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### Executive Summary, Key Findings and Headline Statistics for the Caring City Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive changes to subjective wellbeing scores for beneficiaries</th>
<th>Audience of approximately 22,000 for the Caring City programme</th>
<th>Reduction in anxiety levels for beneficiaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81% of Caring City audiences stated the event they had engaged with had increased their civic pride</td>
<td>c.250 direct beneficiaries of the Caring City Programme</td>
<td>96% of audience survey respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they had a good time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved social cohesion metrics amongst beneficiaries</td>
<td>96% of audience survey respondents rated the quality of their experience as good or very good</td>
<td>61% of Caring City audiences stated the event they had engaged with had improved their perception of Coventry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Stories don’t just happen. People make them happen, and if we look after each other, the story will look after itself.’

This quote, one of the opening lines from Theatre of Wandering, captures the essence of the Caring City strand of Coventry UK City of Culture 2021 – a community-led programme of cultural activities that sought to address some of Coventry’s most significant social issues.

Between January 2019 and May 2022, Coventry City of Culture Trust, under the umbrella of ‘Caring City’ and funded by Spirit of 2012, embedded associate producers into four community organisations (‘hosts’) to develop and deliver community projects across the city. A key element of the work involved working with seldom-heard groups and bringing about social change through a cultural programme that would benefit wellbeing and social cohesion for beneficiaries.

The four partner organisations for Caring City were:

- Central England Law Centre – an organisation working with individuals with experience of homelessness;
- Coventry Refugee and Migrant Centre – an organisation working with asylum seekers, migrants, refugees, and LGBTQ+ people who have fled persecution;
- Grapevine – an organisation working with individuals experiencing isolation or loneliness and those with lived experience of mental health issues;
• Positive Youth Foundation – an organisation that works with young people from a range of backgrounds, including those who have experience of the criminal justice system and those who are not in education, employment, or training.

Through the embedding of producers into these organisations, it was hoped to demonstrate the positive impact that arts and culture can have on the beneficiaries of the organisations, ultimately leading to improved wellbeing within cohorts and better social cohesion across the city.

Having previously funded projects around major cultural events such as the Commonwealth Games in Glasgow in 2014 and Hull UK City of Culture 2017, Spirit of 2012 were keen to build on their learnings around civic pride and the role that cultural participation on a city-wide scale can play in helping create healthier and happier communities.

The notion of the Caring City was born shortly after Coventry was awarded the 2021 title designation in December 2017. Focusing on the city’s seldom-heard communities, a collaborative model with the partner organisations instilled an ethos of genuine co-creation.

Section 3 of this report presents highlights of just some of the Caring City projects that took place throughout the year. The data collected demonstrates the impact which the Caring City strand has had on beneficiaries. For some, there have been noticeable uplifts in mental wellbeing, confidence, and how they interact with the people around them.

Ultimately, the programme was created for real people, placing their experiences, their hopes, their struggles, their triumphs, their ideas, and most of all their stories, centre stage. As one of the participants in the Arts and Homelessness Summit commented, ‘Nothing about us, without us.’
SECTION ONE: INTRODUCTION TO THE CARING CITY PROGRAMME
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1.0 Introduction to the Caring City Programme
The Caring City programme strand of Coventry UK City of Culture 2021 ran from January 2019 to May 2022 and focused on putting the spotlight on some of the city’s most seldom-heard groups and communities, unlocking creativity and including all citizens.

1.1 Programme Context, Aims, and Objectives
The Caring City programme was designed to support host organisations and their networks to co-create cultural activity for presentation during Coventry’s year as UK City of Culture 2021. The programme would enable those most likely to be excluded from mainstream arts events to be central to the programme at a time when the UK arts spotlight was on Coventry. The aim of the programme was also to leave a strong legacy of increased value in arts for social change and inclusion, as well as to embed knowledge, skills, experience, and new creative partnerships in local third sector organisations.

As part of the initial funding application to Spirit of 2012 for the programme, it was stated that the appointed Caring City team will work with host organisations, their networks, and the individuals they support to:

- Co-create a programme with people with lived experience across the specified focus areas. The programme was intended to improve participants’ health and wellbeing, and support and celebrate them as creative individuals and artists
- Release the creativity of communities to help them find creative solutions to the issues they face. Develop and reveal their skills, voices, and abilities
- Develop understanding and create a new value system for how the arts can be a vehicle to challenge, interrogate, and reimagine a better society that works for all
- Change hearts and minds and bring greater awareness to the issues – changing public perception and bringing about change
- Be inclusive – enable the 2021 creative programme and wider activity to be fully inclusive and representative of the people of Coventry
- Test and learn from an embedded model of creative producing, which can be refined and used more widely across the third sector to add value. It can also be used in future cultural programmes both nationally and internationally
- Be intergenerational in our thinking and development – support older people to be visible and celebrated and to have an equal creative voice
- Embrace people and artists with lived experience and support them to be ‘powerful’
- Influence the arts sector, city, national, and international partners
- Champion ‘Nothing about us, without us’
- Stop the ‘othering’ within society, and challenge ‘us versus them’ thinking
- Make the city a safer space
- Support Coventry artists and practitioners working with people with specific requirements

The Caring City team was originally made up of four producers embedded within third sector partner organisations. The recruited producers had experience of engaged practice, developing practice around participatory arts and civic change, and tackling issues such as mental health, isolation, loneliness, homelessness, youth exploitation, and integration.
In the pilot stage of the programme from early 2019 to mid-2020, they began co-creating a programme of cultural and social change activities, intended to support the delivery of step changes within the city and for the communities of the city. At the point of application for the second phase of the Caring City programme in May 2020, it was anticipated that the programme would engage with more than 80,000 participants and audience members during the UK CoC 2021 year. However, the COVID-19 pandemic delayed Coventry’s year as UK City of Culture from starting in January 2021. Its full twelve-month run began in May 2021. Because of pandemic restrictions and having to adapt to different untested ways of working, the programme was only able to reach a fraction of the anticipated number of people. However, the depth of impact for beneficiaries has been profound.

Across the three levels of engagement as described by Spirit of 2012, the Caring City programme achieved:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inspire</td>
<td>Engage</td>
<td>Enable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement from social media to Caring City programme-related news and content.</td>
<td>Audiences who attend individual Caring City programme events and activities.</td>
<td>Beneficiaries who are undertaking regular activity as part of the programme. These people will also be the core project beneficiaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.6,000</td>
<td>c.22,000</td>
<td>c.250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the purpose of this report, audiences are those in Level 2 (Engage) and beneficiaries are those in Level 3 (Enable).

Efforts have been made to avoid double counting in Level 3 (Enable). However, due to a lack of records for specific projects, notably the ones delivered by partners, it is not possible to entirely eliminate the potential for double counting.

The Caring City team was one of three interconnected producing teams charged with co-creating and delivering the programme of activities for Coventry’s year as UK City of Culture 2021. While the Dynamic City team was focused on creating activities that reached mass audiences, and the Collaborative City team ensured that Trust activity was geographically distributed across the city, the Caring City team was in place to ensure that the Trust achieved its main social action priorities. However, all three teams came together to work as one team. For example, although each team worked to create a programme for their priority areas, they worked in a cross-team fashion to ensure inclusion was championed across the programme, and to allow social action to run through events and activities.

The Trust acknowledged that a joyful, celebratory programme of arts and culture in 2021 would achieve short-term benefits for the city and its people. However, they sought to ensure that the programme spoke about the city, its people, its stories, and its challenges; only thus could they ensure the programme had a strong social conscience at its heart. The Caring City team structure was developed as a mechanism to cast a spotlight on the issues facing the city, to create collaborations between citizens and artists to find solutions, and to ensure that those most likely to be excluded from mainstream major arts events had the opportunities to lead, create, and participate alongside everyone else.
1.2 Coventry UK City of Culture 2021

Coventry’s year as UK City of Culture 2021 ran from May 2021 to May 2022.

UK City of Culture is a competition run by the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) every four years. The competition sees places from across the UK (outside of London) bid to be awarded the designation of ‘UK City of Culture’ for 1 year. Derry/Londonderry was the first city to hold the title in 2013, followed by Hull in 2017, and Coventry in 2021. Bradford is to be the UK City of Culture in 2025.

Coventry was awarded the status of UK City of Culture 2021 (UK CoC 2021) in December 2017 but saw its start delayed from January 2021 to May 2021 as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. After that delayed start, a wide-ranging cultural programme reflected Coventry as a diverse, modern city, and demonstrated that culture is a force that changes lives.

Coventry is known internationally as a city of welcome, a city of activists and pioneers, peace and reconciliation, innovation and invention, and now as a City of Culture. For the whole year, Coventry celebrated with events, music, dance, theatre, digital experiences, and large-scale spectacles with numerous international partnerships.

With the vision of ‘reimagining the role of culture in a diverse, modern Britain, demonstrating that culture is a force that changes lives, moving Coventry and the region forward’, Coventry UK CoC 2021 put ‘co-creation’ at the centre of its programme, valuing local stories and the creativity that could be found throughout the city. This deeply rooted way of working, which was presented as ‘The Coventry Model’, presented a range of both intimate events and high impact activities to deliver long-lasting social value. Embedding engagement at a hyper-local level, the ‘co-creation’ approach saw city communities including faith groups, community centres, libraries, schools, community radio stations, the police, and local arts organisations all help to shape and design the creative programme.

Audiences of over 1 million engaged with more than 700 events, which took place in every neighbourhood of the city as well as in Warwickshire.1 Broadcasts by the BBC and Sky Arts that referenced Coventry UK CoC 2021 had a reach of over 100 million, of which 4.5 million was for UK CoC 2021 focused/commissioned programming. Overall, 77% of the programme, excluding commercial events, was co-created with local residents and communities. When the commercial programme is included, 64% of the programme was co-created. In terms of ticketing, 43% of tickets issued by the Trust went to residents on lower levels of income, living in majority-minority ethnic neighbourhoods with lower levels of historic engagement in publicly funded arts and culture.2

As part of the year’s legacy, the Trust’s future focus will be on commissioning arts events and supporting local cultural organisations with an emphasis on ‘Green Futures’. It will also continue to run The Reel Store, the UK’s first permanent immersive digital art gallery.

---

1 The term audiences relate to the number of points of engagement with the UK City of Culture 2021 programme.
1.3 Contribution to Coventry 2021 Outcomes and Spirit of 2012 Outcomes

The Caring City programme has made a contribution to supporting the outcomes of both Coventry UK CoC 2021 and Spirit of 2012. The programme has demonstrated that targeted work with some of the most seldom-heard communities in the city can bring positive changes to the lives of beneficiaries. Positive changes to mental wellbeing scores and a reduction in anxiety levels for those who participated over a long period is noticeable. Within endline data from beneficiaries, there is also positive movement towards increased empowerment to participate in a range of events, including cultural events, and finding opportunities to volunteer within their communities. Their indicators of social cohesion are at higher levels than the city average.

In terms of numbers, the Caring City team reached a very small number of beneficiaries: around 250. This is lower than the levels of engagement predicted at the time of the application for funding from Spirit of 2012. However, the level of impact for this small number of beneficiaries should not be underestimated. When undertaking the Social Return On Investment study, MB Associates noted one beneficiary’s assertion that participating with the Caring City programme had prevented them from taking their own life.

Audiences were also impacted by the Caring City programme in a positive way. They were able to experience and learn about the stories and experiences of those living in circumstances different to their own in a supportive and caring environment, building empathy and a city that cares about all its citizens.

1.4 Meeting the Caring City Objectives

The main objective of the Caring City programme was to target and engage citizens of the city who are seldom heard and not represented in the city’s main cultural programmes through a cultural programme that would drive social change in the city. The programme has done this well, albeit in small numbers.

An additional objective of the programme was to demonstrate to the host organisations that the use of arts and culture can help them meet their objectives and outcomes in delivering social change. The programme sought to instil increased levels of mental wellbeing and improve happiness within beneficiaries; this was accomplished. The host organisations have seen that culture can be a driver for delivering their objectives and outcomes, and they have continued to use culture in their practices.
SECTION TWO:
EVALUATION OF THE CARING CITY PROGRAMME
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2.0 Evaluation of the Caring City Programme

The evaluation of Coventry UK CoC 2021 is the responsibility of the University of Warwick and Coventry University, in partnership with Coventry City Council. Representatives from these organisations, together with the Trust, make up the Core Monitoring and Evaluation Group, which met fortnightly from late 2018 and into the evaluation period of the UK CoC 2021 year.

