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1. **INTRODUCTION**

The Target: Wellbeing (TWB) Process Evaluation is focusing on four levels: portfolio, programmes, projects and individual beneficiaries.

At the programme level, it was agreed that the evaluation should focus on a purposive sample comprising the Pan-Regional Prisons Programme and three local area programmes. In selecting these local area programmes, consideration was given to ensuring:

a) coverage across the three sub-regions of the North West
b) coverage of urban and rural/semi-rural localities
c) coverage of programmes led by different agencies and/or partnerships.

On this basis, Knowsley, Manchester and Pendle (led by the PCT that also leads the Burnley Programme) were selected.

This report presents emergent findings from the first round of interviews with programme managers, which were carried out during April and May 2009.

2. **METHODOLOGY**

2.1 **OVERVIEW**

The process evaluation is informed by a socio-ecological model of health, a theoretical framework that emphasises the interconnections between environment, behaviour and wellbeing, recognising the dynamic interplay between situational and personal factors.\(^1\) It is thus consistent with a psychosocial perspective, which positions the individual in networks of interpersonal relationships, organisations, and social, political and economic systems.\(^2\) It also accords with a critical realist approach, which appreciates the interplay of context and human agency, acknowledges that knowledge is contingent and contextual, and is concerned to address both ‘how’ and ‘why’ questions.\(^3\) \(^4\)

In order to explore these questions effectively, the process evaluation has adopted a qualitative approach, complementing the quantitative impact evaluation being undertaken by North West Public Health Observatory (NWPHO). A qualitative approach is appropriate for studying people within the context of organisations and communities and for exploring the meanings that people bring to their experiences and interactions.\(^5\) A range of methods will be used, including interviews, focus groups, observation, photography and documentary review.

---

2.2 1ST STAGE PROGRAMME-LEVEL RESEARCH: METHODS

With regard to the Programme level, it was agreed that the evaluation should explore the views and perceptions of programme leaders and other key staff in relation to:

- how progress along anticipated change pathways is enabled or constrained at different stages in the TWB cycle
- how synergy is developed between component projects and between the three outcomes
- how system-level capability, capacity and sustainability is built
- how the wider TWB portfolio network supports and adds value to programme delivery.

An outline interview schedule was used (see Appendix 1). Section 3 focuses on the local area programmes and Section 4 focuses on the Pan-Regional Prisons Programme – and as this is an interim findings document we have not drawn any conclusions at this stage.

3. LOCAL AREA PROGRAMMES: EMERGENT FINDINGS

3.1 OVERVIEW

A number of findings have emerged from the analysis of the data gathered through conducting the first round of interviews with local area programme managers:

- For programme managers, TWB aligned with existing health projects co-ordinated by their organisations
- Programmes adopted several different methods of allocating funding to projects (e.g. competition to ensure the highest quality projects; collaboration to merge and strengthen similar projects), each having different strengths and appearing to be appropriate to the respective local area
- The delay in the release of TWB funding to the projects impacted more on projects led by smaller organisations using funding to pay staff costs, as some lacked the cash flow to proceed with recruiting workers
- The administrative load involved in relation to monitoring and evaluation has been experienced more negatively by smaller organisations involved in TWB, as larger and more established organisations are generally more used to this level of scrutiny
- The IT knowledge required to participate in the monitoring and evaluation processes has created problems for some projects – and this has also impacted on the programme managers, who have had to divert additional resources into dealing with these issues
- In some of the projects, the evaluation forms were considered by the programme managers to be not particularly suitable for the beneficiary group, and it was suggested that more consultation with key project staff may have addressed this issue
- Although there are differences between programmes, relationships between programme managers and project managers appear to be generally positive
- Programme managers have been forging links between organisations involved in TWB projects that had previously not communicated or liaised on a regular basis
in their portfolio and other local congruent organisations not involved directly in TWB but involved in ‘wellbeing’ projects

- Wellbeing is understood as a holistic concept by the programme managers despite the specific focus of the three TWB ‘themes’
- In general, programme managers appeared to value the opportunity to discuss issues with the process evaluation researchers

3.2 VISIONS OF TARGET: WELLBEING

The programme managers’ visions of TWB largely aligned with existing health and wellbeing projects and structures being run in their respective locations:

“Wellbeing was talked about clearly with other programmes. [In the unit] it did go hand in hand with the Units’ aim to tackle health inequalities.”

