

# BELIEVE IN US - A SUMMARY OF THE EVALUATION & COMMENTARY

## “THE BEAUTIFUL THINGS WE DO”

### Part One: Evaluation Summary

There were a number of different roles within Believe in Us (BIU) that alongside and integral to the Core and Project Teams worked to ensure that learning disabled and autistic adults from Heart n Soul (HnS), NHS Oxleas (Oxleas) and Royal Borough of Greenwich (Greenwich) led the research process from the start, set their own priorities, built refreshed human-to-human relationships with health and social care staff, and jointly ensured that the right questions informed both the research and design processes. They were: Co-designers, Co-leaders, and Co-researchers, and they worked both as part of the Core and Project Teams.

Evaluation played a key part of BIU. To ensure that the evaluation processes were accessible, and they led the learning process, a group of Co-evaluators met monthly to develop and discuss evaluation, to develop ideas, and to feed back to the Core and Project team meetings.

Four evaluation strands were developed together by the evaluation team;

1. Charting experiences through a comic strip
2. Interviews
3. Reflexive Learning as we go
4. The Survey Application

## Strand 1: Charting experiences through a comic strip

This first strand involved charting people's experiences throughout the project by enabling them to tell their own story of their experiences, with the aim that stories and case studies would illustrate individual impact. Working alongside Ben Connors, an experienced artist in this field, visual representations were created to illustrate individual's experiences throughout the project. Six participants were recruited and four eventually participated. The four individuals included learning disabled or autistic people, health care staff and social care staff. The individuals worked together with Ben to create art to reflect their experiences. Potential participants were identified by the evaluation team and approached by members of the activities team. Information sheets and consent forms were illustrated by Ben Connors both to make them accessible, and also to introduce the style in which he works.

- **Process**

The process undertaken by Ben was to spend the first session with each participant talking about the project and going through the various guidelines and information we created. Then a further 1-2 sessions getting to know them, asking questions, telling them about himself and gently turning the subject to 'Believe in Us'. There were exceptions to this as Ben already had prior relationships with some of the people he was working with, and some were keen to get straight into making some creative work. Each session lasted an hour and were a combination of in person and online. With each person it was explored what worked well, what was positive about 'Believe in Us' and also what could be improved or what could be clearer. They talked about making art and identified any areas they were keen on. Individuals chose to work with drawing, poetry, colouring in, sculpture and even sewing. With some of the participants Ben created collaborative drawings from conversations and poems. They have been keen to colour these in. Some are digital, some are on paper. With other participants Ben had long conversations and the form of the creative output has taken longer to arrive at. Ben aims to see the creativity in everyone he works with, gently support this to emerge, have fun, be a good listener and connect. Each creative output is an expression of individual experiences of the project. Ben also made some artwork of his own to reflect on BIU.

## Strand 2: The Interviews

Interviews were carried out with Core and Project Team members during the course of the project, to gather in-depth data on the experience of co-production. Formal methods included interviews and creative work. An interview schedule was devised for the project, using open ended questions. We used Thematic Analysis, alongside the Care Ethics Framework, has and still is exploring Care-full and Care-less spaces (Rogers, 2016) and the double empathy problem theory (Milton 2012).

- **Recruitment**

It was decided that in order to be fully inclusive, all materials used in recruitment, such as information sheets and consent forms, would use easy read, to be accessible to all. Materials were drafted by the evaluation team. This was then adapted by a member of the project team with lived experience, and then two members of the project team took it to the 'Do you Understand it' group in Greenwich and worked with a group of individuals with learning disabilities to make the language more accessible. Interviews were anonymised, but internal confidentiality was not possible due to the nature of the project, given that the project and core team all knew each other. However, we did anonymise material to disidentify people. Choice was an important element of co-production. As part of the interview process, we asked how individuals felt about co-production, and whether this impacts on trust and limits openness, honesty and relationships.

- **Measures**

An interview schedule was devised for this project. All proposed questions were developed in conjunction with the project team, and with assistance of people with lived experience of a learning disability or who were autistic, to ensure questions were accessible. Following each interview, further questions were developed to probe further. Questions, topics, and emerging themes were fed back and discussed with participants.