The Trust developed the evaluation framework and strategy for the UK CoC 2021 year in partnership with the University of Warwick, Coventry University, and the Insights Team from Coventry City Council. The framing of the strategy’s outcomes and impacts were driven by extensive consultation during the bid phase. The Trust then developed these outcomes and impacts based on the key needs, challenges, and aspirations for the Coventry UK CoC 2021 year. The strategy identified that core data capture and performance monitoring would be the responsibility of the Trust, while the research and evaluation programme would fall under the remit of the universities.

2.1 Performance Measurement & Evaluation Strategy

Coventry UK CoC 2021 sought to engage the widest range of citizens in its cultural offer and shaping. To ensure the programme met local and regional needs, the Core Monitoring and Evaluation Group developed a proactive Performance Measurement & Evaluation Strategy (PM&E Strategy), which was based on a Theory of Change.

Initially released in the latter part of 2019 and revised at the beginning of 2020, the strategy guided the development, monitoring, and evaluation of the UK CoC 2021 programme by reference to planned outputs, outcomes, and impacts. It also aligned the guiding principles for the overarching research questions and evaluation of the UK CoC 2021 year with the articulated Theory of Change logic model.

2.2 Caring City Evaluation Framework

In May 2020, the Trust was invited by Spirit of 2012 to apply for a grant of up to £1 million for a second phase of activity to take place between May 2020 and March 2022. This phase flowed from an initial grant to develop and nurture the concepts and ideas of the Caring City programme. As part of the subsequent application, the Coventry 2021 outcomes, as defined in the PM&E Strategy, were articulated alongside the most appropriate Spirit of 2012 outcomes as specified within their own Theory of Change. A Caring City programme-specific logic model was created as part of the developing, monitoring, and evaluation framework for the programme.

This logic model aligned the Coventry 2021 outcomes with those of Spirit of 2012. The model was shared with partners and used as a tool for the further development and shaping of the programme’s content. The framework also outlined a high-level methodology for the evaluation of the programme. The aligned logic model was a useful tool for Spirit of 2012 to see how the impact of their funding was being measured and how the outcomes defined by the Trust aligned with their own wider funding outcomes and strategy.

Also specified within this application was the approach that was going to be taken by the evaluators for capturing baseline and endline data from participants, including the approach to using the ONS 4 Subjective Wellbeing questions.
2.3 Caring City Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation utilises a mixed methods approach. Hence, this report makes use of the following data sources:

- Programme Data – Collected by Coventry City of Culture Trust
- Programme Data – Collected by project partners and supplied to the Coventry City of Culture Trust
- Ticketing Data – Collected by the Coventry City of Culture Trust and partners
- Independent Research – undertaken by the University of Warwick
- Social Value Data – Collected by MB Associates as part of a wider social value assessment of the UK CoC 2021 programme
- Evaluation sessions held with the Caring City producers throughout and at the conclusion of the programme.

Surveys were the primary method of collecting the data used in this evaluation. The Trust surveyed event audiences through an online post-event survey (the survey questions are in the Appendices at the end of this report). Surveys were sent to ticket bookers who had booked via the Trust’s ticketing platform. To strengthen data collection, in-person surveying also took place at events in order to capture the widest selection of attendees.

Beneficiaries of the Caring City programme engaged with the programme over longer periods of time. Hence, participant surveying took place at the commencement and conclusion of their engagement. Questions were centred around social cohesion metrics (some of which were used in the Coventry Household Survey and some in other Spirit of 2012 projects) around how empowered they felt to participate with activities within their local communities, and the ONS4 Subjective Wellbeing measures. This last measure allows Spirit of 2012 to understand, as a funder, the impact of the work across their whole funding portfolio, and also to allow data to be correlated with the national levels of wellbeing recorded by the Office for National Statistics. A copy of the ‘Before and After’ beneficiary survey is included in the Appendices.

Ticketing data collected by the Trust allows the evaluators to investigate who is booking and attending Caring City events. Postcode data allows the examination of which economic and societal groups are attending, from which it may be determined if the activity is reaching all neighbourhoods in the city.

Supporting this evaluation are two independent pieces of research undertaken by researchers from the University of Warwick. The studies focus on two specific partnerships that occurred as a result of the UK CoC 2021. The first study is by Arts and Homelessness International and it is related to how those with lived experience of homelessness engaged with the UK CoC 2021 programme (this being a key element of the Caring City programme). The second is a study into the relationship between the West Midlands Police and the Coventry City of Culture Trust; the study incorporated Caring City programme-specific outputs.

The HOME: Arts and Homelessness Festival was also studied in more depth as part of the Trust-commissioned Social Return On Investment (SROI) study undertaken by MB Associates. The findings and learnings relating to this study have fed into this report and will be discussed later.
2.4 Independent Research

Two independent pieces of research have contributed to this evaluation report. Both have been conducted by researchers from the University of Warwick and both relate specifically to elements of the Caring City programme, whether they be whole strands such as the HOME: Arts and Homelessness Festival or more granular outputs resulting from the partnership between the Trust and the West Midlands Police.

Both reports provide additional insight into elements of the Caring City programme and demonstrate the impact the Caring City work has had on citizens in the city.

The two pieces of research are:

**Arts & Homelessness in Coventry – What does home mean to you?**

This research report, co-written by Professor Nadine Holdsworth and Dr Jennifer Verson, explores and evaluates the initiatives pioneered by Arts and Homelessness International aimed at re-thinking and re-positioning how arts and creativity can change perceptions, policy, and outcomes for those who are or have been homeless in Coventry. The report is based on a three-year study and draws on a mixed-method approach to data gathering and analysis, including: participant observation, semi-structured interviews, vox pops, photo elicitation, and creative methods of documenting events such as diary entries and photography. It examines key findings resulting from these initiatives, the co-production methodologies they employ, and explores how multiple stakeholders narrate and understand their participation. It concludes by highlighting the legacies of this work and the learning to be taken forward. The report is of interest to policy makers, politicians, and arts and community organisations who are keen to pursue innovative and creative ways of engaging with homelessness and those who have experienced it.

The report is available to read online: [https://coventry21evaluation.info/arts-and-homelessness-in-coventry/](https://coventry21evaluation.info/arts-and-homelessness-in-coventry/)

The report was funded by a grant from the University of Warwick’s Research Development Fund.

**Policing, Culture and Community: West Midlands Police as City of Culture Partners**

This report was a result of a 15-month research project led by Professor Jackie Hodgson, School of Law, Director of Centre for Operational Police Research (COPR) working with Research Fellow Dr Rachel Lewis, School of Law, COPR. The project looks at the potential that police partnerships around arts and culture have to positively impact police relationships with young people and seldom-heard communities. Trust and confidence in the police is at an all-time low, but to be effective, officers need the support of their communities. This project investigates the potential of arts-led community collaboration to build bridges with communities, improve mutual understanding, and strengthen trust and confidence in policing.

The report is available to read online: [https://coventry21evaluation.info/policing-culture-and-community/](https://coventry21evaluation.info/policing-culture-and-community/)

The study was funded by the ESRC Impact Acceleration Account, the Coventry City of Culture Trust, and West Midlands Police.
2.5 Caring City Logic Model

**INVESTMENTS**
- **PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INVESTMENTS**
- **INFRASTRUCTURE**
- **TECHNOLOGY**
- **KEY PARTNERS**
- **COMMUNITY AND PUBLIC STAKEHOLDERS**
- **STAFF**
- **VOLUNTEERS**

**ACTIVITIES**
- Developing arts and cultural initiatives that further social and economic key issues
- Supporting young people and others to play an active role in governance and decision making
- Developing strong working relationships with key partners and stakeholders
- Developing initiatives targeted at specific protected groups
- Working with communities and stakeholders to develop arts and culture events for UK CoC 2021
- Employing professional artists to work with communities to co-create core elements of the programme
- Developing initiatives that have influence beyond Coventry and UK CoC 2021

**OUTPUTS**
- Programmes, planning and production of events involving Coventry communities
- Outreach activities in the community
- Model of co-creation established
- Participation by under-represented groups
- Targeted representation of citizens of the city in cultural leadership and programming
- Human resource capacity development in the cultural sector in Coventry
- Distribution of 2021 events across Coventry
- Increased investment in city projects as a result of UK CoC 2021 profile
- Environmentally responsible programming
- Combined arts and health initiatives developed in the city and region
- Arts and cultural events involving physical activity and other health and wellbeing activities
- International cultural exchanges and partnerships
- Increased attraction as a destination choice
- Coventry's CoC model and outcome lead model shares local, regional and national cultural policy making and funding
- Needs based model for cultural delivery and planning
- Evidence based decision making
- Use of 5G and immersive technology in cultural initiatives

**OUTCOMES**
- Increase in civic pride
- Community led production and programming increases cultural participation and activism
- People's level of empowerment for contributing to their community in a creative and artistic capacity increases through participation
- Cultural leadership and programming reflects and represents the citizens of the city
- People's sense of social connectedness increases through participation

**IMPACTS**
- Coventry citizens positively influence and shape the city they want to live in
- Cultural engagement is geographically dispersed across the city
- People's personal wellbeing increases through participation
- Cultural sector activity makes a significant contribution to the economic, environmental, social, health and wellbeing targets for the region
- Coordinated cultural sector capacity and infrastructure is building a sustainable and resilient sector
- Coventry is recognised as a pioneering model of culture-led inclusive growth
- Cultural programming is environmentally responsible and promotes environmental awareness

**CARING CITY THEORY / STORY OF CHANGE**

*Coventry 2021 UK City of Culture*
2.6 This Report

This report is the Final Evaluation Report for the Caring City programme. It covers the period from the award of funding in early 2019 up to the end of May 2022; it thus encompasses the planning stages and delivery period of the programme. This report builds on findings identified in both the Coventry UK City of Culture 2021 Performance Measurement & Evaluation – Interim (January 2022) and Supplementary (September 2022) Reports. Both are available at [https://coventry21evaluation.info/monitoring-and-evaluation-reports/](https://coventry21evaluation.info/monitoring-and-evaluation-reports/)

The COVID-19 Pandemic: Whilst the impact of the pandemic was varied and ever changing, it should be noted that the entire period of the planning and delivery of the Caring City programme was heavily impacted by the pandemic. The various ‘lockdowns’ and Covid-related government restrictions impacted on how people lived and worked, especially if they already had health issues. Members of the delivery team, the partner organisations, and the co-creation communities suffered from COVID-related illnesses. Furloughing key staff within partner organisations had a detrimental effect on the planning stages of the Caring City programme. The persistent and long-term uncertainty meant that plans had to be revisited and reshaped in response to situations that were not under the direct control of the Trust.

COVID-19 meant that the planning stages for the Caring City programme were elongated. While this was undeniably a challenge, it was also an opportunity. The extension gave the producers who formed the Caring City team the time to build and strengthen relationships with beneficiaries, which could be sustained throughout the duration of the programme. It also allowed for strong co-creation with some of the most seldom-heard communities and groups from within the city, allowing them to feel heard and seen by having a presence in a major cultural festival. However, COVID-19 did mean that the number of beneficiaries who could be reached through the Caring City work was reduced because of varying levels of social isolation and the practical difficulties imposed by the need for social distancing once restrictions began to lift.

There is evidence that the programme was successfully adapted to meet the constraints imposed by the pandemic. Nevertheless, the challenges that the pandemic presented to the programme, the city, and the sector – and its wider impact as a driver of societal change and questioning – should be recognised as the context within which the Caring City programme was delivered.

The remaining sections will cover:

- **Section 3** – Programme Highlights: highlights of key programme outputs and delivery
- **Section 4** – Progress Towards Aligned Outcome: examination of evidence/data collected during all stages of the programme to support progress made towards aligned outcomes
- **Section 5** – Learning and Recommendations: the identified learning insights and recommendations for the future
- **Section 6** – Conclusions: returning to the initial aims and objectives to draw conclusions and reflect on the programme and its outcomes.

