



TIME TO SHINE LOCAL EVALUATION Report 2

METHODS

Produced for Leeds Older People's Forum

PREPARED BY:

Dr Charlene Martin
Dr Ruth Naughton-Doe
Dr Andrea Wigfield
Dr Anna Leyland

The Centre for Loneliness Studies
The University of Sheffield
June 2022

Leeds
Older
People's
Forum



Time to
Shine





Contents

	01 Introduction
05	- About Time to Shine
06	- The purposes of this evaluation
06	- Co-production – the value driving the programme and evaluation
07	- The impact of COVID-19
07	- Summary
	02 The Evaluation Framework: Research Design
08	- What is an evaluation?
09	- Evaluation design
10	- Evaluation governance – co-production of research design
10	- Involving older people as co-researchers
	03 Data Collection: Research Methods
12	- Routinely collected monitoring data
12	- Time to Shine evaluation questionnaire
15	- Stakeholder interviews
16	- Beneficiary interviews
17	- Focus groups
19	- Case studies
20	- Volunteer Listeners project
20	- Additional Methods
	04 Data Analysis
21	- CMF evaluation questionnaire
22	-Output data
23	-Outcome data
24	- Interviews, focus groups and semi-structured interviews
25	-Related reports
25	-Previous Publications

Anything inside quotation marks written in italics”	These are direct quotes from beneficiaries, written as they were spoken by the individual.
...	Three dots indicate that some of the quotation has been deleted by the researcher. This may be because this section was not relevant to the overall quote or to reduce the length of the quotation.
[]	Anything written in square brackets has been added by the research team to help make the quote more understandable. It may also replace some of the beneficiaries' quotes that may have made it easier to identify the person speaking.

Acknowledgements

The authors of this report would like to thank:

Lisa Fearn, Hillary Wadsworth, the Time to Shine Core Partnership and Leeds Older People’s Forum. Louise Warwick-Booth of Leeds Beckett University. Rosie Connell of Leeds Trinity University. Sarah Alden and Ruth Naughton-Doe who carried out research for earlier parts of the evaluation, and Louise Whitehead who studied co-production. Richard Dowsett of the National Lottery Community Fund. TTS trustee - Jean Townsend, the evaluation sub-group, the peer researchers, volunteer listeners, beneficiaries and volunteers of Time to Shine (including local delivery partners and stakeholders) who have given up their time to participate in the research.



A quick guide to the language used at Time to Shine

Ageing Better (AB)

The National Lottery Community Fund's national grant programme which funds Time to Shine until 2022. The full title of the programme is 'Fulfilling Lives: Ageing Better'. 14 'Ageing Better' programmes were funded in England, including TTS in Leeds.

Beneficiary

An overarching term for individuals who engaged with a Time to Shine project on at least one occasion.

Delivery partner

An organisation commissioned to deliver activities or services as part of TTS. Delivery partners were commissioned by Leeds Older People's Forum (LOPF).

Participant

A beneficiary aged 50+ who has engaged on three or more occasions with a TTS delivery partner project (for example joining in activities or receiving services).

Quarterly monitoring

A quarterly cycle used to collect qualitative and quantitative data from Delivery Partners to chart progress towards the Time to Shine targets and so that learning and case studies were captured regularly throughout the programme. Partner payments were only released when satisfactory monitoring returns were received.

Test and Learn questions

A set of questions created by members of the TTS team and Core Partnership to articulate what they would like to learn through the programme.

TTS outcomes

A list of 4 strategic outcomes that TTS worked towards. These are:

- 1 - Beneficiaries report that they are less isolated as a result of a programme intervention.
- 2 - Programme beneficiaries feel confident and able to participate in their communities
- 3 - Older people have been actively involved in managing, designing, delivering and evaluating the programme
- 4 - Our wider partnership will expand each year and will work better together to coordinate services and support for isolated older people.

Common Measurement Framework (CMF) evaluation questionnaire

The way in which the AB programme overall and TTS gathered information from older people involved in Delivery Partner projects.

Volunteer

A person who engaged on three or more occasions with a TTS project to give up their time to support any type of TTS activity. For monitoring purposes volunteers were categorised as either aged 50+ or younger.

