Dadansoddi ar gyfer Polisi

YMCHWIL GYMDEITHASOL Y LLYWODRAETH

GSR

GOVERNMENT SOCIAL RESEARCH

Analysis for Policy

Llywodraeth Cymru
Welsh Government

www.cymru.gov.uk

Ymchwil gymdeithasol
Social research

Number: 15/2015

The Evaluation of Communities 2.0

Final Evaluation Report: Technical Appendix

The Evaluation of Communities 2.0 – Final Evaluation Report

Technical Appendix

oldbell 3
Research Policy Analysis
Ymchwil Polisi Dadansoddi

Views expressed in this report are those of the researchers and not necessarily those of the Welsh Government

For further information please contact:
Dr Mike Harmer
Knowledge and Analytical Services
Finance and Corporate Services
Welsh Government
Rhydycar
Merthyr Tydfil
CF48 1UZ
Email: michael.harmer@cymru.gsi.gov.uk

OGL

All content is available under the Open Government Licence v3.0, except where otherwise stated.
http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3/

Welsh Government Social Research, 24 March 2015
ISBN 978-1-4734-3055-6
© Crown Copyright 2015

INTRODUCTION

In this Technical Appendix to the Final Evaluation of the Communities 2.0 Programme, we present further information about the methodology and work programme.

In Annex A1 we present a list of the national stakeholders interviewed at the interim and final evaluation stage: it should be noted that this does not include the staff interviewed in the focus groups undertaken at both stages.

In Annex A2 we present the semi-structured topic guides used at the interim and final evaluation stage.

In Annex B1 we present information about the personal characteristics of respondents to the telephone survey and in Annex B2 we present the survey questionnaire used for the initial interview and the re-interviews

In Annex C1 we present information about the approach and about respondents to the two web-surveys (in 2011 at the interim stage and in 2014 for the final evaluation) and in Annex C2 we present the survey questionnaire used for these surveys.

Finally in Annex D1, we present information about the sample of case-studies and at Annex D2 we provide the semi-structured topic guides used for the initial and the re-interviews, and for the good practice case-study interviews.

Annex A1: Stakeholders Interviewed

The following individuals were interviewed in 2011 and/or 2014:

Claire Bottomley, Age Cymru (2014 only)

Vera Brinkworth, Care and Repair (2011 only)

Dave Brown, Wales Co-operative Centre (2014 only)

Alun Burge, Digital Inclusion Unit, Welsh Government (2011 only)

Chris Burton, Carmarthenshire County Council (2011 only)

Claudia Davies, Wales Co-operative Centre (2011 only)

Marc Davies, Wales Co-operative Centre (2011 and 2014)

Rhian Davies, Disability Wales (2014 only)

Layton Emery, PC Care (2011 only)

Huw Evans, CyMAL, Welsh Government (2014 only)

Phil Fiander, Wales Council for Voluntary Action (2014 only)

Carys Guile and Adam Williams, Annog Cyf (2011 only)

Steve Hardman, Society of Chief Librarians (2014 only)

Clare Hayle, Wyn Evans and Geraint Nutt, Carmarthenshire County Council (2014 only)

Josh Hoole, Pembrokeshire Association of the Voluntary Service (2011 and 2014)

Phil Jarrold, Wales Council for Voluntary Action (2011 only)

Mandy Jenkins, Wales Co-operative Centre (2014 only)

Jacqueline Jones, Welsh European Funding Office, Welsh Government (2014 only)

Karen Lewis, George Ewart Evans Centre for Storytelling, University of Glamorgan (2011 and 2014)

Hayley McNamara, Community Housing Cymru (2014 only)

Cathryn Marcus, Wales Co-operative Centre (2011 and 2014)

Terry Price, Novas Scarman/People Can (2011 and 2014)

Simon Renault, Digital Wales, Welsh Government (2014 only)

Karen Roberts, Wales Co-operative Centre (2014 only)

Bethan Stacey, Welsh European Funding Office, Welsh Government (2011 only)

Huw Thomas and Kevin Morgan, JobCentre Plus (2014 only)

Ian Tweedale, BBC Wales (2011 only)

Nia Wright, Wales Co-operative Centre (2011 only)

Annex A2: Semi-structured topic guides for stakeholder interviews

A2.1 Topic guide for interviews with stakeholders (interim evaluation)

1 Programme Environment[1]

1.1 What has changed about C2.0's operating environment in the last year or so?

a. What are the implications of these changes for C2.0?

1.2 What has been learnt from digital inclusion related research since C2.0 came into existence?

a. How has this influenced C2.0?

1.3 How aware is the voluntary and community sector/social enterprise sector in general terms of the 'digital inclusion' agenda?

a. What are the main drivers of this awareness?

b. How has this changed over time?

2 Programme Implementation

2.1 How is the digital inclusion agenda promoted to public sector organisations such as Local Authorities etc.?

a. What role does the C2.0 Programme play in supporting the development of e-government at a local level?

2.2 How widely and well is the 'digital inclusion' agenda promoted by C2.0 to community groups/voluntary organisations/social enterprises?

a. How effective is the public engagement activity undertaken by WCC?

b. How effective is the web presence of the Programme?

2.3 How successful do you think C2.0 has been in reaching community groups/social enterprise?

2.4 What kinds of services have C2.0 partners been involved in delivering e.g.:

i Taster sessions for members/clients

ii More in-depth ICT related training for members/clients

iii Assistance with developing a web-site

iv Assistance in spec-ing and/or purchasing new IT equipment

v Assistance in setting up IT based management systems e.g. accounting packages

vi Assistance in setting up/improving use of IT for e-commerce purposes

v Other advice or support on IT (please specify)

[1] Please note numbers refer to a questioning framework and thus do not follow sequentially in all cases.

2.5 How, if at all, has the nature of services delivered changed since the inception of the C2.0 Programme?

a. Why have those changes come about?

2.6 How much cross-fertilisation is there between partner organisations in practice e.g. in terms of drawing upon each other's expertise in working with particular community organisations/social enterprises?

a. What examples are there of effective joint working?

2.7 Is the support provided of the right intensity?

a. Is there a risk that the support is withdrawn too early?
b. Is there too little/enough emphasis on building capacity?

2.8 How successful have partner organisations been in using intermediary organisations e.g. Local Authorities, CVCs, Communities First teams etc. to reach community groups/social enterprises?

2.9 To what extent have community groups/social enterprises provided C2.0 partners with an avenue by which to reach digitally excluded people?

2.10 What other routes has C 2.0 used to reach digitally excluded people?

a. Which are proving most/least successful+?

2.11 How are local area assessments used?

6 Programme Performance

6.1 How is the Programme panning out in relation to plans so far?

a. Where there has been slippage?
b. What has caused any slippage that has occurred?
b. How likely is the Programme to make up this slippage and meet its targets?

3 Outcomes

3.1 How, if at all, has C2.0 input affected public sector bodies' on-line service delivery arrangements?

a. How much of an influence has the Programme had upon Local Authorities' thinking in relation to e-government, community hubs, use of social media etc.?

3.2 What effects have C2.0 partners' activities had upon community groups/social enterprises' use of technology for their own purposes e.g.:

i For management, including book-keeping etc.
ii For communicating with stakeholders e.g. via web-sites, e-mail etc.
iii As a means of attracting members/clients?

a. What examples are there of C2.0 support changing the way organisations work?

   i What was it about C2.0 support that brought about change?

   ii How likely is it that the change would have happened anyway?

b. How sustainable are the changes brought about by C2.0 partners' input?

   i For example, are organisations able to maintain/manage their own web-site or accounting system now, as opposed to simply using what C2.0 partners put in place for them?

3.3 *If appropriate:*
How many community groups/social enterprises engaging with C2.0 have developed 'digital inclusion strategies'/plans for getting members/clients more involved with IT?

a. What generally motivates community groups/social enterprises to develop such plans?

b. What do the 'digital inclusion strategies' developed thus far aspire to e.g.
- recruiting volunteer trainers/Circuit Riders?

3.4 To what extent are C2.0 partners getting involved in delivering taster sessions/training to the members or clients of community groups?

a. What tends to be the focus of these sessions?

b. How much use is made of on-line resources produced under the C2.0 banner in the delivery of this kind of activity?

   i Which resources are most useful and why?

   ii What factors hinder greater use being made of on-line resources?

3.5 Has an appropriate balance been struck between 'train the trainer' type activities and 'end participant' sessions?

a. How easy or difficult is it to engage community group staff/members in 'train the trainer' type sessions?

   i What motivates people to enlist as potential trainers?

   ii What prevents apparently suitable individuals from training up to become potential trainers?

3.6 How many volunteer trainers/Circuit Riders/digital storytelling experts have been recruited?

a. How much use is made of webinars to train Circuit Riders?

b. How are on-line Digital Inclusion Seminars used?

3.7 What effect has training staff or volunteers to train others in the use of IT/digital storytelling etc. had upon community/voluntary organisations?

a. To what extent are community/voluntary organisations themselves delivering IT related training to members/service users?

   i What needs to be in place to enable them to do this?

   ii What hinders them from doing so?

b. How much use is made of bite-sized digital inclusion workshops by volunteer Circuit Riders/trainers?

3.8 What effect has giving/selling refurbished kit to community organisations had upon their use of technology?

3.9 How are case study materials used?

a. What examples are there of case study materials influencing organisations' activities or individuals' behaviours?

3.10 How successful has the Technology Innovation Group been so far in supporting the development of IT enterprises?

4 Emerging Impacts

4.1 What difference has greater/more effective use of IT as a result of C2.0 support made to community organisations/social enterprises?

a. How likely is it that these organisations would have arrived at the same solution without C2.0 partners' input?

4.2 What evidence is there that C2.0 support has helped social enterprises become more profitable/sustainable e.g. though use of technologies to generate income?

4.3 What evidence is there that C2.0 has helped create any new jobs?

4.4 How many community groups/social enterprises have actually started to implement 'digital inclusion strategies'?

a. What effects have these had?

4.5 To what extent are volunteer trainers/Circuit Riders/digital storytelling experts used by community groups?

a. What are they used for?

4.9 What evidence is there that C2.0 has helped to change the way in which people engage with IT?

a. What evidence is there that it has changed digitally excluded people's behaviour?

5 Going Forward

5.1 What needs to change about the Programme going forward?

a. Why are these changes necessary?

5.3 Might there be more effective ways of switching people on to technology?

a. What might work better?

5.2 How does feedback from community groups influence partners' activities?

A2.2 Topic guide for final evaluation stakeholder interviews

FINAL STAGE EVALUATION OF COMMUNITIES TWO POINT ZERO TOPIC GUIDE FOR DISCUSSIONS WITH NATIONAL STAKEHOLDERS

INTRODUCTION

Thank you for agreeing to talk to me.

