the
senior manager of the project; the manager of the building project for the new flats and the
community learning centre; the newly installed transitions manager (whose role is to
oversee the transition of tenants from one location to another); and two members of the
service user involvement team (whose role is to ensure client’s views are listened to). Each
of these interviews was semi-structured, and used progressive questioning to identifying
information in specific areas and to explore avenues of particular interest. The interview
protocol for management is shown in Appendix B2. The names of interviewees are shown
in Appendix C2.

**Interviews with partner organisations**
We interviewed five partner organisations by telephone. The aim of these interviews was to
discover how the partner’s relationship with the Papworth Trust had developed and
evolved through the process of FfL. Amongst other things, this would help us to
understand the long-term sustainability of FfL. We spoke to the Huntingdon Town
Centre Partnership, the Huntingdonshire District Council, Cambridgeshire Social
Services, the Supporting People team and the Hill Partnership (building contractors on
part of the FfL project). We selected these partner organisations from a long list of
organisations the Papworth Trust had worked with to provide service delivery during the
course of FfL. We selected service delivery organisations rather than funding organisations
since the innovative aspect of FfL is the combination of services rather than fundraising
methods.

The five organisations interviewed were chosen on the recommendation of the Trust, as
they are the ones with whom they had the closest working relationship through the FfL
project. Individuals whom we spoke to within organisations were the key point of contact
for Papworth Trust staff. The interview protocol for partner organisations is shown in Appendix B3. Names of partner organisations and specific interviewees are shown in Appendix C3.

2.2.3 **Focus group**

We held a focus group to identify staff expectations of success for the project, their experience of the transition from residential care to independent living, their perception of how things have been affected in Papworth Everard as FfL has come into being, and their conceptual understanding of the FfL project. The structure of the staff focus group is shown in Appendix B4.

The focus group consisted of 14 staff members, selected by the Papworth Trust, who had been directly involved in the FfL process. Of these, eight were support staff (of whom two are now based in Huntingdon) working on a daily basis with the tenants; two were working exclusively in transition management; and the other four worked in progression, community services, independent living advising and project working. This balance of staff reflects the diversity of staffing involved in FfL. The names of staff involved in the focus group are shown in Appendix C4.

2.2.4 **Workshop**

The senior management workshop at the end of the project aimed to agree the structure of the logic models and to identify the most appropriate performance indicators for the evaluation framework. The workshop contained the project team from the Papworth Trust and the project leader from RAND Europe. It identified a consensus on appropriate measures for the FfL evaluation. This workshop was important in terms of the content discussed and for fostering a partnership approach whereby the Trust can take ownership of the research, making implementation of results and recommendations more likely.

2.3 **Other methodological possibilities**

Building evaluation frameworks using logic models is one of a limited of number of ways in which you can address evaluating the FfL project. We considered two other approaches to this evaluation: the use of monetisation\(^47\) of social benefits;\(^48\) and the “balanced scorecard” methodology.

**Monetisation of social capital** through SROI (Social Return On Investment) is a method that has been used in evaluating independent living interventions, such as the “Lawnmowers” theatre and production group. In their report on the value added to the disabled people involved in the group, they used SROI and demonstrated that for every £1 on “Lawnmowers”, £4.25 of benefit was achieved.\(^49\) The evaluation of the theatre group

---

\(^47\) Monetisation is a term describing the attribution of a financial value to qualitative outcomes of an intervention. For example, the monetary value of increased confidence due to increased social interaction


was well suited to this monetisation method, as specific outcomes in terms of new working skills and decreased day care had direct financial impacts. In the case of FfL, the major outcomes are likely to be around the development of new living skills and increased mobility and decision-making. These concepts do not necessarily have direct financial impacts and are hard to monetise. The other reason that monetisation worked particularly well for “Lawnmowers” was that it was used as fundraising tool, showing the financial impact of spending to save with respect to disabled people in “Lawnmowers”. The FfL evaluation aims to identify learning and monitoring data for improving and maintaining the project, rather than explicitly to justify spending or to fundraise. This focus implies that tailoring an evaluation around learning goals is more appropriate than around financial benefits. There is also a long-standing debate over the financial measures of non-financial outputs that would decrease the power of the evaluation.

Robert Kaplan and David Norton created the balanced scorecard method in the 1990s to evaluate organisations from a central point of vision and strategy. In the method, organisation vision feeds into four types of issue: financial; internal business process; customer; and learning and growth. Each of these four areas can be scored for objectives, measures, targets and initiatives using specific metrics in each area. This methodology has been hugely successful and popular in business, with major companies such as IBM and Ford using variations of it in their management strategies. However, its use in performance management of social care interventions is not widespread, mainly due to the business orientation of the method. As such, it is more appropriate to use a methodology that is well understood in social care interventions that can be tailored to identify learning as well as management outcomes for FfL, as learning within the lifetime of the project will be vital in producing the most appropriate outcomes for clients. Also, as the use of the balanced scorecard is more common at (and more suited to) an organisational level than a project level, using the balanced scorecard may not be the most appropriate for understanding the lessons from the project for the Papworth Trust.

---


51 See the website of the “balanced scorecard institute” for more details of companies using the balanced scorecard in their evaluations: http://www.balancedscorecard.org/default.html
CHAPTER 3  Evaluation framework and performance indicators for FfL

Chapter Summary
The evaluation framework for FfL has been built around a series of logic models. This framework followed the FABRIC guidelines for performance information systems (Focused, Appropriate, Balanced, Robust, Integrated and Cost-effective). Within the framework there are six points at which performance information can be gathered. These are relevance, process evaluation, efficiency, effectiveness, utility and social acceptance and sustainability. Performance indicators themselves should follow the SMART guidelines (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Timely). Having created logic models for the constituent parts of FfL and the project as a whole, specific performance indicators for parts of the evaluation framework can be put into place, maintaining a balance between quantitative and qualitative indicators and distributing them appropriately throughout the framework. Some of the key indicators recommended are indices to measure disabled people’s experiences of independent living, community accessibility, social engagement and input into the Papworth Trust organisation.

3.1  What are evaluation frameworks?
Evaluation frameworks specify details of an evaluation process such as objectives, evaluation criteria and performance indicators. Many government departments52 and other organisations53 use performance information in order to ensure accountability of their projects and policies. The National Audit Office (NAO) has developed the use of performance indicators as part of performance information systems. In association with the Cabinet Office, the Treasury, the Audit Commission and the Office for National Statistics, the NAO produced a guideline framework for performance information in 2001.54 It states that a performance information system should be Focused, Appropriate, Balanced, Robust, Integrated and Cost-effective (FABRIC: Box 2).

52 The DTI, for example, uses logic modelling to evaluate, monitor and analyse issues. See http://www.dti.gov.uk/about/evaluation/Geoff_White.ppt
53 For example, Local Authorities have been using performance indicators specified by the Audit Commission since 1992
By applying these criteria to the design of an evaluation framework, the monitoring and evaluation of an organisation or project should run along set guidelines - allowing comparability across projects and against other organisations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focused</td>
<td>Defining a framework that focuses on the aims of the organisation – prioritised to strategy and key objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>Different stakeholders have different ideas of what appropriate performance information is: a good evaluation framework identifies the most appropriate information for the stakeholders likely to use it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Measures within the framework should cover the whole output of the organisation so that specific areas are not neglected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robust</td>
<td>The framework should be applicable regardless of personnel changes within the organisation. This also applies to changes in the way services are delivered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Any evaluation system should be integrated into the management structure of the organisation. This gives “ownership” of measures to the organisation and avoids parallel measures being collected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Effective</td>
<td>An effective evaluation framework has performance measures designed to maximise the cost-benefit of collecting them. The use of existing data sources and externally required performance data can lead to increased cost-benefit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Box 2. The FABRIC system for defining performance information systems


3.2 FfL evaluation framework

One way to create an evaluation framework is to attach it to a logic model. Since logic models are a graphic representation of a project it is simple to identify specific areas for evaluation within the model, as routes between inputs and outcomes can be traced visually. By using a logic model framework without FfL specific information it is possible to identify where particular monitoring of the programme should be. These graphic connections are shown in the example framework in Figure 2. It shows how different elements of evaluation connect different stages of a project. The main thread of the diagram, from interests to broader impact, is a logic model of a process being investigated, linking the stages of the process: interests give rise to policy needs which lead to a design, to the inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, and these give the broader impact of the process. All of these stages are affected by the overall context of the work. The dotted lines show how the linkage between different stages in the process can be evaluated. For example, evaluation of effectiveness would look at how project objectives connect to the outcomes, whereas evaluation of relevance would examine the link between policy needs and project objectives.
Figure 2. An example evaluation framework
3.2.1 Evaluation points in the framework

There are six key elements to the evaluation framework, where linkages between aspects of the project can be assessed. These are:

1. **Relevance** – between policy needs (aims and priorities in the policy field) and objectives (the aims of the FfL policy), allowing exploration of the fit between the vision for the project and the wide policy background.

