

# **Sunderland Reducing Reoffending Beacon Event**

**9<sup>th</sup> December 2008**

**Stadium of Light, Sunderland**

## **1. Introduction**

- 1.1. In March 2008, Sunderland was awarded Beacon status. The Beacon Award is the pinnacle of award schemes for local authorities and their partners. It is different to other award schemes in that it not only rewards innovation or success in a particular area, it also encourages local authorities to develop best practice and share that best practice with others.
- 1.2. On 9<sup>th</sup> December 2008, Sunderland hosted a one day event which gave delegates the opportunity to share learning on the theme reducing reoffending.
- 1.3. The day opened with key note speeches from Dave Smith, Chief Executive of Sunderland City Council and Frances Done, Chair of the YJB. The plenary session also included an overview of the Sunderland strategy for reducing re-offending highlighting key areas of innovation and outcome achievements.

Delegates had a choice of eight workshops to attend facilitated by a variety of partners including Safer Sunderland Partnership, YOS, Northumbria Probation Service, the Youth Justice Board and Wearside Women in Need. The workshops covered a range of youth and adult themes related to reducing re-offending, such as Domestic Violence, Restorative Justice and Adult Prescribing. Exhibition stands supported the workshops and plenary sessions. These included our Beacon Legacy Products (examples of the resources developed by young people in Sunderland), Crime Prevention (Northumbria Police), Unpaid Work (Northumbria Probation Service) and Reducing Youth Custody (Sunderland YOS).

Safer Sunderland Partnership TV, showing some of the innovation and specialist projects in Sunderland was broadcast on various screens around the venue and also on a large screen located outside of the conference venue.

Towards the end of the day delegates were given the opportunity to put questions to a panel made up of various partners including the YOS, Northumbria Probation Service, Safer Communities Team and Northumbria Police. The panel was lead by Keith Moore, Deputy Director of Children's Services.

- 1.4. A total of 59 people attended the conference and 43 (73%) evaluation forms were collected (see Appendix 1 for responses). Of the evaluations collected 26 (60.5%) had completed all or the majority of the questions in each section and sub-section. In 17 (39.5%) evaluations one or more sections or sub-sections were not completed. All 43 (100%) evaluations had answered most or all questions in sections 1 and 2, the remaining evaluations had one or more of the sub-sections in section 3 either with incomplete information (i.e. missing workshop title), or no information at all .

## **2. Evaluation of the Conference**

- 2.1. The evaluation form was split into sections:
  - Overall
  - Aspects of the Conference
  - Workshops (sub-sections Workshops 1, 2 and 3)

***N.B. All data can be found in Appendix 1***

## **2.2. Overall**

Generally delegates agreed that the conference was productive/constructive with 93.1% scoring strongly agree or agree and felt the conference was a worthwhile investment of their time, 88.4% scoring strongly agree or agree. More than two thirds of the delegates agreed that the conference had given them new ways to reduce reoffending, however this was lower, with 74.5% scoring strongly agree or agree. Whilst there were no delegates who felt that the conference was not productive/constructive, a very small percentage felt that the conference did not give them new ideas on ways to reduce reoffending and was not a worthwhile investment of their time, at 7% and 2.3% respectively.

## **2.3. Aspects of the Conference**

### **2.3.1. Pre-course Information and Organisation at the Event**

The vast majority of delegates 86.1% felt the pre-course information was excellent or good, while 4.7% scored poor. All delegates (100%) felt that organisation at the event was either excellent or good, both of these scores received equal marks.

### **2.3.2. The Venue and Catering**

The Stadium of Light conference suite proved to be popular with delegates, 100% scored excellent or good when asked about the quality of the venue and the catering also scored very highly, 95.3% of delegates rating it as good or excellent.