The Time to Shine (TTS) programme, led by Leeds Older People's Forum (LOPF), aimed to reduce isolation and loneliness for older people (50+) living in Leeds between 2015-2021¹. TTS was funded by the National Lottery Community Fund as part of the Fulfilling Lives: Ageing Better programme (AB)², which invested £80 million across 14 local authorities in England to reduce loneliness for older people and share good practice. The TTS programme worked in partnership with local organisations to commission, design, deliver and evaluate a range of activities, including campaigns and specific interventions³. As part of the TTS programme a suite of ten evaluation reports have been published by the evaluation team at the Centre for Loneliness Studies based in the University of Sheffield⁴. An overview of the ten reports is presented in **Report 1 TTS Evaluation Executive Summary**. This report is **Report 2** in this suite of reports.

The four main objectives of the Time to Shine programme were used to design the evaluation:

1. Each year beneficiaries report that they are less isolated as a result of a project intervention
2. Project beneficiaries feel confident and able to participate in their communities by 2021
3. Older people have been actively involved in managing, designing, delivering and evaluating the project
4. The wider partnership will expand each year and will work better together to coordinate services and support for isolated older people

There is very little evidence of what works when tackling loneliness and social isolation⁵. Consequently, one of the objectives of TTS was to generate new knowledge about what works so that evidence-informed approaches can be applied by TTS and others in the future.

¹ As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic the TTS programme continued to operate beyond the original funded period; however, the evaluation reports were prepared at the end of the initial funded period in 2021.

² For more details see <https://www.ageing-better.org.uk/blogs/ageing-better-big-lottery-fund-story-so-far>

³ Details of all TTS projects can be found at www.opforum.org.uk/projects-and-campaigns/time-to-shine/time-to-shine-projects

⁴ For more details see <https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/socstudies/research/centres-and-networks/centre-loneliness-studies>

⁵ Courtin, E., & Knapp, M. (2017). Social isolation, loneliness and health in old age: a scoping review. *Health & social care in the community*, 25(3), 799-812.

1.1. The purposes of this evaluation

Evaluations explore how successful a programme has been in meeting its objectives and help to identify lessons to improve practice. Evaluation was an integral part of the **Fulfilling Lives: Ageing Better programme** as it aimed to increase our knowledge about what works to tackle isolation and loneliness for older people. All the Ageing Better programmes, including Time to Shine, committed to collecting routine monitoring information for a national evaluation, including a before and after questionnaire called the Common Measurement Framework (CMF). The CMF measured impacts for beneficiaries in order to evaluate the programme's effectiveness. A **'Test and Learn'** approach was adopted across all programmes; in practice this meant each programme continually reflecting on their progress towards meeting key objectives, and adapting their approach as appropriate. In addition to collecting routine monitoring information, Time to Shine commissioned an external evaluation led by the University of Sheffield in partnership with Leeds Beckett University and Leeds Trinity University.

The evaluators also considered Time to Shine's 21 **'Test and Learn'** questions, which covered a range of areas they were interested in, including legacy, sustainability and partnership working (see [Appendix 1](#)).

1.2. Co-production - the value driving the programme and evaluation

A **co-production** approach was used to design, deliver and evaluate TTS, and this philosophy underpinned the entire Ageing Better programme. Co-production of evaluation emphasises the importance of involving all stakeholders, including programme managers and people who receive services. This meant involving representatives from TTS and also older people as equal partners in the research. An Evaluation subgroup of the TTS Core Partnership was set up to help oversee the research. The Evaluation subgroup comprised members from TTS, Leeds Older People's Forum (LOPF), Leeds City Council, independent members, and researchers from the University of Sheffield. Between three and five subgroup members were older people. In accordance with the values of co-production, some of the research data were also collected by older people themselves, who were trained either as **peer researchers** or **volunteer listeners**. The Core Partnership, subgroups and co-production approach is described in more detail in [Report 3 Process Evaluation](#).

1.4. The impact of COVID-19

The COVID-19 pandemic and subsequent policies of lockdown (March 2020-August 2020 and November 2020-April 2021), including social distancing (March 2020 onwards), affected the delivery of the TTS programme and the local and national evaluations. The partners delivering activities and interventions were particularly affected, as many of the beneficiaries of TTS activities are aged 50+, and considered a higher risk group for COVID-19 related complications. As a consequence, many of Time to Shine's activities were suspended or adapted, and this in turn had an impact on the ability of the evaluation team to collect data. The research team was unable to conduct face-to-face research with beneficiaries or stakeholders, questionnaire data collection was halted, and the team had to work with extra sensitivity. It was important not to ask too much from stakeholders and delivery partners whose priorities were, of course, to their front-line service delivery, which required even more energy and resources during a seismic period of change. The way that we adapted the evaluation in the changing context of a post-COVID-19 world is discussed in **Report 8: The impact of COVID-19 on Time to Shine service delivery and project beneficiaries**.