2. **Process Evaluation** – between throughput (the process of FfL) and outputs (services produced through FfL), allowing examination of the process of delivering FfL.

3. **Efficiency** – between inputs (resources and time) and outputs, allowing us to identify how well resources are being used in producing the outputs that are expected and required of FfL.

4. **Effectiveness** – between objectives and outcomes (impact of FfL on stakeholders). This measures the ability of the project to deliver the outcomes identified in its vision.

5. **Utility** – between policy needs and outcomes, identifying how successful the project has been at producing suitable results with respect to policies (in this case, independent living policies).

6. **Sustainability and Social Acceptance** – between interests and outcomes and externalities (side effects of FfL, such as increased social support for independent living and increased disability awareness). This allows the impact of the project in terms of wider social acceptance of independent living and in terms of financial and partnership sustainability to be measured.

3.3 Developing PIs

To create an appropriate performance information system it is important to populate the evaluation framework with appropriate PIs. Choosing PIs is facilitated by the construction of logic models for the different streams of FfL (specific models are discussed in Section 3.4). Using these models it is possible to identify PIs at various stages of the evaluation framework (for example within “efficiency” or “effectiveness”).

PIs are measures of achievement (typically numerical) in areas of importance to the organisation or programme in question. For the PIs to be used effectively, they must be “owned” by the organisation being evaluated. Therefore, creating indicators with the organisation forms an important part of identifying appropriate measures.

PIs are used in a variety of contexts, including national government documents on social policy. For example, *Valuing People* identifies a number of PIs for its strategy. These include PIs for the employment section based around increasing the proportion of people with learning difficulties who are in work, and in the “fulfilling lives” section, proposed expenditure on day care as a percentage of expenditure on all non-residential services.\(^55\) There are also other indicators in other areas of the strategy.

Developing PIs follows some simple rules. As far as possible, they are derived from areas over which the organisation has direct influence and should be Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Timely (SMART) as advocated in *Choosing the Right Fabric*.\(^56\) Performance indicators need to be:

---


- Relevant – to the aims of the organisation or project;
- Able to avoid perverse incentives – so as not to encourage unwanted behaviour;
- Attributable – so organisations can track what actions are causal;
- Well defined – unambiguous definition so data is collected consistently and is easy to us;
- Timely – regular collection that is produced in time to use;
- Reliable – accurate and responsive to change;
- Comparable – across timescales, projects and organisations;
- Verifiable – so that measures are accountable.

3.4 Logic models

As mentioned in section 2.2, logic models are a commonly used evaluation technique. The primary purpose of the logic models was to develop a long list of PIs for FfL.

The models outline the outcomes to be achieved and the activities and resources required if these outcomes are to be delivered. As the logic models reflect a shared understanding of the purposes and aims of FfL, they deliver the first step in successfully developing PIs. In particular they identify: vision and purpose; the social (or client) needs to be met; the outputs and outcomes to be achieved; and what the organisation can control or influence.

The logic models required for FfL need to cover the main areas in which the project is acting, as well as the project as a whole (therefore capturing the value added by pursuing a project in which several strands of work interact). To do this, five separate models have been created. They cover FfL as a whole; housing issues; the community learning centre; the community services team; and “back at the ranch issues”. Each of these models was built on the combination of methods explained in section 2.2, thus capturing the explicit policy and research knowledge from the literature and the tacit experiential knowledge of those involved in the program. In addition to the sections of an evaluation framework identified in Figure 2, the logic models contain information that is specific to FfL. These are the interests of the Trust in formulating FfL (i.e. the general and specific objectives of the project – encompassing policy requirements and vision) and the emergent strategy of FfL (an integral part of FfL’s ability to take opportunities when they arose).

3.4.1 FfL as a whole

The logic model for the project as a whole is the most important, with the other four models feeding ideas into it (Figure 4). The policy needs and drivers’ section is built upon the literature review of policy and the interviews with the Papworth Trust management to create a background to why FfL was implemented. The objectives come from the Trust themselves, and are evolving as the project progresses. Inputs cover the three main areas in which the Trust has resources. These are money,57 people and infrastructure. The emergent strategy is an evolving strategy for FfL that can respond to opportunities in the market and input from evaluation. Throughputs are the ways in which the Trust can make use of its human resources to make a success of FfL. This could include engaging its users, staff and partner organisations. Outputs are the tangible results

---

57 Interestingly, the act of fundraising for FfL actually informed the vision of the project as fundraisers bought new ideas to the table and as funding became available more opportunities were opened up to the Trust.
of the major processes in FfL. They cover staff, users and infrastructure outputs as well as financial implications for the Trust. **Outcomes** in the model are those outcomes that are ultimately desired by the Trust but may not necessarily be fully attributable to the FfL project alone. These include the primary goal of FfL - increased independence for clients, and other goals such as financial sustainability of the project and appropriate accommodation for clients. **Externalities** are those effects that may occur as a result of the project but are greatly influenced, or even caused, by external factors. This would include effects such as an increase in community support for, and understanding of, disability issues.
Figure 3. Logic model for the whole Foundations for Living project with evaluation points
3.4.2 Housing and support

Figure 5 shows the model for the new housing developments in Huntingdon that form part of FfL. Once again, the policy needs are built upon a fusion of government policy, information from the Papworth Trust and findings from the interviews. The objectives are modified forms of the FfL vision, to ensure relevance to the housing part of the programme. Inputs are, as above, the resources available to the Trust, specifically staff knowledge of housing and the fund raising required for the housing development. The emergent strategy is the same as in the “FfL as a whole” model. Throughputs are also the same as the logic model for the whole of FfL, since the same human resources of staff, clients and partner organisations are involved. The outputs differ, in that they focused on the housing alone and the impact that it can have on clients and the community. These include the facilities for clients within the new housing, the space standards and accessibility of the housing development; the staffing to facilitate independence; and the way in which housing can offer new independent living opportunities and enhance integrated living. The outcomes are around the sustainability of the impacts that the housing has on independent living, social acceptance of disability and the fact that housing provision remains appropriate for the needs of tenants. Externalities could include an increase in community support for, and understanding of, disability issues through the co-location of housing in the town centre and the integrated presence of general sale flats.
Figure 4. Housing and support logic model
3.4.3 **Community learning centre**

The model for the community learning centre (Figure 6) differs from the housing model mainly in the outcomes that are expected, although there are some differences in the **policy needs**, since the issues surrounding inclusive education are different to those for housing. They include the opportunity to learn new skills and to play an active role within the community. The **objectives** for the CLC are based around independence and opportunities for clients, specifically to learn new skills and to form part of an integrated learning community. The **inputs** are financial and knowledge based; with the Trust’s knowledge of progression training and the College’s knowledge of education being key inputs. **Throughput** is focused on the use of available resources. The **outputs** are focused on the new building itself, the courses offered and the community use of the facilities. The **outcomes** focus on the sustainability of the courses offered and the appropriateness of the centre for disabled clients of the Trust and the wider community. **Externalities** are focused around the effect off the community learning centre on the community and the support of the community for inclusive learning.
Figure 5. Community learning centre logic model
3.4.4 Community support team

The community support team (CST) is a less clearly defined action of FfL and is evolving as the project progresses. Currently, the CST is seen as providing flexible support both in their home and in accessing the community through a single staff team who deliver support based on individual needs assessments. As such, the policy needs section of the logic model (Figure 7) is built around the government policies on supporting disabled people in the community and the provision that was in place for doing so prior to FfL. The objectives are tailored to supporting independent living and an integrated community. The inputs are, as with other models, the resources available to the Trust. In this model they specifically include the experience of independent living advisors. The emergent strategy is important for the community support team since their role is constantly evolving within the boundaries of the project. The throughput is, as with other models, use of the available resources. The outputs are opportunities arising from the actions of the CST, such as facilitated independent living and opportunities for work. The outcomes focus on the sustainability of the outputs facilitated by the group, and partnerships that can lead to a more integrated community in Huntingdon. Externalities are again around increased support for independent living and better understanding of disability issues and the Supporting People agenda and criteria.
Figure 6. Community services team logic model
3.4.5 “Back at the ranch” issues