As you know, Old Bell 3 has been commissioned by the Welsh Government to undertake an evaluation of the Communities Two Point Zero project.

We spoke to you/representatives of your organisation back in 2011 about the rationale for the Communities 2.0 programme and the programme's delivery at that stage.

Today's discussion will follow on from that and explore changes made to the programme since then, the outcomes it has delivered and the impact it has had upon individuals and groups.

Anything you say will be in confidence and will not be attributed to you.

Do you have anything you want to ask before we start?

1 **PROGRAMME ENVIRONMENT**

1.1 What has changed about C2.0's operating environment in the last couple of years?
   a. What have been the implications of these changes for C2.0?

1.2 What has been learnt from digital inclusion related research since C2.0 came into existence?
   a. How has this influenced C2.0?

1.3 How aware is the voluntary and community sector/social enterprise sector in general terms of the 'digital inclusion' agenda?
   a. What are the main drivers of this awareness?
   b. How has this changed over time?

2 **PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION**

2.5 How, if at all, has the nature of services delivered changed since the inception of the C2.0 Programme?

a. Why have those changes come about?

2.9 To what extent have community groups/social enterprises provided C2.0 partners with an avenue by which to reach digitally excluded people?

6 PROGRAMME PERFORMANCE

6.1 How has the Programme panned out in relation to plans?

a. Where has there been slippage?

b. What has caused any slippage that has occurred?

b. How likely is the Programme to make up this slippage and meet its targets?

3 OUTCOMES

3.1 How, if at all, has C2.0 input affected public sector bodies' on-line service delivery arrangements?

a. How much of an influence has the Programme had upon Local Authorities' thinking in relation to e-government, community hubs, use of social media etc.?

3.2 What effects have C2.0 partners' activities had upon community groups/social enterprises' use of technology for their own purposes e.g.:

i For management, including book-keeping etc.

ii For communicating with stakeholders e.g. via web-sites, e-mail etc.

iii As a means of attracting members/clients?

3.2 a. What examples are there of C2.0 support changing the way community groups/social enterprises work?

i What was it about C2.0 support that brought about change?

ii How likely is it that the change would have happened anyway?

3.2 b. How sustainable are the changes brought about by C2.0 partners' input?

i For example, are organisations able to maintain/manage their own web-site or accounting system now, as opposed to simply using what C2.0 partners put in place for them?

3.3 *If appropriate:*
How many community groups/social enterprises engaging with C2.0 have developed 'digital inclusion strategies'/plans for getting members/clients more involved with IT?

a. What generally motivates community groups/social enterprises to develop such plans?
b. What do the 'digital inclusion strategies' developed thus far aspire to e.g.
-recruiting volunteer trainers/Circuit Riders?

3.4 To what extent have C2.0 partners got involved in delivering taster sessions/ training to the members or clients of community groups?

a. What tends to be the focus of these sessions?
b. How much use is made of on-line resources produced under the C2.0 banner in the delivery of this kind of activity?
   i Which resources are most useful and why?
   ii What factors hinder greater use being made of on-line resources?

3.5 Has an appropriate balance been struck between 'train the trainer' type activities and 'end participant' sessions?

a. How easy or difficult is it to engage community group staff/members in 'train the trainer' type sessions?
   i What motivates people to enlist as potential trainers?
   ii What prevents apparently suitable individuals from training up to become potential trainers?

3.6 How many volunteer trainers/Circuit Riders/digital storytelling experts have been recruited?

a. How much use is made of webinars to train Circuit Riders?
b. How are on-line Digital Inclusion Seminars used?

3.7 What effect has training staff or volunteers to train others in the use of IT/digital storytelling etc. had upon community/voluntary organisations?

3.7 a. To what extent are community/voluntary organisations themselves delivering IT related training to members/service users?
   i What needs to be in place to enable them to do this?
   ii What hinders them from doing so?
   b. How much use is made of bite-sized digital inclusion workshops by volunteer Circuit Riders/trainers?

3.8 What effect has giving/selling refurbished kit to community organisations had upon their use of technology?

3.9 How have case study materials used?
   a. What examples are there of case study materials influencing organisations' activities or individuals' behaviours?

3.10 How successful has the Technology Innovation Group been so far in supporting the development of IT enterprises?

4 IMPACTS

4.1 What difference has greater/more effective use of IT as a result of C2.0 support made to community organisations/social enterprises?
   a. How likely is it that these organisations would have arrived at the same solution without C2.0 partners' input?

4.2 What evidence is there that C2.0 support has helped social enterprises become more profitable/sustainable e.g. though use of technologies to generate income?

4.3 What evidence is there that C2.0 has helped create any new jobs?

4.4 How many community groups/social enterprises have actually implemented 'digital inclusion strategies'?
   a. What effects have these had?

4.5 To what extent are volunteer trainers/Circuit Riders/digital storytelling experts used by community groups?

a. What are they used for?

4.9 What evidence is there that C2.0 has helped to change the way in which people engage with IT?

a. What evidence is there that it has changed digitally excluded people's behaviour?

5 GOING FORWARD

5.1 What needs to be different should any successor Programme be developed?

a. Why are these changes necessary?

5.3 Might there be more effective ways of switching people on to technology?

a. What might work better?

5.2 How should feedback from community groups influence partners' activities?

Annex B1: Respondents to the Telephone Survey

A database of supported beneficiaries who had agreed for their details to be made available for research and evaluation purposes was supplied by the Wales Co-operative Centre to Old Bell 3 in August 2011.

A total of 1,790 contact names were supplied to us from a total of 3,398 beneficiaries who had been reported as assisted beneficiaries by the project to WEFO as at the end of Quarter 9.

Of the 1,790 contact names supplied 1,003 had a contact telephone number (landline, mobile or both) and this database was utilised to undertake a telephone-based survey between 15 September and 7 October 2011.

The target of undertaking 175 interviews was slightly exceeded and in the event 180 interviews were completed over this time period – representing just over 5% of the overall beneficiary database as at August 2011.

A second stage of the survey was undertaken in 2013. A database of 1,282 individuals supported by Communities 2.0 between October 2011 and March 2013 who had signed the programme's Data Protection Statement in agreeing for their details to be made available for research and evaluation purposes was supplied to the team in Spring 2013. It should be noted this was less than 10% of all individuals supported, which might potentially have introduced an element of bias in the sample. Given the numbers involved, we used this as the basis for undertaking telephone interviews with a second cohort of participants rather than drawing a sample from within it. Interviews were undertaken in May and June 2013.

The target of undertaking a further 175 interviews from this cohort was comfortably exceeded with a total of 241 interviews completed, representing 19% of the individuals whose contact data was available to us.

In addition, during this same period we sought to complete second wave interviews with those participants who had first been interviewed in 2011. We succeeded in re-interviewing some 94 out of the 180 individuals (52%) above the original target of achieving 75 re-interviews.

Figure B1.1 shows the outcomes of the attempts to re-interview the original 180 interviewees:

Figure B1.1: Outcomes of second wave of survey (2013)

Total sample used/tried	180
Numbers unobtainable	27
Refusal	24
Constant no reply / unable to speak with respondent	23
Ill health/deceased/respondent not available during fieldwork	6
No recollection of support so refusal on this basis	2
Partial interview completed	4
Full interview completed	94

Source: Telephone survey records

A third stage of the survey was undertaken in 2014. On this occasion, it was agreed that we would sample new participants exclusively from within the five digital initiative case-studies which had been agreed as a focus for the final evaluation in order both to inform the case-studies and to increase the overall sample of participants. The five case-studies were selected as a representative sample and there is no reason to believe the participants would not be representative of participants as a whole.

We received a database of 4,373 individuals who had received assistance from these digital initiatives. Of these 4,373 individuals, 2,649 had agreed for the sharing of their data for research and evaluation purposes but only 869 had telephone contact data.

Telephone interviews were undertaken with 150 participants (in accordance with the target), representing 3.4% of all individuals recorded via these five initiatives or 17.3% of the contacts available.

In addition, at this final evaluation stage, we attempted to undertake second wave interviews with those participants first interviewed in 2013 and succeeded in re-interviewing some 129, representing 53% of those originally interviewed, significantly above the target of 75.

Figure B1.2 shows the outcomes of the attempts to re-interview the original 241 interviewees.

Figure B1.2: Outcomes of second wave of survey (2014)

Total sample used/tried	241
Numbers unobtainable	8
Refusal	14
Constant no reply / unable to speak with respondent	76
Ill health/deceased/respondent not availableduring fieldwork	21
No recollection of support so refusal on this basis	2
Partial interview completed	0
Full interview completed	129

Source: Telephone survey records

Turning to the characteristics of respondents, Figure B1.3 presents data of the gender and age of respondents first interviewed in 2011, 2013 and 2014:

Figure B1.3: Gender and Age of Participants (first interviews)

	2011		2013		2014		TOTAL	
	Number	**%**	**Number**	**%**	**Number**	**%**	**Number**	**%**
GENDER								
Male	51	28%	96	40%	71	47%	218	38%
Females	129	72%	145	60%	79	53%	353	62%
Total	180	100%	241	100%	150	100%	571	100%
AGE								
Not stated	-	-	6	2%	1	1%	7	1%
11 to 14	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-
15 to 24	13	7%	14	6%	2	1%	29	5%
25 to 54	44	24%	80	33%	56	37%	180	32%
55 to 64	27	15%	52	22%	36	24%	115	20%
65 and over	96	53%	88	37%	55	37%	239	42%
Total	180	100%[2]	241	100	150	100%	571	100%

The completed survey sample for the first stage survey in 2011 appeared skewed towards older participants, compared to all participants on the database at the time the research was undertaken but the second and third cohorts were much closely representative of the data provided.

In terms of county of residence, respondents represented a good cross-section across the Convergence area as show in Figure B1.4, albeit with quite low numbers of responses from Conwy and Denbighshire (which appears to be representative of the overall population) and a degree of bias introduced by the use of the digital initiative case-studies (four of which were focused on specific local authority areas) to sample participants in the third and final cohort.