“Our vision ties in with the health and wellbeing partnership as well as Target: Wellbeing.”

This reflected the fact that although the local areas selected for the process evaluation differed in terms of landscape (i.e. a mixture of urban and rural; varying population densities) and organisational setups, they were all characterised by a high level of poor health among many of their beneficiaries.

3.3 PLANNING THE PORTFOLIO AND SELECTING PROJECTS

The programme managers’ organisations had existing links with various third sector organisations prior to the TWB bidding:

“We were already trying to develop capacity and ability to work with these organisations in order to promote wellbeing.”

In deciding which projects to incorporate into the local area portfolios, a number of differing approaches were adopted. Two of the programmes contacted numerous voluntary sector organisations:

“We’re a partnership between the Local Authority and the NHS, we have a really good relationship with the voluntary sector. Because we have these good links we thought we’d ask for expressions of interest from community and voluntary groups in taking part in Target: Wellbeing.”

In one programme, 120 expressions of interest were received from third sector organisations. The high level of interest and abundant response was understood to reflect this sector’s experience and history of submitting funding proposals:

“The voluntary sector are used to putting things together with very tight timelines.”

Two of the programmes organised meetings with interested local organisations to work collaboratively on the various bids to try to increase the possibility of securing funding:

“We didn’t have a competitive bidding process...we asked people to talk about proposals around the room, saw it was oversubscribed and then we tried to get projects to join up and get others to cut back on their funding so more projects could fit in overall...the projects evolved organically out of the planning sessions.”

Some of the projects within these programmes began as two or three separate proposals, each targeting a similar participant group, and were subsequently merged as part of the planning process. This was not without difficulties, as one programme manager explained:

“Three projects were advised to form a consortium in order to strengthen the bid, unfortunately when the organisations came to delivery the services the consortium did not function as well as anticipated and a process to separate them and allocate the funding took place.”
This is an important issue to highlight – as it illustrates the importance of building positive working relationships and of appreciating their importance in securing successful delivery. Programme managers emphasised how it had taken time to develop effective relationships with the project managers working within their portfolios.

In terms of making the final choice of projects, various criteria were employed including selecting project managers who would be able to cope with issues such as handling budgets and evaluation, setting minimum budget levels for projects, and getting a spread across the three TWB themes:

“We tended to use pre-existing contacts [to develop projects] rather than advertise and promote the bidding to all organisations.”

“We wanted a mixture of new organisations and ones we were comfortable working with. We didn’t really want to bring in projects that would struggle to handle the bids.”

“We knew we didn’t want a lot of small projects in terms of how it would affect impact and management.”

“The three ‘themes’ of Target: Wellbeing were useful as they enabled us to form an assessment panel of experts in each field to look at each of the proposals in relation to the themes.”

The ‘collaborative’ and ‘competitive’ approaches were both ultimately overseen by programme managers. The possibility of successfully developing a programme portfolio by either means reveals that the approach can to some degree be tailored to the suitability of the region, the set-up of the organisation co-ordinating the programme, and their prior relationship with other organisations. Inevitably, whatever the allocation process, some projects that wanted to be involved in TWB were excluded. However, none of the projects reported a significant fallout with third sector organisations and local projects in this respect:

“[We] did not receive any complaints from the projects that were not selected to be part of the portfolio, just requests for feedback on how they may be more successful in the future.”

3.4 Enabling and Constraining Factors

3.4.1 Funding

Several issues to do with funding affected the programme managers’ decisions in the initial year of TWB. When the overall North West budget was lowered, programme managers had to adjust elements of the projects that were in their portfolio. This was done in a variety of ways without reducing the overall number of projects:

“It was easier to cut the money in the sessional projects (by cutting out sessions), but with others they had to cut the duration of the projects.”

The delay to the start of the programme (due to the time needed for Groundwork North West to negotiate and draw up contracts with BIG Lottery and the programmes) also impacted on the projects:

“The funds were not released until March 2008 – this had a knock-on effect as they were not able to recruit additional workers until they had the funding. One of our projects would not start recruiting (putting the advert out) until they got the money which made [the start] as late as June 2008.”

The delay in obtaining funds was dealt with by using alternative sources of money, both to begin projects on time and to promote projects that were delayed:

“Some of the projects proceeded prior to receiving the contracts, but they were the ones run by the larger organisations that had some kind of contingency money.”
“We were able to get initial funding from another source to work on promotion of the projects which made everyone feel part of the same programme.”