The “Back at the Ranch” model (Figure 8) addresses issues that are not specifically part of the FfL project, but are important to the Papworth Trust. The policy needs for the model are centred on the facilities, and the policy environment surrounding this provision, at Papworth Everard. The objectives are centred on the type of provision that the Papworth Trust wants to offer to tenants in Papworth Everard. Thus, it is more tailored to gaining skills and having a high quality of life. The inputs are the same resources available to the trust as with the other FfL models, although specific to the Papworth Everard site. The emergent strategy is slightly less important in this model, since the strategies that are in place in Papworth Everard are already well established. However, the strategies from the FfL project have already had an impact upon those used back in Papworth Everard. Since the writing of this report, the service provision in Papworth Everard has been rethought to follow more closely the provision in Huntingdon (see section 1.4). The throughput makes use of the resources available, and is similar to those in previous models. The outputs are necessarily slightly different to those for the other FfL models. They are based around the successful provision and impact of services to clients within the village. In line with the FfL aspirations, some of these outputs may be increased independence and greater skill sets for clients – possibly leading to tenants aspiring to a move into a more independent living scheme (such as FfL in Huntingdon). Appropriate training of staff is also an output, since this is an area in which the Trust wants to have an effect through FfL. The outcomes are once again centred on sustainability, specifically on the sustainability of the provision in Papworth Everard in light of the main FfL project in Huntingdon. For example, it is important to understand how there will be a sustainable accommodation provision in Papworth Everard if the demand for services is entirely directed towards the Huntingdon programme; or how Papworth Everard can offer appropriate facilities for disabled people in the future if the model for doing so is based around an integrated community such as the one envisaged for Huntingdon. Externalities are more focused on the support levels within the village for independent living and on the community attitude to disability.
Figure 7. "Back at the Ranch" logic model
3.5 Identifying PIs with the logic models

As previously mentioned, PIs should follow the simple rules laid out in Choosing the Right Fabric. Identifying the most appropriate indicators for use in FfL must be accomplished by identifying how they meet these standards. It is important that indicators build on management information already collected for Papworth Trust reporting to avoid duplication of effort or inconsistent goal-setting. Indicators should also be balanced between those that are quantitative, for example numbers in supported housing, and qualitative, such as increased feelings of independence. By striking a balance between quantitative and qualitative indicators, both accountability for learning and accountability for delivery can be accurately and appropriately identified.

Indicators should also cover the range of evaluation points within the framework (from relevance to utility), so that all aspects of the project are covered within the evaluation. Figure 8 shows how indicators should be chosen from positions within the appropriate “indicator space”. Indicator space is skewed by the fact that as the direct influence of FfL becomes weaker, indicators are generally more qualitative, providing learning rather than audit opportunities.58 Indicator space is the part of the matrix that contains the majority of PIs for a given intervention. However, it does not preclude the fact that there may be appropriate indicators outside the space: for example quantitative indicators of sustainability such as financial sustainability.

Figure 8. Identifying indicator space

3.6 Prioritised PIs

By using the logic models and the evaluation framework, we have identified a variety of PIs for FfL. Since we do not recommend using all of the potential performance indicators (due to the administrative burden outweighing the usefulness of the extra information), we selected a set of 16 recommended PIs, shown below. PIs were selected using the combined knowledge and experience of the RAND Europe project team and Papworth Trust Strategic Management Group to identify PIs that would cover the aspects of FfL that are most important and that will dovetail with the Trust’s own management data.

PI

**Relevance**
1. Documenting fit between FfL and policy – taken from Trustee reports, Strategic Management group reports, national government policy, external inspections (all models)

**Process Evaluation**
2. Service user involvement index (all models)
3. Staff review, performance and development (all models)
4. Questionnaire for partner organisations charting progress over time (all models)

**Efficiency**
5. Staff support - training offered, staff development plans, cost and appropriateness of procuring training and supporting staff development (all models)
6. Utilisation of resources - staff, skills, facilities (housing, CLC*, CST*, BatR*)
7. Cost of resources - possibly benchmarked against other providers (all models)

**Effectiveness**
8. Indices to measure impact (all models)
9. Changing support costs as a proxy for independent living (whole, housing and BatR*)
10. Measured progress of individuals using service (CLC* and CST*)

**Utility**
11. Improvement in results from inspections and other external reviews – e.g. supporting people (all models)

**Sustainability and Social Acceptance**
12. Achievement against financial targets – through accounts and savings to other organisations (all models)
13. Rising client expectations (all models)
14. Improved stakeholder knowledge of and commitment to FfL objectives (all models)
15. More staff recruited and retained with appropriate training and qualification (whole and BatR*)
16. Wider and deeper life choices for clients (whole and BatR*)

* CLC – Community Learning Centre; CST – Community Support Team; BatR – Back at the Ranch

3.6.1 Going into detail on recommended Pls
1. **Relevance** - Documenting fit between FfL and policy – taken from Trustee reports, Strategic Management Group (SMG) reports, national government policy, external inspections
By assessing the literature that Papworth has to produce to justify its own policies to Trustees and to produce SMG reports, this PI creates a minimal additional workload. What is required is evidence that strategic decisions have been taken in accordance with wider policy interests at heart. Since this PI draws upon documents for Trustees, the information contained is required to be of high quality. The degree of ‘fit with policy’ will inevitably be a judgement rather than a precise measurement.

2. **Process Evaluation** - Service user involvement index (see Section 3.8.4)

Addresses the issues of service users (clients) of the Papworth Trust as to their role within the FfL process. This is an innovative way of summarising a basket of characteristics in a figure, collecting a spread of person centred data on the level of involvement in FfL service users feel they have. These can assess the strengths and weaknesses of FfL and compare them across years and sections of the project.

3. **Process Evaluation** - Staff review, performance and development

The ongoing appraisal of staff should be used to provide anonymised data on staff progress towards delivering the goals of FfL. An annual questionnaire should provide more data on how staff understand what facilitates and inhibits their contribution to delivering the aims of FfL.

4. **Process Evaluation** - Questionnaire for partner organisations

An annual survey of partner organizations should identify levels of satisfaction with the processes implemented in FfL (including such issues as transparency, communication, and timeliness).

5. **Efficiency** - Staff support - training offered, development plans

This requires the maintenance of accurate records of delivering training and other staff support, of staff achievement, and of the costs of providing this support. The workload may be high, but the benefit to the organisation as a whole could potentially be large.

6. **Efficiency** - Use of facilities

Data collection on the utilisation of facilities such as housing (occupancy rates), community learning centre (numbers on courses), community support team and progression services should be collected as a matter of course. This produces a clear PI about the utilisation of facilities that can help to chart progress over time.

7. **Efficiency** - Cost of facilities

The cost of facilities is important in that, in association with effectiveness data, it can help identify where money is being well spent in the project. Benchmarking this information against the performance of comparable organisations or against similar processes and services within the Trust can provide additional performance information.

8. **Effectiveness** – Indices (see Section 3.8)

We propose an innovative basket of indices allowing the Papworth Trust to summarise the effectiveness of its work with clients. These allow a spread of person centred data to be collected with which to assess the strengths and weaknesses of FfL and to compare those both across years and across sections of the project.

9. **Effectiveness** – Decreased support costs

As individuals become more independent, their support needs are likely to drop. This can be measured financially in terms of support costs. Reduced support costs are a strong proxy for
greater independence. However, if an individual’s physical or mental condition deteriorates, they will require additional support irrespective of the actions of the Trust.

10. **Effectiveness** – Achievement of individuals using service

Each individual’s progress can be charted over time in all the dimensions where FfL hopes to have an effect. However, with the partial exception of take up of, and progress in, training opportunities, volunteering, and access to work, measurements of individual’s progress may not be summative and therefore they should not be aggregated. For example, an individual may go shopping as often as they desire, but may feel less independent in their own home. Any aggregation of measures could miss this situation.

11. **Utility** - Improvement in results from inspections

Analysis of inspection reports, and the documentation of responses, is part of the existing reporting system.

12. **Sustainability and Social Acceptance** – Financial, assessed by looking at accounts and savings to other organisations

Information on the financial implications of FfL for the Trust’s sustainability, and the financial impact on partnering local authorities are part of the existing reporting system.

13. **Sustainability and Social Acceptance** - Rising client expectations and achievement

Measuring improved client expectations and achievements is not easy. It requires either additional questioning during the process of information gathering for the indices, or the use of a proxy such as clients’ requests to move into different accommodation or clients’ progression through the work market.

14. **Sustainability and Social Acceptance** - Improved stakeholder engagement

An annual survey of partner organizations should identify levels of awareness of, commitment to, and incentives for supporting the aims of FfL among partner organisations. This could be managed as a simple telephone survey, a web-based survey, or as a written document.

15. **Sustainability and Social Acceptance** - Optimal recruitment and retention of staff with appropriate training and qualifications

This acts as a proxy for the success and acceptability of the project. By recruiting and retaining staff better, the Trust can make an assumption that they are providing a better working environment for staff. The quality of staff recruited can be measured by evaluating the qualifications of applicants.

16. **Sustainability and Social Acceptance** - Wider and deeper life choices

This acts as a good measure for the success of training for clients, the public image of FfL within the business sector and the social acceptance of disability. Life choices include working and volunteering opportunities, choices over service provision, shopping and so forth. Measuring working opportunities can be done by looking at the breadth of organisations employing (either paid or unpaid) clients of the FfL project.