The Appendices provide additional supporting material.
SECTION THREE: PROGRAMME HIGHLIGHTS
3.0 Programme Highlights

This section of the report features highlights of selected outputs from the Caring City programme. The outputs presented here are not exhaustive as the full range of projects that comprised the Caring City programme is too extensive. All projects and programme elements within the Caring City programme were rooted in the needs of the beneficiaries involved in the creation and shaping of the ideas that evolved into the programme.

The Caring City programme strand, actuated by the needs of seldom-heard citizens and communities in the city, was specifically targeted at tackling key social issues within the city. The programme outputs featured here spotlight a range of the initiatives created.

**A Crash Course in Cloudspotting**

_A Crash Course in Cloudspotting_ was part of Grapevine and Coventry City of Culture 2021’s Reform the Norm programme. In addition to being part of the Caring City programme, it was also part of the Trust’s Green Futures programme. The city centre action landed in October 2021 to coincide with the programme theme of ‘Utopia’.

Our mental health has been hugely tested and challenged in recent years and maintaining good mental health in an unequitable world is more challenging.

> It was an amazing experience to share a perspective of being alive in a body that doesn’t support them as mine does for me, I am so lucky but was so important to share their experiences as well.

-Audience Member, October 2021

Designed to encourage you to stop, rest, think, and listen, _A Crash Course in Cloudspotting_ was an intimate audio journey allowing audiences to explore the depths of human connection and the subversive act of lying down. The immersive installation ran at the Herbert Art Gallery & Museum, with further opportunities to pause and rest popping-up around other locations in the city centre, such as Coventry Cathedral and Broadgate. The piece was made in collaboration with Grapevine and Coventry Youth Activists and connected with many audiences who shared the experience of needing to rest while out and about in the city.

*Image Credit: Paul Blakemore*
The idea for the project was sparked in 2016 when artist Raquel Meseguer Zafe accidentally set off a security alert by lying down on the top floor of the Southbank Centre in London. Since that day, she has collected over 250 stories about people with hidden disabilities and chronic illnesses, and their attempts to rest in public. An initial iteration of the piece was commissioned for the London Borough of Camden through London Borough of Culture funding. In Coventry, three story-engagement workshops took place in June and July 2021. These saw 50 young participants joining the wider Cloudspotting community by sharing their stories and experiences. To develop the Coventry edition of Cloudspotting, Raquel connected with the pre-existing infrastructure of Coventry Youth Activists through Grapevine, using the existing Walk and Talk sessions to connect and build relationships. These sessions allowed participants to share stories of their lives and call to action their fellow travellers, to create a movement for change on the issues they raised.

As part of these sessions, more than 30 people joined Raquel and Coventry Youth Activists on a Walk and Talk and Rest, during which they lay down in three public spaces, including the interior of Coventry Cathedral. The subversive act of lying down in these spaces was about creative activism that sparks dialogue and playfully disrupts the city. Raquel and four members of the Coventry Youth Activists group shared their stories of rest in these spaces, conveying how they felt about the city. This was responded to by the Lord Mayor, who was inspired by them to call on Coventry to become the first UK City of Rest.

A moment of rest at Coventry Cathedral, October 2021. Image Credit: John Whitmore

The main show, which supplemented the audio journey, took place in October 2021 and was seen by more than 500 people. Raquel also ran live sessions where audience members were encouraged to share their stories and connect with one another.
As a legacy of the work, Coventry Youth Activists, supported by Grapevine, began working with businesses in the city on a project called ‘Resting City’. Due to the support from Unlimited and the introduction to Raquel, all parties remain in touch and continue to talk about ways to carry on working together. Additionally, it has had an impact on local businesses that saw the show. Coventry Building Society has agreed to create a resting space in each of its banks in Coventry, working with Grapevine to design them and work out how to signpost them to Coventry citizens.

As part of the project, The Cloudspotting Archive was developed and stories used in the shaping and development of the work can be viewed online.

**CVX Festival**

CVX Festival is the culmination of a skills development project undertaken in association with Positive Youth Foundation. Young adults from the city developed a two-day festival centred on revealing undiscovered local talent in the Midlands around the themes of community, unity, and social change.

The idea for a festival led by young people in the city centre was created from the desire of young people to reclaim the city centre, which they felt was not welcoming to them, and to change perceptions of young people in the city.

*This brought home to me my autistic son’s daily struggles with tiredness. Thank you for bringing this to life for me.*

Audience Member, October 2021

*A moment of rest at the Herbert Art Gallery & Museum, October 2021. Image Credit: John Whitmore*
Eight young adults from the city embarked between October 2021 and February 2022 on a training and development programme which saw them work with producers within the Coventry City of Culture Trust and other organisations on the creation, development, and delivery of a two-day festival. The training and development programme enabled them to develop into young producers with experience of putting on a cultural event. Initial work leading to the development of the CVX Festival began in 2019, when the Trust and Positive Youth Foundation produced Take The Square, a one-day music event, curated and co-created with young people, which was held in the city centre in July 2019. This then evolved into CVX B-Side, a hip-hop music and dance festival that took place in August 2021 and was again co-created with young people from the city.

*A performance at CVX B-Side in August 2021. Image Credit: FiveSix Photography*

**The CVX Festival is going to mean a lot to me; it gives me a chance to show off my creative ability of other artforms, rather than just music. I am really happy about this because this is a real-life experience, I like workshops but this is something that I can be a part of that’s more professional. As a young producer it’s been stressful but fun. From thinking about my own ideas and then seeing it all come together it’s a really nice experience and gives me a lot of hope.**

Young Producer Syeda Bukhari, February 2022 [CWLEP Website]

**CVX Festival** was also a showcase for the creative outcomes of Barriers to Bridges, a ground-breaking artist in residence programme that has seen four artists – Kay Rufai, Joe Cook, Dom Fleming and Tarju Le’Sano – embedded within West Midlands Police, Extended Learning Centres in Coventry, and Family Hubs across the city. The artists have worked to respond to some of the challenges facing young people/adults and their relationships with key city organisations. The young people involved in the CVX Festival also had further opportunities to extend their learning and experiences through the Changing Trax programme run by Positive Youth Foundation.
The eight young producers from Positive Youth Foundation also teamed up with the likes of Flatpack Cinema, We Are Parable, Graeae, Hereward College, Marshon, Fyah Camp, Fridays, Maokwo, Youthful Cities, Bunny Boiler, Psyches, and Cov Music to plan and produce pop-up art galleries, hip-hop jams, theatre performances, and exclusive spectacular performances that showcased the talents of young people within the city and region.

For the festival, StoryFutures Academy, Rebel Creatives, and JellyBob worked closely with Positive Youth Foundation and a cohort of Digital Ambassadors aged between 16 and 25 to produce a series of co-created place-based experiences. The result was Urban Jungle AR, a smartphone augmented reality (AR) platform developed especially for the festival. The platform hosted a series of virtual performances by established and up-and-coming talent – from spoken word and grime artists to dance and circus performers, which were viewed using a smartphone or mobile tablet at locations around FarGo Village. Akin to ‘virtual busking’, Urban Jungle used innovative but accessible technology to raise the profile of the young talent, offering them a platform in high-profile locations across their city.
Wellbeing of the young producers involved in the project improved over the duration of the project, with increases in the average ONS Four Measures of Personal Wellbeing for life satisfaction (an increase of 0.25 from a score of 8), feeling worthwhile (an increase of 0.3 from a score of 8.3), and happiness (an increase in 0.7 from a score of 7.4). Levels of anxiety also reduced (a reduction of 0.9 from a score of 2.8). At the conclusion of the project wellbeing levels had risen and anxiety levels had dropped between the monitoring points of October 2021 and March 2022.

CVX Festival was a powerful skills development programme. The young producers reported that the skills learned and developed would help them in the future. Like other Caring City projects, survey data from audiences demonstrate stronger increases in civic pride and positive changes around the perception of Coventry. For example, 84% of survey respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the performance ‘increased my pride in Coventry’. This is in contrast to the UK CoC 2021 programme average of 74%. Further, 76% of respondents stated that their perception of Coventry had improved through attending, against a UK CoC 2021 programme average of 59%.

Theatre of Wandering

Theatre of Wandering was a theatrical experience through the city, where the boundaries between fiction and reality become blurred. This project drew upon a community’s experiences and reflections about what it is like to live with dementia. It was developed with Entelechy Arts, Grapevine, and the Care Home Network in Coventry.

---


The figures presented here are based on 46 valid survey responses, which present a margin of error of +/- 13.98% at a 95% confidence level.
Theatre of Wandering was a new theatre performance born out of Coventry’s communities’ experience of what it is like to live with, care for, or know someone with dementia. Inspired by Japanese theatre company OiBokkeShi, audience members followed George, an older man searching for his wife Annie, who is living with dementia, as he encounters Coventry’s people and places. In adjacent streets, Annie is wandering in her nightdress, living a parallel version of her own reality.

Across four performances in September 2021, 115 tickets were issued to audiences who promenaded through Coventry as they followed George in his search of Annie. Building up to the performances, 279 individuals engaged across 80 co-creation sessions. Sessions included school workshops, workshops with the Belgrade Arts Gym, music workshops, sound and writing commissions, and development work undertaken by a community cast of 31 people. The cast included social prescribers, Belgrade Arts Gym members, a young person, a PSCO, market stallholders from Coventry Market, and 25 residents from Bonds Hospital (sheltered accommodation) who hosted the performance’s final scenes and some of whom performed in the final scene.

I was immensely proud and privileged to be part of this whole project. I found it amazing, fun, exhilarating and challenging.

Community Cast Member, September 2021

I was deeply touched (near tears) at certain parts of this performance. Quite surprisingly so! Still processing why this is... Directly brings back memories of similar events/vulnerable loved ones. Feelings of care and concern and wanting to help. I’m now regretting not having invited key family members who I would dearly love to share with experience with. The performance makes for a very strong workshop, a conversation starter in addressing so many complex emotions... Even the sense of burden and guilt that I know exists around this subject. Thank you so much!

Audience Member, September 2021
In addition to the performance, a self-guided audio tour that followed the route of the play was available. For 28 days after the performance, QR codes led to 12 audio soundscapes produced by Coventry sound artist Indira Prasad. The soundscapes were shaped by 55 people who had lived experience of having dementia or were professionals supporting those with dementia. At the entrance to Coventry Market, two murals were created featuring George facing Annie. To be as accessible as possible, the performance was streamed online and an accompanying podcast of 5 episodes documenting the process and the themes of the work was released between November 2021 and January 2022.

Theatre of Wandering allowed for new partnerships to be established. Entelechy Arts, already experienced in embedded practices with healthcare professionals, have been able to refine their practices and identify new ways of working, especially as social prescribing continues to develop in practice. Organisations in Coventry have developed new partnerships and new ways of working.

*Theatre Of Wandering was a Coventry City of Culture Trust and Entelechy Arts co-production, in association with OiBokkeShi, the Belgrade Theatre Coventry, and Belgrade Arts Gym group.*

**HOME: Arts and Homelessness Festival**

*Arts and creativity can shine in the darkest of times. It can bring people together and provides opportunity for expression when other parts of life are challenging.*

A week-long celebration of arts and homelessness projects took place in October 2021. The week provided a platform for work showcasing communities in Coventry that have, now or in the past, lived experience of homelessness. Involving other creative communities from across the city, the festival was co-produced and co-created by the Arts and Homelessness Steering Group established at the beginning of 2021. The steering group was made up of people with lived experience of homelessness. The festival featured a wide range of events including:

- The St Basil’s Coventry Sleep Out – an event where Coventry citizens were invited to sleep out in the Cathedral ruins to raise funds for homelessness charities and experience what it is like to sleep out on the streets
- Agency – a photographic exhibition and community newspaper developed by socially engaged artist Anthony Luvera
- The Ruff Tuff Cream Puff Estate Agency – a new mid-scale main stage musical co-produced by Cardboard Citizens, Belgrade Theatre, and Coventry City of Culture Trust, and funded by Arts Council England
- A series of Legislative theatre debates, held between homeless communities, city council staff, councillors, artists, and members of the public at Belgrade theatre, looking to co-create change in experiences and delivery

*I really enjoyed this festival, seeing the co-creation work really paying off. The work has been inspirational and to see a small cohort of those with lived experience of homelessness in Coventry share their stories has shown that Coventry is one of the most caring cities in the country. Yes, local authorities need to do more but platforming and giving a voice to this community will really help. The Agency portraits are really powerful as you enter the city from the train station, they show that homelessness could happen to anyone, The Summit was fascinating and so insightful.*

Festival Audience Member, October 2021
The 2nd International Arts and Homelessness Summit – a three-day national programme of talks and workshops curated and hosted by Arts and Homelessness International in association with Crisis and Big Issue, as well as various co-created events and showcases.

