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## Background

The Designing for Healthy Cognitive Ageing (DesHCA) aimed to test, understand, and identify facilitators and barriers for various stakeholders, including older people, in achieving cognitively sustainable housing, in both new-build and retrofit contexts.

The DesHCA project has developed a co-produced legacy tool called ‘Our House’ as part of its Work-Package 4, led by Professors McCall and Rutherford. The archived data attached to this work-package has been generated from 10 playtests of the serious game legacy tool that was developed. Our House is a serious game that was developed to generate research insights on how to deliver housing for older people that is cognitively sustainable and inclusive.

## Overview

These are the first set of notes (1 of 1) from playtest session 7, which took place on the 1st of November 2023. The playtest comprised of 23 participants.

These notes have been fully anonymised, with all identifiable characteristics, including the participants’ names, removed, or replaced with pseudonyms.

**Planning for Ageing and Serious Games Workshop Notes**

Introduction to DesHCA project and ‘Our House’, and an overview of the game mechanics. Both teams listening intently, looking at the board.

**Team 1** – Shawn Payne and Kerry Payne – Homeowners. (3 team members).

**Team 2 -** Joseph Logan – Private Renter. (2 team members).

**Round 1 - Teams are asked to look at the rooms in their occupant’s houses, swapping one out for a new room adaption.**

**Team 1** – They begin by talking about the occupants’ needs – particular focus on Kerry and her cognitive ability.

Discuss replacing the bathroom. They want to replace the spare room downstairs with a shower room. The ‘shower conversion’ was a particular point of interest and conversation amongst the players.

The team also discusses future issues, including difficulty accessing the loft.

* Finally, the team reaches an agreement to replace the downstairs spare room (‘Other’), with a ‘bathroom’ with a ‘shower room’.

Future proofing the house is considered a priority amongst all the team members. They express concern over Kerry’s declining cognitive ability, and how they will improve the house’s accessibility.

They want to prioritise the occupants’ ability to live independently – they express concerns over Kerry becoming housebound.

The team begins planning for future changes they could make in the next round – particular interest in increased outdoor access, adding a downstairs bedroom, and combining the kitchen and dining room to create more space.

**Team 2** – The players express initial confusion over the game mechanics. They ask for clarification of the cognitive and physical scoring. Vikki explains the game in more depth, and the team begins playing.

Firstly, they question their occupant’s needs.

The team attempts to clarify their focus – ‘*future or in the moment?’*.

‘*Better to be prepared rather than left at the last minute’*.

The team discusses, in depth, issues surrounding planning for ageing adaptions, and the costs involved.

The team decides to focus on improving accessibility in Joseph’s house.

* They add in an ‘access room’ card with ‘level entry’.

Similarly, to team 1, the participants begin planning for future need in the next rounds. They try to anticipate changes they could make to further improve the accessibility of Joseph’s house.

They consider adaptions to the downstairs bathroom and kitchen a future priority. They especially want to increase accessibility in the kitchen, worrying that *‘If he gets any worse, he can’t use his kitchen’.*

**Overall** –Both teams had a similar initial focus on assessing occupant need, and creating adaptions designed around their specific physical and cognitive conditions.

Future proofing is a key idea amongst the teams, both of whom have focused on anticipating their occupants’ future needs, and the adaptions they will need to make now.

**Round 2 – Opening the Adaptions Table**

The teams are asked to pick three adaptions each. Both teams have an initial discussion and then gather around the adaption table.

**Team 1** – Initial focus on converting the downstairs bedroom.

They want to increase the cognitive accessibility of the house especially.

**Adaptions chosen**:

* Converting the dining room into a downstairs bedroom – (the team made this adaption card themselves).
* Adding a handrail up the stairs.
* Improving the accessibility of the garden.

The team still consider the kitchen a problem area – Kerry cannot access the kitchen currently.

Team appears very interested in the full game mechanics – ask about the differences the house type makes to the gameplay. The members are also very interested in what the cost element adds to the game. Discussions surrounding the housing adaption budget in the full game.

Concerns over Shawn and Kerry’s growing needs.

*‘Nobody can use the bathroom.’.*

*‘They’re just staying in the bedroom the whole time.’.*

Retain their focus on kitchen and bathroom adaptions.

The team goes back to the adaptions table.

**Team 2** – Initial focus on the bathroom. Joseph currently has a bath – the team members are keen to adapt this into either a wet-floor room, or a walk-in shower. Concern over the bathroom is a key theme, consistently brought up throughout gameplay.

The team also discusses possible changes they could make to the living room.

Also discuss making the garden more accessible.

(Still some remaining confusion over the physical and cognitive scores amongst the team).

**Adaptions chosen:**

* Living room – door widening.
* Bathroom – walk-in shower (team made this card themselves).
* Bedroom – added an accessible bed (one that rises and lowers). (Team made this card themselves).

The members go back up to the adaptions table.

The team also starts relating the issues faced by Jospeh to their own life experiences and family.

They begin re-assessing Joseph’s need to properly future proof his house in the next round.

**Overall** – Both teams still retain a focus on future proofing the houses, aiming to allow the occupants to live independently for as long as possible.

A key aim also includes preventing the occupants from becoming housebound.

**Round 3 – Teams are allowed to pick another three adaptions.**

**Team 1** – **New adaptions** (they were given 1 extra):

* Kitchen – door widening.
* Bathroom – ‘integrated assistance technology’.
* Bathroom – sensors (made themselves).
* Bedroom – sensors (made themselves).

Express concerns over cognitive improvement adaptions in the living conditions.

*‘Cognitive still not high enough for Kerry to use the bedroom.’.*

The team are considering ‘storage adaptions’ in the bedroom as a possibility.

*‘Kerry can’t get up and down. She’s living on the ground floor.’.*

*‘She’s housebound, but she can move around the house.’.*

Worried the occupants can’t access the upstairs or use their living room.

One of the team members suggests playing ‘Our House’ with residents – a good way to show them how to adapt their own houses and plan for future need.

*‘The issue is convincing people, when they need to move, to move. Particularly older people.’.*

**Team 2** – Discusses the new adaptions – the team members seem to be struggling to find where to place them.

Game suggestion – they think the game would be easier to understand if the adaptions mirror the room cards, e.g., they look like them in terms of the order of the cognitive and physical scores/the placement of the cost score.

**Adaptions chosen**:

* Bathroom – door widening.
* Bedroom – door widening.
* Living room – integrated assistance technology.

Last 5 minutes – the team members express concern and sadness over vulnerable people finding their own homes inaccessible.

**Both teams fill out their feedback forms.**

**Final overall thoughts** – Both teams share similar ideas surrounding housing adaptions and assessing need.

Key ideas within both teams - need to highlight the inequalities present within the housing market. There are limited choices based on where you live/how wealthy you are/the type of home/household occupants.

The groups priorities remained similar throughout the game – improving the access of their homes and future proofing were a key concern amongst both teams.

Adaptions made must be based on need.

There is an existing significant inequality of access.