These indicators have been chosen to reflect the most important aspects of FfL and range across the different logic models as well as parts of the evaluation framework. This produces a large number of indicators (16) and it may be prudent to reduce the number. However, of these 16 PIs, at least seven are already collected, or would be as a matter of course, within the management of FfL. Therefore collection of new data would not incur high administrative costs to the Papworth Trust. By applying these PIs to the tenants in Huntingdon and those remaining at
Papworth Everard (BatR group) we can use the Papworth Everard tenants as a control group to understand the added value of improved and co-located services within the Huntingdon project.

The following tables contain the full list of potential performance indicators developed that could be used to understand the progress and evaluation of FfL.
### Table 5. Full list of PIs in FfL streams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FfL whole</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Community Learning Centre (CLC)</th>
<th>Community support team (CST)</th>
<th>Back at the Ranch (BatR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td><strong>Housing</strong></td>
<td><strong>Community Learning Centre</strong></td>
<td><strong>Community support team</strong></td>
<td><strong>Back at the Ranch (BatR)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Documenting fit between FfL and policy – taken from Trustee reports,</td>
<td>- Documenting fit between FfL and policy – taken from Trustee reports,</td>
<td>- Documenting fit between FfL</td>
<td>- Documenting fit between FfL</td>
<td>- Documenting fit between FfL and policy – taken from Trustee reports, Strategic Management Group reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Management Group reports</td>
<td>Strategic Management Group reports</td>
<td>and policy – taken from Trustee reports, Strategic Management Group reports</td>
<td>and policy – taken from Trustee reports, Strategic Management Group reports</td>
<td>and policy – taken from Trustee reports, Strategic Management Group reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td><strong>Housing</strong></td>
<td><strong>Community Learning Centre</strong></td>
<td><strong>Community support team</strong></td>
<td><strong>Back at the Ranch (BatR)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Financial</td>
<td>- Requests for housing</td>
<td>- Use of CLC</td>
<td>- Use of CST through contact</td>
<td>- Requests for services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Demonstrating staff support</td>
<td>- Numbers in housing</td>
<td>- Take up of courses</td>
<td>with clients</td>
<td>- Numbers in services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Demonstrating quality assurance (QA)</td>
<td>- Staff training hours</td>
<td>- Cost per course per person</td>
<td>- Staff training hours</td>
<td>- Staff training hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cost effectiveness</td>
<td>- Staff training hours</td>
<td>- Cost effectiveness</td>
<td>- Cost effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td><strong>Housing</strong></td>
<td><strong>Community Learning Centre</strong></td>
<td><strong>Community support team</strong></td>
<td><strong>Back at the Ranch (BatR)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Indices</td>
<td>- Indices</td>
<td>- Indices</td>
<td>- Indices</td>
<td>- Indices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Decreased support cost</td>
<td>- Decreased support cost</td>
<td>- Completion of courses</td>
<td>- Work and training uptake</td>
<td>- Decreased support cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process Evaluation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Housing</strong></td>
<td><strong>Community Learning Centre</strong></td>
<td><strong>Community support team</strong></td>
<td><strong>Back at the Ranch (BatR)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Service User Involvement Index (SUII)</td>
<td>- Service User Involvement Index (SUII)</td>
<td>- Service User Involvement Index (SUII)</td>
<td>- Service User Involvement Index (SUII)</td>
<td>- Service User Involvement Index (SUII)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff review</td>
<td>- Staff review</td>
<td>- Staff review</td>
<td>- Staff review</td>
<td>- Staff review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff development plans</td>
<td>- Staff development plans</td>
<td>- Staff development plans</td>
<td>- Staff development plans</td>
<td>- Staff development plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual questionnaire to partners</td>
<td>- Annual questionnaire to partners</td>
<td>- Annual questionnaire to partners</td>
<td>- Annual questionnaire to partners</td>
<td>- Annual questionnaire to partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utility</strong></td>
<td><strong>Housing</strong></td>
<td><strong>Community Learning Centre</strong></td>
<td><strong>Community support team</strong></td>
<td><strong>Back at the Ranch (BatR)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improvement in results from inspections (e.g. supporting people)</td>
<td>- Improvement in results from inspections (e.g. supporting people)</td>
<td>- Improvement in results from</td>
<td>- Improvement in results from inspections (e.g. supporting people)</td>
<td>- Improvement in results from inspections (e.g. supporting people)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff training level</td>
<td>inspections (e.g. supporting people)</td>
<td>Staff training level</td>
<td>Staff training level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ratio of users (disabled: non-disabled)</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Staff training level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Staff training level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability and Social Acceptance</strong></td>
<td><strong>Housing</strong></td>
<td><strong>Community Learning Centre</strong></td>
<td><strong>Community support team</strong></td>
<td><strong>Back at the Ranch (BatR)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Financial (through accounts) and savings to other organisations</td>
<td>- Financial (through accounts)</td>
<td>- Financial (through accounts)</td>
<td>- Financial (through accounts)</td>
<td>- Financial (through accounts) and savings to other organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improved client expectations</td>
<td>- Improved client expectations</td>
<td>- Improved client expectations</td>
<td>- Improved client expectations</td>
<td>- Improved client expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improved stakeholder engagement</td>
<td>- Improved stakeholder engagement</td>
<td>- Improved stakeholder engagement</td>
<td>- Improved stakeholder engagement</td>
<td>- Improved stakeholder engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Better staff recruited</td>
<td>- Better staff recruited</td>
<td>- More inclusive community</td>
<td>- More inclusive community</td>
<td>- More inclusive community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Better working opportunities for clients</td>
<td>- Better working opportunities for clients</td>
<td>- Community use of CLC</td>
<td>- Community use of CLC</td>
<td>- Community use of CLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability and Social Acceptance</strong></td>
<td><strong>Housing</strong></td>
<td><strong>Community Learning Centre</strong></td>
<td><strong>Community support team</strong></td>
<td><strong>Back at the Ranch (BatR)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Financial (through accounts) and savings to other organisations</td>
<td>- Financial (through accounts)</td>
<td>- Financial (through accounts)</td>
<td>- Financial (through accounts)</td>
<td>- Financial (through accounts) and savings to other organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improved client expectations</td>
<td>- Improved client expectations</td>
<td>- Improved client expectations</td>
<td>- Improved client expectations</td>
<td>- Improved client expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improved stakeholder engagement</td>
<td>- Improved stakeholder engagement</td>
<td>- Improved stakeholder engagement</td>
<td>- Improved stakeholder engagement</td>
<td>- Improved stakeholder engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Better staff recruited</td>
<td>- Better staff recruited</td>
<td>- Better staff recruited</td>
<td>- Better staff recruited</td>
<td>- Better staff recruited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Better working opportunities for clients</td>
<td>- Better working opportunities for clients</td>
<td>- Better working opportunities</td>
<td>- Better working opportunities</td>
<td>- Better working opportunities for clients</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 6. Potential PIs for FfL as a whole