### **2.3.3. Plenary Sessions**

The key note speeches that opened the conference were highly rated with delegates, 83.7% scoring excellent or good, a small number felt the speeches were poor at 4.7%. A total of 60.5% of delegates scored the Panel session towards the end of the conference as being good, no delegates scoring poor. Almost a third of completed evaluations (27.9%) left this question blank, this is probably due to the fact that a number of delegates were unable to stay for the duration of the conference and had left earlier in the day.

## **2.4. Workshops**

All individual scores for workshops can be found in Appendix 1, the following summary is taken from the cumulative scores for all 8 workshops.

89.2% of delegates felt that the facilitators' presentations and ability to interact with them was either good or excellent, and 88% were happy with the level of participation. A slightly lesser number (82.2%) agreed that the learning techniques used were good or excellent, while 13.9% felt that the learning techniques were neither good/excellent or poor/very poor. The understanding of the key issues after the workshops was good, with 85.2% delegates agreeing that their understanding was good or excellent.

For each of the questions relating to the workshops around 4-5% of delegates scored poor, suggesting that a small percentage of delegates did not gain as much from the workshops as other delegates.

## **2.5. Comments**

Delegates were asked to give comments about the conference in a free text box. A wide variety of comments were received both positive and negative. All comments can be found in appendix 1.

Generally, most comments were extremely positive. Comments were widely varied making it difficult to 'pick out' themes, the following is a summary of comments:

Several delegates felt the conference was 'excellent', 'worthwhile', 'thought provoking' and 'very good'. There were also comments that Sunderland seemed to be good at 'joined up thinking and action' and that Sunderland has a 'good story to tell'. Conversely however one delegate felt that Sunderland 'had a better story than came across on the day'. Several delegates felt the conference was 'one sided', i.e. more focus around youth than adult; whilst others felt that there was a 'good balance'.

### **3. Conclusion**

The feedback from the conference was overwhelmingly positive, in the 'Overall' and 'Aspects of the Conference' sections of the evaluation the average percentage of delegates who rated strongly agree/agree and excellent/good was 86.3%. It is worth noting this figure was brought down slightly due to the fact that a considerable portion of delegates did not give an answer for the Panel Question and Answer Session. The workshops were also rated very highly, the average percentage of delegates who answered excellent or good was 84.1%.

The numbers of delegates who gave ratings of poor were very low, in the 'Overall' and 'Aspects of the Conference' sections this was an average of just 1.8%, whilst the overall average rating for poor for the workshops was 4.8%. 0% of delegates rated very poor for any of the questions asked.

## Appendix 1

### Evaluation Scores

#### 1. Section 1: Overall:

a) Was productive/constructive (42/43 answers)

Strongly Agree	14	(32.6%)			
Agree	26	(60.5%)			
Neither	2	(4.7%)	No answer	1	(2.3%)
Disagree	0	(0%)			
Strongly Disagree	0	(0%)			

b) Gave me new ideas on ways to reduce reoffending (40/43 answers)

Strongly Agree	2	(4.7%)			
Agree	30	(69.8%)			
Neither	5	(11.6%)	No answer	3	(7%)
Disagree	3	(7%)			
Strongly Disagree	0	(0%)			

c) Was a worthwhile investment of my time (41/43 answers)

Strongly Agree	10	(23.3%)			
Agree	28	(65.1%)	No answer	3	(7%)
Neither	1	(2.3%)			
Disagree	1	(2.3%)			
Strongly Disagree	0	(0%)			

#### 2. Aspects of the conference:

a) Pre-conference information (43/43 answered)

Excellent	7	(16.3%)			
Good	30	(69.8%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Neither	4	(9.3%)			
Poor	2	(4.7%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

b) Organisation at the event (42/43 answers)

Excellent	21	(48.8%)			
Good	21	(48.8%)	No answer	1	(2.3%)
Neither	0	(0%)			
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

c) Quality of the venue (42/43 answers)

Excellent	31	(72.1%)			
Good	11	(25.6%)	No answer	1	(2.3%)
Neither	0	(0%)			
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

d) Catering (42/43 answers)