Leading the shape and development of the festival, the Steering Group (which comprised citizens with lived experience of homelessness) ensured there were opportunities for members of the wider community to get involved with the festival. The group worked with artists and organisations to truly embed the work in their lived experience of homelessness. Importantly, members of the Steering Group who were not in employment were paid for their time; a move that recognised labour and skills and professionalised the process, bringing value to participants.

On a local level, the festival has influenced policy change in the Housing Department at the City Council, which has committed to more co-creation work with homeless people. This will
inform policy and provide more employment opportunities for people with lived experience of homelessness.\footnote{The commitments made by Coventry City Council feature in a post-event video from Arts and Homelessness International.}

The HOME: Arts and Homelessness Festival profoundly improved participants’ (those with current or past lived experience of homelessness) sense of value in society. Evaluation sessions as part of the Social Return On Investment for the UK City of Culture year saw participants attributing this improved sense of value to feeling in control of their own lives and positively influencing public opinions about homelessness.\footnote{The Social Return On Investment study focused on four projects from the overall UK City of Culture 2021 programme; namely, HOME: Arts and Homelessness Festival, Pirates of the Canal Basin, the Global Youth Summit, and Animals.}

The group in-evaluation sessions placed feeling valued, feeling part of an empowered network, and the development of new skills above their health and wellbeing. This is corroborated by participants and beneficiaries of the HOME festival taking part in additional projects, including the major event Ghosts In The Ruins, which featured the Coventry version of The Choir With No Name.

For Steering Group members, there were significant increases in the average \textit{ONS Four Measures of Personal Wellbeing} for life satisfaction (an increase of 1.9 from a score of 6), feeling worthwhile (an increase of 1.5 from a score of 6.5), and happiness (an increase in 1.0 from a score of 6.7). In all cases scores before the project were, on average, well below those of the general UK and Coventry population, and afterwards they had exceeded them. This finding is reinforced by recurring comments about finding increased joy in life, which were made at the evaluation sessions. Anxiety scores had showed levels above those of the general UK population (a score of 3.06), before the project (a score of 4.4), and they were significantly lower after the project (a score of 2.6). It is important not to over-claim from these figures; however, the qualitative evidence is reassuring that being involved with the festival was transformative.\footnote{A full examination of wellbeing data related to Caring City projects is included in Section 4 of this report. A summary table of quantitative data from beneficiaries is also included in the appendix.}

\section*{The Walk}

At a time of unprecedented global change, The Walk is an artistic response: a cultural odyssey transcending borders, politics, and language to tell a new story of shared humanity – and to ensure the world doesn’t forget the millions of displaced children, each of whom has their own story. The Trust saw The Walk as an opportunity to highlight the plight of the many unaccompanied children who have arrived in the city, the wider issues of refugees fleeing conflict and losing family, and also a chance for Central England Law Centre to create and stage in the city the very first citizenship ceremony for children.

\begin{quote}
\textit{A thought-provoking musical about housing and homelessness which whilst dealing with serious issues was also a burst of colour and music that had the audience literally dancing in the aisles.}

\textit{Audience Member, The Ruff Tuff Cream Puff Estate Agency, October 2021}
\end{quote}
Little Amal, a 3.5 metre-tall puppet of a 10 year old refugee girl from Syria, forms the heart of The Walk. Created by Good Chance Theatre working with Handspring Puppets, she demonstrates the plight and challenges of many refugees, and especially unaccompanied children, who have to flee their home in the hope of a better life. Little Amal travelled 8,000km across 12 countries to find a new home and her mother.

Following on from their delivery of the Robert Montgomery Peace Poem project, which was delivered in the city in September 2020 for International Peace Day, The Trust commissioned Emergency Exit Arts to produce this event with communities in the city working with Coventry Refugee and Migrant Centre, Central England Law Centre, Positive Youth Foundation, and the Belgrade theatre. Sita Thomas, who was from Coventry, was appointed as director. A story was created with communities to form a welcome and a route was designed so that Little Amal could meet citizens and feel the welcome of the city.

Arriving in Coventry to a welcome by over 6,000 people, Amal walked the streets of the city centre. She was greeted by the city’s community groups and organisations that had, through many hours of workshops, designed banners, produced music, and choreographed dance under Sita’s guidance, as a form of welcome.

I loved it - it actually brought tears to my eyes to see so many people welcoming refugees at a time when our country is not giving a very welcoming message to the world. I found it very moving.

Audience Member, The Walk, October 2021

Young people from Coventry welcome Little Amal to Coventry. Image Credit: Dylan Parrin
Following Little Amal’s arrival and walk through the city, she witnessed the first Children’s Citizenship Ceremony. Devised in collaboration with Central England Law Centre, the ceremony was a landmark event that celebrated and recognised the importance of British Citizenship to children and young people from across the world. The ceremony acted as a poignant and powerful illumination of the plight of refugees and the many children who come to the UK. The implications of a lack of British Citizenship for children and young people can be profound, with practical, social, and economic impacts that reverberate into adulthood. Becoming a British Citizen is a significant milestone and while there is an official ceremony for adults to mark the occasion, there has not previously been one for children and young people. The ceremony also featured a poem written and performed by Coventry’s young poet laureate, Hawwa Hussain, which highlighted a sense of community spirit and the start of a new chapter in the lives of these newly-conferred British Citizens. The importance of the ceremony has been recognised, such that it was repeated in September 2022 by Coventry City Council.

Last year’s ceremony was an overwhelming success celebrating and recognising our newly ordained young, British Citizens.

Our young citizens are a vital part of our community, of our society, and it is imperative that we continue to recognise the importance of citizenship to them and their families so we can continue to build an inclusive community where we celebrate those commonalities that unite us and make us a part of this United Kingdom

Councillor David Welsh, Cabinet Member for Housing and Communities, September 2022

The evening saw The Walk: Coventry Embraces, a theatre performance featuring sound, light, and choreography. The performance presented a moment of reflection for Little Amal; she remembers how far she has come and how much she has learned. Stand and Be Counted Theatre collaborated on the performance. As the first Theatre Company of Sanctuary, they had

Little Amal during the performance, The Walk: Coventry Embraces on the steps of Coventry Cathedral in October 2021. Image Credit: Dylan Parrin

Welcoming Little Amal’s walk to Coventry was a beautifully poignant and moving event to be a part of. The performance was a great combination of celebrating the history and diversity of Coventry whilst bringing attention to the plight of child refugees.

Audience Member, The Walk: Coventry Embraces, October 2021
previously worked with local Coventry people and citizens, many from minority communities and with different levels of status, on projects such as Coventry Welcomes, which formed part of the City of Culture programme in May 2021.

Little Amal showed us where she had come from, and Coventry demonstrated its nature as the city of peace and reconciliation by welcoming her and showing her that she will always have a home in the city.

Survey data from audience members demonstrated increased sentiment and pride of place, with 84% of survey respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing that the performance ‘increased my pride in Coventry’. This is in contrast to the UK CoC 2021 programme’s average of 74%. Further, 68% of respondents stated that their perception of Coventry had improved through attending, against a UK CoC 2021 programme average of 59%.7

There is so much that isn’t known or understood about how the immigration process in the UK really works. Being informed, genuinely listening and making space for discussion is the only way that we can make sure people’s experiences are never dismissed or manipulated.

Stand and Be Counted Theatre, October 2021

Little Amal on arrival in Coventry. Image Credit: Dylan Parrin


The figures presented here are based on 73 survey responses, which present a margin of error of +/- 10.86% at a 95% confidence level.
Coventry Welcomes

Celebrating Coventry’s heritage, traditions, and diversity, Coventry Welcomes offered a chance to explore the lives of those seeking sanctuary and those who have welcomed them throughout the generations. Designed to celebrate the people of Coventry, the events within Coventry Welcomes spanned genres and included some of the things humankind enjoys most: music, dance, drama, food, literature, poetry, workshops, storytelling, and much more, embracing diversity in all its forms. It was co-created and led by a steering group of citizens who have lived experience of being a refugee or a migrant, or who support newly arrived groups or citizens to the city.

Coventry Welcomes took place over the same period as the UK’s national Refugee Week. This is an annual UK-wide festival, initiated and led by Counterpoint Arts, which celebrates the contributions, creativity, and resilience of refugees and people seeking sanctuary. The Coventry Welcomes 2021 programme built on programmes that were developed in 2019 and 2020, and saw over 30 partner organisations from across the city come together to deliver a series of events that were thought-provoking, encouraged debate, and promoted the sharing of ideas. The programme included:

- Stand and Be Counted Theatre - *Can you Hear Me, Now?*
- CARAG presents Still We Rise Podcast with special guests
- She Cannot Walk Alone sharing by artist Laura Nyahuye, Creative Director of Maokwo
- Positive Images Festival launch and workshops
- Inini and CARAG launch their new zine, illustrated by Majid Adin
- In the City Festival presented by CRMC
- Additional workshops, talks, debates, theatre performance, comedy, and film events.

Central to the week were performances from Stand and Be Counted Theatre and their co-created show *Can You Hear Me, Now?* This was a celebratory, large-scale outdoor performance that took place in Swanswell Park. It was an immersive and joyous experience, made with and for the people of Coventry, featuring live music, dance, spoken word, and storytelling.

*Stand and be Counted’s Can You Hear Me Now? In Swanswell Park. Image Credit: Mandip Seehra*
SECTION FOUR: PROGRESS TOWARDS ALIGNED OUTCOMES
4.0 Progress Towards Aligned Outcomes
This section details the evidence that demonstrates progress towards the aligned outcomes for the programme, as set out in the Caring City Logic Model. The overall heading of each sub-section is the Coventry UK CoC 2021 outcome, underneath which are listed the aligned Spirit of 2012 outcomes, where appropriate.

As the Caring City programme was focused primarily on beneficiaries, these sections mainly feature data relating to the beneficiaries and how they were impacted by the Caring City programme. Data collected relating to audiences are featured in the appropriate sections.

4.1 Increase in civic pride
The Caring City programme has increased levels of civic pride for audiences who came to witness the stories and hear the voices of beneficiaries.

81% of audience survey respondents for the Caring City programme either agreed or strongly agreed that the event they had participated in or attended had increased their pride in Coventry as an area.8

Further to this, 61% of audience survey respondents stated that the event or activity they had attended or participated in had positively impacted their perception of Coventry.9

When looking at quality of the event or if the audience had a good time, 96% of audience survey respondents rated the quality of their experience as good or very good.10 The same percentage (96%) of audience survey respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that they had had a good time at the event they attended or participated with.11

Qualitative responses from audiences demonstrate that creative outputs that put the voices and stories of seldom-heard communities at centre stage are important for reducing stigma, raising awareness, and opening up difficult conversations on the difficult topics society faces.

Tonight, was a truly beautiful experience. Well done to everyone involved. It takes courage to be vulnerable and share your lived experience.

Audience Member, Reform the Norm: Story of Us Live, November 2021

Powerful portrayal of some of the most vulnerable members and societal experiences. I felt a sense of guilt and responsibility I didn’t before tonight’s show. So nice to see so many different people from Coventry coming together to make a difference.

Audience Member, Reform the Norm: Hungry Nation Part 1, December 2021

It is hoped that audiences of the Caring City programme will take what they have learned and make changes or lobby for changes that would contribute to a fairer and more inclusive society.