1.5. Summary

This report first discusses research evaluations generally, and the ways in which evaluations can be used to explore how successful a programme has been in meeting its aims and objectives. We then discuss the **evaluation framework and design**, before summarising the wide range of research methods that were used to gather information and answer specific questions about TTS's **processes, outputs and outcomes**. These methods included the collection of **routine monitoring data**; data collected through completion of the **CMF evaluation questionnaire**; **focus groups** and **interviews**. Finally, this report describes some of the ways in which we analysed the evaluation data to answer the main research questions and find out if TTS had met its aims and objectives.

02

The Evaluation Framework: Research Design

This section first explains the purposes of evaluation before exploring the specific process of the Time to Shine evaluation. It also introduces some key evaluation terms used throughout this report.

2.1. What is an evaluation?

- **Processes** – This is **how** programmes operate, their governance structure, their organisational culture and their values. For example, Time to Shine was informed by a co-production approach which steered key decisions.
- **Outputs** - This refers to what activity a programme **creates**, and how many people are involved. For example, Time to Shine engaged 8,475 older people as beneficiaries, and funded 105 projects.
- **Outcomes** – This refers to the **impacts** a programme has on the lives of the people who participate. Time to Shine was specifically interested in the outcomes of reducing isolation and loneliness.



2.2. Evaluation design

The evaluation was designed to collect data about Time to Shine processes, outputs and outcomes to answer the research objectives. Evaluation research happens in **four distinct stages** (see **Figure 1**), although in practice this process is not linear and evaluations should adapt, reflect and change throughout. For example, this evaluation adapted to the changing priorities of Time to Shine and the COVID-19 pandemic.

Referring to **Figure 1**, the first stage of evaluation is **research design**. This is where the aims and objectives of the research are decided, the research questions to be explored, and the overarching values of the programme are considered. The second stage is **data collection**. This is where different research methods are used to collect information to answer the research questions. The third stage is **analysis**, this is when the information gathered is used to create a story about the programme journey and how it achieved its objectives. In other words, how processes created outputs which led to outcomes. Finally, the evaluation is written up to **share the research findings**.

Figure 1. The cycle of evaluation



2.3. Evaluation governance – co-production of research design

When TTS commissioned the evaluation, they stressed the importance of using a co-produced research design. Traditionally, evaluations involve research ‘experts’ (such as university academics) collecting data about programmes without involving the opinions of staff or service users. Co-production values the expertise of everyone involved, and in this evaluation, representatives from TTS and also older people themselves were involved as equal partners in the research, collaborating with university partners. An Evaluation subgroup of the TTS Core Partnership was set up to help manage the research. The Evaluation subgroup included between three and five older people alongside paid staff from a number of organisations, including LOPF, and the team of University researchers.

2.4. Involving older people as co-researchers

In accordance with the values of co-production, older people were also involved as co-researchers, contributing to the research design and data collection. In addition to providing valuable knowledge and experience, involving older people as co-researchers also contributed towards TTS’s aim of reducing isolation and loneliness and providing meaningful activities for those participating.

A total of 19 older people were trained and supported to become peer researchers, contributing towards the design of research tools, and helping to facilitate focus groups (alongside an experienced researcher). Four training sessions took place in June 2016 and September 2019. At each session, peer researchers were also asked to provide feedback on draft topic guides.

Older people also collected research data through the Volunteer Listeners Project, which was led by David Woodcock (an older member of the Evaluation subgroup) in 2019, with support from a steering group, and senior academics and researchers from the University of Sheffield and Leeds Beckett University. The aim of the **Volunteer Listeners Project** was to capture opinions, feedback and experience using a person-centred approach, where volunteers held conversations with older people involved in TTS activities. The project also aimed to provide a further opportunity for social interaction and meaningful engagement for older people. The Volunteer Listeners project is discussed in more detail in [Section 3](#).

Evaluation research uses a wide range of methods, including interviews, surveys and focus groups, to answer specific questions about processes, outputs and outcomes. The evaluation was designed to collect lots of different types of information which involved using multiple research methods. This section first outlines all of the methods we used to collect information (see **Table 1** for an overview), and then presents details of exactly what method was used to inform different parts of the evaluation.