Excellent	24	(55.8%)			
Good	17	(39.5%)	No answer	1	(2.3%)
Neither	1	(2.3%)			
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

e) Key note speeches (43/43 answers)

Excellent	9	(20.9%)			
Good	27	(62.8%)			
Neither	5	(11.6%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	2	(4.7%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

f) Panel question and answer session (31/43 answers)

Excellent	0	(0%)			
Good	26	(60.5%)			
Neither	4	(9.3%)	No answer	12	(27.9%)
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

## 4. Workshop Choices

### 3.1. Workshop 1: Reducing Youth Custody (14 evaluations completed)

a) Facilitators' presentation and ability to interact with you

Excellent	1	(7.1%)			
Good	13	(92.9%)			
Neither	0	(0%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

b) The extent to which you were able to participate

Excellent	3	(21.4%)			
Good	11	(78.6%)			
Neither	0	(0%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

c) The learning techniques used

Excellent	1	(7.1%)			
Good	12	(85.7%)			
Neither	1	(7.1%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

d) Your understanding of the key issues after the workshop

Good	12	(85.7%)			
Excellent	1	(7.1%)			
Neither	1	(7.1%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

### 3.2. Workshop 2: Data Segmentation (12 evaluations completed)

a) Facilitators' presentation and ability to interact with you

Excellent	3	(25%)			
Good	8	(66.7%)			
Neither	1	(8.3%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

b) The extent to which you were able to participate

Excellent	4	(33.3%)			
Good	7	(58.3%)			
Neither	1	(8.3%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

c) The learning techniques used

Excellent	3	(25%)			
Good	6	(50%)			
Neither	2	(16.7%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	1	(8.3%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

d) Your understanding of the key issues after the workshop

Excellent	3	(25%)			
Good	6	(50%)			
Neither	3	(25%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

### 3.3. Workshop 3: Domestic Violence (16 evaluations completed)

a) Facilitators' presentation and ability to interact with you

Excellent	2	(12.5%)			
Good	11	(68.8%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Neither	1	(6.3%)			
Poor	2	(12.5%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

b) The extent to which you were able to participate

Good	9	(56.3%)			
Excellent	3	(18.8%)			
Neither	2	(12.5%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	2	(12.5%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

c) The learning techniques used

Excellent	4	(25%)			
Good	7	(43.8%)			
Neither	2	(12.5%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	3	(18.8%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

d) Your understanding of the key issues after the workshop

Excellent	4	(25%)			
Good	9	(56.3%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Neither	1	(6.3%)			
Poor	2	(12.5%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

### 3.4. Workshop 4: Media Management (14 evaluations completed)

a) Facilitators' presentation and ability to interact with you

Excellent	2	(14.3%)			
Good	11	(78.6%)			
Neither	1	(7.1%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	1	(6.3%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

b) The extent to which you were able to participate

Excellent	4	(28.6%)			
Good	9	(64.3%)			
Neither	1	(7.1%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

c) The learning techniques used

Excellent	2	(14.3%)			
Good	11	(78.6%)			
Neither	1	(7.1%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

d) Your understanding of the key issues after the workshop

Excellent	3	(21.4 %)			
Good	11	(78.6%)			
Neither	0	(0.0%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

### 3.5. Workshop 5: Restorative Justice (9 evaluations completed)

a) Facilitators' presentation and ability to interact with you

Excellent	5	(55.6%)			
Good	4	(44.4%)			
Neither	0	(0.0%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

b) The extent to which you were able to participate

Excellent	2	(66.7%)			
Good	6	(33.3%)			
Neither	1	(11.1%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

c) The learning techniques used

Excellent	3	(33.3%)			
Good	6	(66.7%)			
Neither	0	(0%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

d) Your understanding of the key issues after the workshop

Excellent	3	(33.3%)			
Good	5	(55.6%)			
Neither	0	(0%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