Audience Member, Haus of Kraft, April 2022

---

8 Based on 595 valid responses, which at a 95% confidence level provides a +/- 3.96% margin of error.
9 Based on 696 valid responses, which at a 95% confidence level provides a +/- 3.66% margin of error.
10 Based on 705 valid responses, which at a 95% confidence level provides a +/- 3.63% margin of error.
11 Based on 703 valid responses, which at a 95% confidence level provides a +/- 3.64% margin of error.
For beneficiaries of the Caring City programme, between the baseline and endline points of all projects, there was a 2% increase in beneficiaries feeling satisfied with the local area they live in.\textsuperscript{12} While this may seem insignificant, data from the Coventry Household Survey 2018 and 2022 demonstrates that in 2018, 84% of citizens in the city were satisfied with the local area they live in, but that by 2022 this had decreased to 66%. While the increase within the beneficiary pool cannot be directly attributed to the Caring City programme, positive changes to wellbeing, social connectedness, and connections to others are all known to contribute to people’s satisfaction with where they live and spend their time.

4.2 Cultural sector activity makes a significant contribution to the economic, environmental, social, health and wellbeing targets for the city and the region

**Spirit of 2012 Outcomes:**

- People’s personal wellbeing increases through participation
- People’s sense of social connectedness increases through participation
- People’s connection to ‘others’ (e.g., generations, cultures, ethnicities, etc.) increases through participation

Beneficiaries of the Caring City programme saw a noticeable uplift in wellbeing scores. From baseline data collected at the start of individual projects and endline data collected at the conclusion of projects, self-reported answers to the ONS Four Measures of Personal Wellbeing demonstrate a reduction in levels of anxiety and increases in life satisfaction, the feeling that the things done in life are worthwhile, and levels of happiness. Baseline data shows beneficiaries on average were reporting lower levels of wellbeing and higher levels of anxiety than the UK average at the commencement of projects; however, endline data on project conclusion has, except for levels of anxiety, moved into line with the UK average.

![Caring City Beneficiary - Wellbeing Changes Baseline Against Endline Compared to the UK Average](image)

Wellbeing changes of Caring City beneficiaries, baseline against endline compared to the UK average.\textsuperscript{13}

Sample Size, baseline: \(n=136\), endline: \(n=132\) which at a confidence level of 95% presents a confidence interval of +/-5.75%.

\textsuperscript{12} Sample Size, baseline: \(n=136\), endline: \(n=132\) which at a confidence level of 95% presents a confidence interval of +/-5.75%

It is acknowledged that because of their lived experience and complex needs, the levels of wellbeing of the target beneficiaries were lower than the estimated average level for the UK population prior to participation. A success of the Caring City programme is the achieving of an uplift to self-reported wellbeing scores, particularly for life satisfaction, the feeling that the things done in life are worthwhile, and levels of happiness, bringing these into line with the UK average.

The reduction in anxiety levels from the baseline starting point to the endline is significant. Beneficiaries of the Caring City programme, due to their personal circumstances, often self-report high anxiety levels or anxiety disorders. These can be a barrier to participating in programmes like Caring City. The beneficiaries saw a reduction in feeling anxious; it can be argued that this was a result of participation. Achieving this required high levels of investment in human resource, time, and capacity, to ensure that projects had the appropriate support structures and that relationships could be built over a long period. An emphasis on creating an environment of care by the Caring City producing team ensured...
beneficiaries were offered opportunities to thrive and develop, leading to increased levels of wellbeing.

The duration of projects was an important factor in beneficiaries seeing positive changes in mental wellbeing. Typically, the longer the project, the more noticeable the uplift in wellbeing. Anecdotal evidence from an Evaluation Debrief with members of the Caring City producing team demonstrates that for the producers, building relationships, trust, and a supportive environment was key to supporting the beneficiaries who were participating in the projects. This was not without challenge. For the producers, doing this consumed significant periods of time, and as the beneficiaries had individual needs, a tailored approach was required rather than one where ‘one size fits all’.

The two projects that saw the most significant increases in wellbeing were Coventry Welcomes and HOME: Arts and Homelessness Festival. Both were significant projects, not only in terms of duration (9 and 10 months respectively) but also in the beneficiaries’ levels of involvement. These two projects also share a commonality of being community-led through co-creation. For both, beneficiaries formed steering groups that would go on to create, shape, and develop important festivals in the city. These events showcased communities that were seldom heard, or newly arrived, or had lived experience of homelessness. Being able to co-create and shape the direction of a project is a driver for increased wellbeing. It is important to note that data for Reform the Norm shows the same pattern; however due to the low return of the endline surveys it is not possible to draw the same conclusions from the data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Baseline Satisfaction</th>
<th>Endline Satisfaction</th>
<th>Satisfaction Change</th>
<th>Baseline Worthwhile</th>
<th>Endline Worthwhile</th>
<th>Worthwhile Change</th>
<th>Baseline Happiness</th>
<th>Endline Happiness</th>
<th>Happiness Change</th>
<th>Baseline Anxiety</th>
<th>Endline Anxiety</th>
<th>Anxiety Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coventry Welcomes</td>
<td>9 Months</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>-1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Homeless</td>
<td>10 Months</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>-1.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis from the Social Return On Investment (SROI) study found that some beneficiaries (those with current or past lived experience of homelessness) working on the HOME: Arts and Homelessness Festival had a profoundly improved sense of value in society. Evaluation sessions as part of this SROI work saw participants attributing this improved sense of value to feeling in control of their own lives and to being able to positively influence public opinion about homelessness. The group in the evaluation sessions placed feeling valued, feeling part of an empowered network, and developing new skills above their health and wellbeing. However, this sense of value is inherently linked with wellbeing, as evidenced by the Steering Group members’ increases in average scores for life satisfaction (an increase of 1.9 from a score of 6), feeling worthwhile (an increase of 1.5 from a score of 6.5) and happiness (an increase in 1.0 from a score of 6.7). These increases were significant. In all cases, scores prior to the project had been, on average, well below those of the general UK and Coventry population, and afterwards they had exceeded them. This survey evidence is reinforced with recurring comments relating to an increased joy in life, which were presented at the evaluation sessions. Anxiety scores before the project (a score of 4.4) are above those of the general UK population (a score of 3.06), but are significantly lower after the project (a score
of 2.6). It is important not to over-claim from these figures; however, the qualitative evidence is reassuring in that it is apparent that being involved with the festival was transformative.

The SROI study of the HOME: Arts and Homelessness Festival undertaken by MB Associates noted that the festival produced a high social return on the investment made. For every £1 spent there was a £3.20 return on investment in social value. This is driven through participants rating their experience very highly, feeling valued, and being able to change homeless strategies within Coventry City Council. The independent research piece on Arts & Homelessness in Coventry also demonstrates that the festival fostered a positive experience of self-discovery, affirmation, and enhanced wellbeing. It is noted in both reports that this positive shift in wellbeing is, like the change in how beneficiaries felt, down to the strong foundations that Arts & Homelessness International, the Trust, and other parties laid down for the festival.

Those involved with Coventry Welcomes had similar uplifts in mental wellbeing. Across both of the projects, co-creation was identified as essential. Both projects saw the nurturing and shaping of ideas that had come directly from the communities. Power was held by those communities, and the producing team and other agencies were facilitators. The Coventry Model was about putting co-creation at the heart of a public facing, large scale event such as City of Culture and what the data demonstrates is that when this is done correctly, it can result in significant positive changes to wellbeing. Across the wider UK City of Culture programme, outside of the work of the Caring City, the wellbeing data demonstrates a similar pattern. The intrinsic link between feeling represented within the city and wellbeing is also clear when looking at the data from across the other Caring City projects.

Participation in projects with a performative element also saw positive increases in general levels of wellbeing. However, there were negative changes to anxiety levels. Beneficiaries reported feeling more anxious, and the qualitative feedback from both producers and beneficiaries indicate that high levels of encouragement and a supportive environment were required so that beneficiaries could feel able to perform publicly, often for the first time.

Beneficiary data collected also demonstrates positive indications of improved social connectedness and connections to others:

- There was a 12% increase in beneficiaries reporting that they chatted to their neighbours more than just to say hello.
- There was a 14% increase in beneficiaries agreeing that their neighbourhood is a place where people from different backgrounds (i.e., different ethnic groups, faith groups, social backgrounds, or countries of origin) get on well together.

---


• There was a 7% increase in how engaged beneficiaries generally felt with their local community (engagement refers to a feeling that you are meaningfully connected to other people in your community and/or the community as a whole).16

4.3 Community-led production and programming increases cultural participation and activism

Spirit of 2012 Outcomes:

• People’s levels of empowerment for contributing to their community in a creative and artistic capacity increases through participation

Endline data from beneficiaries demonstrates that they felt more empowered to contribute to activities within their communities, most notably around arts/cultural heritage and volunteering. Beneficiary endline data also indicates a decrease in the likelihood that beneficiaries would feel empowered to engage with leisure and sporting/physical activities. This result, given the beneficiaries involved in the Caring City programme, is not unexpected.

Endline beneficiary data indicates:

• 2% of beneficiaries at the endline point felt more empowered to engage with arts/cultural heritage activities
• 6% of beneficiaries at the endline point felt less empowered to engage with leisure activities
• 11% of beneficiaries at the endline point felt less empowered to engage with sporting and physical activities
• 3% of beneficiaries at the endline point felt more empowered to engage with volunteering activities
• 6% of beneficiaries stated at the endline point that they planned to get more involved with activities with members of different generations17

While the data above is encouraging, some of the percentages are quite small and, given the margin of error relating to the data, they could mean no change in reality. However, the journey of some of the beneficiaries from a place of social isolation and zero engagement with arts and culture to engaging with multiple Caring City projects should not be glossed over or minimised.

One of the unintended outcomes of the Caring City programme was the fact that some beneficiaries went on to engage with multiple projects, some of which were targeted at groups to which they technically did not ‘belong’. One beneficiary, who was initially referred to the programme through having lived experience of homelessness, then engaged with projects that were targeted at migrant and newly arrived communities, meaning that social networks and connections amongst the different groups within the city were expanding.

Also, during the course of Haus of Kraft, a project that brought together an inter-generational cohort of eight women, one beneficiary in their late twenties struck up a

16 Sample Size, baseline: n=136, endline: n=132 which at a confidence level of 95% presents a confidence interval of +/-5.75%
17 Sample Size, baseline: n=136, endline: n=132 which at a confidence level of 95% presents a confidence interval of +/-5.75%
friendship with another beneficiary in their eighties, and the two were meeting outside of the sessions in a social setting.

4.4 Cultural leadership and programming reflect and represents the citizens of the city

The Caring City programme, through the embedding of cultural producers within host organisations, was able to reach some of the most seldom-heard groups and communities in the city, which was in line with the original aims and intentions of the programme.

This targeted approach allowed those who had not previously felt empowered to engage with cultural activities to come forward and take part. From the evaluation sessions that were part of the externally undertaken SROI study, beneficiaries reported that a good outcome for them as individuals would be for them to feel valued in society, listened to, and represented in mainstream life. During the final evaluation sessions, the beneficiaries reported all these feelings, prompted by having platforms where their stories, lived experiences, and voices could be shared in safe and supportive environments.

The demographic characteristics of beneficiaries captured during baseline surveying at the commencement of their participation with the Caring City programme reveals that the Caring City programme reached some of the city’s traditionally underrepresented groups, most noticeably those who identify as coming from an ethnic minority.

Demographic Characteristics of Caring City Beneficiaries

Sample Size, n=90 which at a confidence level of 95% presents a confidence interval of +/-8.28%

It is noticeable that 59% of the beneficiaries identified as being not White British, which is, according to data from the 2021 Census, an overrepresentation based on the city’s
demographic makeup (44.7% of Coventry’s citizens identify as being not White British).\textsuperscript{18} In relation to disability, 18% of beneficiaries identified as having a disability or a long-term health condition, which is in line with data from the 2021 Census (18.4% of the citizens of Coventry identify as having a disability as defined under the Equality Act).\textsuperscript{19} In terms of gender, 62% of beneficiaries identified as female; this is not dissimilar to other programmes within the UK CoC 2021 such as Love Coventry and Green Futures, where females were overrepresented in comparison to the city’s population. Within the general population of Coventry, 50.1% of citizens are female.\textsuperscript{20} The higher number of females engaging and participating with the programme is not unique to either the Caring City programme or the UK CoC 2021, but reflects a wider trend. For example, the evaluation of the Birmingham 2022 Festival shows that 76% of its participants were female.\textsuperscript{21} Looking to the future, programmes like Caring City and similar mass-participation co-creation events could potentially develop new ways and strategies for engaging those identifying as male to combat this trend. In terms of age, the age distribution of beneficiaries maps fairly closely that of Coventry’s population, with 30% of beneficiaries of the Caring City being aged 35 to 49, 23% aged 50 to 64, 21% aged 20 to 34, 19% under the age of 19, and 7% aged 65 or older.