Table 1. Research methods used to evaluate TTS

Type of data	Who collected it	What data
Routinely collected monitoring data	Quarterly monitoring reports were completed by all delivery partners	-Quarterly monitoring reports from all delivery partners between 2015-2021. -Beneficiary demographics -Case Studies -Test and Learn examples -Quotes from beneficiaries
Common Measurement Framework (CMF) Evaluation Questionnaire	The CMF questionnaire was completed on joining a project, approximately six months later, and where possible, a third time	CMF Evaluation Questionnaire 2015-February 2020 CMF data from all Ageing Better sites 2011 Census data
Interviews with Stakeholders	University of Sheffield researchers	56 interviews with a range of stakeholders including TTS programme team and a range of delivery partners
Beneficiary Interviews	University of Sheffield and Leeds Trinity University researchers	38 interviews between 2016-2020
Focus Groups	University of Sheffield and Leeds Trinity University researchers; TTS Peer Researchers	12 focus groups for project case studies 12 beneficiary experience focus groups
Case Studies	University of Sheffield and Leeds Trinity University researchers	13 project case studies
Volunteer Listeners	Leeds Beckett University	26 conversations captured by 10 volunteer listeners in 2019

3.1. Routinely collected monitoring data

Monitoring data was collected routinely throughout the TTS programme. Time to Shine compiled quarterly information about the projects they commissioned, asking their delivery partners to review how individual projects were progressing with their objectives and which older people they were engaging. Delivery partners were also asked to complete Test and Learn case studies, and these are focused on in [Report 10](#).

According to monitoring data returns, 19,934 people have been involved in the programme overall, including 8,475 older people as beneficiaries. Overall the TTS programme involved 1,240 older volunteers (aged 50+) and 557 younger volunteers as of September 2020.

3.2. Time to Shine evaluation questionnaire

The Common Measurement Framework (CMF), was used by all Ageing Better partners for the purposes of programme wide evaluation. The questionnaire was completed by all consenting participants at entry to a project, then approximately six months later, and if possible, a final questionnaire after a further six months.

The questionnaire recorded demographic information such as age, gender and ethnicity, and also asked questions about known risk factors of isolation and loneliness, including whether the participant lived alone, was a caregiver, or had a longstanding disability or illness. The questionnaire also measured outcomes for respondents. It included two validated measures of loneliness and isolation (**the De Jong Gierveld Loneliness Scale** and the **UCLA Loneliness Scale**), and a widely used measure of well-being (the **Shortened Warwick Edinburgh Mental Well-Being Scale**) (see [Table 2](#) for more details). The CMF also included four questions to measure social isolation; two measures of social contact and two measures of social participation.

Table 2. Measures of loneliness, isolation and well-being

Measure	Details of questions	Significance of responses
<p>De Jong Gierveld Loneliness Scale</p> <p>Measure of social and emotional isolation, and loneliness</p>	<p>Six questions measuring social and emotional isolation, and overall loneliness.</p>	<p>Scale 0-6, where 6 represents the loneliest. A decrease in score shows a reduction in loneliness.</p>
<p>UCLA Loneliness Scale</p> <p>Measure of loneliness</p>	<p>Three questions measuring loneliness as a whole.</p>	<p>Scale 3-9, where 9 represents the loneliest. A decrease in score shows a reduction in loneliness. A score of 6 and above represents people who are lonely.</p>
<p>Measures of Isolation: Social Contact</p>		
Measure	Details of questions	Significance of responses
<p>Social Contact Friends/ Family</p> <p>Social contact with children, family and friends</p>	<p>Not counting the people that you live with, how often do you do any of the following with children, family or friends? (meet up in person, phone (including FaceTime or Skype), email or write, text message).</p>	<p>Scale 0-5, where 5 is the most social contact. The score is calculated from an average of responses to all questions. An increase in score shows an increase in social contact.</p>
<p>Social Contact Local people</p> <p>Contact with non-family and friends / local people</p>	<p>Thinking about the people in your local area, how often do you speak to anyone who isn't a family member. Please include local friends, neighbours, acquaintances, people who come in to help you, people you see if you go out, and so on.</p>	<p>Scale - 0-8, where 8 is the most social contact. An increase in score shows an increase in social contact.</p>

