

Mobile Me

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

Mobile Me: Questionnaire (V1)

Activity reference:

Location reference:

Date:

This questionnaire is to help us evaluate the activity sessions run by Active Norfolk through a scheme called 'Mobile Me'. Your details will not be used for any other reason.

1. Your contact details

First name: _____ Last name: _____

Address: _____

Postcode: _____

Phone or email: *(optional)* _____

2. About you

Date of birth: __ / __ / 19 __

Gender: Male Female

Ethnic group: White Mixed/Multiple Ethnic Groups
 Asian/Asian British Black/African/Caribbean/Black British
 Other Ethnic Group Don't know

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)

	Completed at baseline	Completed at 12 weeks
Control	59	29 (49%)
Intervention	40	N.A.

Functional fitness test Phase 1 (Oct-Dec 2015)

	Completed at baseline	Completed at 12 weeks
Control	27	13 (48%)
Intervention	21	N.A.

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 -

activities (4) company (5) competitive (2)
enjoyed (10) flat (4) fun (2) mixing (3) moving (2) occupied (2)
people (4) playing (4) residents (3) social (3) socialising (2) together (2)

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.