It is clear from the data presented here that the Caring City programme can be argued to be reflective and representative of the city. There are, however, some limitations to the data collected. First, it was difficult to capture baseline and endline data from beneficiaries early on in the programme. This was partly because of the pandemic and the impact it was having on beneficiaries, and partly due to the digital exclusion felt by some beneficiaries. This hampered data collection and therefore there is only beneficiary baseline and endline data for c.130 beneficiaries out of 250. Furthermore, for some projects the demographic questions were not asked because one of the project partners did not feel comfortable about asking them. Hence, the data presented here is from a sample size of 90, which at a confidence level of 95% presents a confidence interval of +/-8.28%.

A further challenge to the data presented here is that the postcodes of beneficiaries were not collected. This was not an oversight. The decision to omit this data collection came from a perspective of care and support for the beneficiaries, given that two of the main groups being surveyed had either lived experience of homelessness or were newly arrived in the city and awaiting housing. Therefore, it is not possible to map where beneficiaries came from, other than by relying on assurances from the host and other organisations that had


\textsuperscript{19} ONS 2021 Census Interactive Maps <https://www.ons.gov.uk/census/maps/choropleth/health/disability-age-standardised/disability-4a/disabled-under-the-equality-act-day-to-day-activities-limited-a-lot?lad=E08000026> [accessed 22/02/2023]

\textsuperscript{20} ONS 2021 Census Interactive Maps <https://www.ons.gov.uk/census/maps/choropleth/population/sex/sex/female?lad=E08000026> [accessed 22/02/2023]

links to the beneficiaries that they came from the city and the immediate neighbouring areas.

The above evidence relates to the beneficiaries of the Caring City programme. Turning to the programme’s audiences, these break down as:

- 70.1% of the Caring City audience identified as female as opposed to 50.1% of the Coventry population at the 2021 Census; 28.1% identified as male, 0.9% as non-binary, and 0.9% as other.
- 15.2% of the Caring City audience identified as having a disability or long-term health condition against a city average of 18.4%.
- 35.0% of the Caring City audiences were aged 50 to 64, 28.6% were aged 35 to 49, 22.2% were aged 20 to 34, 12.1% were aged 65 + and 2.1% were aged 19 or under.
- 9.3% of the Caring City audiences identified as LGBTQIA+.
- Cultural identity/ethnicity:
  - 60.6% identified as White British (Coventry – 55.3%)  
  - 13.3% identified as White Other, White Irish, or White Gypsy or Irish Traveller (Coventry – 10.2%)  
  - 7.5% identified as Black, African, Caribbean, or Black British (Coventry – 8.9%)  
  - 9.1% identified as Asian or Asian British (Coventry – 18.5%)  
  - 3.2% identified as Mixed or multiple ethnic group (Coventry – 3.4%)  
  - 2.7% identified as being from any other ethnic group (Coventry – 3.7%)  
  - 3.6% preferred not to say

There are some limitations to this data as it is based on survey data. The invitations to complete surveys were sent out digitally to the ticket booker or participant, or they were filled in at events by audience members and participants. This gives a good representation but is not the full picture.

Again, like the beneficiary data there is some overrepresentation of certain characteristics but this is encouraging as it demonstrates the programme is reaching the targeted groups.

4.5 Cultural engagement is geographically dispersed across the city

There is limited data to suggest that cultural engagement for the Caring City programme has been geographically dispersed across the city. Assessing the progress towards this outcome can be done in three ways. Firstly, through the assessment of the location of events and activities. Secondly, through assessing where direct beneficiaries of the Caring City programme came from, and thirdly, through assessing where the audiences for Caring City events came from.

---

22 Based on 633 valid responses, which at a 95% confidence level provides a +/- 3.84 margin of error.
23 Based on 632 valid responses, which at a 95% confidence level provides a +/- 3.84% margin of error. Data from the 2021 Census shows that 18.5% of the citizens of Coventry identify as having a disability as defined in the Equality Act.
24 Based on 618 valid responses, which at a 95% confidence level provides a +/- 3.89% margin of error.
25 Based on 484 valid responses, which at a 95% confidence level provides a +/- 4.41% margin of error. Data from the 2021 Census shows that 3.16% of the citizens of Coventry are LGBTQIA+.
26 Based on 624 valid responses, which at a 95% confidence level provides a +/- 3.87% margin of error.
27 Coventry figures are based on the 2021 Census.
In terms of the locations for the Caring City programme’s events and activities, these were concentrated in a narrow geographic area of the city with Coventry city centre at its heart. It is important to note that the Caring City programme’s events could not be presented in many of the city’s usual venues. The direct beneficiaries of the programme were identified from their links to the host and other similar organisations, and the event locations had to be known to those organisations and beneficiaries. The venues also had to be within walking distance of the base locations of these organisations, and they had to be fully accessible. As some of the beneficiaries of the Caring City programme can be described as vulnerable, with lived experience of mental health issues, or lived experience of homelessness or newly arrived to the city, it was necessary to use locations that were known to them as safe spaces so that they could feel they were in a supportive environment where participation could be encouraged. These requirements, although entirely reasonable and understandable, did somewhat restrict the number of locations where events and activities could be staged; from an event delivery perspective, this was quite limiting.

While the host and other producing organisations are rooted primarily within Coventry’s city centre, the reach of the beneficiaries with whom they work covers the whole of Coventry and its neighbouring areas. It is known that proximity to events is a driver for cultural participation: people are more likely to participate to a cultural event or intervention when it is close to where they live. However the pull of the host and existing organisations was able to draw beneficiaries to the city centre, allowing events to take place successfully within a narrow geographic area.

The previously noted decision to not obtain data from beneficiaries about their residential postcodes means that for this evaluation, there is insufficient evidence to understand the extent of the geographic area beneficiaries came from. Anecdotally, beneficiaries were known have a direct relationship to the city and neighbouring areas because of their links to the host and existing organisations. However, because this evidence is anecdotal, the geographic area covered remains unknown.

On the other hand, the audiences for Caring City events came from all neighbourhoods, electoral wards of the city, and beyond. The analysis of ticketing data for events that were ticketed to Coventry postcodes via the Trust’s ticketing platform reveals a fairly even distribution of tickets across the city. The exception is the

---

28 Brook, Orian and Scott, Mark (2022) Art for the many not the few: Addressing cultural & other inequalities at scale. Coventry: AHRC/University of Warwick <http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/171829> [accessed 22/02/2023].
Earlsdon area, which requested a higher proportion of the tickets. However this is not unexpected, as that area also had the highest proportion of tickets issued to it across the entire UK CoC 2021 programme (indeed, it is also one of the areas with the highest levels of cultural participation, as identified by the Coventry Household Survey 2022). Overall, the data offers encouraging evidence that engagement with this programme, which celebrated and championed seldom-heard communities, came from across the whole city and beyond.

It is clear that the Caring City programme has generated engagement from a wide and fairly evenly dispersed geographical area of the city. However, due to limited data and the narrow geographic area of events and activities, it is hard to understand the geographical area to which beneficiaries came from.

4.6 Coordinated cultural sector capacity and infrastructure is building a sustainable and resilient sector
At the time of writing this evaluation report there is insufficient evidence to assess progress towards this outcome.

4.7 Coventry is recognised as pioneering model of culture-led inclusive growth.
At the time of writing this evaluation report there is insufficient evidence to assess progress towards this outcome.

4.8 Cultural programming is environmentally responsible and promotes environmental awareness
Environmental responsibility and awareness were embedded in the production and event delivery practices of the Trust. The Trust had a Green Code which outlined the aspirations and good practices established, and the production and delivery of the Caring City programme followed these principles. Further information regarding the environmental practices of the UK CoC 2021 in general can be found in the focus study on the environment undertaken by Coventry University available here: https://coventry21evaluation.info/environmental-awareness/
SECTION FIVE:
LEARNINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
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5.0 Learnings and Recommendations

This section details key learnings and recommendations that emerged from the Caring City programme. The following sections have been identified via a programme evaluation debrief session undertaken with the Caring City producing team, the results of independently undertaken research, and the Social Return On Investment Study undertaken for the UK CoC 2021 year.

The learnings and recommendations fall into the following categories:

- Digital Exclusion – pandemic-related learning on managing the digital exclusion of seldom-heard groups and communities
- Collection of Monitoring and Evaluation Data – learnings from the trial of Community Evaluators and the challenge of capturing meaningful monitoring data under pandemic circumstances
- Partnership Working and Associated Challenges – learnings related to the importance of building networks and partnerships for effective working
- Maintaining Engagement – learnings around the time and resources required for building safe spaces for the development of creative work
- Wellbeing of Beneficiaries and Delivery Staff – learnings relating to improving wellbeing for beneficiaries while also maintaining wellbeing for delivery staff

The next sections go into further detail about these points and highlight recommendations for future similar projects.

5.1 Digital Exclusion

The COVID-19 pandemic, like any other shock, highlighted inequality in society, especially for the beneficiaries the host organisations serve. However, early on in the pandemic the biggest barrier to reaching the beneficiaries was digital inequality.

A noticeable example of this was the Positive Youth Foundation. Prior to March 2020, it was working with around 2,000 young people a month. As a result of the first national lockdown, that number dropped to around 50 young people a month because very few of the young people were in a position to engage online. This was the same for the other host organisations. For example, connecting with the core beneficiaries from Central England Law Centre became a particular challenge. This was partly because of regulations but also because the organisation lost direct access to its beneficiaries, who were now working more closely with intermediary organisations that focused on the beneficiaries’ immediate needs.

The Caring City team managed to build engagement through the use of creative packs and postcard activities. The uptake indicates that these strategies were successful. However, further attention should be given to the measurement of engagement and to closing the gap between activity to feedback, as feedback from these activities is light.

Obviously, the pandemic presented the Caring City team with an unprecedented set of working circumstances and digital exclusion was an issue that arose as a direct result of the pandemic. While it was initially hoped that the issue of digital exclusion would be a short-term one, the duration of the pandemic and the fact that a majority of beneficiaries were shielding from it meant that the challenge was significant.
Access to wi-fi and data packages is particularly challenging for residents in sheltered accommodation and for newly arrived communities. This meant there was a significant barrier for these groups to participate. Following consultation with the beneficiaries of the programme, the Trust provided them with free telephone numbers so they could join online sessions during 2020. Each call made was at cost to the Trust but the facility did allow participation by those who did not have access to the internet, suitable devices, or data packages. While this was occurring, the Caring City team were developing hybrid and blended approaches to programme delivery, including small group meetings that allowed for social distancing (once small gatherings were permitted under the pandemic regulations).

As pandemic restrictions eased, the Caring City team continued with their blended approach to the delivery of activity. Host organisations at this time also enabled participation by physically opening up and allowing service users to make use of their facilities and equipment, such as IT, which allowed them to engage. While a blended approach is by its nature more time consuming and resource heavy for the Trust, this hybrid approach has become the default way of working and it looks set to continue.

**Recommendations for future projects:**

- Build in provision for blended approaches to engagement, including physical and digital approaches
- Budget and resources to allow for digital exclusions by having loanable equipment, free telephone numbers, and other means for participation

5.2 Collection of Monitoring and Evaluation Data

Early on in the Caring City programme, one of the key challenges faced was in relation to Monitoring and Evaluation and the collection of useable data through surveys and other means.

It became evident from projects within the programme that involved certain groups that the use of traditional methods of data collection, such as surveys, were not appropriate. Language barriers, access needs, and the nature of the workshop sessions or events meant that the response rate for both baseline and endline surveying was low or non-existent. However, these groups have provided a vast amount of personal testimony and qualitative data, which has provided valuable insight into how their engagement with the Caring City programme has improved their confidence and wellbeing. Nevertheless, without quantifiable data it is hard to make such claims.

The problems were exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic in that the vulnerabilities of beneficiaries meant that it was inappropriate for evaluators to undertake the required data collection because it was paramount that the beneficiaries had a safe and a supportive environment for them to engage. Collecting data through online means proved difficult despite encouragement from facilitators. Unfortunately, this means that early beneficiary data is missing, as already noted in this report.