- **Process**

In-depth interviews were undertaken to understand the co-constructed part of the project in design and evaluation. Interviews were conducted quarterly, to document any changes in beliefs, attitudes, and relationships throughout the project on how to do meaningful co-constructed research. Interviews were conducted with six participants, by two researchers. Four interviews (24 interviews in total) with each participant. Participants included members of the core team, and project team, with lived experience of learning disabilities and autism, as well as those working with healthcare and workshop facilitators. Interviews were

conducted on Microsoft Teams. Interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim. Transcripts were then coded using NVivo 12 by one member of the evaluation team, data and themes were then shared with the other members of the evaluation team to be discussed and agreed upon.

## Questions

What does good wellbeing and good health mean?

Prompts:

- What is wellbeing?
- What is good health?
- What does it look like? (how can you tell that someone has good/bad health or wellbeing)
- Is this the same as people without disabilities?

We would like to ask you about co-constructed research. Can you tell us about what you think co-constructed research is? What you think is important when doing research with people with learning disabilities and autistic people PWLDA\*? (\*in practice we would use preferred terms of individual participants).

Prompts:

- Who makes the decisions?
- Who decides what to research and how to do it?
- Who analyses the data?
- Who writes it up and presents it?
- Do the co-researchers with learning disabilities or autistic people have the same control on this project than the people without disabilities?
- How has co-production changed the way you do things?
- How has co-production impact on your working relationships? (e.g. building relationships, openness, honesty, trust?)
- Do you feel comfortable with your co-producers knowing how you feel and what you have said? (Anonymity vs identification)?

What makes it difficult for people with learning disabilities and autistic people to be able to see their doctor and get other health care e.g. hospitals , medication?

What makes it easy for people with learning disabilities and autistic people to access health care e.g. doctors, medication hospitals etc ?

Prompts:

- How is this different to people without disabilities?
- What makes it difficult/easy to access health/wellbeing services?
- What impact does this have?
- What makes it easy to access health/wellbeing services?

What do you hope will change for people with learning disabilities and autistic people because of this project?

Prompt:

- in adult social care?
- In health care?

What would you like to change in adult social care and NHS for people with learning disabilities / Autistic people?

### **Strand 3: Reflexive Learning/Learning as we go**

The aim of this strand was to be able to tell the story of how, internally, we shared, reflected on, and acted on, our learning as a team.

- **Design**

1. Feedback was collected regularly during project and activity meetings and making plans were based on this learning. Feedback was collected via an anonymous Jamboard. A Jamboard is a virtual whiteboard which allows people

to add digital 'post it notes' with the ability to update and work collaboratively in real time. This enabled the team to reflect on what they had learnt, and what they could do differently as the project progressed.

2. Creative packs were developed by the evaluation and core teams at the start of the project, this was then adapted by Ben Connors into an accessible creative workbook. The purpose was to collect a snapshot of team members' thoughts, beliefs, and feelings at the beginning of the project in relation to wellbeing. A second creative pack was devised towards the end of the project, and circulated amongst the team, in the hope to gain further understanding and insight into any changes or developments in these thoughts, feelings and beliefs as well as what had been learnt throughout the project and what changes could be made in the future.

- **Recruitment**

1. Learning as we go was part of an internal evaluation process, undertaken by the project and core teams. The core team met once a month. The project team met everyone two weeks. All members of these meetings were invited to contribute to the Jamboard. All responses were recorded anonymously.
2. The creative packs were shared within both the Core and Project teams. They were distributed to the teams via the project manager. Consent to share the completed creative packs, was sought via the project manager. Once returned, the project manager allocated an anonymised code before sending copies of the packs to the Evaluation team.

- **Measures**

Semi structured questions were answered anonymously via the Jamboard.

A bespoke creative pack was devised and circulated at the start and end of the project.

- **Process**

1. During the project meetings, members of the project team were invited regularly to reflect on things they had learnt during the process (meetings and workshops) and to note these on a Jamboard. At the following meeting, the

project team would reflect on what had been learnt, and assess what changes, if any, needed to be made. In addition, three members of the project team met regularly to discuss, group and theme the Jamboards adding additional symbols to make these more accessible. At the end of the first year, all the Jamboards were analysed using word clouds, common word analysis and sentiment analysis to better understand the data. These findings were presented at the project and core team meetings in July 2022. A co-researcher with lived experience coded each of the Jamboards in year one putting the post-it notes into themes and adding icons to make them less text heavy and more accessible. Additionally, co-researchers put together a word document summarising the themes from across the first year of the project.

2. Core and project team members completed creative packs at the start and end of the project. A thematic analysis of the material from the packs was conducted at both data collection points.