[2] Does not sum to 100 due to rounding

Figure B1.4: County of Residence of Participants (first interviews)

County	Number	%
Anglesey	39	7%
Blaenau Gwent	25	4%
Bridgend	41	7%
Caerphilly	99	17%
Carmarthenshire	74	13%
Ceredigion	26	5%
Conwy	5	1%
Denbighshire	6	1%
Gwynedd	76	13%
Merthyr Tydfil	26	5%
Neath Port Talbot	30	5%
Pembrokeshire	23	4%
Rhondda Cynon Taf	38	7%
Swansea	29	5%
Torfaen	24	4%
Other	9	2%
No response	1	-
Total	**571**	**100%**

The qualifications held by surveyed respondents were as follows[3]:

- 10% (57 respondents) had professional qualifications
- 4% (20 respondents) had NVQ Level 4-5, HNC, HND, RSA Higher Diploma or BTEC Higher Level qualifications
- 12% (69 respondents) had a Degree or Higher Degree
- 4% (25 respondents) had an NVQ Level 3 or equivalent
- 7% (40 respondents) had two or more A-levels or equivalent
- 11% (60 respondents) had an NVQ Level 2 or equivalent
- 12% (71 respondents) had five or more O-Levels (passes)/CSEs (grade i)/GSCEs (grades A* to C), School Certificate 1 A-Level/2-3 AS levels/VCEs, Welsh Baccalaureate Intermediate Diploma
- 5% (26 respondents) had NVQ Level 1, Foundation GNVQ or Basic Skills qualifications

[3] Respondents were asked to select all options that applied to them in order to compare the profile with that of the National Survey of Wales.

- 23% (132 respondents) had 1-4 O Levels/CSEs /GSCEs (any grades), Entry Level, Foundation Diploma
- 9% (49 respondents) had other vocational or work-related qualifications
- A third (33% or 191 respondents) had no qualifications at all.

The characteristics of those participants which we successfully re-interviewed broadly mirrored the entire population of the first wave interviewees in 2011 and 2013 as shown in Figures B1.5 and B1.6 below, though with some bias towards older participants. In part, however, this reflected the ageing of the cohort. Any effects of this were mitigated by comparing the responses of second wave respondents with the responses of the same individuals in the first wave.

Figure B1.4: Gender and Age of Participants (re-interviews)

	2013		2014		TOTAL	
	Number	**%**	**Number**	**%**	**Number**	**%**
GENDER						
Male	27	29%	52	40%	79	35%
Females	67	71%	76	53%	143	64%
Not stated	-	-	1	1%	1	1%
Total	94	100%	129	100%	223	100%
AGE						
Not stated	-	-	-	-	-	-
11 to 14	-	-	-	-	-	-
15 to 24	4	4%	5	4%	9	4%
25 to 54	16	17%	33	26%	49	22%
55 to 64	9	10%	25	19%	34	15%
65 and over	65	69%	66	51%	131	59%
Total	94	100%	129	100%	223	100%

Figure B1.6: County of Residence of Participants (re-interviews)

County	Number	%
Anglesey	3	1%
Blaenau Gwent	11	5%
Bridgend	18	8%
Caerphilly	22	10%
Carmarthenshire	52	23%
Ceredigion	14	6%
Conwy	1	-
Denbighshire	3	1%
Gwynedd	15	7%
Merthyr Tydfil	16	7%
Neath Port Talbot	16	7%
Pembrokeshire	10	5%
Rhondda Cynon Taf	18	8%
Swansea	15	7%
Torfaen	5	2%
Other	3	1%
No response	1	-
Total	**223**	**100%**[4]

[4] Does not sum to 100 due to rounding

Annex B2: Telephone Survey Questionnaires

B2.1 Topic guide for first wave interviews

COMMUNITIES 2.0 BENEFICIARY QUESTIONNAIRE
TELEPHONE SURVEY (FIRST INTERVIEW)

Good morning/afternoon.

[Note: Interview to commence in respondent's first language - specified on database]

Your details have been supplied to us by the Wales Co-operative Centre and I understand you recently received technology related support from [name of organisation] as part of the Communities 2.0 project. My name is [name] and I'm calling from Old Bell 3. We are carrying out a review for the Welsh Government on some aspects of this project.

1. **Firstly, can I check that you remember getting advice or support from [name of organisation]?**

❑	Proceed with survey	*Yes*
❑	Terminate Interview	*No*
❑	Attempt to prompt with details of support and proceed if possible	*Unsure*

I'd like to ask you some questions about the help and advice that you were given by [name of organisation] so that we can understand whether or not it has helped you and find ways of improving the services provided as part of the Communities 2.0 project.

All answers you provide are confidential.

I'd like to reassure you that no details the support you obtained were passed on to us and that this is about getting your feedback on the help you got so that your views and experiences can be used to improve the way things are done in the future.

2. **Would you be happy to take part in this brief interview? It shouldn't take more than 10 minutes at the most?**

❑	Go to 3.	*Yes*	❑	Go to End	*No*

3. **Would you like to do the interview in English or Welsh?**

❑	Use Welsh survey	*Welsh*	❑	Use English survey	*English*

Section 1: The first thing I'd like to ask you is about your use of computers and information technology before getting involved with [name of organisation].

4. **Did you/ Did your household have access to the internet at home, before you got involved with [name of organisation]?**

❑	*Yes*	❑	*No*	❑	*Don't Know*

5. **Did you personally use the internet at home, work or elsewhere before you got involved with [name of organisation]?**

- ❑ **Go to 6.** *Yes*
- ❑ **Go to 7.** *No*
- ❑ **Go to 8.** *Don't Know*

6. **[IFQ5=1]How often, on average, did you use the Internet before you got involved with [name of organisation]? [whether at home, work or elsewhere]**

❑ *On most days* ❑ *At least once a week* ❑ *Less often than once a week* ❑ *Can't remember*

7. **[IF Q5=2] Had you ever used the internet anywhere in the past before you got involved with [name of organisation]?**

❑ *Yes* ❑ *No*

8. **How much experience of computers and information technology did you have before getting involved with [name of organisation]?**

❑ *A lot* ❑ *A fair amount* ❑ *Some but not much* ❑ *Hardly any at all* ❑ *None*

9. **How often, on average, did you use computers before you got involved with [name of organisation]?**

❑ *On most days* ❑ *At least once a week* ❑ *Less often than once a week* ❑ *Never* ❑ *Can't remember*

Section 2: This next section covers the actual support you had from [name of organisation].

10. **Can you tell me what kinds of information technology related workshops, courses or activities you got involved with via [name of organisation]? [Prompt with examples and code all that apply]**

- ❑ *Basic computer courses (e.g. Work processing, E-mail, the Internet)*
- ❑ *Digital photography course*
- ❑ *Skype*
- ❑ *Social media (e.g. Facebook or Twitter)*
- ❑ *Digital storytelling*
- ❑ *Film making*
- ❑ *Mobile phone courses*
- ❑ *Other*

If other, please specify

11. **On a scale of 1 to 5 (where 1 is no difference and 5 is a significant difference) what difference did doing the workshops, courses or activities make to the way you feel about information technology in terms of:**

	No difference 1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*Significant difference 5*
How useful it can be?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
How easy it can be to use?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
The confidence to use it?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
The desire to make more use of technology?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
The skills to use technology effectively?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

12. **Do you think that doing the workshop(s), course(s) or activity/ies has/have made you any more likely to take part in courses to develop your computer or information technology related skills further?**

❑ *Definitely* ❑ *Possibly* ❑ *Probably not* ❑ *Defiantly not* ❑ *Don't Know*

13. **How, if at all, do you think that doing the workshop, course or activity has affected your job prospects?**

❑ *Made me much more employable*
❑ *Made me a bit more employable*
❑ *Made no difference*
❑ *Not relevant (e.g. not looking for work or retired)*
❑ *Don't Know*

14. **Do you think that doing the workshop, course or activity has made you any more likely to do some volunteering or unpaid work to help others in the community?**

❑ *Definitely* ❑ *Possibly* ❑ *Probably not* ❑ *Definitely not* ❑ *Don't Know*

Section 3: Next, I'd like to ask you about your current and recent use of computers and information technology

15. **Since completing the course, workshop or activity have you used a <u>computer</u> at all [NOTE TO RESEARCHERS: Computer includes desktop, laptop or handheld computers]?**

❑ **Go to Q16** *Yes*
❑ **Go to Q18** *No*

16. **[IF Q15=YES] How often, on average do you use a computer?**

❑ *On most days*
❑ *At least once a week*
❑ *Less often than once a week*

17. **[IF Q15=YES] Thinking about the last three months have you used a computer in any of the following places? [Please select all that apply]**

- ❑ *At your home*
- ❑ *Another person's home*
- ❑ *At place of work (other than home)*
- ❑ *At place of education (other than home)*
- ❑ *In another public place e.g. library, community centre, internet cafe*
- ❑ *At other places (please specify)*
- ❑ *Not used the computer in the last three months*
- ❑ *Don't know*
- ❑ *Refused*

If other, please specify where:

18. **Do you/Does your household currently have access to the internet at home?**

❑ *Yes* ❑ *No* ❑ *Don't Know*

19. **Do you personally use the internet at home, work or elsewhere?**

❑ **Go to Q22** *Yes* ❑ **Go to Q20** *No* ❑ **Go to Q20** *Don't Know*

20. **[IF Q19=NO]Have you ever used the internet anywhere since completing the course, workshop or activity?**

❑ **Go to Q22** *Yes* ❑ **Go to Q21** *No* ❑ **Go to Q28** *Don't Know*

21. **[IF Q20=NO]Can I ask why you don't currently use the internet? [Please select all that apply]**

- ❑ *Don't want to use the internet*
- ❑ *Don't need to use the internet*
- ❑ *Equipment cost is too high*
- ❑ *Access cost is too high*
- ❑ *Lack of skills*
- ❑ *Privacy/security concerns*
- ❑ *Health problems make it difficult*
- ❑ *Other*
- ❑ *Don't Know*
- ❑ *Refused*

Please specify these other reasons

GO TO QQ28 AT SECTION 4

22. **How often, on average, do you access the internet, whether at home, work or elsewhere?**

- ❑ *On most days*
- ❑ *At least once a week*
- ❑ *Less often than once a week*

23. **Thinking about the last three months have you used the Internet in any of the following places? [Please select all that apply]**

- ❑ *At your home*
- ❑ *Another person's home*
- ❑ *At place of work (other than home)*
- ❑ *At place of education (other than home)*
- ❑ *In another public place e.g. library, community centre, internet cafe*
- ❑ *At other places (please specify)*
- ❑ *Not used the internet in the last three months*
- ❑ *Refused*

If other, please specify where:

24. **Which of the following devices do you use to access the internet?**

	Yes	*No*	*Don't Know*	*Refused to answer*
Desktop computer	❑	❑	❑	❑
Laptop at home or in work	❑	❑	❑	❑
Laptop away from home or work	❑	❑	❑	❑
Mobile phone or smartphone	❑	❑	❑	❑
Handheld computer (e.g. tablet, iPad, palmtop)	❑	❑	❑	❑
Games console	❑	❑	❑	❑
Digital TV	❑	❑	❑	❑
Other	❑	❑	❑	❑