Once social distancing requirements had eased, it became easier to collect data and consequently response rates increased. It was also found that early in the evaluation process, facilitators were worried that asking beneficiaries certain questions might be triggering, especially when the questions concerned the wellbeing of those with lived experience of mental health problems. In actuality, beneficiaries were fine with the questions...
as they come from measures that are used in other service areas. However, the initial qualms about asking such questions did limit data collection early in the process.

Working with host organisations on the initial survey design was helpful. However having a survey that takes into consideration the bespoke needs of specific groups can present challenges. For example, postcode data for beneficiaries was not collected because the Caring City programme was working with those with lived experience of homelessness and those who were newly arrived to the city and awaiting accommodation. In such situations, the inability to collect postcode data is understandable, but it does mean that in-depth analysis of data is not possible.

In the first phase of the Caring City programme, the Trust developed and trialled the use of volunteers as Community Evaluators to undertake data collection with the communities and groups engaging with the Caring City programme. The trial proved successful and a cohort of five Community Evaluators were recruited to undertake data collection at events in late 2019; these included Feast, an event that brought the Caring City host organisations and potential beneficiaries together for a shared meal in Coventry Cathedral. However the pandemic stymied efforts to develop the Community Evaluator programme. Once pandemic restrictions had eased, the City Host volunteers undertook some data collection but not to the same extent as the Community Evaluators would have done. It is important to note that during the trial period, the administration and resource management for the Community Evaluators was time consuming.

**Recommendations for future projects:**

- Provide surveys in multiple languages in line with the targeted groups
- Think beyond the survey: it is possible to come up with different data collection methods, such as ‘stand on the line’ or ‘select the most appropriate colour or image’
- Community Evaluators were effective; however, the administration and resource management were time consuming and this must be taken into account when devising a similar programme
- Ensure all partners understand the importance of data collection and the need to be flexible when working across different groups

### 5.3 Partnership Working and Associated Challenges

Partnership was key for the successful delivery of the Caring City programme. The relationships with the host organisations were essential for targeting and reaching the groups and communities the programme was seeking to engage. Partnerships with delivery organisations were also key for the delivery of Caring City outputs.

While partnership working has allowed the target groups to be reached such that the organisations involved have been able to see the benefit of arts and cultural work to delivering their outcomes, this hasn’t been without challenge. Bringing together a range of different organisations who all have social change on their agendas means that organisations have different outcomes they wish to achieve. Aligning these outcomes took careful negotiation during the early stages of the Caring City programme. The negotiation helped create a general consensus of the mission and crystallised the objectives of the programme, but continued stakeholder management was required. This was often time consuming and meant that members of the producing team were spending time
undertaking administrative tasks as opposed to creating a programme directly with beneficiaries. Additional administrative support would have been helpful, particularly during the early stages of the programme.

There were issues around the ‘just in time’ issuing of contracts and making payments to partners and those delivering the Caring City programme. These issues did cause some tensions, especially given that the small organisations or freelancers who were working on the delivery of projects often had little or no reserves of their own to operate in this way. A strength of the Caring City programme was the producing team behind it, who were able to manage this tension and maintain good relationships.

On a positive note, one of the unintended outcomes for the Caring City programme was the generation of unplanned partnerships within Coventry between organisations that had not previously worked with each other. These organisations often had similar goals and may even have been working with the same beneficiary pool, but their work, because of how they were operating or their funding mechanisms, was done in silos. Through the programme’s collaborative work for producing a cultural output to support social change, they were able to see the value in future collaboration beyond the life of the programme.

Further to this, there was a noticeable change in the way in which practitioners worked when delivering the Caring City programme. New ways of working and more inclusive practices developed from being exposed to working on a programme of social change. As the Caring City team worked with existing organisations and freelancers in the delivery of the programme, it is hoped that this positive way of working with beneficiaries and communities can continue beyond UK CoC 2021 and on into the future.

**Recommendations for future projects:**

- Plan for appropriate administrative support especially around contracting and finance
- Build a network of local partners who can contribute to the social change outcomes by having local knowledge and links to beneficiaries
- Draw on the expertise of organisations and individuals who have developed practice in tackling social change
- Allow partners and practitioners to be taken on the journey to develop their own work for future social change projects
5.4 Maintaining Engagement

Maintaining engagement was a challenge for the programme. The Caring City team were successful in developing a cohort of beneficiaries who were responsive and eager to engage outside of their original project. The majority of these beneficiaries were the individuals whom the Trust supported as a result of referrals from host organisations in the initial lockdown. As a consequence, the individuals had strong levels of trust in the Caring City producers and with one another. Engaging new individuals is a challenge and often within the period of a project it is difficult for the appropriate level of trust to be established.

The Caring City programme’s impact on trust building and establishing relationships with beneficiaries is highlighted in both of the independent pieces of research. In the report on Arts & Homelessness in Coventry, the care ethics manifesting in the different approaches to the work were highlighted, including the need for ‘careful listening and decisions about spaces that were familiar and accessible’.29 The report into the relationship between the West Midlands Police and Coventry City of Culture Trust also highlights the need for careful relationship building and the creation of trust, and it emphasises that this takes a long time.30

What the Caring City team has done immensely well is to work with smaller cohorts of individuals and really engage them in a deep and meaningful way. This has allowed for a space of mutual respect, understanding, and trust to be established. Working in this safe space has enabled some of the most seldom-heard citizens in the city to engage in UK CoC 2021. For these individuals, the impact from the programme can be profound. This is evident through the increased wellbeing, reduced anxiety, and greater social cohesion felt by beneficiaries. It was identified in the Social Return On Investment study undertaken by MB Associates that one beneficiary’s participation in the Caring City programme prevented them from taking their own life.

The Caring City programme allowed beneficiaries to tell their stories and share their experiences in their own voices. The respect and care given to these stories and experiences by the Caring City team helped to maintain engagement, as beneficiaries saw their stories and experiences being valued and used for a positive purpose. All the producers from the Caring City programme noted in the evaluation debrief that they had learned and developed new ways of working from working directly with beneficiaries. Beneficiaries could see that culture helped them tell their stories how they wanted, and the co-creation ethos of the UK CoC 2021 programme helped with this.

---


30 Hodgson, Jacqueline S. and Lewis, Rachel (2023) Policing, Culture and Community: West Midlands Police as a City of Culture Partners Coventry: University of Warwick
It is obviously hard to reach large numbers by working with small cohorts successfully. Future thinking about similar projects should look at how work of this nature can be scaled up effectively; the challenge is to maintain deep engagement while widening its breadth.

I think certainly for the participants I’ve worked with, you know, working with creativity, it’s about that it creates that space for people to, as you say, to see themselves reflected, to heal, to imagine better futures, to like, to create new ideas and ways of being, to create connections, to feel less isolated. It just, it becomes this mechanism for so many different possibilities.

Caring City Producer, Evaluation Debrief, June 2022

When thinking of future work, it is also key to ensure that the appropriate amount of time for building relationships and trust is factored into delivery plans when working with beneficiaries who can be classed as vulnerable. Spaces where activity should also be carefully considered, as the beneficiaries need to regard them as a safe place.

**Recommendations for future projects:**

- Ensure time is built into delivery plans for building trust and relationships: do not underestimate the time such trust building takes.
- Build safe spaces where the work can take place, taking into consideration the lived experience and needs of beneficiaries
- Small cohorts lead to deep levels of impact and engagement; consider ways to scale up work of this nature

**5.5 Wellbeing of Beneficiaries and Delivery Staff**

Having small cohorts within projects was a driver for increasing levels of wellbeing. Small numbers within cohorts allowed beneficiaries to receive tailored care and nurturing, if they desired it. The use of safe spaces also contributed to this.

Supporting beneficiaries was at times a challenge. The Caring City producers took on pastoral responsibilities in addition to the job of delivering the Caring City programme. These pastoral duties came about organically, as the producers and beneficiaries built up the levels of mutual trust and respect that were essential for nurturing and developing creative outputs rooted in the lived experiences of beneficiaries. Taking on this additional burden did negatively impact on the mental wellbeing of the producers in some ways and it is vital that appropriate networks and support are in place when running programmes that deliver social change. Producers felt the responsibility of caring for the beneficiaries because they were the ones who had brought them into that space. They shared in the pain of beneficiaries who came to harm or were upset.

The most difficult moments inevitably are when you end up working with people who are vulnerable. And, you know, you can be struggling with work. You plough through those emotional moments where you know you are dealing with people in bad places and when there are good moments, they are the most rewarding. But it’s also difficult emotionally and you take that difficulty on board.

Caring City Producer, Evaluation Debrief, June 2022
Ensuring that proper support for both beneficiaries and those delivering the programme is essential. Building in additional layers of care for beneficiaries and for those who are delivering the programme with beneficiaries would improve the wellbeing of everyone concerned.

Recommendations for future projects:

- Build in additional support layers which can be accessed by those delivering the programme
SECTION SIX:
CONCLUSIONS
6.0 Conclusions

The Caring City programme within the UK CoC 2021 has had a positive impact on its direct beneficiaries in quite profound ways. Positive changes to mental wellbeing, reduction in anxiety levels, positive indicators of increased social connectedness, and increased connections to others are evident through beneficiary data collected as part of the programme. Unfortunately, thanks to the pandemic creating everchanging and at times quite testing circumstances, the programme only reached around 250 beneficiaries and approximately 22,000 in audiences. The Caring City producing team adapted and flexed to these circumstances and created supportive and nurturing environments for beneficiaries, which allowed them to share their stories, have a voice, and be represented within a major UK cultural festival. The beneficiaries reached were some of the city’s most vulnerable and seldom-heard citizens.

Partnership working was the key to reaching beneficiaries. By using host and other organisations who had an existing pool of beneficiaries, groups and cohorts could be formed and utilised. Without these host and existing organisations, reaching the targeted groups and citizens would have been difficult for the Trust. The beneficiary experience was a positive one, as indicated by the fact that beneficiaries took part in multiple projects and had a deep level of engagement across the Caring City programme and in other programme elements of the UK CoC 2021.

Supporting beneficiaries was at times a challenge. The Caring City producers took on pastoral responsibilities in addition to the job of delivering the Caring City programme. This occurred organically, as the producers and the beneficiaries built up levels of mutual trust and respect for each other. Such pastoral care was essential to nurturing and developing the creative outputs, which were rooted in the lived experiences of beneficiaries and it was important for those experiences to be respected and valued. Taking on this additional burden did negatively impact on the mental wellbeing of the producers and it is vital that appropriate networks and support are in place when running a programme of this nature which delivers social change.

There is evidence that long-term projects that celebrate the lived experience and make beneficiaries feel they are valued and able to drive change in the city can generate high returns on investment in relation to social value. MB Associates, in their SROI study of the HOME: Arts and Homelessness Festival, noted that the festival produced a high social return on the investment made. For every £1 spent there was a £3.20 return on investment in social value. This was driven through participants rating their experience very highly, and feeling valued and able to help change homeless strategies within Coventry City Council.

For young adults involved in the Caring City programme, they were able to reclaim spaces which they previously felt were unwelcoming to them and change the perceptions of young people in the city through co-creating and producing a festival that celebrated emerging young talent from the Midlands. This process increased confidence, and the skills developed will contribute towards enhanced life skills in the future. Older people were able to be part of creative workshops and performances in projects such as Haus of Kraft, Coventry Welcomes, and Theatre of Wandering.

Issues such as food poverty, immigration, environmental action, homelessness, and loneliness were approached and tackled by the programme in sensitive and meaningful
ways through the use of arts and culture. To do this well, it was essential to put the lived experiences, stories, and voices of beneficiaries' centre stage and give them a platform during a major arts festival. Organisations in the city are now working in different ways. Culture is being used as a driver for social change and it is hoped this will continue into the future.
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7.0 Appendices
The following sub-sections detail supporting evidence for aspects of this report.