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PI</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Qualitative (Ql) or Quantitative (Qn)</th>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Relevance**                                                      | • Documenting fit between FfL and policy – taken from Trustee reports, Strategic Management Group reports | • Evidence of fit from management documents and reporting | • Ql  
• Difficult to assess objectively  |
| **Efficiency**                                                     | • Financial  
• Demonstrating staff support  
• Demonstrating QA | • Taken from accounts (profit/loss)  
• Built into staff review  
• Measured through the quality assurance frameworks in place for assessments | • Qn  
• Qn  
• Qn  
• Ql  
• Ql  
• Incontestable  
• Could be gamed by staff  
• Already set up for external assessments |
| **Effectiveness**                                                  | • Indices  
• Decreased support cost | • Changes to the indices  
• Support costs of individual | • Ql/Qn  
• Qn  
• Difficult to attribute numbers to qualitative data  
• Does not take into account any deterioration of condition |
| **Process Evaluation**                                             | • Service User Involvement Index (SUII)  
• Staff review  
• Staff development plans  
• Annual questionnaire to partners | • Changes to index  
• 360 degree review procedure  
• Identification of goals achieved  
• Coding of satisfaction data | • Ql  
• Ql  
• Ql  
• Ql  
• Difficult to attribute numbers to qualitative data  
• Can be time consuming  
• Build into management system  
• Could lead to gaming by partners |
| **Utility**                                                        | • Improvement in results from inspections (e.g. supporting people) | • Results of external inspections | • Ql/Qn  
• Might not be entirely attributable to FfL |
| **Sustainability and Social Acceptance**                           | • Financial (through accounts) and other savings  
• Improved client expectations  
• Improved stakeholder engagement  
• Better staff recruited  
• Better working opportunities for clients | • Taken from accounts and other savings data  
• Annual survey of life expectations; requests to move to more independent living arrangements  
• Partner survey and community survey  
• Quality of applicants for jobs  
• Breadth of working opportunities offered to clients | • Qn  
• Qn  
• Ql  
• Ql or Qn  
• Qn  
• Incontestable  
• Difficult to compare across years  
• How to survey community – Can use CLC but may not provide a representative sample  
• Measuring quality  
• How to measure breadth – numbers of companies or job types? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PI</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Qualitative (Ql) or Quantitative (Qn)</th>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>Documenting fit between FfL and policy – taken from Trustee reports, Strategic Management Group reports</td>
<td>Evidence of fit from management documents and reporting</td>
<td>Ql</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Requests for housing</td>
<td>Number of requests</td>
<td>Qn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Numbers in housing</td>
<td>Numbers in housing</td>
<td>Qn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff training hours</td>
<td>Number of hours training</td>
<td>Qn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Return on financial investment</td>
<td>Potential for SROI</td>
<td>Qn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Indices</td>
<td>Changes to the indices</td>
<td>Ql/Qn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decreased support cost</td>
<td>Support costs of individual (support plans)</td>
<td>Qn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Evaluation</td>
<td>Service User Involvement Index (SUII)</td>
<td>Changes to index</td>
<td>Ql</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff review</td>
<td>360 degree review procedure</td>
<td>Ql</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff development plans</td>
<td>Identification of goals achieved</td>
<td>Ql</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual questionnaire to partners</td>
<td>Coding of satisfaction data</td>
<td>Ql</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>Improvement in results from inspections (e.g. supporting people)</td>
<td>Results of external inspections (e.g. Housing Corporation satisfaction survey)</td>
<td>Ql/Qn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff training level</td>
<td>Level of achievement</td>
<td>Qn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability and Social Acceptance</td>
<td>Financial (through accounts)</td>
<td>Taken from accounts</td>
<td>Qn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved client expectations</td>
<td>Annual survey of life expectations; requests to move to more independent living arrangements</td>
<td>Ql: Qn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved stakeholder engagement</td>
<td>Partner survey and community survey</td>
<td>Ql</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sale of private housing</td>
<td>Sale values of private housing compared to valuations</td>
<td>Qn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8. Potential PIs for FfL community learning centre (CLC) stream

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PI</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Qualitative (Ql) or Quantitative (Qn)</th>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>• Documenting fit between FfL and policy – taken from Trustee reports, Strategic Management Group reports</td>
<td>• Evidence of fit from management documents and reporting</td>
<td>• Ql</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>• Use of CLC</td>
<td>• Numbers using CLC</td>
<td>• Qn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Take up of courses</td>
<td>• Room bookings</td>
<td>• Qn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cost per course per person</td>
<td>• Numbers on courses</td>
<td>• Qn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Staff training hours</td>
<td>• Cost of courses</td>
<td>• Qn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cost effectiveness</td>
<td>• Number of hours training</td>
<td>• Qn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Potential for SROI</td>
<td>• Qn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>• Indices</td>
<td>• Changes to the indices</td>
<td>• Ql/Qn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Retention on courses</td>
<td>• % retained on courses</td>
<td>• Qn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Achievement on courses</td>
<td>• Levels of achievement</td>
<td>• Qn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Courses meeting need</td>
<td>• Needs assessment of community and client group and then % of courses meeting need</td>
<td>• Qn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Evaluation</td>
<td>• Service User Involvement Index (SUII)</td>
<td>• Changes to index</td>
<td>• Ql</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Staff review</td>
<td>• 360 degree review procedure</td>
<td>• Ql</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Staff development plans</td>
<td>• Identification of goals achieved</td>
<td>• Ql</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Annual questionnaire to partners</td>
<td>• Coding of satisfaction data</td>
<td>• Ql</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>• Improvement in results from inspections (e.g. Adult Learning Inspectorate)</td>
<td>• Results of external inspections</td>
<td>• Ql/Qn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Inclusivity of learning</td>
<td>(e.g. Adult Learning Inspectorate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Staff training level</td>
<td>• Ratio of users (disabled: non-disabled)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Level of achievement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability and Social Acceptance</td>
<td>• Financial (through accounts)</td>
<td>• Taken from accounts</td>
<td>• Qn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved client expectations</td>
<td>• Annual survey of life expectations; requests to move to more independent living arrangements</td>
<td>• Qn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ql: Qn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved stakeholder engagement</td>
<td>• Partner survey and community survey</td>
<td>• Ql</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• More inclusive community</td>
<td>• Community survey</td>
<td>• Ql</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Community use of CLC</td>
<td>• Hours booked by community groups</td>
<td>• Qn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Qualitative (QI) or Quantitative (Qn)</td>
<td>Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>• Documenting fit between FfL and policy – taken from Trustee reports, Strategic Management Group reports etc...</td>
<td>• Evidence of fit from management documents and reporting</td>
<td>• QI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Efficiency | • Use of CST through contact with clients  
• Staff training hours  
• Cost effectiveness | • Numbers using CST  
• Number of hours training  
• Potential for SROI | • Qn  
• Qn  
• Qn | | |
| Effectiveness | • Indices  
• Work and training uptake | • Changes to the indices  
• Places taken up by clients | • QI/Qn  
• Qn | | |
| Process Evaluation | Service User Involvement Index (SUII)  
• Staff review  
• Staff development plans  
• Annual questionnaire to partners | • Changes to index  
• 360 degree review procedure  
• Identification of goals achieved  
• Coding of satisfaction data | • QI  
• QI  
• QI  
• QI | | |
| Utility | • Improvement in results from inspections  
• Staff training level | • Results of external inspections  
• Level of achievement | • QI/Qn  
• Qn | | |
| Sustainability and Social Acceptance | • Financial (through accounts)  
• Improved client expectations  
• Improved stakeholder engagement  
• More inclusive community | • Taken from accounts  
• Annual survey of life expectations; requests to move to more independent living arrangements  
• Partner survey and community survey  
• Community survey | • Qn  
• QI: Qn  
• QI  
• QI | | |
## Table 10. Potential PIs for FfL “Back at the Ranch” (BatR) stream

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PI</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Qualitative (Ql) or Quantitative (Qn)</th>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td>• Documenting fit between FfL and policy – taken from Trustee reports, Strategic Management Group reports</td>
<td>• Evidence of fit from management documents and reporting</td>
<td>• Ql</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Efficiency** | • Requests for services  
  • Numbers in services  
  • Staff training hours  
  • Cost effectiveness | • Number of requests (housing and progression)  
  • Number in services (housing and progression)  
  • Number of hours training  
  • Potential for SROI | • Qn  
  • Qn  
  • Qn  
  • Qn | • Good measure  
  • Good measure  
  • Gaming - irrelevant training  
  • Difficult to assess – may be better on biannual basis |
| **Effectiveness** | • Indices  
  • Decreased support cost | • Changes to the indices  
  • Support costs of individual | • Ql/Qn  
  • Qn | • Difficult to attribute numbers to qualitative data  
  • Does not take into account any deterioration of condition |
| **Process Evaluation** | • Service User Involvement Index  
  • Staff review  
  • Staff development plans  
  • Annual questionnaire to partners | • Changes to index  
  • 360 degree review procedure  
  • Identification of goals achieved  
  • Coding of satisfaction data | • Ql  
  • Ql  
  • Ql  
  • Ql | • Attributing numbers to data  
  • Can be time consuming  
  • Build into management system  
  • Could lead to gaming by partners |
| **Utility** | • Improvement in results from inspections (e.g. supporting people)  
  • Staff training level | • Results of external inspections  
  • Level of achievement | • Ql/Qn  
  • Qn | • Good measure  
  • Good measure |
| **Sustainability and Social Acceptance** | • Financial (through accounts) and savings to other organisations  
  • Improved client expectations  
  • Improved stakeholder engagement  
  • Better staff recruited  
  • Better working opportunities for clients | • Taken from accounts and other savings data  
  • Annual survey of life expectations; requests to move to more independent living arrangements  
  • Partner survey and community survey  
  • Quality of applicants for jobs  
  • Breadth of working opportunities offered to clients | • Qn  
  • Ql: Qn  
  • Ql  
  • Ql or Qn  
  • Qn | • Incontestable  
  • Difficult to compare across years  
  • How to survey community  
  • Measuring quality  
  • How to measure breadth – numbers of companies or job types |
3.7 Discussion of PIs

Several of the PIs are self-explanatory, in particular those that are more quantitative. The following section contains clarifying notes on qualitative indicators addressing the impact of FfL on the wider community. Section 3.8 explains the indices that are mentioned in Tables 5-10. These indices allow identification of the learning opportunities available to evaluate FfL.