Measures of Isolation: Social Participation		
Measure	Details of questions	Significance of responses
<p>Membership of Social Groups</p> <p>Social participation in clubs, groups, organisations and societies</p>	<p>Are you a member of any clubs, organisations or societies? (political party, trade union, environmental group, tenants group, church or religious organisation, charitable organisation, education, arts or music club, social club, sports class, gym, exercise class, other).</p>	<p>Scale - 0-8, where 8 shows more membership of groups. Each category is scored as 1 if a member, 0 means the respondent is not a member of any group.</p> <p>An increase in the average score shows greater participation in different categories of membership.</p>
<p>Taking Part</p> <p>Taking part in social activities</p>	<p>Compared to other people your age, how often would you say you take part in social activities?</p>	<p>Scale - 0-4, where 0 is much less than most and 4 is much more than most. An increase in score shows greater participation in social activities.</p>
Measure of Well-being		
Measure	Details of questions	Significance of responses
<p>Shortened Warwick Edinburgh Mental Well-Being Scale</p>	<p>Seven questions measuring well-being.</p>	<p>Scale 7-35, where 35 represents the highest well-being. An increase in score represents an increase in well-being.</p>

The CMF Evaluation Questionnaire was intended to run right through to the end of the programme in 2021. However, in March 2020, the Covid-19 pandemic meant that it would be difficult to collect questionnaires, so this was paused. It was also noted that follow-up questionnaires from respondents would not be measuring the impact of TTS, but the impact of the pandemic. For example, questions that measured social contact would be affected by social distancing policies. As a result, the National Lottery Community Fund decided that from March 2020, the whole Ageing Better programme would stop collecting all entry and follow-up questionnaires. Consequently, all data from the CMF evaluation questionnaires collected by Time to Shine is from October 2015 to the end of February 2020.

3.3 Stakeholder interviews

Stakeholders included members of the TTS programme team, Core Partnership, or representatives of project delivery organisations (either staff overseeing the project in a managerial role or staff involved in delivering the project). The main aim of these interviews was to find out how the TTS programme and its partners were organised and managed, and how they delivered the services. A wide range of stakeholders, representing the variety of TTS projects, were interviewed to explore their experiences of developing and setting up the programme and the different delivery strands. The stakeholder interviews were carried out by a university researcher, and lasted around 45-60 minutes. Interviews were held face-to-face, by telephone or video call, and followed a semi-structured topic guide. The interviews were recorded, transcribed and analysed manually, looking for common themes and recurring issues. Responses were kept anonymous and pseudonyms were used.

A total of 56 stakeholders were interviewed (see Table 3). The analysis of stakeholder data is discussed in more detail in Report 3: Process Evaluation.

Table 3. Stakeholder Interviews

Year	Number of interviews	Who interviewed
Nov-Dec 2015	10	3 Core Partnership/TTS programme team 7 TTS delivery partners
Jan-May 2017	14	3 Core Partnership/TTS programme team 11 TTS delivery partners
March-July 2018	11	2 Core Partnership/TTS programme team 9 TTS delivery partners
May-July 2019	10	6 Core Partnership/TTS programme team 4 TTS delivery partners
Aug-Sept 2020	11	6 Core Partnership/TTS programme team 5 TTS delivery partners



3.4. Beneficiary interviews

Time to Shine beneficiaries included service users, volunteers and peer researchers who were involved in TTS projects and activities. The aim of these interviews was to capture in-depth information about the experience of being involved in TTS projects and activities. Views were sought on their motives for involvement, the nature of the activities they engaged in, the impact the activities had, their experiences of loneliness, the opportunities they had for participation in the design and delivery of the activities, any difficulties or barriers to their involvement, and any suggestions for improvement. The beneficiaries were selected to represent a wide range of projects (**Table 4**), and where possible, we tried to recruit participants with a range of demographic characteristics.

Beneficiary interviews were carried out by a university researcher, and lasted around 45-90 minutes. Interviews were held face-to-face, by telephone or video call, and followed a semi-structured topic guide. The interviews were recorded, transcribed and analysed manually, looking for common themes and recurring issues. Responses were kept anonymous and pseudonyms were used. Findings from beneficiary interviews were discussed in a previous beneficiary report (Alden and Wigfield, 2016) and are explored further in **Report 7: The impacts of Time to Shine on project beneficiaries**.