#### **Strand 4: The Survey Application**

- **Design**

Due to limited time funded for evaluation on the project, it was not possible to interview all twenty-two members of the core and project teams as originally anticipated. In order to gather individual experiences, an accessible survey app (Chapko et al 2020, Cook et al, 2021) was used to ask these questions. The technology involved in the survey app allowed the questions to be asked via a video recording, and allowed participants to record their response in writing, creatively through drawing, or by recording a response. Initially the survey app was used within Believe in Us as an internal evaluation tool – to collect responses from members of the project and core teams.

- **Recruitment**

Initially, members of the Core and Project teams were asked to complete the survey. Subsequently, it was decided to extend the use of the app to gauge the experience of co-researchers attending the creative workshops. This included 32 people, 10 of whom work in health and social care, 26 people with learning disabilities or autistic people from Greenwich and 10 learning disabled or autistic people from Heart n Soul.

- **Measures**

The measure was devised specifically for this project. The questions were drafted by the evaluation team based on the overarching evaluation framework and goals. The questions were subsequently refined by members of the project team to make them as clear and as accessible as possible. For example, 'Can you tell us about what you think co-constructed research is?' was changed to 'How do you think we are working together in Believe in Us? What do you think we're trying to do together?'

**Questions for the Core and Project Team were as follows:**

Q1a	What does feeling good and feeling well mean to you?
Q1b	How do you think we are working together in Believe in Us? What do you think we're trying to do together?
Qc	How does this project make you feel? For example, are you noticing any changes in you from being part of this project?
Q1d	Can you tell us about a memorable experience that you've had during this project? For example, this could be in your work or your personal life.
Q1e	What do you think makes it difficult for people with learning disabilities and autistic people to access health and social care services?
Q1f	What do you think would make it easier for people with learning disabilities and autistic people to access health and social care services?
Q1g	What do you hope will change for people with learning disabilities, autistic people and health and social care staff because of this project?
Demographics	



D1a	What is your name
D1b	What is your age?
D1c	What is your gender?
D1d	What is your ethnicity?
D1e	Do you identify as disabled? If so, how?

### Workshop questions

Once again questions were adapted by the evaluation team in order to be broad yet accessible.

Q1	What has it been like coming to the Believe in Us sessions?
Q2	Have you noticed any changes in yourself or others because of taking part in the sessions?

- **Process**

To engage the Core and Project Team, the project manager co-ordinated the mailout and sent email prompts to remind participants of the deadline to complete this. The initial survey went live in May 2022. In total we received 21 completed surveys, with a total of 242 answers of which 40 were audio, 4 video, 4 images and the rest written responses. The audio recordings were transcribed, and the data was then themed (by a researcher with lived experience). A different procedure was completed for the creative workshops. The survey was completed by co-researchers within workshop time. Disabled people were supported in a separate space (to ensure confidentiality) to complete the survey during workshops during November 2022.

- **Reliability**

The reliability of qualitative data has been long debated (Aspers and Corte, 2019, Yadav, 2021). Aspers and Corte (2019: 146-147) defined qualitative research as a method that 'investigates relations between categories that are themselves subject to change in the research process.'. Qualitative researchers traditionally explore the lives of others, seeking to tell their story, but it is important to recognise that the emerging narrative is not the only story, it is one of many possible versions of events and is, by definition subjective (Braun and Clarke, 2013 pg. 20).

- **Ethics**

Ethical approval was sought and obtained via the Tizard Ethics Committee at the University of Kent on 16<sup>th</sup> September 2021. Further amendments relating to the survey app were obtained on 4<sup>th</sup> May 2022 and 21<sup>st</sup> November 2022. The Health Research Authority decision tool assessed the project as a service evaluation and as such it did not require HRA approval. The project was approved by the Research and Development Office of Oxleas NHS Foundation Trust. All participants were over 18 and had the capacity to consent. Participants that attended the workshops received gift vouchers to thank them for their participation.

# Part Two: Commentary by John Kieffer

## Preface: About John

My history with Heart n Soul goes right back to 1984 before it existed as an independent organisation. I worked at the time for Shape (now Shape Arts) an organisation that works to ensure that "all disabled people should have the opportunity to participate fully in arts and culture". At the time Shape's main activity was to set up creative sessions (or workshops as they were called then) where professional artists worked with groups of people mostly in institutional settings. One such session I set up was matching up musician Mark Williams (now Artistic Director/CEO of Heart n Soul) with a group of people with learning disabilities (including Pino Frumiento and some others still associated with Heart n Soul) who went to the The Mulberry Centre in Deptford. After a while the creative session moved to the Albany and was then named Heart n Soul. After I left Shape I went on to work with arts funding bodies, arts organisations and the British Council, edited several books (including one with Wellcome), and most recently set up a long term research project looking at values across twelve countries.