3.7.1 PIs for the community

There are three ways we suggest to address the impact of FfL on the community. Probably the most effective method is to directly survey the community for its views on disability, independent living and inclusive community and learning. Although this is more data for the Trust to collect, it can provide valuable information on the views of the community. It could be collected by surveying people attending the community learning centre, although this may bias the sample toward those already involved in inclusive learning. One way to avoid this bias is to survey community groups using the centre, as these groups may or may not have direct contact with disability issues.

The Trust could also use the views and opinions of their clients living in Huntingdon to understand how the community has reacted and how attitudes have changed through the lifetime of the project. However, these are difficult to attribute to just FfL, as compounding factors will play a part in the attitudes of the community towards disability. This is measured within the community accessibility index in section 3.8.3.

There are also quantitative measures that relate to community attitude. These might include uptake of community learning centre facilities and the selling of private flats in the Hartford Road location. The drawback to these quantitative measures is that they miss the changing views of the community on disability. Indeed, they may not reflect community opinions on disability, but opinions on learning and housing opportunities within Huntingdon.

3.8 Indices identifying learning opportunities

We recommend surveying clients on an annual basis using a questionnaire designed to address the independence of Papworth Trust clients; their say in the organisation of FfL; and their views of service and community accessibility. This will help the Trust understand the qualitative outcomes for clients involved in FfL. The main issue with the use of indices is identifying suitable numeric values to assign to people’s views. Although this is not always easy, it is a common issue addressed in social science surveying and can be addressed with the use of Likert-type scales. Using these indices early in the evaluation process establishes a base value that FfL can work to improve for each client.

59 Likert-type scales are rating scales used to assess subjective reactions to a system, involving a statement followed by a judgement of strong to moderate agreement or disagreement. They allow coding of qualitative data to produce composite and comparable measures (cf http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/scallik.htm for more details on Likert scoring).
3.8.1 **Independent Living Skills Index (ILSI)**

The proposed ILSI would cover aspects of independence considered important by the clients of the Papworth Trust, the Disability Rights Commission, and also relevant necessities of life.\(^{60}\) The different axes in the index are scored using Likert-type scales that measure satisfaction with one’s own abilities. These are plotted to give a visual representation of each person’s views on how independent they feel. Indices allow identification of specific areas of independent living that either work well for clients or within which FiL could enhance people’s opportunities. Table 11 shows indicators in different axes and how data on those indicators might be collected. Figure 9 shows an example representation of how one person’s index might look. By overlaying the indices of multiple tenants, the Trust can identify areas of independent living that are more frequently either positive or negative for clients. The Trust can also identify person centred solutions to problems experienced by clients, since ILSI will contain data on where individual clients feel they are having most problems with independent living.

**Table 11. ILSI axes, indicators and data collection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Axis</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Potential data collection problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cooking</strong></td>
<td>Able to cook own food when wanted</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Scoring the survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Varied and nutritious diet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Money management</strong></td>
<td>In control of money</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Scoring the survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managing support</strong></td>
<td>Decides what support is needed and when</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Scoring the survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transport and mobility</strong></td>
<td>Can get out to where they want to go</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Scoring the survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cleaning and housework</strong></td>
<td>Is able to clean and look after accommodation</td>
<td>Decrease in support needed from previous assessment</td>
<td>Proxy may not be appropriate, as support needs will reach a limit when the client lives as independently as possible for them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety and security</strong></td>
<td>Is confident of safety and security</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Scoring the survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hobbies</strong></td>
<td>Can perform and maintain hobbies if wanted</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Scoring the survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cleaning oneself</strong></td>
<td>Can clean and look after self</td>
<td>Decrease in support needed from previous assessment</td>
<td>Proxy may not be appropriate, as support needs will reach a limit when the client lives as independently as possible for them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Developing new skills</strong></td>
<td>Is learning new skills</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Scoring the survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8.2 **Social Engagement Index (SEI)**

Social engagement of disabled people involved in FfL is one aspect of independent living that an index of indicators can readily assess. Since increased social engagement can be a product of a more independent lifestyle for disabled people, we feel that it warrants an index separate from the ILSI. As with the ILSI, the SEI can help to identify which areas clients of the Trust are happy with and which they would like to have more control over. As such, the SEI can be a valuable learning tool for identifying the strengths and weaknesses of FfL. Table 12 shows indicators in different axes and how data on those indicators might be collected. Figure 10 shows an example representation of how one person’s SEI might look.

**Table 12. SEI axes, indicators and data collection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Axis</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Potential data collection problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>Shops as often as desired</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Scoring the survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialising out</td>
<td>Socialises out as often as desired</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Scoring the survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialising in</td>
<td>Socialises in as often as desired</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Scoring the survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td>Volunteers as often as wanted</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Scoring the survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>Works as often as wanted</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Scoring the survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Is involved in training when wanted</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Scoring the survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.8.3 Community Accessibility Index (CAI)
In contrast to the ILSI and SEI, the CAI would look at the external factors affecting independent living opportunities for disabled people involved in FfL. Since there are not reliable figures on the accessibility of buildings and public transport, users’ perceptions of accessibility can be used to determine the “knock-on effect” that FfL is having on the wider community. As these are not directly within the sphere of influence of FfL, it is important that the index is not used for auditing the progress of the project; only for learning of its influence. Table 13 shows indicators in different axes and how data on those indicators might be collected. Figure 11 shows an example representation of how one person’s CAI might look.

Table 13. CAI axes, indicators and data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Axis</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Potential data collection problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical accessibility</td>
<td>Can access community buildings when wanted</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Scoring the survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community attitude</td>
<td>Feels that community treats them appropriately</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Scoring the survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport accessibility</td>
<td>Can get to where they want at reasonable cost</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Scoring the survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education accessibility</td>
<td>Can access education at an appropriate level</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Scoring the survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment accessibility</td>
<td>Can access employment opportunities</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Scoring the survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer engagement</td>
<td>Employers know about disability issues</td>
<td>Survey employers</td>
<td>Could be done in association with equal rights group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare access</td>
<td>Can access healthcare when required</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Scoring the survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.8.4 **Service User Involvement Index (SUII)**

Building an index to look at service user involvement in FfL will allow the Trust to understand how users of their services are involved. This could involve users planning their care, support and the level of assistance they need to live independently. The information within this index can be used to identify how well FfL, and the Papworth Trust as a whole, engages their users in decision making. Table 14 shows indicators in different axes and how data on those indicators might be collected. Figure 12 shows an example representation of how one person’s SUII might look.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Axis</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Potential data collection problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complaints</td>
<td>Users understand how to complain and who to</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Scoring the survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support plans</td>
<td>Users involved in deciding appropriate support plans</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Scoring the survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate housing</td>
<td>Users involved in identifying what should be in housing</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Scoring the survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td>Users involved in staff development agenda</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Scoring the survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff development plans</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost of creating plans on staff time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>360 reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td>Can be complicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service provision</td>
<td>Users define the services on offer to them from Papworth</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Scoring the survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community learning centre needs assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Needs assessments are a well established method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say in organisation</td>
<td>FfL follows user need</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Scoring the survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14. SUII axes, indicators and data collection
Figure 12. Example of a potential SUII graphical output
Chapter Summary

Through the data gathering process for the FfL evaluation framework, we identified a number of lessons for the different stakeholder groups involved in FfL. These can be split into lessons for, or involving: clients, staff, management and partner organisations. Client lessons cover engagement, understanding, support and desires for independent living. Staff lessons cover engagement, training and support, and levels of expectation for clients. Management lessons cover project management, strategic planning, partnership working and financial issues. Outputs from FfL that can already be identified include housing in Huntingdon and positive staff attitudes to FfL and identification of new ways of working. The chapter finishes by identifying key facilitators and barriers to the success of FfL.

4.1 Sources of information

The data gathered through the interviews, focus groups and workshops (during the formulation and validation of the logic models) includes lessons for the Trust about the conception of FfL and the emergent issues for running the project. These lessons cover clients, staff and management. We can also identify early outputs from FfL using these data.

4.2 Client lessons

The majority of these lessons come from client interviews, although some come from management interviews and the staff focus group.

4.2.1 Engagement

A large amount of information on the transition to an independent living service provision was made available to Papworth Trust clients. However, this information was not always presented in a way that clients could fully understand. Clients were told in group meetings about the new policies for independent living accommodation in Huntingdon. Because different clients had different abilities to take in information, presenting to a group meant that only a few understood fully what the new policies were and what affect those policies might have on them. In its initial phase, when alternatives to Robert Ellis House were
identified, there was no designated person to manage the issues arising from people moving out of residential accommodation. Later in the process, when people started to move to Huntingdon, the Trust employed a transitions manager. This appointment has greatly improved the transmission of information to clients. The transitions manager has been able to disseminate information on a one-to-one basis; ensuring people understand what is being said. Staff felt that involving tenants’ key workers in the process of disseminating information at the outset of FfL would have been helped clients understand the new policies more completely.