Table 4. Beneficiary interviews

Year	One-to-one Project interviews	Project	
2016	7	Sage; Leeds Community Connect; Lychee Red; Shared Tables; TTS BME Network; Street Links; Walking With Confidence; Young at Arts.	Evaluation of Time to Shine: Year 2 Interim Findings (2017) ⁶
2019	16	Choices; Don't Call Me Old; Sage; Float Your Boat	Final Evaluation Report 5 and Report 7
2020	15	The Great Outdoors; Older People's Forum; Carers Leeds; Bollywood Dance; Wood Squad, TTS Steering Group; TCV; Making a Match	Final Evaluation Report 5 and Report 7

3.5. Focus groups

A focus group is a group discussion where a range of participants are invited to discuss a topic of interest. The focus groups used in this evaluation were designed to explore a specific project (as part of a case study) or broad themes such as ‘meaningful relationships’ and ‘mental health.’ People who had been involved with TTS activities were invited to take part, including both beneficiaries and volunteers. The focus groups facilitated participants to share: their views on the activities they attended; how they became involved with the programme; and any difference this had brought to their lives.

Focus groups were carried out in various locations across Leeds, and followed a topic guide. Peer researchers were trained and supported to facilitate the focus groups alongside an experienced researcher. The focus groups were audio recorded, transcribed and analysed manually for common themes and recurring issues. All focus group participants were provided with a £10 gift voucher as a thank you for taking part. A total of 24 focus groups were held (see **Table 5** and **Table 6**) (including those as part of a case study), and 221 participants took part in these.

Table 5. Focus Groups held with TTS projects as part of a case study

Year	Number of participants	TTS projects represented
2016	28 beneficiaries and volunteers (2 groups)	Cara project; Lychee Red.
2017	26 beneficiaries and volunteers (3 groups)	Shared Tables; Young at Arts; Small Funds.
2018	14 beneficiaries and volunteers (3 groups)	Digital Angels; Sage; Supporting Wellbeing
2019	32 beneficiaries and volunteers (4 groups)	Leeds Community Connect; Small Funds; Shared Tables

⁶ The Year 2 Interim Findings (Wigfield & Alden, 2017) are published on the TTS website and are available through this link:

https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/polopoly_fs/1.750658!/file/Time-to-Shine-Final-Report.pdf

Table 6. Mixed focus groups held with beneficiaries and volunteers from TTS projects

Report (Year of focus group)	Theme/Report (Number or focus groups)	Project	TTS projects represented
TTS Evaluation Interim Report: The Beneficiary Experience (2016)	(4 groups)	65 beneficiaries and volunteers	Sage; Cara Project; Leeds Community Connect; Shared Tables; TTS BME Network; Walk With Me; Walking with Confidence; Young at Arts.
Final Evaluation: Report 5, Report 7 (2019-2020)	Volunteering (1 group)	5 volunteers	LOPF; Carers Connections; The Great Outdoors, Choices
	Meaningful Relationships (1 group)	10 beneficiaries and volunteers	Toast Love Coffee; Choices; Float Your Boat
	Getting Involved and Staying Involved (2 groups)	12 beneficiaries and volunteers	Cross Gates and District Good Neighbours; Bramley Elderly Action; Shared Tables
	Mental Health (2 groups)	13 beneficiaries and volunteers	Toast Love Coffee; Bramley Elderly Action
	Men (2 groups)	16 beneficiaries and volunteers	Connections; Sporting Memories; Float Your Boat

⁷ The TTS Evaluation Interim Report: Beneficiary Experience (Alden & Wigfield, 2016) is available through The University of Sheffield website and through this link:

https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/polopoly_fs/1.667374!/file/TtoS.full.report.pdf



3.5. Case studies

Case studies are stories about one particular aspect of a programme. Thirteen case studies were carried out to explore how the individual projects commissioned by TTS were working and what impacts they had. We used information from stakeholder and beneficiary interviews, focus groups, analysis of survey data and information provided by project staff to build a case study story. A range of different projects were selected each year to represent the diversity of the TTS programme (see [Table 7](#)).

Table 7. Case studies carried out

Year	Number of case studies	Projects captured
2016	2	Cara project; Lychee Red.
2017	3	Shared Tables; Young at Arts; Small Funds.
2018	3	Digital Angels; Sage; Supporting Wellbeing.
2019	3	Leeds Community Connect; Small Funds; Shared Tables.
2020	3	Bee Together; In Mature Company.

Some of the case studies have already been published on the Time to Shine website and can be accessed on the [resources page](#) of the Leeds Older People's Forum website.