Please specify these other devices:

25. **Thinking about when you have accessed the Internet for personal or private use, have you used the Internet for:**

	Yes	*No*	*Don't Know*	*Refused to answer*
E-mail	❑	❑	❑	❑
Telephoning over the internet/video conferencing	❑	❑	❑	❑
Chat rooms, message boards, social networking sites or blogging (e.g. Facebook, Twitter)	❑	❑	❑	❑
Finding information about health, government or public services	❑	❑	❑	❑
Finding information related to schoolwork or an education course	❑	❑	❑	❑
Finding information about other goods or services (including holidays, flights, houses)	❑	❑	❑	❑
Listening to the radio or watching TV programmes	❑	❑	❑	❑
Playing or downloading music, games, books or other software	❑	❑	❑	❑
Reading or downloading on-line news (including newspapers or sports news)	❑	❑	❑	❑
Buying or ordering tickets, goods or services (excluding shares and financial services)	❑	❑	❑	❑

Personal banking, financial and investment activities	❑	❑	❑	❑
Selling goods or services (e.g. through on-line auctions)	❑	❑	❑	❑
Looking for jobs or work	❑	❑	❑	❑
General browsing	❑	❑	❑	❑

26. **Have you ever used the Internet to get information about, or to contact the Welsh Government?**

❑ *Yes* ❑ *No* ❑ *Don't Know*

27. **Have you ever used the internet to get information about, or to contact a public sector organisation such as your local authority or a government department or agency (but not the Welsh Government)?**

❑ *Yes* ❑ *No* ❑ *Don't Know*

Section 4: Finally I have a few personal questions to ask about you and what you do. Your responses will be kept completely confidential and will only be used to report on the profile of those surveyed.

28. **In which local authority do you live?**

❑ *Anglesey*	❑ *Carmarthenshire*	❑ *Gwynedd*	❑ *Rhondda Cynon Taf*
❑ *Blaenau Gwent*	❑ *Ceredigion*	❑ *Merthyr Tydfil*	❑ *Swansea*
❑ *Bridgend*	❑ *Conwy*	❑ *Neath Port Talbot*	❑ *Torfaen*
❑ *Caerphilly*	❑ *Denbighshire*	❑ *Pembrokeshire*	❑ *Other*

29. **Can you tell me what best describes your current status?**

❑ *Self employed*
❑ *In paid employment (full or part time)*
❑ *Unemployed*
❑ *Retired*
❑ *On maternity leave*
❑ *Looking after family or home*
❑ *Full-time student*
❑ *Long term sick or disabled*
❑ *On a government training scheme*
❑ *Unpaid worker in family business*
❑ *Doing something else*

30. **Which of the following qualifications do you have?**

INTERVIEWER NOTE: IF UK QUALIFICATION IS NOT LISTED, SELECT ITS NEAREST EQUIVALENT.

IF QUALIFICATIONS GAINED OUTSIDE THE UK, SELECT 'FOREIGN QUALIFICATIONS' AND THE NEAREST UK EQUIVALENTS (IF KNOWN).

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

- ❑ *1 - 4 O levels / CSEs / GCSEs (any grades), Entry Level, Foundation Diploma*
- ❑ *NVQ Level 1, Foundation GNVQ, Basic Skills*
- ❑ *5+ O levels (passes) / CSEs (grade 1) /GCSEs (grades A*- C), School Certificate, 1 A level /2 - 3 AS levels / VCEs, Welsh Baccalaureate Intermediate Diploma*
- ❑ *NVQ Level 2, Intermediate GNVQ, City and Guilds Craft, BTEC First /General Diploma, RSA Diploma*
- ❑ *Apprenticeship*
- ❑ *2+ A levels / VCEs, 4+ AS levels, Higher School Certificate, Progression / Welsh Baccalaureate Advanced Diploma*
- ❑ *NVQ Level 3, Advanced GNVQ, City and Guilds Advanced Craft,ONC, OND, BTEC National, RSA Advanced Diploma*
- ❑ *Degree (for example BA, BSc), Higher degree (for example MA, PhD,PGCE)*
- ❑ *NVQ Level 4 - 5, HNC, HND, RSA Higher Diploma, BTEC Higher Level*
- ❑ *Professional qualifications (for example teaching, nursing, accountancy)*
- ❑ *Other vocational / work-related qualifications*
- ❑ *Foreign qualifications*
- ❑ *No qualifications*
- ❑ *Don't Know*

31. **How old are you?**

❑ *11 to 14*	❑ *25 to 54*	❑ *65 plus*
❑ *15 to 24*	❑ *55 to 64*	❑ *Not stated*

32. **CODE:Gender**

❑ *Male* ❑ *Female*

Thank your for your feedback.
Just to confirm that my name is [interviewer name] calling from Old Bell 3 and that this survey has been conducted according to the Market Research Society Code of Conduct. If you'd like to check our credentials, you can telephone the MRS via the freephone number 0500 39 69 99. Thanks again and goodbye.

B2.2 Questionnaire for second wave interviews

COMMUNITIES 2.0 BENEFICIARY QUESTIONNAIRE
TELEPHONE SURVEY: RE-INTERVIEW

Good morning/afternoon.

You may recall that you received technology related support from [name of organisation] as part of the Communities 2.0 project about a year or 18 months ago. My name is [name] and I'm calling from Old Bell 3. You very kindly completed a telephone survey for us during 2013 about the project and the support that you received.

As part of our on-going evaluation of the Communities 2.0 project we would like to ask a few questions about whether you have continued to use IT or not since you were involved with the project. This will help us establish what different the project has made to individuals in the long term.

All answers you provide are confidential.

1. **Would you be happy to take part in this brief interview? It shouldn't take more than 6 minutes at the most?**

- ❑ Yes
- ❑ No

2. **Would you like to do the interview in English or Welsh?**

- ❑ Welsh
- ❑ English

Section 1: First, I'd like to ask you about your current use of computers and information technology

3. **Do you currently use a <u>computer</u> at all? [NOTE TO RESEARCHERS: Computer includes desktop, laptop or handheld computers]**

- ❑ Yes
- ❑ No

4. **[IF Q3=YES] How often, on average do you use a computer?**

- ❑ On most days
- ❑ At least once a week
- ❑ Less often than once a week

5. **[IF Q3=YES] Thinking about the last three months have you used a computer in any of the following places? [Please select all that apply]**

- ❑ At your home
- ❑ Another person's home
- ❑ At place of work (other than home)
- ❑ At place of education (other than home)
- ❑ In another public place e.g. library, community centre, internet cafe
- ❑ At other places (please specify)
- ❑ Not used a computer in the last three months
- ❑ Don't know
- ❑ Refused

If other, please specify where:

6. **Do you/Does your household currently have access to the internet at home?**

❑ Yes ❑ No ❑ Don't Know

7. **Do you personally use the internet at home, work or elsewhere?**

❑ Yes ❑ No ❑ Don't Know

8. **[IF Q7=NO]Have you ever used the internet anywhere since you first got involved with the Community 2.0 project?**

❑ Yes ❑ No ❑ Don't Know

9. **[IF Q7=NO]Can I ask why you don't currently use the internet? [Please select all that apply]**

- ❑ Don't want to use the internet
- ❑ Don't need to use the internet
- ❑ Equipment cost is too high
- ❑ Access cost is too high
- ❑ Lack of skills
- ❑ Privacy/security concerns
- ❑ Health problems make it difficult
- ❑ Other
- ❑ Don't Know
- ❑ Refused

Please specify these other reasons

10. **How often, on average, do you access the internet, whether at home, work or elsewhere?**

- ❑ On most days
- ❑ At least once a week
- ❑ Less often than once a week

11. **Thinking about the last three months have you used the Internet in any of the following places? [Please select all that apply]**

- ❑ At your home
- ❑ Another person's home
- ❑ At place of work (other than home)
- ❑ At place of education (other than home)
- ❑ In another public place e.g. library, community centre, internet cafe
- ❑ At other places (please specify)
- ❑ Not used the internet in the last three months
- ❑ Refused

If other, please specify where:

12. **Which of the following devices do you use to access the internet?**

	Yes	*No*	*Don't Know*
Desktop computer	❑	❑	❑
Laptop at home or in work	❑	❑	❑
Laptop away from home or work	❑	❑	❑
Mobile phone or smartphone	❑	❑	❑
Handheld computer (e.g. tablet, iPad, palmtop)	❑	❑	❑
Games console	❑	❑	❑
Digital TV	❑	❑	❑
Other	❑	❑	❑

Please specify these other devices:

13. **Thinking about when you have accessed the Internet for personal or private use, have you used the Internet for:**

	Yes	*No*	*Don't Know*
E-mail	❑	❑	❑
Telephoning over the internet/video conferencing	❑	❑	❑
Chat rooms, message boards, social networking sites or blogging (e.g. Facebook, Twitter)	❑	❑	❑
Finding information about health, government or public services	❑	❑	❑
Finding information related to schoolwork or an education course	❑	❑	❑
Finding information about other goods or services (including holidays, flights, houses)	❑	❑	❑
Listening to the radio or watching TV programmes	❑	❑	❑

Playing or downloading music, games or other software	❑	❑	❑
Reading or downloading on-line news (including newspapers, sports news or news magazines)	❑	❑	❑
Buying or ordering tickets, goods or services (excluding shares and financial services)	❑	❑	❑
Personal banking, financial and investment activities	❑	❑	❑
Selling goods or services (e.g. through on-line auctions)	❑	❑	❑
Looking for jobs or work	❑	❑	❑
General browsing	❑	❑	❑

14. **Have you ever used the Internet to get information about, or to contact the Welsh Government?**

❑ Yes ❑ No ❑ Don't Know

15. **Have you ever used the internet to get information about, or to contact a public sector organisation such as your local authority or a government department or agency (but not the Welsh Government)?**

❑ Yes ❑ No ❑ Don't Know

Section 2: Next I'd like to ask you about any IT learning that you may have done since you got involved in the Communities 2.0 project

16. **Have you attended any courses or done any other sort of learning about computers, the internet or IT since you participated in the Communities 2.0 project?**

❑ Yes
❑ No
❑ Don't know

17. **[IF Q16=YES]**
What sort of learning was this? [Prompt with examples and code all that apply]

- ❑ Basic computer courses (e.g. Work processing, E-mail, the Internet)
- ❑ On-line course or learning
- ❑ Digital photography course
- ❑ Skype
- ❑ Social media (e.g. Facebook or Twitter)
- ❑ Digital storytelling
- ❑ Film making
- ❑ Mobile phone courses
- ❑ Being shown how to do things by friends or family
- ❑ Other

If other, please specify

18. **Would you have participated in this further learning had it not been for your involvement with the Communities 2.0 project?**

- ❑ Definitely
- ❑ Probably
- ❑ Probably not
- ❑ Definitely not
- ❑ Don't know

Section 3: Finally I have a few personal questions to ask about you and what you do. Your responses will be kept completely confidential and will only be used to report on the profile of those surveyed.