The quarterly allocation of funding proved to be a further cause for concern in the early stages of programme implementation:

“The budgets were also divided equally over quarters and don’t account for seasonal projects which need more money one quarter and then hardly any the next.”

The level of skill involved in handling financial monitoring was also described as problematic, requiring more extensive support than initially envisaged:

“The administrative aspect of Target: Wellbeing was rather more onerous then originally imagined.. People needed to be really familiar with Excel. They are getting better and we’re working hard to improve them.”

After receiving the funding, allocating the money correctly was a further challenge for a number of third sector organisations:

“The biggest problem area for voluntary organisations was costing out people’s time, and working out issues such as match funding. It was interesting to see how voluntary organisations work ‘hand to mouth’ – quite illuminating – and the programme managers have attempted to allocate more support to such organisations.”

It was also apparent that the weight of the administrative work attached to the projects was felt most heavily by the smallest organisations, which in turn impacted on the programme managers:

“Some small projects that only received 15k have the same level of financial and output administration as a larger organisation that has dedicated staff to deal with this...This in turn has resulted in a great deal of support being given to the projects by the Programme Managers in order to help them comply with their Target: Wellbeing funding conditions.”

3.4.2 Evaluation

The programme managers all had comments to make about the impact evaluation. The first issue was to do with the timing of receipt of the questionnaires:

“We could have done with having the questionnaires earlier...a lot of the data has been lost that could have been gathered last year.”

“...it will be difficult for some projects that have already been running for a while, to gather data from service users that no longer access their activities.”

After viewing the questionnaires and gaining a fuller understanding of what would be required of their projects, programme managers had little opportunity to adjust project budgets to reflect the time that would need to be allocated to filling them in, as well other costs involved:

“[Projects] didn’t budget for ink, paper, the time taken for participants to fill in forms, etc. That has become a major issue - one or two project managers have even said that they wouldn’t have bothered participating in Target: Wellbeing if they had known. I think they would have, but with their eyes open.”

“The support needed to fill in the questionnaires for some projects is clearly a capacity problem. It will depend on the programme leads having the time and the money to incentivise the projects to do the evaluation.”

One programme manager explained that in order to motivate project managers, they have to emphasise the value of participating in the evaluation in terms of potential future funding – as:

“an opportunity to gain further funding – i.e. the value of being evaluated through an accredited organisation and being included in the reports that will be collated from...the entire Target: Wellbeing projects.”
One programme manager voiced surprise at the extent of evaluation work involved, understood to be a particular issue in situations where the lead organisations (at programme and project levels) had already planned or established their own independent evaluation:

“The evaluation has been a real difficulty. We’d talked about commissioning a local evaluation but there’s too much going on so we’re not doing that now!”

“Some projects already have their own evaluation model in place, and now have to incorporate another one.”

Another, perhaps more crucial, aspect concerned the content of the questionnaires and its perceived and actual relevance to individual projects:

“With more than half the projects the questionnaires are not really useable – especially with [a project involving refugees]...”

Within the sample of local area programmes chosen for the process evaluation, there were no projects identified as ‘small and vulnerable’ by Groundwork North West – and managers only identified one project in each of their programmes as dealing with a particularly vulnerable participant group. However, programme managers expressed a degree of concern that the questionnaires may bring up some difficult emotional content, especially concerning mental health issues of the beneficiaries, and that this may affect the capacity of projects to secure a high response rate:

“One tool is not going to work for 91 projects. The ‘small and sensitive’ distinction is a problem as all the projects are small and sensitive in their own way.”

“Some more clarity about the consequences of not capturing data would be useful, and perhaps some more reassurance. Getting the evaluation forms filled in and uploaded intimidated a lot of the projects. We are trying to make sure we do as much as we can, but there needs to be a bit of leeway which seems to be happening now.”

### 3.5 Relationship with Groundwork North West

As the programme managers are major portfolio stakeholders, their relationships with Groundwork North West are crucial. Programme managers provided positive and useful feedback concerning the relationships and how to ensure that they work effectively:

“In terms of getting help on the phone or by email, it is good and Groundwork recognise the same issues and problems as we do. Over time they have become aware of the issues. I see it more as a mutual support thing.”

“In the main it’s all positive, the key staff are accessible and helpful.”

Reflecting on the initial development stage, it was suggested that more extensive consultation could have been usefully sought with programme managers initially:

“I would’ve preferred to see more meetings at an earlier stage where we could’ve shaped the agenda more.”