3.7. Volunteer Listeners project

The Volunteer Listeners project (Warwick-Booth and Woodcock, 2019) captured informal conversations between project participants (referred to as ‘storytellers’) and ‘Volunteer Listeners,’ who were tasked with listening and capturing the stories. The aim of this project was to **explore experiences of loneliness and outcomes** for participants in TTS. Storytellers were recruited from partnership organisations and their individual stories were written up by a volunteer ‘Storywriter.’ These stories were shared with the evaluation team, and thematic analysis was used to produce the findings. Volunteers were provided with training about the evaluations and the Volunteer Listener approach.

Ten Volunteer Listeners (eight women, two men) went on to visit Time to Shine funded projects and hold conversations with older people. A total of 26 conversations were held between June and November 2019. Projects that Volunteer Listeners attended were: **Don’t Call Me Old, Toast Love Coffee; Choices; Carers Connections; Cara Too; Dancing for Parkinson’s; The Great Outdoors; and Float Your Boat.**

3.8. Additional Methods

The research team were involved in the project from 2015 and also participated in meetings, reviewed policies, explored content on the website and attended the Core Partnership and Evaluation subgroup meetings. The researchers were considered partners in Time to Shine through their co-production model. It is worth noting that the experiences of reading TTS material and taking part in meetings also contributed to an understanding of the programme.



04 Data Analysis

Data analysis is the process of making sense of evaluation data to answer research questions. This section explores how different types of data were analysed and then brought together to answer whether TTS had met the key objectives of the evaluation. This section of the report outlines how we analysed the TTS Evaluation Questionnaire and the Interviews/Focus groups, before building stories for each report.

4.1.1. CMF evaluation questionnaire

Responses from respondents to the CMF were first prepared for analysis. Data was uploaded onto Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) and then the data was cleaned to remove errors. Data was then coded and statistical tests were run to answer questions about outputs and outcomes.



There were two main stages of analysing output data. First, we reviewed the **demographic information** for respondents and analysed whether they were experiencing isolation, loneliness, or reduced well-being. Second, we considered whether **different types of interventions engaged** with different groups of respondents.

This is also the focus of **Report 6: Participation, engagement and outcomes for older people**.

a. Demographic data and isolation, loneliness and well-being data

We were interested in finding out who was joining TTS. Data for respondents who completed questionnaires at baseline (n=1893) was analysed to explore demographic characteristics and whether the respondents were experiencing isolation, loneliness or reduced well-being. It is important to note that not every respondent answered every question, so there may be differences between numbers. Time to Shine scores were compared to Ageing Better and the UK Census 2011 to see how the respondents compared to other programmes and if they were representative of older people in England.

A series of Chi-square statistical tests were then run to see if certain groups were more likely to be experiencing isolation, loneliness, or reduced well-being. If the result was $p = > 0.05$, the result was statistically significant, that means-not likely to have happened by chance and represents a real difference.

Chi Square test for associations - this test shows whether one group was more likely to experience something compared to another group. For example, were men more likely to be experiencing loneliness than women?

b. Comparisons of different types of interventions

We were also interested in finding out whether different types of interventions were successful in engaging different groups of respondents. This is explored in Report 4: Intervention Typologies. A series of Chi-square statistical tests were run to see if certain groups were more likely to join different types of intervention. As mentioned previously, if the result was $p = > 0.05$, the result was statistically significant, that means, not likely to have happened by chance and represents a real difference

There were two main stages of analysing outcome data: comparing baseline and follow up data for each measure and comparing the differences in outcomes across different groups.

a. Comparing baseline and follow up data for each outcome measure

We were interested in whether respondents' scores across outcome measures had changed between baseline and follow up, and whether these changes represented a statistically significant finding (it could not have happened by chance, and was due to engaging in TTS). Data for respondents who completed questionnaires at baseline and follow up (n=893) were analysed to explore differences in outcome measures. First, the mean score at baseline for a range of outcome measures was compared to the score at follow up to see if there was a difference. Then, a Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test was run in SPSS to see if this difference was statistically significant.

The Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test analyses the difference between the baseline and follow up scores. This test shows whether a programme has made a difference, such as, to isolation, loneliness or well-being.

b. Comparing the differences in outcomes across different groups

We were interested in whether different groups of participants experienced different levels of changes to outcome measures between baseline and follow up, and whether these differences were statistically significant. The difference between the respondents' scores at baseline and follow up across all of the outcome measures were calculated. A One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was then run in SPSS to see if there were any statistically significant differences when comparing the correspondents by categories within groups. ANOVAs were calculated for the different types of interventions.