19. **Do you still live in [name of local authority on database]?**

❑ Anglesey	❑ Carmarthenshire	❑ Gwynedd	❑ Rhondda Cynon Taf
❑ Blaenau Gwent	❑ Ceredigion	❑ Merthyr Tydfil	❑ Swansea
❑ Bridgend	❑ Conwy	❑ Neath Port Talbot	❑ Torfaen
❑ Caerphilly	❑ Denbighshire	❑ Pembrokeshire	❑ Other

20. **Are you still [employment status on database]?**

- ❑ Self employed
- ❑ In paid employment (full or part time)
- ❑ Unemployed
- ❑ Retired
- ❑ On maternity leave
- ❑ Looking after family or home
- ❑ Full-time student
- ❑ Long term sick or disabled
- ❑ On a government training scheme
- ❑ Unpaid worker in family business
- ❑ Doing something else

21. **[IF NOW EMPLOYED OR SELF-EMPLOYED AND PREVIOUSLY NOT ASK]:**

Do you think that your IT skills and the learning you did through Communities 2.0 played any role in helping you get your current job?

- ❑ Yes a lot
- ❑ Yes a little
- ❑ No
- ❑ Don't know

22. **[ASK IF Q21=YES A LOT]**
Why do you say this?

23. **Can I confirm that the highest qualification which you have is [as shown on database]:**

INTERVIEWER NOTE: IF UK QUALIFICATION IS NOT LISTED, SELECT ITS NEAREST EQUIVALENT.

IF QUALIFICATIONS GAINED OUTSIDE THE UK, SELECT 'FOREIGN QUALIFICATIONS' AND THE NEAREST UK EQUIVALENTS (IF KNOWN).

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

- ❑ 1 - 4 O levels / CSEs / GCSEs (any grades), Entry Level, Foundation Diploma
- ❑ NVQ Level 1, Foundation GNVQ, Basic Skills
- ❑ 5+ O levels (passes) / CSEs (grade 1) /GCSEs (grades A*- C), School Certificate, 1 A level /2 - 3 AS levels / VCEs, Welsh Baccalaureate Intermediate Diploma
- ❑ NVQ Level 2, Intermediate GNVQ, City and Guilds Craft, BTEC First /General Diploma, RSA Diploma
- ❑ Apprenticeship
- ❑ 2+ A levels / VCEs, 4+ AS levels, Higher School Certificate, Progression / Welsh Baccalaureate Advanced Diploma
- ❑ NVQ Level 3, Advanced GNVQ, City and Guilds Advanced Craft, ONC, OND, BTEC National, RSA Advanced Diploma
- ❑ Degree (for example BA, BSc), Higher degree (for example MA, PhD, PGCE)
- ❑ NVQ Level 4 - 5, HNC, HND, RSA Higher Diploma, BTEC Higher Level
- ❑ Professional qualifications (for example teaching, nursing, accountancy)
- ❑ Other vocational / work-related qualifications
- ❑ Foreign qualifications
- ❑ No qualifications
- ❑ Don't Know

24. **How old are you?**

- ❑ 11 to 14
- ❑ 15 to 24
- ❑ 25 to 54
- ❑ 55 to 64
- ❑ 65 plus
- ❑ Not stated

25. **CODE:Gender**

- ❑ Male
- ❑ Female

Annex C1: Respondents to the Web Survey

Web surveys with local stakeholders were undertaken in 2011 and 2014.

In 2011, a database of 320 working e-mails was constructed from within the research team, based on certain roles which might be expected to come into contact with Communities 2.0. The database included details made available to us via the following sources:

- WCVA: contact details for Chief Executives of Voluntary Councils;
- Welsh Government: contact details for Communities First Co-ordinators;
- Society of Chief Librarians (Wales): contact details for Welsh Chief Librarians;
- WLGA: Local Authority Economic Regeneration Officers;
- WLGA: Local Authority Heads of Corporate Policy Officers.

A web survey was developed and deployed between 13 and 30 of September 2011 and 62 responses were received. This represents a reasonable response rate of 19%.

The profile of respondents was as follows:

- The majority (74% or 46 respondents) were employed by a local authority with smaller numbers working for other types of organisations (seven or 11% in a third sector organisation, five or 8% in a County Voluntary Council, one or 2% in a private sector organisation and two or 3% in other types of organisation[5]).
- 44% (27 respondents) were working in operational roles whilst 42% (or 26 respondents) were working in strategic or senior management roles. The remaining few were either based in policy making roles (3% or 2 respondents) or in other roles (7% or 4 respondents) such as administrative work.

In 2014, a different approach to the selection of stakeholders was adopted. Given the re-organisation of the Programme staff into regional teams and the development of digital initiatives covering each county area, Communities 2.0 staff were asked to identify key stakeholders in each area. From this a database of 155 potential

[5] Identified as a co-operative and a Communities First project.

respondents was compiled. The web-survey was deployed between early September and mid October 2014 and in total some 50 responses were received, representing a good response rate of 33%.

Figure C1.1 shows the employing organisation for respondents.

Figure C1.1: Employing Organisation for Web-Survey Respondents

Organisation Type	No. of respondents
In Local Authority Library Services	6
In a Local Authority Communities First Role	2
In another role within a Local Authority	10
In JobCentre Plus	3
In another public sector organisation	0
In a County Voluntary Council	6
In a Housing Association	9
In another third sector organisation	11
In a private sector organisation	1
In another type of organisation	2

The two 'other' respondents worked for the Welsh Government and for a Communities First cluster led by The Wales Co-operative Centre.

Figure C1.2 provides details of the role which respondents to the web-survey held.

Figure C1.2: Role Held by Web-Survey Respondents

Role	No. of respondents
Chief Executive or Director	6
Strategic or Senior management	18
Policy making	1
Chief or Head Librarian	3
Librarian	2
Operational	11
Research-based	0
Other	7

Six of the seven respondents who selected 'other' provided a response as to what their roles were. These were: family and community learning manager, partnership co-coordinator for the local service board, community development officer, borough councillor and cabinet member, lead for poverty intervention activity (including digital inclusion), and lifelong learning coordinator

Annex C2: Web Survey Questionnaire

Old Bell 3 is undertaking a long-term evaluation of the Communities 2.0 Programme on behalf of the Welsh Government. As part of this evaluation we wish to capture the views of a range of stakeholders who may have had some involvement with the Communities 2.0 Programme and would be very grateful if you would complete this short questionnaire. It should take no more than ten minutes of your time and your responses will not be shared outside the research team or attributed to you in our report.

We appreciate that some of you have already contributed to our evaluation and spoken directly with one of our researchers. However we would still be very grateful if you could complete this brief web survey so that we can obtain a comprehensive overview of the programme.

Section 1: You and your organisation

1.1. Are you employed:

- ❑ *In Local Authority Library Services*
- ❑ *In a Local Authority Communities First Role*
- ❑ *In another role within a Local Authority*
- ❑ *In JobCentre Plus*
- ❑ *In another public sector organisation*
- ❑ *In a County Voluntary Council*
- ❑ *In a Housing Association*
- ❑ *In another third sector organisation*
- ❑ *In a private sector organisation, or*
- ❑ *In another type of organisation?*

Please specify this other type of organisation:

1.2. Is your role primarily:

- ❑ *Chief Executive or Director*
- ❑ *Strategic or Senior management*
- ❑ *Policy making*
- ❑ *Chief or Head Librarian*
- ❑ *Librarian*
- ❑ *Operational*
- ❑ *Research-based*
- ❑ *Other*

Please specify this other role:

1.3. How involved have you been with the Communities 2.0 Programme over the last two to three years?

- ❑ *Very involved*
- ❑ *Quite involved*
- ❑ *Not particularly involved*
- ❑ *Not involved at all*
- ❑ *I was previously employed by the Programme*

Section 2: Awareness of the 'digital inclusion' agenda across the voluntary and community/social enterprise sector

'Digital inclusion' involves getting people to access and use digital technology so that they can communicate as well as access goods and public services more easily.

2.1. **From your experience, how does the voluntary and community/social enterprise sector usually hear about the 'digital inclusion' agenda? [Please select all that apply]**

- ❑ *Media sources (e.g. TV, newspapers)*
- ❑ *From other organisations in their sector*
- ❑ *From users of their services*
- ❑ *Directly from the Communities 2.0 Programme*
- ❑ *From other Digital Inclusion projects*
- ❑ *From County Voluntary Councils*
- ❑ *From Public Sector Organisations*
- ❑ *From their funders*
- ❑ *From sector related associations*
- ❑ *From specialist advisors/consultants*
- ❑ *Don't know*
- ❑ *Other*

Please specify what these other sources are?

2.2. **How aware would you say is the voluntary and community/social enterprise sector of the 'digital inclusion' agenda?**

- ❑ *Very aware*
- ❑ *Quite aware*
- ❑ *Not particularly aware*
- ❑ *Not aware at all*
- ❑ *Don't know*

2.3. **How, if at all, has awareness of the digital inclusion agenda within the voluntary and community/social enterprise sector changed over the last two to three years?**

- ❑ *There has been a significant increase in awareness*
- ❑ *There has been some increase in awareness*
- ❑ *There has been no change in awareness*
- ❑ *There has been a relative drop in awareness*
- ❑ *Don't know*

2.4.

What contribution, if any, has the Communities 2.0 Programme made to the current level of digital inclusion awareness amongst the voluntary and community/social enterprise sector?

- ❑ *Significant contribution*
- ❑ *Some contribution*
- ❑ *No particular contribution*
- ❑ *No contribution at all*
- ❑ *Don't know*

Section 3: Awareness of the 'digital inclusion' agenda across the public sector

3.1. **From your experience, how do <u>public sector organisations</u> tend to <u>hear about</u> the 'digital inclusion' agenda? [Please select all that apply]**

- ❑ *Media sources (e.g. TV, newspapers)*
- ❑ *From other public sector organisations*
- ❑ *From users of their services*
- ❑ *Directly from the Communities 2.0 Programme*
- ❑ *From other Digital Inclusion Initiatives (e.g. BT)*
- ❑ *From their funders*
- ❑ *From sector related associations*
- ❑ *From specialist advisors/consultants*
- ❑ *Don't know*
- ❑ *Other*

Please specify what these other sources are?

