

Results for Indicator II by Diakonisches Werk Bremen (Final Progress Report Annex)

Bremen, Sept. 2023

Indicator II – Accessibility (“Improved efficiency of delivery of public social services in order to improve social inclusion and counteract loneliness”) of Services (10% increase)

The **baseline** for this indicator was fixed, as communicated with the I2I partners, during a set of discussion rounds with Diakonie Bremen network Day or Meeting Centres for various target groups **spring (Febr. to May) of 2020**. This was a time of strict lock-down and closure of facilities, therefore it was a looking-back on the situation before the pandemic infection waves and it could not be completed by organized meetings with centre users.

In the interviews 2020 we explained the seven items of accessibility used by I2I, using a scale of 1-5 for evaluation of the own institution or service, considering “3” as the basic level which fulfils all formal and official quality requirements (by Bremen city for the Senior Centres for Elder Citizens, Day Centres for Disabled persons or by Federal project management for the More-Generation-Centre). Therefore it is a sort of standard value, the higher and lower rates consider obvious problems (not considered by the official quality standards – if there are established) or special achievements

	Aval- bility	Acessa- bility	Publicity	Affor- dability	Compre- hensability	Usability	Reliability
BZ Blthal	3	3	3*	3	3	3	4
BZ St M	4	4	3 D	3	3	3	4
BZ JHaus	3	3	4*	3	3	3	4
BZ BTor	4	3	3*	3	3	3	4
BZ Hemln	4	4	3	3	3	3	4
ALZ	5	3	3*	5	4	3	4
MGH	5	3	3 D	5	4	3	4
GesImp	4	3	3* D	3	3	3	4
Wichernhs	3	2	3	4	3	3	4

Dates of interviews (most of them by telephone due to lock-down and contact restrictions at the moment of activity) after analysis of written material

Meeting Center for Elder People (BZ) Blumenthal	Apr: 16th
Meeting Center for Elder People (BZ) St. Magnus	March 23rd
Meeting Centre for Elder People (BZ) Johanniterhaus	Febr 18th
Meeting Centre for Elder People (BZ) Buntentor	Apr. 13th
Meeting Centre for Elder People (BZ) Hemelingen	Apr.22nd
Unemployed Persons Meeting Centre (ALZ) Tenever	May 3rd
Multi-Generation-Activity Centre (MGH) Lüssum	March 25th
Health Education Training Centre “Gesundheitsimpulse” at DIAKO Hospital	March 16th
DayCentre for Psychically Disabled Persons Wichernhaus (Eastern Centre district)	Aprl 8th

Due to staff vacancy, the Meeting Centre (BZ) Findorff, member of Diakonie network, too, could not be included into activities until 2022.

Comments:

Availability might be reduced below the best possible level at the Seniors Centers by the general impression that they are made just for “very” old (female German) persons – obviously this general picture is an obstacle for people a bit “younger” to get into contact. Special efforts to avoid this and any discrimination of target groups would give better rates. The targeting of Wichernhaus for people with a special diagnosis as “psychic impaired” is an open question for the institution which in theory is an open and inclusive house for all people in the area.

Better rates as **Accessibility** are given to institutions which undertook recent investment in the venues, therefore looking at physical barriers, for example “true” barrier-free toilets (very bad situation at Wichernhaus about this, the main floor of the activities has got no WC at all). All institutions lack special help for sensually impaired persons.

Publicity: Use of printed leaflets, the “Gemeindebrief” and local newspaper editions give a successful standing in the media, but other possible ways to communicate, esp. via New Media are mostly not used in a systematic way. JHaus gives each two months “press conference” on program points. All institutions rely heavily on “mouth-to-mouth-propaganda” of users. * means mentioning in the local “Sozialstadtplan” - not realized in all suburbs - or in special Apps or print media for such suburbs. D means a useful and regularly updated information in the internet – most of the centres had 2020 no regular information by these means, which we see as a disadvantage to be noted (but there is no official requirement by Bremen city for this)

Affordability – better rates are noted, when there are indeed no payments required for any part of the program. In all BZ centres, “entrance is free” (this is the official requirement for city co-funding) but several courses or events expect some financial contribution (“self-cost principle”) and one has to pay for drinks, cake and snacks on offer. Reduced or zero price for persons without means to pay would have to be arranged with the centre staff.

