TRUUD

External Advisory Board Agenda

Wednesday 29th September 2021, 10am – 12pm

Attendees:

Julia Goldsworthy (Chair), Sarah Ayres, Geoff Bates, Daniel Black, Krista Bondy, Rachel Brierley, Dan Bristow, Nancy Edwards, Leah Fisher, Leila Gamaz, Matthew Hickman, Halima Khan, Sunand Prasad, Abigail Stratford

Apologies: Stephen Aldridge, Nicola Kane, Richard Meier, Victoria Ofovbe, Gabriel Scally, Richard Upton

Actions:

- All – Agreed that group should come back to consider a long list of interventions, with a view to inputting into and supporting the process as they are refined and finalised between Mar/Jun 2022.
- TRUUD Group – Consider broader framing issues/questions around the proposed interventions.
- EAB Group - Consider how best to think about potential interventions beyond the selection process of this project (i.e. were there recommendations that could be presented back to the broader system in other ways?)
- ALL – Agreement that we need to bring forward the discussion on co-production.

Agenda:

1. **Welcome (JG)**

2. **Previous minutes and actions (JG)**
   No amendments/comments.

3. **Brief general TRUUD update (MH/GS)**
   The timing of this meeting coincides with submitting the annual report to the funder this week, this is a brief update on where the programme is currently up to. The programme is slightly delayed primarily due to COVID, but is at an exciting point in analysis – a lot of interviews have happened and data is currently being analysed. Also near completion is the work package (WP)2 publication of the economic tool. WP3, which covers intervention, will also be touched upon in this meeting. We want to start a discussion today about when we should come to EAB with our interventions (for sense checking). The website is live and we are developing a series of blogs that we will begin releasing soon. We are also participating in Festival of the Future City in October. In the next 6 months we will start to have more defined findings to share.

   With regards to economic tool, the paper can be shared with EAB once submitted.

4. **WP1 update (KB)**

A brief update was presented, a full update will be given at next EAB meeting – once the process of analysis is more complete.

Work over the past two years has focussed on transdisciplinary working practices. We have been developing and creating a shared understanding of what the problem space is and what the boundaries are around TRUUD. We have found it difficult to come to a shared understanding about what "upstream" really means, as how it is defined depends on where colleagues sit within the system. We developed interview questions based on transdisciplinary discussion, debate and other outputs, e.g. via literature and policy reviews. Over 100 interviews were conducted with a whole range of stakeholders – e.g. central government, community & private sectors, architects, investors, planners and bankers. Our primary interest from TRUUD is around the system of decision making and how that system is understood. Interviews have been coded into NVIVO and the first round of analysis is nearly complete. We expect to have an early set of findings by the end of December. The coded data will be taken and analysed in detail by the individual interview teams, before coming back to the wider team for transdisciplinary analysis. These early findings will inform the intervention development.

We are also running systems workshops through the autumn, these are focused on: Bristol citizen engagement, industry roundtable, elected representatives, Manchester focus (tbc). The analysis for these will be done by Jan/Feb 2022. This data can be overlapped and analysed in different ways. Up until December, different outputs and foundations for interventions will be created. Initially there will be a long list of interventions, systems maps; potential leverage and problem points; and key findings for publications.

Examples of interview questions
General research questions were worded appropriately for specific sectors.

- If you could wave a magic wand, and you were in charge of incorporating health and wellbeing in your sector, what would it be and why?
- What are your evidence needs?

Do you see the interviewees and workshop attendees as the same individuals who will undertake interventions?
To an extent yes, we have identified many senior people who will act as gatekeepers and co-design the interventions. Most interviewees are interested in playing a part in TRUUD, which is very positive.

Translating questions into systems. How do you consider triangulation in a methodological way? We're trying to understand how decision makers are understanding the systems. The causal relationship may be 'wrong' between two different structures but that is how the interviewee understands it. We are not necessarily looking for correct answers, but are instead trying to map people's understanding or lack of. As we aggregate data we need to know where tensions are coming from, we can map out structures, but we also need to understand where people

are thinking differently. We also need to know what does this mean in terms of how we can intervene in the system.

How do you categorise barriers, opportunities, misunderstandings etc? We are considering where are our interventions are going to have most impact within the system? We're trying to shift the way people value health, currently many are only likely to do something if forced (e.g. by policy changes). How we shift the norm will be different, depending on which part of the system we're in.

Dan Bristow- Wales Centre for Public Policy are encouraging decision makers to use evidence, this is some parallel work to TRUUD. As we map, we will start to see the divergence in systems and lack of understanding which then become leverage points. The method is an intervention itself, by having conversations you are intervening in the system, it may be useful to capture and reflect on this as a source of output.

Discussion around not obtaining too small a sample – The TRUUD sample is not necessarily representative, we are just getting a flavour of what is happening in that system. We are not able to draw conclusions about what a whole group thinks but the disparate views help us to understand a range of perspectives.

5. **Intervention development criteria (GB) (**_see attachment 'Criteria for intervention selection'_**)**

We are anticipating a long list of interventions, there are disciplinary champions keen to investigate certain areas. We are considering how we go through the narrowing-down process and bring stakeholders in. We are looking across systems, as well as a specific intervention areas, to design, test and evaluate. TRUUD are asking: how does EAB want to be involved in this? This may be method development or testing of intervention – we have presumed the latter. What aspects are to be co-produced?