3.2. **How <u>aware</u> would you say are the following public sector organisations of the 'digital inclusion' agenda?**

	Very aware	*Quite aware*	*Not particularly aware*	*Not aware at all*	*Don't know*
Welsh Government departments	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Communities First clusters	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Local Authority Library services	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Housing Associations	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Other Local Authority departments	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
JobCentre Plus	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

3.3. **What contribution, if any, has the Communities 2.0 Programme made to the current level of digital inclusion awareness amongst the following public sector organisations?**

	Significant contribution	*Some contribution*	*No particular contribution*	*No contribution at all*	*Don't know*
Welsh Government departments	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Communities First clusters	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Local Authority Library services	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Housing Associations	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Other Local Authority departments	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
JobCentre Plus	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

Section 4: How the Communities 2.0 Programme has been reaching community groups and digitally excluded people

4.1. **How successful has the Communities 2.0 Programme been in using intermediary organisations (such as Local Authorities, County Voluntary Councils, Communities First teams etc) to reach community groups and social enterprises?**

- ❑ *Very successful*
- ❑ *Fairly successful*
- ❑ *Not successful*
- ❑ *Not at all successful*
- ❑ *Don't know*

{If successful}
Why do you say that?

{If not successful}
Why do you say that?

4.2. **How successful has the Communities 2.0 Programme been in using community groups or social enterprises to reach digitally excluded people?**

- ❑ *Very successful*
- ❑ *Fairly successful*
- ❑ *Not particularly successful*
- ❑ *Not at all successful*
- ❑ *Don't know*

4.3. **How successful has the Communities 2.0 Programme been in using local, regional and thematic Digital Initiatives to reach digitally excluded people?**

- ❑ *Very successful*
- ❑ *Fairly successful*
- ❑ *Not particularly successful*
- ❑ *Not at all successful*
- ❑ *Don't know*

4.4. **What aspects of the Communities 2.0 Programme have been particularly successful in reaching digitally excluded people?**

4.5. **What aspects of the Communities 2.0 Programme <u>have not</u> been successful in reaching digitally excluded people?**

Section 5: Communities 2.0 Website, Social Media and Case Studies

5.1. **How would you rate the web presence of the Communities 2.0 Programme?**

- ❑ *Very effective*
- ❑ *Fairly effective*
- ❑ *Not particularly effective*
- ❑ *Not at all effective*
- ❑ *Don't know*

5.2. **How, if at all, could the web presence of the Communities 2.0 Programme be improved?**

5.3. **How would you rate the social media campaign deployed by the Communities 2.0 Programme?**

- ❑ *Very effective*
- ❑ *Fairly effective*
- ❑ *Not particularly effective*
- ❑ *Not at all effective*
- ❑ *Don't know*

5.4. **How, if at all, could the social media campaign be improved?**

5.5. **How would you rate the case study materials produced by the Communities 2.0 Programme?**

- ❑ *Very useful*
- ❑ *Fairly useful*
- ❑ *Not particularly useful*
- ❑ *Not at all useful*
- ❑ *Don't know*

5.6. **Is there a specific Communities 2.0 Programme case study that you have found to be particularly useful to your own organisation?**

- ❑ *Yes*
- ❑ *No*
- ❑ *Don't know*

If Yes
What was this case study?

If Yes
In what way, if at all, did the case study influence your own organisation's activities or behaviour?

Section 6: The support made available via the Communities 2.0 Programme to community groups and social enterprises

6.1. **How would you rate the support made available by the Communities 2.0 Programme to community groups/social enterprises in terms of its:**

	Very Good	*Good*	*Neither Good or Poor*	*Poor*	*Very Poor*	*Don't Know*
Appropriateness?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Quality?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Timeliness?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

6.2. **How effective have the following Programme services for community groups/social enterprises been?**

	Very effective	*Fairly effective*	*Not particularly effective*	*Not at all effective*	*Don't Know*
Train the trainer provision for staff or volunteers	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Helping community groups make effective use of technology	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Providing community groups' with technical advice	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

Please feel free to add any comments below:

6.3. **Over the last two years or so to what extent do you think that community groups/social enterprises have:**

	Significant increase	*Some increase*	*No particular increase*	*No increase at all*	*Don't Know*
Increased their use of ICT to manage their organisations	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Increased their use of ICT as a tool for engaging members	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Increased their use of ICT for wider communications and marketing	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

6.4. **[ROUTED FROM 6.3 WHERE THERE HAS BEEN AN INCREASE]**
What contribution, if any, do you think the Programme made towards these changes within the community groups/social enterprises sector?

	Significant contribution	*Some contribution*	*No particular contribution*	*No contribution at all*	*Don't Know*
Increased use of ICT to manage organisations	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Increased use of ICT as a tool for engaging members	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Increased use of ICT for wider communications and marketing	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

6.5. **To what extent, if any, do you think the Programme had helped social enterprises become more profitable or sustainable?**

- ❑ *To a significant extent*
- ❑ *To some extent*
- ❑ *To not particular extent*
- ❑ *To no extent at all*
- ❑ *Don't know*

Section 7: The support made available via the Communities 2.0 Programme to individual beneficiaries

7.1. **How effective have the following Programme services for beneficiaries been?**

	Very effective	*Fairly effective*	*Not particularly effective*	*Not at all effective*	*Don't Know*
Taster sessions or workshops for beneficiaries	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
In-depth ICT related training for beneficiaries	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

7.2. **How successful has the Programme been in engaging participants from the following groups to get involved with technology?**

	Very successful	*Fairly successful*	*Not particularly successful*	*Not at all successful*	*Don't know*
Older people	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
People living in social housing	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Disabled people	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Unemployed individuals	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

7.3. **Overall, how successful has the Programme been in engaging participants to get involved with technology?**

- ❑ *Very successful*
- ❑ *Fairly successful*
- ❑ *Not particularly successful*
- ❑ *Not very successful*
- ❑ *Don't know*

7.4. **[If Q7.3= Successful] In what way has the Programme been successful in engaging participants to get involved with technology?**

7.5. **[If Q7.3= Unsuccessful] In what way has the Programme not been successful in engaging participants to get involved with technology?**

7.6. **How successful, or otherwise, has the Communities 2.0 Programme been in engaging participants to undertake further learning related to the use of IT?**

- ❑ *Very successful*
- ❑ *Fairly successful*
- ❑ *Not particularly successful*
- ❑ *Not very successful*
- ❑ *Don't know*

7.7. **How successful, or otherwise, has the Communities 2.0 Programme been in helping people to develop IT skills which will make them more employable?**

- ❑ *Very successful*
- ❑ *Fairly successful*
- ❑ *Not particularly successful*
- ❑ *Not very successful*
- ❑ *Don't know*

Section 8: The support made available via the Communities 2.0 Programme to developing on-line service delivery

8.1. **Has <u>your organisation</u> made any changes to its on-line service delivery arrangements over the last two years or so? [These would include any e-government developments, community hubs or use of social media etc]**

- ❑ *Yes*
- ❑ *No*
- ❑ *Unsure/Don't Know*

8.2. **[IF Q8.1=YES]**
What have been the nature of the changes made to your organisation's on-line service delivery arrangements?

8.3. **[IF Q8.1=YES]**
What contribution, if any, did the Communities 2.0 Programme make to these on-line service delivery arrangement changes?

- ❑ *Significant contribution*
- ❑ *Some contribution*
- ❑ *No particular contribution*
- ❑ *No contribution at all*
- ❑ *Don't know*

8.4. **Could you provide a specific example of how the Communities 2.0 Programme has changed the way your organisation works? Please explain whether this change would have happened anyway.**

8.5. **At a more general level what contribution, if any, do you think the Programme has had in supporting the development of <u>public sector bodies' on-line service delivery arrangements?</u>**

- ❑ *Significant contribution*
- ❑ *Some contribution*
- ❑ *No particular contribution*
- ❑ *No contribution at all*
- ❑ *Don't know*

Section 9: The future

9.1. **How likely is it that any digital inclusion activities which your organisation is currently delivering in partnership with Communities 2.0 Programme will be sustained after the end of the programme?**

- ❑ *Very likely*
- ❑ *Fairly likely*
- ❑ *Not very likely*
- ❑ *Not at all likely*
- ❑ *Don't know*

9.2. **[IF 9.1=1 or 2] Which aspects of digital inclusion activities are likely to be sustained after the end of the programme?**

9.3. **[IF 9.1=1 or 2] How will these digital inclusion activities be funded in the future?**

9.4. **Is there a need for a successor programme to Communities 2.0?**

- ❑ *Yes*
- ❑ *No*
- ❑ *Unsure or don't know*

9.5. **What changes, if any, should be made to any successor programme?**

Thank you for completing this questionnaire.

Please click on the Submit button below to send your responses back to us.

Annex D1: Organisation Case-studies

The original methodology for the evaluation involved a significant focus on longitudinal work with a sample of organisations supported by Communities 2.0, covering both social enterprises and voluntary and community organisations.

For the Interim Evaluation, we received data from the Communities 2.0 monitoring officer for organisations assisted and drew a representative sample of seven social enterprises and 13 voluntary and community organisations which were recorded as being assisted by the Programme. We subsequently between September and November 2011 undertook face-to-face[6] interviews with 20 organisations (six social enterprises and 14 voluntary and community organisations): however, six of the original organisations approached (all but one of them voluntary and community organisations) and seven organisations in all declined to take part, generally on the basis that the support received was too slight to allow them to discuss it in detail, with substitutions being made to reach the quota.

In 2013, around 18 months after the initial interviews, we sought to re-interview representatives of the same organisations. We were able to make contact with interviewees from 17 of these organisations. In one (which had received the most significant level of support from the programme at the time of the first interview), the original contact had moved on and no-one else was able to talk about the assistance and in two others, the original interviewee did not respond to repeated messages.

Of the 17, staff or organisational changes meant that we were not able to talk to the original interviewee in five cases:

- In one, the original interviewee had retired;
- In a second, funding cuts had meant the original interviewee had left the organisation;
- In two further organisations, we were told other staff/officers were now more appropriate for us to talk to;

[6] In two cases, this was undertaken by telephone at the request of the respondent.

- In a fifth, the organisation had ceased to exist, but we were able to talk to two former staff, one of whom was now working in a County-wide digital initiative which had largely taken on the same role.

Second wave interviews were subsequently undertaken with the 17 organisations between March and June 2013.

During the same fieldwork period, we also undertook a first round of interviews with a new sample of organisations. We secured updated comprehensive data (including contact data) in respect of both voluntary and community organisations and social enterprises supported by the Programme and drew a case-study sample of an additional 13 voluntary and community organisations and seven social enterprises (and reserves) which had accessed support since the first sample was drawn, broadly balanced to reflect factors of geography and intensity of support and (as far as possible) nature/sector of organisation. We subsequently undertook face-to-face interviews with representatives of the additional case-study sample of voluntary and community organisations and social enterprises (in all, interviewing 21 organisations).