4.2.2 Understanding
The Trust believed that there was a need to simultaneously tell large groups of clients of their intentions to close Robert Ellis House in order to stop rumours spreading of changes happening (the Trust felt that this would cause more problems in understanding what was happening). By addressing the issue in groups, some clients had severe problems understanding what they were being told (see above). There were two ways in which clients had problems understanding the changes being made by the Trust. First, there was confusion over what “independent living” meant, with some clients understanding this to mean that they would need to do everything independently. This misapprehension led to anxiety for some clients who felt that this would mean they received no support. Second, clients were not clear that the potential options open to them when Robert Ellis House was closed were limited: some were under the impression that their choice of where to move was unlimited within the UK.

4.2.3 Support
Clients who have already moved to Huntingdon report good levels of support. Most are satisfied that support is available when they ask for it, rather than permanently in the building. However, there are exceptions, with some clients feeling that they are not receiving sufficient support. Although in some cases, the level of support required might be difficult to predict, the fact that some clients feel they do not have enough support so early in the project either reveals the need for person centred planning or suggests the need to explain more clearly the implications of having limited resources.

4.2.4 Wishes for independent living
Through all of the client interviews, one element was consistently mentioned as important. All clients wanted to be able to access shops more easily, regardless of other differing aspirations for independent living. The next most popular aspirations were to be involved in more paid work or volunteering, and to be able to get out and meet people more often. Whether this is a general issue for disabled people moving to independent living or a factor associated with social isolation issues identified by the Papworth Trust is not possible to tell here since we have no benchmark of other independent living projects.

61 Key workers work closely with disabled people to ensure that relevant support to meet their needs is in place.
4.3 **Staff lessons**

Lessons for the staff were identified by all interviewed (clients and management groups as well as staff themselves).

4.3.1 **Engagement**

Both staff and management raised the issues of the staff engagement in FfL. During the initial stages of FfL, management were concerned about insufficient engagement by staff, since some staff seemed to not be interested in helping FfL progress. Staff themselves were told about the new project in group meetings once management had taken decisions on the direction of the project. Staff felt that they could have been involved earlier within the decision making process. This issue may have been better addressed through inclusion of staff in the scoping phase of FfL.

4.3.2 **Training**

Staff felt that they had little or no formal training in new working methods or how to provide appropriate services for tenants wanting more independent living opportunities. Since the closure of Robert Ellis House was decided in 2000, five years prior to its actual closure, staff felt training needs should have been addressed earlier. Robert Ellis House closing 9 months earlier than planned (due to the small number of tenants in the building) made the training problem worse. However, the early closure may have removed the training window in which the Trust would have provided formal training. Ideally, training would have been put in place prior to the transition process on how to facilitate independent living for tenants. Without formal training, staff identified amongst themselves the best way to support tenants and learned techniques from one another.

4.3.3 **Support**

Staff expressed a desire for more support. This included training (mentioned above) and pastoral support. Staff moved from providing care and support to only support (with personal care outsourced to agency staff) and this meant a change in the relationship between staff and tenants. This change was difficult for some staff members, particularly those who had been used to working within the existing residential care model in which staff helped people do things rather than supporting them to do it themselves. Support in the transition process for staff came mainly from other staff members, and the close nature of the staff team was a key factor in providing this support. Staff would also appreciate support in understanding government policies relevant to independent living.

4.3.4 **Expectations**

Staff themselves admit to being surprised at the levels of independence that have been achieved by a number of clients since moving out of residential accommodation. Clients and management both noted staff’s lower expectations of what tenants would be capable of. These low expectations may be due to the length of time that staff have been involved in residential care, where there has traditionally been a culture of “care for” rather than
“support with”. This ties in with the difficulties that some staff found in managing their support relationship with the client, as staff felt they should be performing certain actions for clients (often at clients’ request).

4.4 Management lessons

Lessons for management, other than those identified above about the clients and staff, came only from the management meetings and the interviews with the outside stakeholders.

4.4.1 Management structure

When the project began, there was no team specifically responsible for running the project. People’s roles in FfL were additional to their everyday role within the Papworth Trust. This led to a tension between people’s workload on the project and their position in the Papworth Trust as a whole. With a large project such as FfL, it may be better to identify a team exclusively for the project early on within the life of the project.

4.4.2 Strategic planning

FfL did not have a set strategic plan prior to its inception. There were values within the Papworth Trust that drove its evolution, combined with the policy environment and the availability of funding. The strategy was therefore more about the way the project fed back into the values present at its inception and held in the Trust (see Figure 13).

Figure 13. How values, the policy environment and the financial situation shaped FfL strategy.

Figure 13 shows how the strategic plan for the project evolved with changes to the availability of funding and those values important to the Trust. As the FfL project progressed and new opportunities for funding or partnership arose, these could feed back

into the Trust’s ideas on what FfL would be able to offer. Feedback from the project to the policy environment, was in the form of new opportunities presenting to the Trust (e.g. partnership with Huntingdon Regional College) and the feedback from the charity appeal for funding (which provided an opportunity to create new ideas for the project as more funding became available). Without this ‘structured opportunism’ approach to the project, the chance to purchase land and enter into partnerships manage in the project could have been missed.

4.4.3 Maintaining relationships with stakeholders

FfL is a large project that covers a range of services. Consequently, the Papworth Trust has had to liaise with a variety of different organisations in the process of FfL. From the Trust’s point of view, having a skilled negotiator (their chief executive) facilitated liaising with some organisations. Other organisations, for example the building contractors, have been helped by the expertise in the Trust management team, where the knowledge of experts in wheelchair accessible housing made it easier to communicate ideas and overcome barriers. However, other relationships between the Trust and partner that could have been managed better through maintaining a single point of contact within the two organisations (although this is difficult within organisations in transition), through negotiating a shared understanding of the implications (both positive and negative) for both parties in the partnership, and through clarification of plans and intentions of both sides early on in discussions.

Outside stakeholders interviewed were in agreement that the relationship with the Trust was improved by the creation of a single contact in Trust management. The key barrier mentioned by partner organisations was a lack of early information transfer between the Trust and partners. By identifying strategic planning early with partners, the Trust could ensure greater understanding and a more informed working relationship between organisations. This early identification of strategic plans could be through formalised documentation or informal discussions on the future of the partnership and project.

4.4.4 Financial lessons

By transferring costs from residential care to supported living, the savings for the public purse work out at over £45 thousand for 2005/06. However, this aggregate figure masks winners and losers among Local Authorities. By moving people from residential care to supported living, the costs associated with each person shift from their commissioning area to the area in which they will be living. Therefore, although the costs associated with each individual are reduced by the move to independent living, the costs for a local council could in fact increase. In the case of clients moving out of the residential home in Papworth Everard (Robert Ellis House), of the ten out-of-county residents, seven will become the responsibility of Cambridgeshire County Council, transferring their (admittedly decreased) costs to Cambridgeshire, giving the County Council a greater total

---

63 Figures calculated by the Papworth Trust using a costs-savings analysis, based on the cost of residential care and the predicted support costs of residents in supported housing.

64 A person’s commissioning area is the County Council that commissions and pays for their care and support. This is usually the home county council of the person, but may not necessarily be the same county in which they receive their care and support.
sum to finance. This could potentially be a disincentive to local authorities supporting independent living.

4.5 **Outputs from FfL**

There are a number of identifiable outputs at this stage of FfL. The first of the new housing developments in Huntingdon is complete and conforms to the standards required for fully wheelchair accessible housing. The building work on the community learning centre and the second housing development is also nearly complete. The next tenants are due to move to Huntingdon in July 2006 and the CLC due to open in September 2006. The final housing development is due to be completed before the end of the year, with the final wave of tenants moving in by December 2006. The development and ownership of real estate alone is a considerable infrastructure output.

Staff strongly held the view that they were learning new ways to work. However, at the time of our focus group with the staff their had been no official training, so staff had not gained qualifications in supporting people (such as the NVQs available in Health and Social Care) that could be considered quantitative outputs.