I continued to follow the development of Heart n Soul closely mostly as a fan and on a couple of occasions exploring future strategy with Mark and others. I had been thinking for some time that what Heart n Soul does and how it does it, was significant not just for those directly involved in its creative work and the wider Heart n Soul community, but also had lessons for the wider society. The powerful combination of the lived experiences of people with learning disabilities and autistic people with creative expression, and all facilitated through a dynamic ever-changing 'bottom up' non-structure developed over many years. So I was over the moon to be asked to be part of the Core Team for Heart n Soul at The Hub at the Wellcome Collection in from 2018 - 2020, an experimental project that looked for and found new and inclusive models of co-research that 'flipped the microscope' and explored alternative futures informed by the lived experience of people with learning

disabilities and autistic people. Over the 2+ years of Heart n Soul at The Hub I tried to capture some of the informal interactions between the participants on the project and weave them together into a story that is on the website, and I also worked with Robyn Steward and Ben Connors to make a book out of some of the nuggets we found along the way called 'The Little Book of Brainwaves'. Most directly related to Believe in Us, I was part of a Hub group with Dora Whittuck, Catherine Long and others called Third Space that brought together people with learning disabilities and autistic people with health and social care professionals from Camden and started to explore some of the themes that have been fully explored and expressed here.

So with this background I was delighted to be asked to explore some of the material produced by Believe in Us, to talk to some of the participants, and to write what is of course a personal commentary on what is clearly another milestone for Heart n Soul.

## **Part two: Commentary**

With all the evaluation now complete I have attempted to provide a commentary on the emerging themes.

The more formal evaluation whilst undoubtedly useful tends to be rather 'circular' - reinforcing and repeating the initial propositions and questions of Believe in Us whilst not providing much of a feel for how things developed and maybe shifted during the project.

To try and dig a bit deeper I sifted through comments and responses irrespective of where they were located in the different evaluations, work produced by the design jams other activities, and the handful of conversations I've had with team members.

Similar themes emerge repeatedly from what was produced. They show themselves both as actualities and aspirations

Loosely grouped they are :

Trust / listening / being heard / sharing power / meaningful relationships

Flexible structures / making time / comfortable environment

Team working / meaningful relationships

Creativity / risk taking / openness / flexibility / fun

Kindness / friendship / humility / meaningful relationships

The most colourful, dynamic and interesting (to an outsider at least) were the Learning As We Go jam boards from the project and core teams - anonymous post-its that are a combination of what was done, how it was done and how it made a person or group of people feel - a kind of blurring of modes and boundaries that is very much a characteristic of Heart n Soul. They have also been called a **"wonderful splurge"** or a **"group confessional"**. These often display how ideas and themes emerge and then also how people are feeling (if they want to say) about the ideas (or just life in general) in something akin to real time. I believe it is proposed that these jam boards are re-organised into themes but I would hope that the raw originals are also kept intact.

The attached timeline produced at the end of the project of how the different strands of BIU developed provides a crucial framework for understanding the project from outside. For example, the role of the Creative Club early in the project is somewhat hidden in the other evaluation material but it is clear that the three large meetings of the Club - a broad based creative induction for everyone involved in BIU - and the subsequent evaluation provided the basis for the three smaller Design Jam groups and informed much of the further development of BIU. The fact that Wellbeing/Self Care sessions for health staff were happening at the same time and both were prior to the people with learning disabilities and autistic people and the health and social care staff meeting for the first time in person is also important for understanding the shape of the whole project and the amount of work packed in to the early months.

The second creative packs analysis produced by SQW seems particularly useful in providing the most extensive breakdown in all the evaluation material of what to look out for in the whole area of working together / co-production. The final suggestion about **"Using frameworks instead of plans"** is particularly powerful and a useful pointer for others considering similar projects.

# ALIGNMENT

**“Everyone is starting from a different place so take time to give people the space to align.”**

One possible reading of the evaluation to date as it exists is that the two cohorts - participants with learning disabilities / autistic people on the one hand or health and social care staff on the other - were inevitably slightly out of sync and therefore had a quite different passage through the Design Council’s Double Diamond that adopted by Believe in Us as a whole.