Criteria include the following areas - Impacts, Feasibility and Principles & Foundations. We have been coming up with ideas and are now moving into the design process. There will be a process of narrowing and prioritising potential interventions. The team have already realised that there are different opinions on what is meant by "interventions". The list of 10 proposed criteria was presented (shown in slides).

We expect a number of potential interventions to emerge- the UPSTREAM pilot identified hundreds of opportunities and barriers. There is a very wide range, but when we are using the exclusion criteria, we could end up with a small list – so numbers are uncertain at this time. More understanding is needed around what has worked before, and why, so that we don't repeat any mistakes.

Sunand Prasad – Will there be a basket of interventions that we will apply criteria to? Or will this take place continuously? The more the project gathers momentum, the higher the risk of a barrage of un-implementable ideas. 'Reinventing the wheel' requires collective expertise and skills. Barriers – TRUUD need to be very alert that systems are kept in place because of vested interests, often these are not acknowledged or called out. There may be unintended consequences of well-intentioned interventions in public policy and it may be useful to brainstorm what these might be.

Dan Bristow – Interested in talking about the intervention criteria. Are TRUUD referring to several different types of interventions and intervening levels? E.g. community groups disrupting the system, corporate sectors leaning into changing thinking. Prioritising within the criteria – clarity would be useful on which are fixed and which are open. Degree of buy in – without buy in the intervention(s) will be hard to implement. What is a priority based on different types of interventions/public groups? Impacts – conceptual rather than instrumental. Getting people to think differently about what they are doing.

Halima Khan – The criteria are helpful to have alongside types of interventions. Is it still helpful to propose extra interventions back to the system? List of criteria – implementation and feasibility are the crux, as this is often where things fall down. Other people will be interested in criteria 5,6,7 (implementation and feasibility). Power/dynamics etc – vested interest, incumbency vs new entrance. The narrative around incumbency is slightly less challenging – the issue is balance between incumbency and new entrance, and it would be useful to draw on this kind of literature. Individual views against the norm – findings may be unearthed around identity/psychology. How people view themselves in system and sense of agency – this insight is useful and undervalued.

Nancy Edwards – Criteria are very good; some implicit points should be more explicit. Sometimes we can see policy windows coming, and TRUUD should look at how to make these work for the programme. With regards to the role of EAB group – we can provide a higher level of input – we could be asking questions that are consistent with criteria but a bit different. Would this bundle of interventions work in a coherent way? Would they prod the system for change? Produce ripple effects? Meet public demands? Sustainable? Are there plans to debrief either interviewees or others on their experience of trying to make the changes? Looking at unintended consequences, what did and didn't work and why. What processes are underway by the end of project which will sustain your work?

Where would EAB like to input on this criteria?
Daniel Black – There is a two-year design and implementation period, and we would like to see interventions narrowed between March-June next year.

Julia Goldsworthy – Any feed in from group should be carried out before March, creating a first cut to ask any elevated questions/discussion. It is important to extract maximum value from and for the group.

6. **Festival of the Future City (DB)**
   Largest public debate about future of cities in the UK and part of the Festival of Ideas.
   https://www.bristolideas.co.uk/attend/how-do-we-build-healthier-cities/
   https://www.bristolideas.co.uk/projects/festival-of-the-future-city/

   Mix of face-to -face and hybrid sessions due to COVID procedures (theatre is at 50% capacity) The TRUUD session is taking place on 21st October.

Communications – Please push this out to individual networks where possible.

Sunand Prasad- Healthy City Design Conference – 11th to 16th October. Aimed at practitioners, but also very much about health. There is some fairly upstream content, a good outreach forum, doubling in size every year. Could be a useful network in future years.

7. **Setting the scene for replicability and scalability (DB)**
   It was noted that scalability of process should also be considered, as well as that of interventions.

8. **AOB**

Next meeting: Wednesday 15th December 2021 (10am-12pm)

External Advisory Board Membership:

Julia Goldsworthy (Chair)

Stephen Aldridge: Director for Analysis & Data, Ministry of Housing, Development & Local Government

Dan Bristow: Director of Policy & Practice, Wales Centre for Public Policy

Nancy Edwards: Professor Emeritus, School of Nursing, University of Ottawa

Leila Gamaz: Public Contributor

Nicola Kane: Head of Strategic Planning, Insight and Innovation, Transport for Greater Manchester

Halima Khan: Executive Director Communities & Skills, Mayor of London/London Assembly

Richard Meier: Co-Founder & CEO, Stories

Victoria Ofovbe: Public Contributor

Sunand Prasad: Principal, Penoyre & Prasad Architects London

Abigail Stratford: Head of Regeneration, Bristol City Council

Richard Upton: Chief Development Officer, U+I

TRUUD Management Team:

Matt Hickman: PI and Research Director, Professor in Public Health and Epidemiology, University of Bristol

Gabriel Scally: Research Director, Visiting Professor, University of Bristol

Daniel Black: Programme Director and WP3 Lead, Specialist in Urban Development for Planetary Health, University of Bristol

Rachel Brierley: Programme and Communications Manager and WP5 lead, University of Bristol

Leah Fisher: Programme Administrator, University of Bristol

TRUUD Consortium members attending:

Sarah Ayres: Professor of Public Policy & Governance, University of Bristol

Krista Bondy: Senior Lecturer in Management, University of Bath

Geoff Bates: Research Associate, University of Bath