4.6 **Key success drivers within FfL.**

- The team spirit of the staff after the closure of Robert Ellis House helped provide learning and support for staff involved in the transition to FfL.
- The emergent nature of the project as a whole has meant that new opportunities could be taken up when they arose.
- Papworth Trust expertise has helped facilitate partnership working in FfL. For example, Papworth’s experience of building housing for disabled people meant that their partnership with the housing developer was easier to manage.
- The timing of the project was a major facilitator: key partnerships, development opportunities and the policy landscape in which FfL could thrive, were all available during the time scale of the project.
- The availability of negotiating skills in the Papworth Trust helped relationships and enabled robust but negotiated new service contracts to be established with partner organisations and potential funders, despite a changing commissioning context.
- Management, staff and clients acknowledged the introduction of a transitions manager into the FfL project facilitated success. Having a point of contact for all three stakeholder groups in the organisation meant that information could flow more freely and people knew where to access information if they needed it.
4.7 **Key Barriers to FfL**

- Strategic partnership with some organisations was a barrier. There were issues of ownership of the project and disagreements over costs: this led to delays causing problems elsewhere in the project.

- There were also issues with partner organisations over the flow of information early on in the partnership. The emergent nature of FfL made it difficult for the Papworth Trust to identify exactly how the project and partnership might affect both partner organisations.

- There was no original budget for the transition process. Instead, this was funded through reallocation of money from different funding streams.

- Staff’s original scepticism of clients’ capability of to live independently may have acted as a barrier to FfL. This was for two reasons. First, some clients moving to Huntingdon were influenced to think that they might not be able to live independently. Second, some clients not moving to Huntingdon believe that it might be beyond them to live independently with appropriate support. This belief may be correct or incorrect, but since some staff members were not confident of clients’ abilities to live independently, some clients took staff’s opinion to mean that they would not cope in supported housing.

- There may still be issues with the second and third waves of Papworth Trust clients moving to Huntingdon. As originally envisaged, the project would have seen most residents of REH move to Huntingdon. This plan has changed for a number of reasons (see Figure 1 for details), and there are still clients who have not yet made a firm decision to move to Huntingdon. Making sure that these clients are confident about moving to Huntingdon could considerably improve the success of FfL.
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Appendix A: Glossary of terms

Balanced scorecard
An integrated framework for describing strategy through the use of linked performance measures in four, balanced perspectives - Financial, Customer, Internal Process, and Employee Learning and Growth.

Community Accessibility Index (CAI)
Summarises the level of community accessibility individuals within FfL feel they have.

Community Learning Centre (CLC)
The new centre in Huntingdon that will offer courses to both disabled and non-disabled people ranging from independent living training to IT courses.

Community Services Team (CST)
Papworth Trust employees based within the Community Learning Centre who will offer independent living advice to disabled people, as well as information about disability to the community.

Evaluation framework
An evaluation framework specifies various details of an evaluation process such as objectives, evaluation criteria and performance indicators.

Foundations for Living (FfL)
The independent living project run by the Papworth Trust which allows disabled people to move into town centre flats and incorporates a multidisciplinary community learning centre.

Huntingdon
The town in which the Foundations for Living project is based.

Inclusive learning
Inclusive learning addresses the educational needs of all learners in a non-threatening, supportive learning environment, this includes learners who are formally disadvantaged and excluded from education because of barriers to learning.

Independent living
The ability to make autonomous decisions; this does not mean living without support.

Independent Living Skills Index (ILSI)
Summarises the level of independence experienced by individuals within FfL.

Index
A way to summarise a set of characteristics in a graphical form. Indices allow a spread of data to be collected and compared across...
individuals and years

**Logic model**  
A roadmap or a diagram showing the chain of results connecting activities to the expected initial outputs, and to intermediate and final outcomes. It provides a basis for developing the performance measurement and evaluation strategies.

**Monetisation of social capital**  
Often done through SROI (Social Return On Investment) and is a means to express the value of social interventions

**Papworth Everard**  
The village in which the Papworth Trust is based, housing many of the tenants of the Trust

**Papworth Trust**  
The disability charity that runs Foundations for Living

**Performance Indicator (PI)**  
An indicator that provides information (either qualitative or quantitative) on the extent to which a policy, programme or initiative is achieving its outcomes.

**Person Centred Planning**  
Identifying the needs of a specific individual prior to the creation of appropriate policies for fulfilling those needs and desires

**Ripple Effect**  
The movement of the effects of an intervention from direct to indirect influence; used in performance evaluation systems

**Service User Involvement Index (SUII)**  
Summarises the level of involvement users feel they have in the running and management of FfL (this includes staff training, housing and education opportunities)

**Social Capital (Putnam R. D., 2000)**  
The collective value of all social networks and the inclinations that arise from these networks to do things for each other

**Social Engagement Index (SEI)**  
Summarises the extent of social networks and level of socialising individuals within FfL experience
Appendix B: Interview protocols

B1. Skeleton interview protocol for Papworth Trust clients

Confidentiality arrangements – *Any comments made will not be attributable to a single person, there will be anonymity of views. Recording of interviews in note form is for RAND Europe use only.*

Voluntary interview – *you are not obliged to answer questions*

**What is your experience of current situation in Papworth Everard?**

Housing

Community (including the attitudes shown by others towards them)

Skills and work (may include money - income)

Support and Autonomy (may include money – expenditure)

**How did you make the decision to move (or not move)?**

**What are your hopes and expectations of your new home?**

Housing

Community (including the attitudes shown by others towards them)

Skills and work (may include money - income)

Support and Autonomy (may include money – expenditure)

**What will be particularly good about it?**

These may include things such as access to shops, bars, cinemas, ability to work, access to training and education, opportunities to make new friends, etc…

B2. Interview protocols for management

Outline of Project

Explanation of RAND’s role

Confidentiality arrangements – *Any comments made will not be attributable to a single person, there will be anonymity of views. Recording of interviews in note form is for RAND Europe use only.*
Voluntary interview –you are not obliged to answer questions
What is your role within the Papworth Trust?
How does your role fit with FfL?
How has FfL evolved in your opinion?
What specific challenges do you face through FfL?
What would constitute success for FfL – in the short term (1-2 years)? In the long term (4-5 years)?

B3. Skeleton interview protocol for Papworth Trust partner organisations

Outline of Project
Explanation of RAND’s role
Confidentiality arrangements – Any comments made will not be attributable to a single person, there will be anonymity of views. Recording of interviews in note form is for RAND Europe use only.
Voluntary interview –you are not obliged to answer questions
What is your role within your organisation?
Describe how your organization relates to the work of the Trust and FfL.
How did you first find out about Foundations for Living? Was it clear what its purposes and processes were? Describe how you first started to contribute to FfL.
How has FfL impacted on your organization’s current work and how does your organisation contribute to the aims of FfL?
How is the relationship managed and have you felt that you have had any influence on FfL?
What do you expect to be the implications of FfL for your organization in the next 1-2 years? And in the longer term (3-5 years)?

Next steps in report production

B4. Staff focus group structure

Outline of Project
Explanation of RAND’s role
Confidentiality arrangements – Any comments made will not be attributable to a single person, there will be anonymity of views. Recording of focus group is for RAND Europe use only.
Voluntary participation –you are not obliged to partake in discussions
Get participants to individually note down 3-5 “Indicators of success” for FfL.
Discussion over what the problem was that FfL was created to solve
Discussion about the process itself
How did staff support clients in decision making over moving accommodation?
How were staff supported and engaged throughout the process?
How staff members were informed
Redeployment (the care and support split)
Training
Opportunities to give feedback to management and feel it was taken seriously
How has the transition affected “back at the ranch” issues? How will it affect them in the future?
Go back to indicators of success - group discussion on suitability of indicators
Appendix C: List of interviewees

C1. Clients
Ken Burn
Nina Cawthorn
Stephen Drane
Clare Durrant
Trevor Evans
Kevin Garley
Tracy Haines
Neville Hunting
Leila Khawam
Brian Milan
Andrew Natkanski
Graham Peet
John Sage
Nigel Stone
Fiona Tran
Gary Trusgnach
Annalise White

C2. Staff
MacFarlane Grieve House (MGH) support staff:
Moira Dean
Hazel Dickerson
Christine Hayward
Julie Inman
Jayne Jarrett
Peter Rushton

Wood Street support staff (Huntingdon accommodation):
Kath Knights
Yvonne Simpson

Transitions staff:
Caroline Gough
Natasha Gunn

Other staff:
Lucy Bolden (Project Worker)
Tony Darnell (Progression Outreach Team)
Pauline Venables (Independent Living Advisor)
Heather Wood (Community Services Manager)

C3. Management
Brian Calvert (Service User Involvement Team)
Alan Carter (Director of Housing and Care)
Sarah Coward (Director of Development)
Julian Garner (Director of Marketing and Communications)
Caroline Gough (Head of Transition)
Paul Hawkins (Service User Involvement Team)
Yvonne Pinchen (Head of Community Services Development)
Jeff Skip (Director of Care and Progression)

C4. Partner organisations
Hill Partnership (building contractors) - Andy Hill
Huntingdon Town Centre Partnership - Emma Thornton
Hunts District Council - planning dept - Malcolm Sharp
Social Services - Area Manager for Huntingdonshire - Derrick Biggs
Supporting People Team - Melanie Gray