

open

Obesity Prevention through
European Network

#*opentomove*



www.openprogram.eu





OPEN Evaluation study: Final appraisal of the integrated community-based approaches

Amsterdam, November 25th 2016





Aim of the final appraisal

To assess whether selected weak elements of community-based approaches (programmes) aiming to prevent childhood obesity, improved or not, after a 2-year support from the OPEN project



Objectives of the OPEN evaluation study

1. To identify the strengths and weaknesses of the community-based programmes in reference to the four EPODE pillars (baseline-2014)
2. To identify potential improvements of the programmes' weaknesses after the OPEN interventions (final-2016)



Methods of the OPEN evaluation study

What was the study object of the OPEN evaluation?

13 European programmes targeting the prevention of childhood obesity

- Community Based approaches (CBPs), Initiatives (CBIs) and Public Organizations, aiming to prevent childhood obesity
- Information: principal programme coordinators and project managers

What did we measure and with which tools?



Baseline

- **Good practice appraisal tool for obesity prevention programmes, projects, initiatives and interventions (GPA Tool)**

- I. Main **intervention** characteristics
- II. Monitoring and evaluation
- III. Implementation



- **OPEN tool** (Interview guide and analysis framework)

- I. General organisation
- II. Political commitment
- III. Public-Private partnerships
- IV. Supporting information for the development of interventions/campaigns
- V. Scientific aspects and dissemination





Using the GPA and OPEN tools

Our experience regarding...

- Data collection
- Appraisal process
- Usefulness

... resulting in recommendations

- Programme documentation
- Questionnaire assessing main programme aspects (improved GPA tool)
- Interviews to clarify the programme methods, barriers and facilitators (improved

OPEN tool)

What did we measure and with which tools?



At follow-up

What?

- Changes regarding the *improvement objectives*, i.e. elements (OPEN tool) related to baseline weaknesses
- Barriers and facilitators
- Satisfaction

How?

- Questionnaire tailored to the each programme
- In person interviews



Results: Improving the programmes' weaknesses

Examples and key observations

Political commitment



Example

Formal agreement with a municipality → Municipal support →
Intersectoral collaboration and contribution →

Fostering implementation



Political commitment

Main barriers and facilitators

Barriers

- Political instability
- Working with private partnerships

Facilitators

- Local/National government motivated
- Existing relationships/networking with governmental entities

Public and Private partnerships (PPPs)

Example



Engagement of key associations ➡ Human resources/expertise ➡
Interventions in **different target groups** and **reaching adolescents**



PPPs

Main barriers and facilitators

Barriers

- Obesity prevention not a priority
- Lack of time

Facilitators

- Networking
- Existing relationships/networking with private partners

Supporting services for implementation of interventions / campaigns



Key success factors

- ✓ Target group analysis
- ✓ Involvement of target groups in the planning phase
- ✓ Involvement of stakeholders in the planning phase

Supporting services for implementation of interventions / campaigns



Main barriers and facilitators

Barriers

- Lack of time
- Lack of resources

Facilitators

- OPEN trainings/support
- Funding

Scientific Aspects

Support and evaluation



○ Main observations

Improved

- Scientific support
- Effect evaluation
- Dissemination

Not improved

- Evaluation framework
- Process evaluation

○ Priority given to implementation over evaluation aspects



Scientific Aspects

Main barriers and facilitators

Barriers

- Difficulty in monitoring the processes
- Lack of resources

Facilitators

- Priority of programme coordinator
- Collaboration with Universities



Satisfaction

Did the programmes benefit from OPEN?

YES!

- Insightful trainings
- Exchange of ideas and experience through OPEN Network
- Considerable support by the OPEN coordination
- Funding



How?

Recommendations

- Concrete methodology regarding evaluation
- More time devoted to implementation
- Facilitate more interaction among the programmes



Conclusions and key messages

How to respond to the needs of complex approaches?



- I. A single approach is not enough
- II. GPA tool: is useful for monitoring simple interventions
- III. OPEN tool: identification of methodological strengths and weakness of complex programmes
- IV. OPEN project: responded to a large extend to needs of complex programmes

open

Obesity Prevention through
European Network

#*opentomove*



www.openprogram.eu