7.1 Caring City Beneficiary Questions
The following questions formed the Caring City question bank for the surveying of beneficiaries.

a) Generally, how satisfied are you with your local area as a place to live? (Circle appropriate answer) [Very Satisfied, Fairly Satisfied, Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied, Fairly Dissatisfied, Very Dissatisfied]

b) Generally, how satisfied are you with your local area as a place to live? (Circle appropriate answer) [Definitely Agree, Tend To Agree, Don't Know, Tend To Disagree, Definitely Disagree]

c) How often do you chat to your neighbours, more than to just say hello? [On Most Days, Once Or Twice A Week, Once Or Twice A Month, Less Than Once A Month, Never, Don't Have Any Neighbours]

d) To what extent do you agree or disagree that your neighbourhood is a place where people from different backgrounds (i.e., different ethnic groups, faith groups, social backgrounds or countries of origin) get on well together? [Definitely Agree, Tend To Agree, Tend To Disagree, Definitely Disagree, Too Few People In Local Neighbourhood, Don't Know]

e) Please rate how engaged you generally feel with your local community (engagement refers to a feeling that you are meaningfully connected to other people in your community, and/or the community as a whole) [Very Engaged, Engaged, Disengaged, Completely Disengaged]

f) Please rate how empowered/confident you feel to join the following activities: Arts and cultural heritage, Leisure, Sporting and physical, Volunteering [Very Empowered, Empowered, Sometimes Empowered, Never Empowered]

g) Do you plan to get involved in activities with members of different generations? (e.g., join community centre activities, take part in sports, do more voluntary work) [Yes, No, Not Sure]

h) Please rate how much you agree/disagree with the following statement: "My community and myself as an individual is well represented in the city" [Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree]

i) Please rate how much you agree/disagree with the following statement: "My local area is a place where people from different generations mix well together" (Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree)

j) What is your age? [Numerical Input]

k) Please indicate your gender? [Female, Male, Non-Binary, Other]

l) Do you identify as disabled? [Yes, No, Prefer Not To Say]

m) Please indicate your ethnic origin and cultural background: [White British, White Irish, White Gypsy/Irish Traveller, Other White Background, Mixed - White and Black Caribbean, Mixed - White and Black African, Mixed - White and Asian, Other Mixed/Multiple Ethnic Background, Asian or Asian British - Indian, Asian or Asian British - Pakistani, Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi, Asian or Asian British - Chinese, Other Asian Background, Black or Black British - African, Black or Black
British - Caribbean, Other/Black/African/Caribbean Background, Arab, Other, Prefer Not to Say]
n) Overall, how satisfied are you with your life? (On a 0-10 scale, where 0 is not satisfied at all and 10 is completely satisfied) [Scale 0-10]
o) Overall, how much do you feel the things you do in your life are worthwhile? (On a scale of 0-10, where 0 is not at all worthwhile and 10 is completely worthwhile) [Scale 0-10]
p) Overall, how happy did you feel yesterday? (On a 0-10 scale, where 0 is not at all happy and 10 is completely happy) [Scale 0-10]
q) Overall, how anxious did you feel yesterday? (On 0-10 scale, where 0 is not anxious and 10 is completely anxious) [Scale 0-10]
### 7.2 Caring City Beneficiary Summary of Wellbeing Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>[A] Number of Respondents with low levels of wellbeing</th>
<th>[B] Number of Respondents with higher levels of wellbeing</th>
<th>[C] Total Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Baseline AVERAGE of all responses</th>
<th>Baseline % of Positive Respondents</th>
<th>Endline AVERAGE of all responses</th>
<th>Endline % of Positive Respondents</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how satisfied are you with your life?</td>
<td>No. of participants who responded 0 to 4</td>
<td>No. of participants who responded 7 to 10</td>
<td>Total number of people who responded to the question</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(On a 0-10 scale, where 0 is not satisfied at all and 10 is completely satisfied)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how much do you feel the things you do in your life are worthwhile? (On a scale of 0-10, where 0 is not at all worthwhile and 10 is completely worthwhile)</td>
<td>No. of participants who responded 0 to 4</td>
<td>No. of participants who responded 7 to 10</td>
<td>Total number of people who responded to the question</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how happy did you feel yesterday?</td>
<td>No. of participants who responded 0 to 4</td>
<td>No. of participants who responded 7 to 10</td>
<td>Total number of people who responded to the question</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(On a 0-10 scale, where 0 is not at all happy and 10 is completely happy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how anxious did you feel yesterday? (On a 0-10 scale, where 0 is not anxious and 10 is completely anxious)</td>
<td>No. of participants who responded 6 to 10</td>
<td>No. of participants who responded 0 to 3</td>
<td>Total number of people who responded to the question</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question for individuals aged 16+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 7.3 Caring City Beneficiary Summary of Social Cohesion Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Number of Positive Respondents (Numerator)</th>
<th>Total Number of Respondents (Denominator)</th>
<th>Numerator</th>
<th>Denominator</th>
<th>Baseline % of Positive Respondents</th>
<th>Numerator</th>
<th>Denominator</th>
<th>Endline % of Positive Respondents</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally, how satisfied are you with your local area as a place to live? (Very satisfied, Fairly satisfied, Neither satisfied or dissatisfied, Fairly dissatisfied, Very dissatisfied)</td>
<td>No. of respondents who answered very satisfied, or fairly satisfied.</td>
<td>Total number of people who responded to the question</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree or disagree that you can influence decisions affecting your local area? (Definitely agree, Tend to agree, Tend to disagree, Definitely disagree, Don't know)</td>
<td>No. of respondents who answered definitely agree or tend to agree.</td>
<td>Total number of people who responded to the question</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Number of Positive Respondents (Numerator)</td>
<td>Total Number of Respondents</td>
<td>Numerator</td>
<td>Denominator</td>
<td>Baseline % of Positive Respondents</td>
<td>Numerator</td>
<td>Denominator</td>
<td>Endline % of Positive Respondents</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you chat to your neighbours, more than to just say hello?</td>
<td>No. of respondents who answered on most days, once or twice a week, or once or twice a month.</td>
<td>Total number of people who responded to the question</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(On most days, Once or twice a week, Once or twice a month, Less than once a month, Never, Don't have any neighbours)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you agree or disagree that your neighbourhood is a place where people from different backgrounds (i.e., different ethnic groups, faith groups, social backgrounds or countries of origin) get on well together?</td>
<td>No. of respondents who answered definitely agree or tend to agree.</td>
<td>Total number of people who responded to the question</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Definitely agree, Tend to agree, Tend to disagree, Definitely disagree, Too few people in local neighbourhood, Don't know)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Number of Positive Respondents (Numerator)</td>
<td>Total Number of Respondents</td>
<td>Numerator</td>
<td>Denominator</td>
<td>Baseline % of Positive Respondents</td>
<td>Numerator</td>
<td>Denominator</td>
<td>Endline % of Positive Respondents</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please rate how engaged you generally feel with your local community</td>
<td>Number of respondents who responded engaged, very engaged</td>
<td>Total number of people who responded to the question</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[engagement refers to a feeling that you are meaningfully connected to other people in your community, and/or the community as a whole]</td>
<td>(Very engaged, Engaged, Disengaged, Completely disengaged)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please rate how empowered/confident you feel to join the following activities:</td>
<td>Number of respondents who responded very empowered and empowered</td>
<td>Total number of people who responded to the question</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Arts and cultural heritage</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Number of Positive Respondents (Numerator)</td>
<td>Total Number of Respondents (Denominator)</td>
<td>Baseline % of Positive Respondents</td>
<td>Endline % of Positive Respondents</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please rate how empowered/confident you feel to join the following activities: *Leisure</td>
<td>Number of respondents who responded very empowered and empowered</td>
<td>Total number of people who responded to the question</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Very empowered, empowered, sometimes empowered, never empowered]</td>
<td>Number of respondents who responded very empowered and empowered</td>
<td>Total number of people who responded to the question</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Number of Positive Respondents (Numerator)</td>
<td>Total Number of Respondents (Denominator)</td>
<td>Numerator</td>
<td>Denominator</td>
<td>Baseline % of Positive Respondents</td>
<td>Numerator</td>
<td>Denominator</td>
<td>Endline % of Positive Respondents</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Please rate how empowered/confident you feel to join the following activities:  
*Volunteering  
(Very empowered, empowered, sometimes empowered, never empowered) | Number of respondents who responded very empowered and empowered | Total number of people who responded to the question | 82        | 125         | 66%                               | 84        | 123         | 68%                               | 3%     |
| Do you plan to get involved in activities with members of different generations?  
(e.g., join community centre activities, take part in sports, do more voluntary work)  
[Yes, No, Not sure] | Number of respondents who responded yes | Total number of people who responded to the question | 93        | 134         | 69%                               | 98        | 130         | 75%                               | 6%     |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Number of Positive Respondents (Numerator)</th>
<th>Total Number of Respondents (Denominator)</th>
<th>Numerator</th>
<th>Denominator</th>
<th>Baseline % of Positive Respondents</th>
<th>Numerator</th>
<th>Denominator</th>
<th>Endline % of Positive Respondents</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please rate how much you agree/disagree with the following statement:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;My community and myself as an individual is well represented in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>city&quot; (Strongly agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly disagree)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of respondents who responded Strongly Agree and agree</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of people who responded to the question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please rate how much you agree/disagree with the following statement:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;My local area is a place where people from different generations mix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well together&quot; (Strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of respondents who responded Strongly Agree and agree</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 7.4 Caring City Beneficiary Summary of Demographic Data

#### Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Category</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any other ethnic group</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, African, Caribbean, or Black British</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed or multiple ethnic group</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Other, White Irish, or White Gypsy or Irish Traveller</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS** 90 100.0

#### Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Bracket</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 49</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 64</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 +</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS** 90 100.0

#### Disability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you identify as disabled?</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS** 90 100.0

#### Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-binary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS** 90 100.0
7.5 Caring City Audience Survey Questions

The following questions formed the general audience survey for the Caring City programme.

A summary of the data findings is included later on in this section.

a) Please give us your thoughts about the event you attended or participated in? [Free Text Response]
b) Please rate the quality of your experience: [Very good, Good, Not sure, Poor, Very poor]
c) I had a good time! [Strongly agree, Agree, Not sure, Disagree, Strongly disagree]
d) Did the event have an impact on your perception of Coventry? [Yes - it has improved, No - it is the same, Yes - it has worsened]
e) This experience increases my pride in Coventry as an area. [Strongly agree, Agree, Not sure, Disagree, Strongly disagree]
f) What is your age? [Numerical Input]
g) Please indicate your gender? [Female, Male, Non-Binary, Other]
h) Do you identify as disabled? [Yes, No, Prefer Not To Say]
i) Please indicate your sexual orientation: [Bisexual, Gay Man, Gay Woman/Lesbian, Heterosexual/Straight, Queer, Prefer Not To Say]
j) Please indicate your ethnic origin and cultural background: [White British, White Irish, White Gypsy/Irish Traveller, Other White Background, Mixed - White and Black Caribbean, Mixed - White and Black African, Mixed - White and Asian, Other Mixed/Multiple Ethnic Background, Asian or Asian British - Indian, Asian or Asian British - Pakistani, Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi, Asian or Asian British - Chinese, Other Asian Background, Black or Black British - African, Black or Black British - Caribbean, Other/Black/African/Caribbean Background, Arab, Other, Prefer Not to Say]
### 7.6 Summary Table of Audience Survey Data
Below are summary tables of quantitative audience data provided through surveying.

**Did the event have an impact on your perception of Coventry?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No, it has stayed the same</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, it has improved</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, it has worsened</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please rate the quality of your experience:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**This experience increases my pride in Coventry as an area.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I had a good time!**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTALS 697 100.0

TOTALS 705 100.0
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## 7.7 Summary Table of Audience Demographic Data

Below are summary tables of demographic audience data provided through surveying.

### Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Category</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any other ethnic group</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, African, Caribbean, or Black British</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed or multiple ethnic group</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Other, White Irish, or White Gypsy or Irish Traveller</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**

|                          | 624              | 100.0            |

### Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Bracket</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 34</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 49</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 64</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 +</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**

|                          | 618              | 100.0            |

### Disability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you identify as disabled?</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**

|                          | 632              | 100.0            |

### Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>70.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-binary</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**

|                          | 633              | 100.0            |

### Sexuality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexuality</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay Man</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay Woman / Lesbian</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual / Straight</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>80.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**

|                          | 484              | 100.0            |