Over the last 10 years in particular the desire to improve the lived experience of people with learning disabilities (PWLD) and autistic people (AP) that has always been implicit in HnS’ work has become more pronounced as had the need to work with health & social care staff to make this happen. HnS also come to the project with what is now a huge amount of co-production experience in making high quality spaces and materials (real and virtual) for PLWD and AP to be collaborative, creative, expressive, open, risk taking etc. It’s what HnS does.

**“Heart n Soul quickly - sometimes almost instantly - introduces its mindset”**

**“Beautiful logos and design makes me feel proud of the project”**

***“They (Heart n Soul) are just so good at what they do”***

We also know that all of its events (for example the Beautiful Octopus Club) are a way for non-disabled people to see this process at work and to gain some insights into and an empathy for the lived experience of PLWD and AP.

The latter is of course particularly relevant to health and social care staff. After all - it’s their part of their job - their professional identity - and they’ve reached this point after (often quite tough) education and training and varying amounts of experience. It’s what they do. Everyone knows however that the health and social care system, if not completely broken, is not working properly.

**“If you miss a lecture, you may miss the entirety of your ‘training’”**

Believe in Us essentially tests out how effective ‘a project where people with learning disabilities and autistic people collaborate with health staff and designers in a truly

equal and inclusive way' can be. Elsewhere (in one of the Tizard documents) the project is described as 'radical co-design and co-constructing processes led by learning disabled and autistic adults'

'Led by' may in fact be a better description. Heart n Soul through all of its 35+ year plus experience are the grown ups in the room when it comes to how to 'Co-create, co-research, co-develop, co you name it'

During BIU, the care staff find themselves in a place where much of their training, knowledge and experience though not irrelevant starts to move into the background and themselves as people moves into the foreground. A number of people talked about initially being unsure, uncomfortable or even vulnerable with the very open ended forms of collaboration and expression - even for those who have nominally done this kind of co- work before.

***"Relationships were shaken up"***

**"Actually, by working in this project, I've realised that there's a lot of projects out there that call themselves co-design, participatory collaboration, but actually they may just involve people once, twice... The participants aren't necessarily leading or taking part in the big decision".**

**"The learning has been amazing for me personally. And that's made me, it's almost raised some uncomfortable truths in my previous projects I've worked on, that actually maybe they weren't as truly collaborative as I thought they were. [...] I think this project has made me feel more vulnerable at many stages but I think that's a really positive sign, that I don't know, it's a real true collaboration".**

**"It's interesting actually because the pendulum's kind of swung the other way. Because in those sessions (research sessions) I think we were noticing that actually the health and social care staff that were coming, were in a listening position (not contributing). ...Health and social care staff found it really difficult to move away from that"**

**"Building relationships were the key to unlocking everything"**

This starts to shift momentum after about a year, towards a more fulsome and meaningful appreciation of what is going on and also excitement as professional roles start to be left at the door. As far as I can tell by about 18 months of the project most if not all of have be immersed in the world of 'co-you name it'.

So, alongside the process of getting to know each other, valuing everyone's contributions, trusting each other, and establishing a good listening space, it may be the creative skills - "**Imagination skills**" - required for 'co-you name it' take a good while to bed down.

### **"The creative sessions are the project"**

#### TIMING/PHASING

Unsurprisingly, given the above, there seems to be a general view that BIU could have done with a bit more time - 6 more months was mentioned a couple of times to me. This would have also given more time for ....

#### THINGS THAT COULD HELP

It is not clear from conversations and what I have read so far about what happens with the ideas that have come up throughout BIU. It could be useful to do a 'sweep up' across Design Jams, Creative Club, jamboards and the project in general all the ideas for how to improve the experience of PWLD and AP (jargon buster, films, improvements to GP surgeries) to prevent them from being lost

## **A NOTE ON FRIENDSHIP**

The question of friendship has come up in my conversations and is mentioned frequently and understandably in the context of individual well being, and also the notion of a friendly atmosphere/environment in health and social care settings. There were clearly a number of friendships that developed within the group during BIU but maybe some consideration of the possible limits of friendship in a 'client/professional' type relationship might be worthwhile in a future project of this kind. Towards the end of BIU there was an example of one of the HnS cohort feeling angry and let down by what they saw as an overly risk averse response from one of the staff who they had worked with closely. Which brings me to .....