As with the first wave, we did however, find it difficult to pin down some organisations which were in our initial sample. Of the original 20 selected, we successfully interviewed 12 (eight voluntary/community groups and four social enterprises), with a further seven (five voluntary/community groups and two social enterprises) being drawn from our reserve list, with the sample 'topped up' by two further organisations.

In all, 11 organisations either refused or were unable to see us for the following reasons (Figure D1.1)

Figure D1.1: Reasons for failure to interview

Reason	Number
Staff member left/on secondment – no-one else able to comment	3
Do not recall assistance	3
Too busy/could not meet in the timescale	3
Organisation no longer exists	2

Source: Fieldwork monitoring records

In addition, we attempted to contact a further four organisations which had not definitively responded to our request at the time we completed the fieldwork.

This unusually high rate of difficulties (compared with other evaluations we have undertaken) probably reflects a number of issues which were apparent during both the 2011 and the 2013 fieldwork, viz. the small scale and vulnerability of many of the organisations assisted, the reliance on a small number of key staff or volunteers, and the often light-touch nature of the intervention by Communities 2.0. In terms of those who could not recall the assistance, it was striking that all of these were in North Wales and that two of those successfully interviewed in North Wales did not recognise the name Communities 2.0 (seeing the assistance as having been delivered by Menter Môn and/or specific individuals) – whereas comparable problems were not found in South and West Wales, where the 'brand' appeared much more visible.

In 2014, in the context of the final evaluation, we re-contacted the 21 organisations which we had interviewed in 2013 in order to undertake a second wave of research with them. However, we were only able to secure this second round of interviews (which took place between June and September 2014) with 16 organisations (although one additional organisation first interviewed in 2013 was 'transferred' to the good practice sample, as it had been identified by Programme staff within this sample). In four of these 16, the original interviewee no longer worked with the organisation and in one of these, their successor was not sighted on the involvement with Communities 2.0.

In addition, for the final evaluation we interviewed a small sample of organisations from a list of 20 organisations selected by Communities 2.0 staff as examples of good practice, of which 10 were initially selected as the sample with the remaining 10 earmarked as reserves. Even with this sample where it might have been expected that organisations would be keen to speak to us, there were some issues in terms of securing contributions to the research: five of the original 10 selected, as well as a further two organisations from the reserve list either declined to meet us or did not respond to repeated attempts to contact them.

In all, we succeeded in interviewing three voluntary and community organisations and six social enterprises[7] between June and September 2014.

[7] One of these was the organisation that had been interviewed as part of the 2013 sample.

Annex D2: Semi-structured topic guides for interviews with assisted organisations

D2.1 Topic guide for first wave interviews with sampled organisations

1 **Programme Environment**

1.3 How aware do you think the voluntary and community sector/social enterprise sector in general terms are of the 'digital inclusion' agenda?

a. What are the main drivers of this awareness?
b. How has this changed over time?

2 **Programme Implementation**

2.8 How did you come to be involved with C2.0?

a. How important a role did any 'intermediary' organisations (e.g. Local Authorities, CVCs, Communities First teams etc.) play in putting you in touch with C2.0?

2.2 How effectively do you think C2.0 is promoted to organisations like yours?

a. How effective is the public engagement activity undertaken by WCC?
b. How effective is the web presence of the Programme?

2.4 Please tell me a little about the sort of support you have received from C2.0 partners e.g.:

i Taster sessions for members/clients
ii More in-depth ICT related training for members/clients
iii Assistance with developing a web-site
iv Assistance in spec-ing and/or purchasing new IT equipment
v Assistance in setting up IT based management systems e.g. accounting packages
vi Assistance in setting up/improving use of IT for e-commerce purposes
v Other advice or support on IT (please specify)

2.14 If you hadn't received support from C2.0 partners, how likely is it that you would have looked elsewhere for the kind of help you got?

a. Which organisation(s) would you most likely have turned to for support?
b. Why did you opt for assistance from C2.0 partners in the end?

2.6 Have you had any contact with C2.0 partners, other than [organisation name]?

a. Please tell me a little bit about your involvement with other C2.0 partners?
How effectively do you think these C2.0 partners work together?

2.13 How do you rate the support your organisation has received so far in terms of:

a. Appropriateness - is it what you needed/were looking for?
    i If not, what support would you have liked to have that you haven't been given?
b. Quality - how relevant/accurate was any advice that you were given?
    i What might be done to make the advice given more relevant?
c. Quality - how effectively did the advisor communicate with you?
    i What might be done to improve communication arrangements?
d. Timeliness - did you receive the support in good time?
    i If not, how much of a delay was there?

2.7 How satisfied were you with the support you received?

Was/is the support provided of the right intensity?

a. Is there a risk that the support is withdrawn too early?
b. Is there too little/enough emphasis on building capacity?

3 **Outcomes**

3.2 What effects have C2.0 partners' activities had upon your organisation's use of technology for its own purposes e.g.:

    i For management, including book-keeping etc.
    ii For communicating with stakeholders e.g. via web-sites, e-mail etc.
    iii As a means of attracting members/clients?

a. How, if at all, has C2.0 support changed the way your organisation works more generally?
    i What was it about C2.0 support that brought about change?
    ii How likely is it that the change would have happened anyway?
b. How sustainable are the changes brought about by C2.0 partners' input?
    i For example, are you as an organisation able to maintain/manage your own web-site or accounting system now, as opposed to simply using what C2.0 partners put in place for you?

3.4 To what extent have C2.0 partners got involved in delivering taster sessions/training to the members or clients of your organisation?

a. What tends to be the focus of these sessions?
b. How much use is made of on-line resources produced under the C2.0 banner in the delivery of this kind of activity?
    i Which resources are most useful and why?
    ii What factors hinder greater use being made of on-line resources?

3.5 Has an appropriate balance been struck between 'train the trainer' type activities and 'end participant' sessions?

a. How easy or difficult is it to engage your organisation's staff/members with 'train the trainer' type sessions?
    i What motivates people to enlist as potential trainers?
    ii What prevents apparently suitable individuals from training up to become potential trainers?

3.6 How many volunteer trainers/Circuit Riders/digital storytelling experts have been recruited?

a. How much use is made of webinars to train Circuit Riders?
b. How are on-line Digital Inclusion Seminars used?

3.7 What effect has training staff or volunteers to train others in the use of IT/digital storytelling etc. had upon your organisation?

a. To what extent is your organisation itself delivering IT related training to members/service users?
    i What needs to be in place to enable the organisation to do this?
    ii What hinders your organisation from doing so?
b. How much use is made of bite-sized digital inclusion workshops by volunteer Circuit Riders/trainers?

3.8 What effect has giving/selling refurbished kit to your organisation had upon your use of technology?

3.9 How are case study materials used?

a. What examples are there of case study materials influencing your organisation's activities or individuals' behaviours?

3.10 How successful has the Technology Innovation Group been so far in supporting development of IT enterprises?

4 Emerging Impacts

4.1 What difference has greater/more effective use of IT as a result of C2.0 support made to your organisation/social enterprise?

a. How likely is it that your organisation would have arrived at the same solution without C2.0 partners' input?

4.2 What evidence is there that C2.0 support has helped your social enterprise become more profitable/sustainable e.g. though use of technologies to generate income?

4.3 What evidence is there that C2.0 has helped create any new jobs?

4.4 Has your organisation actually started to implement a 'digital inclusion strategy'?

a. What effects has this had?

4.5 To what extent are volunteer trainers/Circuit Riders/digital storytelling experts used by your group?

a. What are they used for?

4.6 What evidence is there that workshops/seminars/digital storytelling activities are succeeding in engaging community members with technologies?

a. How likely is it that participating individuals would have got involved with technology anyway?

i If more likely than not, what other factors would have influenced them to do so?

4.7 What evidence is there that workshops/seminars/digital storytelling activities are succeeding in engaging community members in further learning related to the use of IT?

4.8 What evidence is there that C2.0 has helped people to develop IT related skills that make them more employable?

5 Going Forward

5.1 What needs to change about the Programme going forward?

a. Why are these changes necessary?

5.3 Might there be more effective ways of switching people on to technology?

a. What might work better?

5.2 How does feedback from community groups influence partners' activities?

D2.2 Topic guide for re-interviews with assisted organisations

COMMUNITIES TWO POINT ZERO EVALUATION
TOPIC GUIDE FOR USE DURING SECOND WAVE INTERVEIWS
WITH ORGANISATIONS SUPPORTED

NOTE FOR INTERVIEWERS

You should familiarise yourselves with the case-study report from the earlier fieldwork, and prompt, where necessary, the interviewee by reference to this. You should take care to note any changes in perception, particularly in terms of outcomes, since the previous interview, as well as (where relevant) gathering information about more recent contact with C2.0.

INTRODUCTION

- Thank you for agreeing to talk to me.
- As you know, Old Bell 3 has been commissioned by the Welsh Government to undertake an evaluation of the Communities Two Point Zero project.
- We spoke to you/representatives of your organisation almost two years ago now about activities which you were undertaking at about that time with the support of one of the Communities 2.0 partner organisations.
- Today's discussion will follow on from that and explore whether you've had any further dealings with Communities 2.0 partners as well as the effects of your organisation's involvement with Communities 2.0 upon the organisation itself, its members, employees or the community more widely.
- Anything you say will be in confidence and will not be attributed to you.
- Do you have anything you want to ask before we start?

A BACKGROUND

A.1 (If necessary) First of all, please can you tell me a little bit about your role within the organisation?

a. how, if at all has your role changed since we last met?

b. how closely involved, if at all, have you been with Communities 2.0 over the last couple of years?

1 PROGRAMME ENVIRONMENT

1.3 How, if at all, do you think the voluntary and community sector/social enterprise sector's awareness of the digital inclusion agenda has this changed since we last spoke?

a. What has brought about this change?