Comprehensability: The standard rate is German information trying to avoid special difficulties and with larger picture of script in the Senior Centres. Translated material on foreign language or Easy Language would give better rate as well as any use of technical approach (as audio information)

Usability for the people who actually use the centres and **Reliability** are considered as main strength of the centres by all actual stakeholders statements and confirmed by many reports and comments. Both items are supported and secured by the organized participation of clients in the running of the centres (“Beirat” co-council). Note: We put until further discussion the question of the “general picture” of the institution not at Usability but at Availability, see above. As the **open question is how useful the institutions are for people not informed and participating**, we do nevertheless and for the purpose of this partnership not consider the basic value higher than 3 at Usability. About Reliability, there are intense preparations in every centre for example to inform all users when some event is cancelled or to find substitute trainers to avoid cancelling but several reports showed that this information was not available early enough and people arrived expecting a cancelled activity to happen.

A second round of meetings and interviews about the same issues where held in the last months of the I2I partnership, between March and June (some final talks even in Sept.) 2023.

In the meantime, two more institutions participated in the I2I proceedings with service design activities, the Freizeithaus Friedehorst (Leisure Time centre at an Diaconie institution in the Bremen Lesum suburb) and Stadtteilhaus Bornstraße, a day centre at the Bahnhofsvorstadt suburb – both with focus on adult but mostly not “senior” people with

multiple and mental disabilities. These centres had structures that allowed them to function with basic services even during the lock-down months. On the other hand, Diakonisches Werk Bremen itself had decided to make service offers by own design because it resulted more and more difficult and time-consuming to employ service design measures in other centres, respecting all pandemic regulations in place. Therefore the Board of Diakonisches Werk gave way to making some service offers by itself (which is not the central vision of this organisation that should in first place “serve” and support measures and work by their network members). Therefore the new table had three more rows without “baseline” comparable to those of the other institutions.

Diakonisches Werk considers the **inclusion of the two “new” institutions in the field of I2I work as a “success-story” caused by the good results the I2I service design** showed at other institutions. The way it got involved itself is just a result of the pandemic structures that made it more and more difficult to realize new types of services inside the institutions that were overloaded with restrictions and demands for coping at all with CoviD rules.

The result of the talks (again with staff, some of them with representatives of users and volunteers, see table of dates)

Table of Accessibility Rating of service centres June 2023 – DATE OF FINAL REVIEW TALK IS MENTIONED AFTER THE INSTITUTIONS NAME

	Aval- bility	Acessa- -bility	Publi- city	Affor- dabi- lity **)	Compre- hensa- bilty	Usabi- lity	Reliabi- Lity	New service designed with I2I tools
BZ Blthal July 17 th	3	3	3*	4	3	4 DT	4	
BZ St M June 15 th	3	4	3 D	4	3	4,5 DT	4	Online cinema on meadow in front of centre
BZ JHaus June 7 th	3	3	4*	4	3	4,5 DT	4	Walking group “Different Speed”
BZ BTor June 19 th	3	3	3*	4	3	4,5 DT	4	“Post-Covid-Training”
BZ HemIn June 14 th	3	4	3	4	3	4,5 DT Nd	4	Excursion together with Turkish migrant organisation
ALZ June 21 rd	3	3	3*	5	4	3	4	
MGH Sept. 20 th	3	3	3 D	5	4	4,5 DT	4	Waling with different speed “Language Training Tandems”
GesImp May 2 nd	3	3	3* D	4	3	3,5	4	Post-Covid Training
Wichernhs May 24 th	3	5*)	3	4	3	4	4	Hobbykeller activity about favourite leisure time activities inclusive pilgrimage walks
FDH Freizi (*) May 26 th					+ 0,5	+ 1		inclusive pilgrimage walks, LandArt activities
Stadtteil- haus Bornstr. (*) May 23 rd						+ 0,5 DT Nd		Hobbykeller Activity, combined with “Language Café” at Ethno Museum
Diakoni- sches Werk Bremen (*) current review					+ 0,5	+ 1,5 DT		Virtual excursions Gudied Tours for visual impaired persons to Fine Art Museum Kamichibai Training

(*) not rated with baseline in 2020

Independently from I2I activities, Wichernhaus found ways to get barrier-free access for wheelchair users to all rooms (new elevator) and toilets (new installations)

again independently from I2I activities, **EU tax regulation** made it unadvisable for Non-Profit institutions like meeting centres mentioned here to “sell” meals, coffee, cake etc. to visitors or service users. Starting 2021, such “goods” were no longer “sold” with price lists but users were asked to consider a voluntary “donation”, in most cases given anonymously by putting money in a typical “savings pig” etc.. Certainly, persons with small means could now avoid to pay for the offered things more easily, nevertheless there is some sort of informal “social control” in place at most centres. All reports agree that at least the centres for elder persons get more funding this way than before. We rate the “affordability” as higher in this system than before. Institutions like the Wichernhaus have some special rules in apply.