### 3.6. Workshop 6: Adult Prescribing (7 evaluations completed)

a) Facilitators' presentation and ability to interact with you

Excellent	0	(0%)			
Good	4	(57.1%)			
Neither	1	(14.3%)			
Poor	2	(28.6%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

b) The extent to which you were able to participate

Excellent	0	(0%)			
Good	3	(42.9%)			
Neither	1	(14.3%)			
Poor	3	(42.9%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

c) The learning techniques used

Excellent	0	(0%)			
Good	3	(28.6%)			
Neither	4	(57.1%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	1	(14.3%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

d) Your understanding of the key issues after the workshop

Excellent	1	(14.3%)			
Good	3	(42.9%)			
Neither	3	(42.9%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

### 3.7. Workshop 7: Youth Village (9 evaluations completed)

a) Facilitators' presentation and ability to interact with you

Excellent	0	(0%)			
Good	9	(100%)			
Neither	0	(0%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

b) The extent to which you were able to participate

Excellent	1	(11.1%)			
Good	8	(88.9%)			
Neither	0	(0%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

c) The learning techniques used

Excellent	2	(22.2%)			
Good	7	(77.8%)			
Neither	0	(0%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

d) Your understanding of the key issues after the workshop

Excellent	2	(22.2%)			
Good	7	(77.8%)			
Neither	0	(0%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

### 3.8. Workshop 8: Reducing Adult Offending using a Targeted Approach (20 evaluations received)

a) Facilitators' presentation and ability to interact with you

Excellent	2	(10%)			
Good	15	(75%)			
Neither	3	(15%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

b) The extent to which you were able to participate

Excellent	4	(20%)			
Good	15	(75%)			
Neither	1	(5%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

c) The learning techniques used

Excellent	1	(5%)			
Good	12	(60%)			
Neither	7	(35%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

d) Your understanding of the key issues after the workshop

Excellent	2	(10%)			
Good	12	(60%)			
Neither	6	(30%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

### 3.9. Overall Scores for Workshops

a) Facilitators' presentation and ability to interact with you

Excellent	15	(14.9%)			
Good	75	(74.3%)			
Neither	7	(6.9%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	4	(4%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

b) The extent to which you were able to participate

Excellent	21	(20.8%)			
Good	68	(67.3%)			
Neither	7	(6.9%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	5	(5%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

c) The learning techniques used

Excellent	18	(17.8%)			
Good	65	(64.4%)			
Neither	14	(13.9%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	4	(4%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

d) Your understanding of the key issues after the workshop

Excellent	21	(20.8%)			
Good	65	(64.4%)			
Neither	11	(10.9%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	4	(4%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

### 4. Comments made by delegates

The following comments were made by delegates on completed evaluation forms:

- A well rounded event with a good balance of plenary and workshops
- Frances Done was an excellent speaker
- Refreshing that Sunderland knows that youth is much stronger than adults (workshop 8) however the session still had a useful exchange and some constructive suggestions
- Good venue, good subject. It helps when you've got a good message to give, Sunderland seems a bit better at joined up action and thinking
- Very well organised and excellent facilities. Information passed was very beneficial
- I am from London and found it a worthwhile trip
- Very good, thank you
- Generally I felt you had a better story to tell than came across on the day
- Event not inclusive of all services, very one sided and did not utilise the expertise in the team
- DV focused on work of WWIN, good but Probation input sidelined
- Adult prescribing would have benefitted from more interaction less presentation to foster a greater understanding of different agencies work and perspectives
- Workshop 8 interactive, networking took place and very productive
- The video was not properly visible and needed to be read.
- No evidence of voluntary sector in planning or speaking at the conference and not represented on the panel
- Felt a bit 'talked out' in some of the workshops – would have welcomed more discussion
- A thought provoking day well structured event with good interactive workshops.

- Venue excellent
- Networking opportunities extremely useful
- An excellent, thought provoking conference with some good ideas that I can use in the future

Helen Lancaster  
January 2009