2 PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION

2.4 If relevant, please tell me a little about the sort of support you have received from C2.0 partners since we last spoke e.g.:

- i Taster sessions for members/clients
- ii More in-depth ICT related training for members/clients
- iii Assistance with developing a web-site
- iv Assistance in spec-ing and/or purchasing new IT equipment
- v Assistance in setting up IT based management systems e.g. accounting packages
- vi Assistance in setting up/improving use of IT for e-commerce purposes
- v Other advice or support on IT (please specify)

2.13 [Prompting from previous interview, if no further assistance received] Overall, how do you rate the support your organisation received in terms of:

a. Appropriateness - is it what you needed/were looking for?
   - I If not, what support would you have liked to have that you haven't been given?

b. Relevance- how relevant/accurate was any advice that you were given?
   - I What might be done to make the advice given more relevant?

c. Quality - how effectively did the advisor communicate with you?
   - I What might be done to improve communication arrangements?

d. Timeliness - did you receive the support in good time?
   - I If not, how much of a delay was there?

e. Intensity – was the support provided of the right intensity
   - Was the support withdrawn too soon?

f. Capacity Building – did the support help build your own capacity to deal with your IT infrastructure and issues

2.7 [If relevant] Has the quality of the support provided changed over time – in particular since we last spoke?

a. In what way?

2.14 If you hadn't received support from C2.0 partners, how likely is it that you would have looked elsewhere for the kind of help you got?

a. Which organisation(s) would you most likely have turned to for support?
b. Why did you opt for assistance from C2.0 partners in the end?

2.6 Have you had any contact with C2.0 partners, other than [organisation name]?

a. Please tell me a little bit about your involvement with other C2.0 partners?
b. How effectively do you think these C2.0 partners work together?

2.9 To what extent do you feel your organisation has provided C2.0 partners with an avenue by which to reach digitally excluded people (for example, through work with your staff, volunteers or clients/members/customers)?

3 OUTCOMES

3.2 What effects have C2.0 partners' activities had upon your organisation's use of technology for its own purposes e.g.:

- i For management, including book-keeping etc.
- ii For communicating with stakeholders e.g. via web-sites, e-mail etc.
- iii As a means of attracting members/clients?

a. How, if at all, has C2.0 support changed the way your organisation works more generally?

- i What was it about C2.0 support that brought about change?
- ii How likely is it that the change would have happened anyway?

b. How sustainable are the changes brought about by C2.0 partners' input?

- i For example, are you as an organisation able to maintain/manage your own web-site or accounting system now, as opposed to simply using what C2.0 partners put in place for you?

3.9 How, if at all, have you used C2.0 case study materials?

a. What examples are there of case study materials influencing your organisation's activities or individuals' behaviours?

4 IMPACTS

4.9 What evidence is there that C2.0 has helped to change the way in which people engage with IT in or around your organisation?

a. What evidence is there that it has changed digitally excluded people's behaviour?

4.1 What difference has greater/more effective use of IT as a result of C2.0 support made to your organisation/social enterprise?

a. How likely is it that your organisation would have arrived at the same solution without C2.0 partners' input?

4.2 What evidence is there that C2.0 support has helped your organisation/social enterprise become more profitable/sustainable e.g. though use of technologies to generate income?

a. Did the assistance received lead to any increase in income/turnover?

- i If so, what was it about the assistance received that impacted upon income e.g. enabled the organisation to get involved in e-commerce, enabled more effective marketing of products or services, enabled the organisation to reach new customers/a wider market etc.
- ii Roughly how much of an increase in income has the organisation enjoyed since receiving C2.0 support?
- iii Is this increase entirely attributable to the support received - how likely is it to have happened in the absence of C2.0 support?
- Iv How likely is it that this increase in income will be sustained going forward?
- v Is this increase entirely attributable to the support received?

b. Did the assistance received have any effect upon costs?

- i If so, what was it about the assistance received that impacted upon costs e.g. enabled the organisation to use less manpower to undertake tasks, reduced the amount of travelling staff/volunteers are required to do etc.

Ii Roughly how much of a reduction in cost has the organisation enjoyed since receiving C2.0 support?
iii Is this reduction entirely attributable to the support received - how likely is it to have happened in the absence of C2.0 support?
Iv How likely is it that this reduction in costs will be sustained going forward?

4.3 What evidence is there that C2.0 has helped create any new jobs?
a. If not, was it ever envisaged that C2.0 support would allow your organisation to create new jobs?
i If so, what prevented the jobs envisaged actually being created?
b. If so, how many jobs have been created?
i What kinds of jobs are they?
ii When were they created?
iii Do they still exist?
iv How likely is it that these jobs would have been created in the absence of C2.0 support?
v How likely is it that the jobs will be sustained going forward?

4.4 Has your organisation actually started to implement a 'digital inclusion strategy'?
b. If so, please tell me about what you've been doing
a. What effects has this had?
c. How influential was C2.0 support in getting your organisation to do this?

4.8 What evidence is there that C2.0 has helped people to develop IT related skills that make them more employable?
a. What effect, if any has the programme had upon:
i Trustees and/or board members
ii Employees
iii Volunteers
iv The wider community - probe for specific groups
b. What, if anything, would these different groups have done to develop their IT skills if C2.0 support hadn't been available?

5.3 Might there be more effective ways of switching people on to technology?
a. What might work better?

Thank you for your time.

D2.3 Topic guide for interviews with good practice case-study organisations

COMMUNITIES TWO POINT ZERO EVALUATION
TOPIC GUIDE FOR USE WITH GOOD PRACTICE ORGANISATIONS SUPPORTED

NOTE TO INTERVIEWERS: Please ensure that you read the relevant case-study on the C2.0 website before undertaking the interview (http://www.communities2point0.org.uk/who-have-we-helped)

1 **Programme Environment**

1.3 How aware do you think the voluntary and community sector/social enterprise sector in general terms are of the 'digital inclusion' agenda?

a. What are the main drivers of this awareness?
b. How has this changed over time?

2 **Programme Implementation**

2.8 How did you come to be involved with C2.0?

a. How important a role did any 'intermediary' organisations (e.g. Local Authorities, CVCs, Communities First teams etc.) play in putting you in touch with C2.0

2.2 How effectively do you think C2.0 is promoted to organisations like yours?

a. How effective is the public engagement activity undertaken by WCC?
b. How effective is the web presence of the Programme?

2.4 Please tell me a little about the sort of support you have received from C2.0 partners e.g.:

i Taster sessions for members/clients
ii More in-depth ICT related training for members/clients
iii Assistance with developing a web-site
iv Assistance in spec-ing and/or purchasing new IT equipment
v Assistance in setting up IT based management systems e.g. accounting packages
vi Assistance in setting up/improving use of IT for e-commerce purposes
v Other advice or support on IT (please specify)

2.14 If you hadn't received support from C2.0 partners, how likely is it that you would have looked elsewhere for the kind of help you got?

a. Which organisation(s) would you most likely have turned to for support?
b. Why did you opt for assistance from C2.0 partners in the end?

2.13 How do you rate the support your organisation received from C2.0 in terms of:

a. Appropriateness - is it what you needed/were looking for?
i If not, what support would you have liked to have that you haven't been given?

b. Quality - how relevant/accurate was any advice that you were given?
    i What might be done to make the advice given more relevant?
c. Quality - how effectively did the advisor communicate with you?
    i What might be done to improve communication arrangements?
d. Timeliness - did you receive the support in good time?
    i If not, how much of a delay was there?

2.7 How satisfied were you with the support you received?
Was/is the support provided of the right intensity?
a. Is there a risk that the support is withdrawn too early?
b. Is there too little/enough emphasis on building capacity?

3 **Outcomes**

3.2 What effects have C2.0 partners' activities had upon your organisation's use of technology for its own purposes e.g.:
    i For management, including book-keeping etc
    ii For communicating with stakeholders e.g. via web-sites, e-mail etc
    iii As a means of attracting members/clients?
a. How, if at all, has C2.0 support changed the way your organisation works more generally?
    i What was it about C2.0 support that brought about change?
    ii How likely is it that the change would have happened anyway?
b. How sustainable are the changes brought about by C2.0's input?
    I For example, are you as an organisation able to maintain/manage your own web-site or accounting system now, as opposed to simply using what C2.0 partners put in place for you?

3.4 To what extent have C2.0 partners got involved in delivering taster sessions/training to the members or clients of your organisation?
a. What tends to be the focus of these sessions?
b. How much use is made of on-line resources produced under the C2.0 banner in the delivery of this kind of activity?
    i Which resources are most useful and why?
    ii What factors hinder greater use being made of on-line resources?

3.5 Has an appropriate balance been struck between 'train the trainer' type activities and 'end participant' sessions?
a. How easy or difficult is it to engage your organisation's staff/members in 'train the trainer' type sessions?
    i What motivates people to enlist as potential trainers?
    ii What prevents apparently suitable individuals from training up to become potential trainers?

3.6 How many volunteer trainers/Circuit Riders/digital storytelling experts have been recruited?
a. How much use is made of webinars to train Circuit Riders?

b. How are on-line Digital Inclusion Seminars used?

3.7 What effect has training staff or volunteers to train others in the use of IT/digital storytelling etc. had upon your organisation?

a. To what extent is your organisation itself delivering IT related training to members/service users?

i What needs to be in place to enable the organisation to do this?

ii What hinders your organisation from doing so?

b. How much use is made of bite-sized digital inclusion workshops by volunteer Circuit Riders/trainers?

3.8 What effect has giving/selling refurbished kit to your organisation had upon your use of technology?

3.9 How are case study materials used?

a. What examples are there of case study materials influencing your organisation's activities or individuals' behaviours?

3.10 How successful has the Technology Innovation Group been so far in supporting development of IT enterprises?

4 Emerging Impacts

4.1 What difference has greater/more effective use of IT as a result of C2.0 support made to your organisation/social enterprise?

a. How likely is it that your organisation would have arrived at the same solution without C2.0 partners' input?

4.2 What evidence is there that C2.0 support has helped your social enterprise become more profitable/sustainable e.g. though use of technologies to generate income?

4.3 What evidence is there that C2.0 has helped create any new jobs?

4.4 Has your organisation actually started to implement a 'digital inclusion strategy'?

a. What effects has this had?

4.5 To what extent are volunteer trainers/Circuit Riders/digital storytelling experts used by your group?

a. What are they used for?

4.6 What evidence is there that workshops/seminars/digital storytelling activities are succeeding in engaging community members with technologies?

a. How likely it is that participating individuals would have got involved with technology anyway?

i If more likely than not, what other factors would have influenced them to do so?

4.7 What evidence is there that workshops/seminars/digital storytelling activities are succeeding in engaging community members in further learning related to the use of IT?

4.8 What evidence is there that C2.0 has helped people to develop IT related skills that make them more employable?

5 Going Forward

5.0 How far might it be possible to copy or roll out any successes you have had to other organisations/in other parts of Wales?

a. (if it is possible) Has anything been done to enable this to happen so far?

b. (if not) What else might/ought to be done?

5.1 What sort of support does your organisation need going forward to ensure you make best use of technology and help support people to use ICT and access the internet?

5.3 Might there be more effective ways of switching people on to technology?

a. What might work better?