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Evaluation of sport in sheltered housing and care settings in Norfolk.

Phase 1 Delivery

Presentation by Amanda Burke: UEA
The intervention

- Run by ‘Active Norfolk’, the Local Sports Partnership
- 49 settings, Oct 2015 – Sep 2018
- 10 week, weekly sport session
- Residents decide
- Equipment to be left on site
- Guided by a steering group
The evaluation

- Evaluation being run by UEA and Active Norfolk in partnership
- Guided by National Obesity Observatory S.E.F. for PA
- 24 of 48 sites acting as ‘waiting list control’
- Phase 1 (Oct-Dec 2015) piloted both intervention and evaluation
- Phase 2 in progress
Data collection

Carried out by Active Norfolk Staff

• Questionnaire: IPAQ-E, EQ-5D, ELSA question on loneliness, and WEMWBS, fear of falling VAS

• Fullerton Functional Fitness Test

• Force plate for standing balance

• Coming soon...waterproof, wrist-worn, accelerometers
Accessible tools

- Discussed questionnaire with residents
- Large font, white space, minimal text
- IPAQ for the elderly
- Senior Fitness Tests
- Waterproof accelerometers
How did it work?

• Functional Fitness Tests: sheltered housing residents very keen! However, many care home residents too frail

• Many care home residents lack mobility to stand on force plate

• Questionnaire useful when resident too frail for physical tests, however, the IPAQ-E is cognitively demanding, especially daily sitting time question

• Some residents lack capacity to consent to evaluation, but enjoy activities

• Possible issues with loss to follow-up
Return rates

Questionnaire Phase 1 (Oct-Dec 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Completed at baseline</th>
<th>Completed at 12 weeks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>29 (49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Functional fitness test Phase 1 (Oct-Dec 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Completed at baseline</th>
<th>Completed at 12 weeks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13 (48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings for intervention group (pre/post)

Questionnaires (n=29):

• No significant findings apart from the average minutes of sport per day (8.6mins @ BL / 36.1 mins @FU)

• EQ-5D DS borderline significant.

Functional fitness (n=13)

• Significant differences in 4 out of 6 tests (upper and lower body strength, lower body flexibility, and agility and balance)
Open-ended feedback

Social aspects by far most frequently mentioned, also........

- Something to do - Keeping active and moving – Competition -
Can it be sustainable?

- Pre-funding pilot project involved residents of two care settings
- They play for two hours a week at alternative venues
- Playing for 1 year
- ‘Betty Price’ memorial match between residents
Thoughts

- Self-reported increase in sport not reflected in self-reported ‘moderate’ or ‘vigorous’ activity. Because it is ‘light’ activity? Are our tools to measure self-reported PA in this group appropriate?

- Is improved functional fitness due to familiarity with the test? Should we be testing control at 12 weeks?

- Borderline EQ-ED significance…..could this be related to functional fitness?

CONTINUED……
Thoughts........

• Open-ended comments about social aspects of activities not reflected in questionnaire results.

• Competition, how important is this?

• This intervention can be characterised as ‘light’, social, physical activity with an element of competition.