The geographical location of Groundwork North West and the format of the meetings were also issues that raised some concern:

“Some people don’t go because the meetings are only two hours...There could also be more meetings at venues around the region as travelling to Groundwork Manchester is time consuming for some programmes. Time needs to be allocated better in the Groundwork meetings, too long is spent on certain things. The last couple of items are always rushed.”

Another programme manager explained that Groundwork North West had listened and responded constructively to feedback:

“[The training can be] difficult for some of the key staff of the organisations to access it due to the overall time including travelling that it takes to get to Manchester. This difficulty was recognised by Groundwork North West and several workshops have now been held locally.”
3.6 **Forging Links Between Projects**

As mentioned previously, the programme managers discussed the strength in partnership working, with a particular emphasis on the development of strong and supportive links between voluntary sector project leaders.

“Some of the projects in the programme are working well together...[the refugee action project] put on physical activity sessions...which the participant group who are particularly vulnerable benefited from.”

“One of the projects has more volunteers then they can afford to train, and in a meeting other project managers were suggesting other funding sources for them.”

“Projects...have been linking in with each other to share beneficiaries and enable their service users to experience different aspects of the Target: Wellbeing programme of activities.”

However, it should be noted that this partnership approach often built on extensive development work that had occurred prior to TWB:

“There is a good dynamic between the organisations as they have prior knowledge of each other.”

An example was given of a cycling project that has the same parent organisation in two separate areas, and this organisation has been working on links between these congruent projects.

Programme managers expressed enthusiasm for TWB and its role in building enthusiasm and releasing energy within and between local organisations. Although programme managers have adopted different approaches, they all appear well integrated into Local Authority and PCT structures and have played pivotal roles in securing such an ethos – and in relation to this, one spoke of their “embedded role” in local organisations:

“In between putting the bid in and hearing the decision we kept the relationship going with the organisations whilst awaiting to hear the decision, and there was a lot of mutual enthusiasm to keep the network going (and obtain funding from somewhere else if unsuccessful from Target: Wellbeing)...There are a number of very passionate and enthusiastic people working in local organisations – some quite experienced in going for funding. As the projects have gone on, they have supported and learned from each other, fostering more links. There is a lot of synergy in the region’s projects.”

3.7 **Connections With Existing Health and Wellbeing Projects**

As well as the connections between projects within the TWB portfolio, programme managers discussed links being made with other projects that are not part of TWB, suggesting that there is a wider ripple effect:

“At first, some organisations were a bit wary of the whole thing, but now it’s seen as a beacon as a few of the projects are getting a good local profile, people know about them.

“[An older people’s project] builds upon existing work about peer health mentors, we can do more of something that was working well.

“We recently held a networking event for the region, to share good practice, not just for Target: Wellbeing, but for local voluntary schemes and the community sector funded by the PCT.”

One programme manager suggested that, whilst TWB might not have a particularly strong recognition with beneficiaries, this is not necessarily a problem:

“To the local community, there is no particular distinguishing between projects being Target: Wellbeing or not, it is more about how good the projects are at affecting people’s wellbeing...Target: Wellbeing seems to be welcomed by organisations as another funding source, I don't think the beneficiaries really care where the funding comes from.”
Although this may seem to conflict with TWB’s strong emphasis on branding, there was a sense that the actual impact of the projects as experienced by local beneficiaries is in reality the most important and enduring thing.

### 3.8 Concept of Wellbeing and Connections Between ‘Outcome Areas’

TWB has three outcome areas: healthy eating, physical exercise and mental well-being. In general, programmes have tried to achieve a balance of projects leading on each of the three themes. However, programme managers explained that both they and the projects do not necessarily make this distinction themselves, raising questions about the usefulness of designating a ‘priority’ outcome area for each project:

“We tried to get a balance between all the three. Some of the organisations were already working with a notion of wellbeing that blurred the boundaries between these themes, the whole holistic picture. The mental health at work project is more specifically categorised than others but even this project is forging links (e.g. with the cycling project). This is the added value of the projects – the connections being made.”

“Target: Wellbeing appears to view [the themes] separately, but the projects view them all holistically incorporating all or several of the three strands of the wellbeing theme.”

It was suggested across the programmes that although generally participants have a similar understanding of wellbeing:

“Wellbeing is a difficult concept for some refugees and asylum seekers, culturally they don’t have the same concept.”