Looking back at the results it is very clear that **mid- and long-term effects of the pandemic regulations weigh much more for the daily life of the institutions than any achievement of the I2I proceedings**. Even after the lifting of last official requirements and restrictions, for example, most services, groups and meetings are still only accessible after registration before the event with a set of contact data. The number of “open” events or groups where people could come on impulse without such registration is reduced very much, in some institutions just abolished. Groups are organized in a smaller scale, which results in waiting-lists for interested persons not in existence before the pandemic waves. This is in line with official requirements and with the explicit wishes of the actual users who like the feeling of security by a system where everyone is protected against “surprise” encounters and where there are possibilities of notification in case of symptoms of infection. This way each participant can be notified even if some persons shows symptoms after the event to take precautions or do testing.

But according to the criteria we used for the rating, it is indeed a loss of availability (the general idea was that availability is higher if an access is possible without registration and procurement of data). For centres where such rules are in force now, we put availability now at a “3” rating which means that all requirements are met but no special effort is made.

Nearly all institutions offered more phone and online services during the lock-down and some of them, especially the digital services were kept in place after the lifting of restrictions, as all stakeholders were convinced that the higher importance of digital contacts and service delivery was a “trend” to stay and to grow independently from pandemic effects. **Here the general direction of pandemic rules, general trends in society and the intentions of I2I service design found coincidence in a wide range, even one is not led to a conclusion of a decisive role that I2I methodology played here for innovations. At least our co-design activities, Quadruple Helix stakeholding and background discussion gave staff, volunteers and representatives of centre users some protected and organized forum for their considerations and so-called “stupid” or doubtful questions (often not easy because of great insecurity about the challenges and recommendation of digital tools).**

In centres of our network we made experiments and installations of several additional services that were designed following “I2I” principles, as ideas were discussed in the co-creation sessions with quadruple helix participation, developed further in cooperation between staff, volunteers, users and other stakeholders and evaluated with the tools for “indicator I” as described above. Results are mentioned in the column on the right side of the table. To show some not exaggerated result, we put the **value for “utility” 0,5 point higher for each intervention realized with these three components** (reports on the interventions were made at due place in the OMS reports).

The centre for mental disabled persons where we developed and used the “Easy Language” version of the accessibility items and at Diakonisches Werk as a whole we put 0,5 points higher at “comprehensibility”.

Summing up our discussions there is one point to add to the general table and the “items of availability” use din I2I: the **criterium of “Non-Discrimination”** is of such an important in the actual development of urban society that one should not regard it as some “sub-point” of the other items-. Respect of all people involved in services and their “diversity” due to migration, sexual orientation or habits of living (perhaps due to reaction to climate change) are most important for the inclusion of all people in the range of acceptance. Nevertheless many people with such background and habits report again and again cases of direct discrimination and last not least an not-spoken-of requirement by the service providers and their teams that they better should hide of down-play elements of their orientation or lifestyle, as better not use clothing showing their migration cultural background, not “coming-out” in the public of the service with gay or lesbian preferences or lay too much emphasis of food habits like not drinking alcohol or not eating meat or animal-generated products. Full accessibility it not given under such circumstances. In the meetings with experts and diverse users of services we found out that they recommend institutions intense information and coaching of their staff and stakeholders about these points. Experts and users give good feed-back when symbols of “openness to diversity” are shown and displayed inside of the institution or reports in print or internet show clearly that the service involves itself into solidarity activities. With “nd” we mention such special activities in the table and show examples in the annex.

Summary: Against our hope when starting this kind of rating in summer 2020 it is not possible to show a success of I2I measures and activities directly in the “rating” of accessibility of the institutions. The effect of Pandemic was just too strong a factor of change to leave a “visible trace” for the small means we could apply. Nevertheless we are convinced that the methodical innovations and the new types of services applied and mentioned here and in the former reports gives us an equivalent value of a .10 point increase.

To give some **quantitative counting** nevertheless, counting the result values 2020 and 2023, the average rating was 3,057 in 2020 and 3,151 in 2023 (near to 5% increase). The 10% increase would be 3,363, but if we look at the qualitative steps forward and the achievements of the three institutions not included in the 2020 baseline, it is clear that we were moving quite in the direction of the 10% indicator as whole network.

Non discrimination on display in front of Seniors’ Meeting centre Hemelingen

