

Sunderland Reducing Reoffending Beacon Event: Youth Homelessness Conference

13th March 2009

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. As part of the Beacon year Sunderland was approached by the Youth Justice Board to host a Youth Homelessness conference. The aim of the conference was to create better links between North East Youth Offending Teams and Supported Accommodation Providers, to improve young offenders access to accommodation.
- 1.3. The day consisted of presentations, workshops facilitated by colleagues and young people and an opportunity for delegates to have questions answered by a panel at the end of the day.
- 1.4. A total of 27 people attended the conference and 15 (55.5%) evaluation forms were collected (see Appendix 1 for responses). Of the evaluations collected 12 (80%) had completed all of the questions in each section. In 3 (20%) evaluations one or more sections were not completed, for all three this was due to the fact the delegates were not in attendance for one or more of the workshops.

2. Evaluation of the Conference

- 2.1. The evaluation form was split into sections:
 - Overall
 - Aspects of the Conference
 - Workshops
 - Comments

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

2.2. Overall

The overall feedback from the conference was excellent. All delegates (100%) felt the conference was productive and constructive and gave them new ideas on ways to tackle youth homelessness issues. Similarly, 100% delegates felt the conference was a worthwhile investment of their time.

2.3. Aspects of the Conference

2.3.1. Pre-course Information

Over 90% of delegates felt the pre-workshop information was excellent or good and organisation at the event was either excellent or good (40% rated excellent).

2.3.2. The Venue and Catering

The Stadium of Light was a popular venue with delegates, 100% scored excellent or good when asked about the quality of the venue and the catering also scored very highly, 86.6% of delegates rating it as good or excellent.

2.3.3. Presentations and Panel Session

The feedback for the plenary sessions, including the presentations and panel session were overwhelmingly positive, 100% delegates rated the presentations as good or excellent, while 93.4% gave the panel question and answer session a good or excellent score.

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 4 workshops.

Again the feedback was excellent, with 100% of delegates scoring facilitators' presentations and ability to interact with them as either good or excellent (66.7%), and 100% were happy with the level of participation. Over 95% of delegates (95.9%) agreed that the learning techniques used were good (54.2%) or excellent. Delegates gained a comprehensive understanding of the key issues after the workshops, over 95% delegates agreeing that their understanding was good or excellent.

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.

The vast majority of comments were extremely positive and supported the scores given in the main evaluation. The following is a summary of comments:

Several delegates felt aspects of the conference, particularly those workshops run by young people were 'brilliant' and the day was 'very good' and 'well organised'. Other delegates commented that the day was 'very informative' and 'good to have young peoples views'. Unfortunately there were some technical problems that impacted on the delegates view of the day as more than one comment was received in this area.

3. Conclusion

The feedback from the event was very positive, in the 'Overall' and 'Aspects of the Conference' sections of the evaluation the average score for excellent or good was 96%. The workshops were also rated very highly, the average percentage of delegates who answered excellent or good was 98%.

None of the delegates scored poor or very poor for any of the questions asked.

Appendix 1

Evaluation Scores

1. Section 1: Overall

a) Was productive/constructive

Strongly Agree	11	(73.3%)			
Agree	4	(26.7%)			
Neither	0	(0%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Disagree	0	(0%)			
Strongly Disagree	0	(0%)			

b) Gave me new ideas on tackling youth homelessness issues

Strongly Agree	7	(46.7%)			
Agree	8	(53.3%)			
Neither	0	(0%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Disagree	0	(0%)			
Strongly Disagree	0	(0%)			

c) Was a worthwhile investment of my time

Strongly Agree	9	(60%)			
Agree	6	(40%)			
Neither	0	(0%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Disagree	0	(0%)			
Strongly Disagree	0	(0%)			

2. Aspects of the Conference:

a) Pre-conference information

Excellent	1	(6.7%)			
Good	13	(86.7%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Neither	1	(6.7%)			
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

b) Organisation at the event

Excellent	6	(40%)			
Good	8	(53.3%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Neither	1	(6.7%)			
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

c) Quality of the venue

Excellent	5	(33.3%)			
Good	10	(66.7%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Neither	0	(0%)			
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

d) Catering

Excellent	2	(13.3%)			
Good	11	(73.3%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Neither	2	(13.3%)			
Poor	0	(0%)			

Very Poor 0 (0%)

e) Presentations

Excellent	7	(46.7%)			
Good	8	(53.3%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Neither	0	(0%)			
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

f) Panel question and answer session

Excellent	4	(26.7%)			
Good	10	(66.7%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Neither	1	(6.7%)			
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

3. Workshop Sessions

3.1. Overall Workshop Scores (scored out of 24 scored workshops)

a) Facilitators' presentation

Excellent	16	(66.7%)			
Good	8	(33.3%)			
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	13	(54.2%)			
Good	11	(45.8%)			
Neither	0	(0%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

c) The learning techniques used

Excellent	10	(41.7%)			
Good	13	(54.2%)			
Neither	1	(4.1%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

d) Your understanding of the key issues after the workshop

Excellent	12	(50%)			
Good	11	(45.8%)			
Neither	1	(4.2%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

3.2. HARP Protocol (8 evaluations completed)

a) Facilitators' presentation

Excellent	3	(37.5%)			
Good	5	(62.5%)			
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	2	(25%)			
Good	6	(75%)			
Neither	0	(0%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

c) The learning techniques used

Excellent	0	(0%)			
Good	7	(87.5%)			
Neither	1	(12.5%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

d) Your understanding of the key issues after the workshop

Excellent	1	(12.5%)			
Good	6	(75%)			
Neither	1	(12.5%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

3.3. Mad4U (3 evaluations completed)

a) Facilitators' presentation

Excellent	3	(100%)			
Good	0	(0%)			
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	(100%)			
Good	0	(0%)			
Neither	0	(0%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

c) The learning techniques used

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

3.4. A young persons perspective on homelessness (8 evaluations completed)

a) Facilitators' presentation

Excellent	8	(100%)			
Good	0	(0%)			
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	5	(62.5%)			
Good	3	(37.5%)			
Neither	0	(0%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

c) The learning techniques used

Excellent	5	(62.5%)			
Good	3	(37.5%)			
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	6	(75%)			
Good	2	(25%)			
Neither	0	(0%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

3.5. Homelessness Services – snakes or ladders? (6 evaluations completed)

a) Facilitators' presentation

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

c) The learning techniques used

Excellent	3	(50%)			
Good	3	(50%)			
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	4	(66.7%)			
Good	2	(33.3%)			
Neither	0	(0%)	No answer	0	(0%)
Poor	0	(0%)			
Very Poor	0	(0%)			

4. Comments:

- Mad4U brilliant
- Really good workshops, young people were brilliant. Sound on DVDs poor, might have been worth putting them onto computer
- YOS presentation did not always allow sufficient time to read the commentary and was occasionally unreadable, white on white
- The overall issue I felt the young people present faced, was a lack of useful information to guide them to agencies that can help
- Was a very good day
- Very informative, good to have young peoples views of their experiences and what could be improved
- The important things is to get reliable info on youth need, particularly offenders – local regional and national
- PA system spoiled the presentation
- I cannot comment on workshops
- Very good event, well organised

Helen Lancaster
March 2009