Wellbeing can be more clearly applied in holistic terms in certain projects. For example, an allotment-based project with socialising in a community garden, exercise involved in tending to the land, eating of the produce and caring for the growing vegetables and plants.

### 3.9 Sustainability

Linked to this, the programme managers are all interested in how the projects in their respective portfolios can be sustainable. This concern manifests itself in a variety of forms, from confidence building and establishing networks to extending funding:

“[Target: Wellbeing] is giving the third sector more confidence, especially regarding working towards continuing the projects when the money runs out and getting projects commissioned from other funders.

“The voluntary sector do a lot for a little money. What I really want to do is try to get more money to extend these projects…”

“[Our] strength is in partnership working, they have a strong link in the statutory sector with all the voluntary sector group leaders…We have a great relationship with the projects leads. A lot of the things we do are based on trust, the projects know that I am rooting for them, I’m always asking for extra money for stuff and they get a sense that this isn’t just a programme I manage – I believe in it.”

A word of caution was given in relation to the current financial climate and some knowledge of prior Big Lottery-funded projects:

“Who knows where the money is going to come from. With a lot of lottery programme projects they unfortunately fizzle out.”
4. **PAN-REGIONAL PRISONS PROGRAMME: EMERGENT FINDINGS**

4.1 **OVERVIEW**

As the Pan-Regional Prisons Programme is structured and managed differently from the local area programmes and faces different challenges, it is appropriate to present the emergent findings as a separate section.6

Our key distinctive findings from the pan-regional programme manager interview are:

- A key component is to join together across a variety of institutions that are often working in isolation
- In working with such a complex organisational structure, more time should be allocated to initial contract exchange and agreement than was allocated
- Prisons often appear to have a different focus on Wellbeing more related to the skills agenda than the TWB agenda's health outputs
- There are some early examples of some prisons linking up the TWB outcome areas
- Prisons have particular issues which can delay projects that do not affect community projects
- The process evaluation will be more valuable if it is honest about addressing issues within the prison system that prevent pan-regional project implementation, as well as understanding the successes

4.2 **VISION**

The programme manager spoke of her vision of the TWB Pan-Regional Prisons Programme as being about:

"joining up across the criminal justice system using health as a theme. We work with prison systems and their partners to achieve wellbeing outcomes that can be monitored, using Target: Wellbeing as a framework and an umbrella to achieve this and using the Target: Wellbeing themes as drivers to achieve outcomes."

However, within the context of this optimism, it was also recognised that the programme presents very real challenges due to the nature of the criminal justice system:

"Prisons can be difficult to work with. The complexity of the system means it takes time to organise meetings and contact people."

The programme manager believes that good outcomes can be achieved even with limited budgets, but that this will take time as the system as a whole is still evolving with strong cultural norms and values. Part of the challenge is to get prisons to communicate and share their work and learning with each other:

"The culture of prisons is one of isolation...We want to reduce the level of competitiveness to maximise the outcomes that we can achieve."

The emphasis on a system-level approach reflects a concern to ensure that the projects – and prisoners’ involvement in these – will be beneficial for their wellbeing not just whilst in prison but also when they are released into the wider community.

---

6 When the programme manager has made points that refer more generally to Target: Wellbeing, they have been incorporated into the main section.
4.3 INITIAL STEPS

At the time of interview, the Pan-Regional Prisons Programme was still in its early stages. In order to secure the active participation and buy-in of prisons, it has been crucial to work with and gain high-level support from the North West Regional Offender Management office. This has proved to be both an important and challenging part of the programme's development, because the offender management service is undergoing restructuring at all tiers.

A further challenge has involved putting contracts in place – both between Groundwork North West and the University of Central Lancashire (UCLan) and between UCLan and individual prisons. This has resulted in delays, which on reflection could possibly have been predicted and built into the programme timeline:

“As the project lasts for four years, it would have been good to have a year to sort out administration. It would [also] be useful if we had templates for all the programmes that could have been used.”

However, the enthusiasm for TWB is illustrated by the fact that a number of prisons have not only invested significant amounts of money and time in setting up projects, but also in some cases taken the risk of proceeding with work in advance of contracts being signed and funding being transferred.