One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) analyses the difference between scores across different categories of respondents. This test shows whether a programme has benefited some groups of respondents more than others. It also shows whether certain types of interventions have made a bigger difference than others.

4.2. Interviews, focus groups and semi-structured interviews

Fieldwork data was collected by researchers by taking detailed written notes and digital recording (where consent was given by the participant). The data were then analysed manually or within software packages (such as NVivo) to look for common themes and recurring issues. This involved pulling out key quotes and building an analytical framework which was used to make sense of the data. In academic research, this is called thematic analysis. Some of the themes explored in the interviews included motives for involvement, the nature of the activities they engaged in, the impact the activities had, their experiences of loneliness, the opportunities for participation in the design and delivery of activities, and any difficulties or barriers to their involvement. The focus groups discussed both individual experiences, but also broader themes around how to reach isolated older people, what is meant by loneliness, and potential pathways into loneliness.



05

Related Reports

All evidence from the data collection process described in this report has been analysed to inform a series of reports which discuss different aspects of the evaluation of TTS. The final evaluation is presented in the following series of reports:

Report 1: Executive Summary of Time to Shine

Report 2: Time to Shine Evaluation Methods

Report 3: Process Evaluation

Report 4: Intervention typologies

Report 5: Motivations and Barriers for beneficiary engagement

Report 6: Participation, engagement and outcomes for older people

Report 7: The impact of Time to Shine on project beneficiaries

Report 8: COVID-19 impact on the TTS programme

Report 9: Legacy, systems change and sustainability

Report 10: Test and Learn: Understanding the experiences and challenges of frontline organisations

06

Previous Publications

Alden and Wigfield (2016) *Time to Shine Evaluation Interim Report: The Beneficiary Experience.*

Available:

https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/polopoly_fs/1.667369!/file/TtoS.Summary.pdf

Alden and Wigfield (2016) *Evaluation of Time to Shine: Year 2 Interim Findings.*

Available:

https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/polopoly_fs/1.751594!/file/TimeToShineFinalReport.pdf

Naughton-Doe, R., Wigfield, A. and Martin. C. (2020) *CMF Interim Report.*

Warwick-Booth, L and Woodcock, D.M (2019) *Time to Shine: Volunteer Listeners Report. December 2019.*

Available:

<http://eprints.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/6580/1/TimeToShineVolunteerListenersReportPV-WARWICKBOOTH.pdf>

Appendix 1. Time to Shine Test and Learn questions

Key word:	TTS Outcome link	Test and Learn questions to answer:
Barriers:	2	What barriers to participation are happening now for participants and volunteers?
Prevention:	1	Does Time to Shine help prevent social isolation and loneliness?
Sustainability:	4	What enables successful projects / programmes to become sustainable?
Reaching out:	1	Are we reaching socially isolated older people? How?
Diversity:	2	What approaches work best to engage target groups of people most at risk of loneliness?
Replicable:	4	Can elements of the programme be replicated or expanded successfully?
Commissioning:	4	How has the learning from Time to Shine been used to inform commissioning in Leeds?
Legacy:	1	What is Time to Shine's legacy? Can impact be measured beyond 2021?
Feelings:	1	How does loneliness and social isolation make people feel?
Complexities:	3	What are the complexities behind loneliness and people's experiences of loneliness?
Triggers:	1	What attracted or motivated people to join in an activity?
Co-production:	3	To what degree has the programme been led by a diverse group of older people?
Impact 1:	1 & 3	How has involvement in Time to Shine made individual people feel?
Impact 2:	2	Have people developed social networks/accessed other services after becoming involved?
Approaches:	3	How has the learning from Time to Shine been used to inform delivery partner or Time to Shine approaches?
(Not) worked:	1	What has worked? What hasn't worked? Why? For whom?
Awareness:	2	Have we increased awareness of social isolation and the support services available in Leeds?
Stigma:	2	Have we reduced the stigma of loneliness and changed public perceptions? How?
Partnerships:	4	Have new partnerships been formed? Are organisations working 'better together'?
Benefits:	2	How have older people and communities benefited from new partnerships and new ways of working?
Intergenerational:	2	What has been the impact of intergenerational approaches on both older people and their wider communities?



Leeds
Older
People's
Forum



The
University
Of
Sheffield.

Time to
Shine



COMMUNITY
FUND