## THE 'IDEAL WORLD' ISSUE

Many people mentioned the real sense of achievement in BIU. Creating an almost ideal world or environment for collaborative working between PLWD, AP and health/social care staff. Some however were concerned about what happens when the real world floods back in, and the danger of momentum being lost. Maybe this should also be considered within the scope of the project itself? (In Greenwich the extension of Allsorts into a new season will certainly help with maintaining some continuity)

**“Useful to begin to get more realistic about sharing opportunities and drill down to what is achievable, what we are already doing and what now needs to be done”**

**“Accepting that there are successes and failures”**

**“Focusing on the areas where change is possible”**

## THINGS THAT COULD BE IMPROVED

**“Change is happening but not everyone in the project knows about it or feels it”**

**“It's hard with so many sub groups and activities going on to know what is happening and what we are learning from the workshops”**

**“Simplifying things to make it easier for people to understand”**

The overwhelming impression was massively positive but a few things came up in conversation and on jam boards:

Difficulty for some people to get an overview of BIU. Too many different things, themes and teams

The need to acknowledge that some people experience uncomfortable emotions during the project, including feeling isolated, confused, uncertain, vulnerable, anxious and overwhelmed by other people's problems and emotions.

The need for a more gentle downwards slope towards the end of the project

The time issue mentioned above

Often not enough notice of cancelled meetings etc

People at HnS Deptford feeling remote from what was happening with BIU

## Last Word

Believe in Us was an open ended project not tied to set outcomes and targets. It used a bottom up experimental approach to arriving at themes, activities and the also much of the evaluation process itself. Given the very wide range of high quality activity that was generated in just two years of BIU this clearly works!

**“Life felt like a blur before. I was just existing, not living. I feel happy now. I am more interested in talking to other people”.**

**“Next stop social work. Every doctor and nurse.”**

As I mentioned above, some of the evaluation material tends to be rather ‘circular’ - reinforcing and repeating the initial propositions and questions of Believe in Us whilst not providing much of a feel for how things developed and maybe shifted over time during the project. As someone not involved in the project, I didn’t really get a feel for the excitement and innovation of BIU until I went through the various Jamboards. I am not sure how this dynamism and the range of voices blending could be captured in an evaluation but it would be interesting to try.

***Quotes in italics - made to me or on July zoom meetings***

**Quotes not in italics - from documents, jam boards etc**

# SOURCE MATERIAL READ/VIEWED

## PDF/Word Documents

Findings report - summary Uni of Kent  
Findings report - the interviews BiU - JUNE 2023  
Common Ambition - BiU Creative pack themes  
BIU Survey Analysis Report  
Evaluation day September 2021  
Learning As We Go - Year 1 v1.0  
Learning discussions Dec 21  
BiU creative packs analysis\_themes  
BIU\_Creative Club\_Pack 2 v1.2 DRAFT  
Creative Club completed booklists  
Believe in Us - Project timeline

## Powerpoint

You & Me sharing FINAL 2023

## Jamboards

LEARNING AS WE GO - Core team Nov 2022  
BIU PROJECT TEAM 'REFLECTIONS ON WHAT WE HAVE BEEN LEARNING' 3/2/23  
7TH MARCH BIU PROJECT TEAM MEETING  
BIU LEARNING - PROJ TEAM MEETING 22ND NOV  
LEARNING - PROJ TEAM MEETING 11TH JULY  
LEARNING AS WE GO - CORE TEAM 19 JAN 2023  
CORE TEAM LEARNING - 17 FEB 2022  
SHARING BIU 31ST OCT 2022  
LEARNING AS WE GO PROJECT TEAM NOV 2022  
WHAT WE LEARNT SO FAR 27TH MARCH 2023  
LEARNING PROJECT TEAM MEETING 12TH DEC 22  
BIU CORE TEAM LEARNING 20 APRIL 2023  
BELIEVE IN US LEARNING 11TH OCTOBER 2021  
WHAT WE HAVE LEARNED SO FAR 25TH OCTOBER  
WHAT WE WANT TO TELL PEOPLE ABOUT BIU  
BIU-WHAT HAVE WE LEARNT IN THE LAST FEW WEEKS 24TH JAN 2022

## Videos

tuesday group felipe.mp4  
robyn evaluation.mp4

Connection stories:

Ifeoma 1 intro (1).mp4

Ifeoma 2 track intro (1).mp4

Ifeoma 4 connection story (1).mp4

Luke 1 intro (1).mp4

Luke 2 track intro (1).mp4

Luke 4 connection story (1).mp4

BIU Research in Practice webinar 050723.mp4

## **INTERVIEWS ETC**

Ben Connors

Will Renel

Robyn Steward

Katie Gaudion

+

July Webinar attended