4.4 WELLBEING: CONNECTING DIFFERENT AGENDAS

The offender management context creates particular issues and challenges relating to the delivery of wellbeing projects that aren't present to the same extent in local area programmes:

“Prisons have a different understanding of wellbeing...when you're working with prisons and not healthcare...they want to hit all the targets around the skills agenda - it's not easy to marry up with Target: Wellbeing and the health agenda...The set up of Target: Wellbeing has in part created this situation by asking the prisons what projects they would like to run that fit into Target: Wellbeing and we have found ourselves getting drawn in to the target driven culture of prisons. However, anything positive you do in prison is going to have an impact on wellbeing for the prisoners.”

It is therefore necessary to find ways of connecting different understandings and agendas. Working within the framework of the BIG Lottery outcomes, the Pan-Regional Prisons Programme manager is viewing the programme in terms of measurable elements of the prisoners’ wellbeing – such as the positive impacts of being outdoors as opposed to locked up in the cell, healthier eating and taking more exercise. However, she is also keen to demonstrate how the programme can contribute to the resettlement agenda – which is trying to prevent ex-offenders drifting back into crime and re-offending, and consequently has a strong focus on skills development, qualifications and future employability.

In addition, mental health is a sensitive subject to raise within the prison context and often has to be approached indirectly with prisoners to avoid producing a range of negative responses.

4.5 CHALLENGES AND EARLY SUCCESSES

Whilst any findings are at this stage emergent, the Pan-Regional Prisons Programme has already stimulated extensive interest and enthusiasm across the offender management system in the North West region. As with the local area programmes,
there has been a strong focus on developing an holistic understanding of wellbeing. Alongside this, there has been a concern to work at a systems level and to transfer learning across the sector:

“We’ve got some good examples of how a prison has linked up the three outcome areas with a three-phased project – it is an ideal example of a prison demonstrating a systems level programme that hits those target outcome areas.. and has so many transferable components...from it to other prisons. If we could hold it up as best practice..and take the learning from it and apply it to other prisons.”

Interestingly, whilst much of the work is innovative in the context of the prison health agenda, it is actually revisiting and reformulating activities with a much longer history. This is particularly true of the ‘Greener on the Outside (Prisons)’ project:

“The environmental project is only what prisoners used to do - prisoners used to go out in work parties. It’s not new.”

The specific context means that there can be unforeseen difficulties and problems that can seriously influence the effective delivery of projects:

“Time delays getting in touch with people can be very tough. I’m working with...a project that may have a training session for prisoners, but there might be a shutdown in the prison and it might be cancelled, and you can't really reschedule sessions.”

There are further issues concerning the fact that prisoners are under no obligation to come to sessions, making recruitment to projects a potential challenge. Additionally, there is a need for ongoing risk assessment and for clarifying motivation for prisoners’ involvement. For example, do prisoners sign up for environmental outworking projects because they are genuinely interested or are they being coerced into bringing drugs back into the prison? All of these challenges highlight the need for adaptability and flexibility in implementing the Pan-Regional Prisons Programme.

However, the overall mood is one of optimism – acknowledging the challenges and being prepared to discuss them openly within the context of process evaluation:

“We need to be confident in this whole process, that the complexities of the system will allow us to be honest, will let us to say for example ‘yes, it worked – but only with these people and in this context. These sorts of findings wouldn’t be picked up in a number-crunching exercise.”
APPENDIX 1: PROGRAMME MANAGERS’ INTERVIEW GUIDE

Semi-structured interviews will be used with all the main stakeholders: project beneficiaries, delivery workers, project managers and programme managers. They will be conducted with programme managers at early and mid points; and used as part of a portfolio of methods with project stakeholders.

The interview schedule/aide memoir for the semi-structured interviews will include the following considerations:

- stakeholder perceptions of wellbeing and how these may change over the course of the programme/project
- stakeholder perceptions of relational issues relevant to the individual programmes/projects selected
- issues concerning management and resourcing (e.g. differences between third sector led and PCT led projects)
- any anticipated ‘added value’ in relation to the TWB outcomes.

Specific questions for managers and key staff will include:

- Describe how progress along anticipated change pathways is enabled or constrained at different stages in the TWB cycle
- How have connections between the three outcome areas been explored and developed?
- What understandings of wellbeing have influenced different programmes and projects?
- How have programmes worked to build and sustain wider system-level capability and capacity?
- What role has the TWB portfolio network played in supporting and adding value to programme delivery?
- What are the key issues concerning project initiation, development and implementation?
- What are the main contextual factors affecting your particular intervention and how do these factors help/hinder the project?
- Is there any ‘added value’ of your project in relation to the TWB outcome areas and more widely?