

Richmond upon Thames | Community Safety Partnership

Richmond upon Thames Community Safety Partnership Stakeholders Day-Tuesday 1st December 2009

Feedback Results

The second Richmond upon Thames Community Safety Partnership Stakeholders Day for 2009 was held in the Clarendon Hall, York House in Twickenham on Tuesday 1st December 2009. The main item on the agenda was the presentation of the updated strategic assessment, which presents and interprets the analysis of levels, patterns and changes to crime, disorder and substance misuse in the borough. Its purpose is to assist the Community Safety Partnership in revising the [Community Safety Partnership Plan](#). The presentation was made by Hollie Phillips, the CSP team Intelligence Manager.

The theme of the rest of the day was “partnership” and a number of our colleagues and partners in the Richmond upon Thames CSP made short presentations to raise awareness of their work with other partners and community representatives.

Those attending were asked to grade and feedback on the following areas-venue and facilities, catering and each of the individual presentations. They were able to grade each area from 1 to 5 (1=very poor, 2=poor, 3=satisfactory, 4=good and 5=excellent) and make any additional comments.

In total we received 51 feedback forms from the 82 people who attended, which represents a return of 62%.

The results for each area were as follows

Strategic Assessment Presentation

Poor-3 Satisfactory-9 Good-26 Excellent-11 No score-2

Additional comments (Each individual comment is in inverted commas)

“Would have been helpful to have the statistics prior to meeting to enable informed comment”

“Point 1-Are areas of LBRuT with KT and WC postcodes included in the alcohol figures”

“Point 2-Do you take account of those who get taken to neighbouring hospitals e.g. KUT/ Kingston 2nd worst figures A & E under age drinking in London!”

“Presentation has greater impact if the speaker isn’t simply reading from the screen. Info content was good”

“Lots of information presented well”

“Very informative”

"Handout of main stats would have been useful"
 "Excellent information"
 "Would have preferred statistical info prior to event"
 "Informative and interesting"
 "Mind numbing-too long only of interest to chart analysts"
 "Lots of information-would like more info on the matrix process. Exercise too extensive
 1-25 too many choices."
 "Insufficiency time for questions and discussions"
 "Need to absorb facts"
 "Went on too long although interesting to start with"
 "Too many figures and stats-power point was blurred"
 "Very detailed so a pity not to have a handout then and there!"
 "I liked the exercise –it gave us an understanding of how difficult it is to prioritise"
 "Slides too busy, not readable at back"

Safer Transport Team Presentation

Satisfactory-12 Good-28 Excellent-9 No score-2

Additional comments (Each individual comment is in inverted commas)

"Very useful and informative"
 "Inter-active quiz helped discussion"
 "Good to know about these teams"
 "Very succinct-great to have the quiz"
 "Interactive-involved audience"
 "Enjoyed the quiz and learning more"
 "Interaction with those attending good"
 "Useful overview"
 "I liked the quiz"

Victim Support, Refuge and Welcare Presentation

Poor-1 Satisfactory-16 Good-23 Excellent-9 No score-2

Additional comments (Each individual comment is in inverted commas)

"A little disjointed-one presenter would have been preferable"
 "Really good"
 "Excellent-lots of useful info. Very clear and helpful"
 "Useful information and inter-active presentation very good"
 "Good to know about these teams"
 "Good use of the electronic voting system"
 "Interactive-involved audience"
 "More needs to be done! Excellent presentation"
 "Good but disjointed"
 "Way to make an impact"
 "Enjoyed quiz. Needed more time. Should have been titled as Dom Abuse/16 Days
 Presentation"
 "Wasn't in room for this"
 "Liked the interaction"
 "Good interactive quiz, learnt something new"

“Good to hear from all agencies”

“I really liked this quiz! Good to know what services area available”

Probation-Community Service Presentation

Poor-1 Satisfactory-13 Good-25 Excellent-12

Additional comments (Each individual comment is in inverted commas)

“Rather confused presentations and clearly unconvincing. Probably too long”

“Excellent-more publicity should be given to the fact that impact statements can be made in magistrates courts”

“Okay”

“Very good-gave an interesting perspective on the CSP. Raised lots of moral/ethical/other issues”

“Interesting presentation looking at custody versus community penalty”

“Very good”

“An eye opener”

“Lengthy-could have been dealt with in shorter presentation with questions after. However, very interesting subject matter”

“Not relevant and frustrating as not done properly. Too long”

“More consideration for victim”

“Good-well presented. Clear answers”

“Would have liked more info. On aligned services e.g. drug treatment programmes-resources for this programme”

“Good discussion”

“Interactive-so very good”

“Liked the dual approach”

“Liked the dual approach but question part too long”

“Clever and effective way of educating”

“Interesting and informative. Lively delivery. Generated lots of discussion. Could have been good to discuss amongst table”

Criminal Prosecution Service Presentation

Very poor-1 Poor-2 Satisfactory-20 Good-12 Excellent-9 No score-6

Additional comments (Each individual comment is in inverted commas)

“Very interesting and informative”

“Very good-very clear”

“A power point presentation with main points would have been helpful”

“Interesting well presented”

“Presentation too long”

“Too long”

“Bit laboured-clearly enjoys it”

“Too much info not broken up”

“Case studies might be useful”

“All oral-too much listening/concentration-some power point would've helped”

“Hard to take his information in-lots of facts. Process presentation not easy to follow. Different style might assist the lay person”

“Boring-too static for after lunch”

“Power point might have made it easier to follow. Some inaccuracies. Inappropriate discussion of an individual case which could have been identified-too technical”

Richmond Housing Partnership Presentation

(This presentation was not included on the feedback form)

Additional comments (Each individual comment is in inverted commas)

“Interesting to learn what they do”
“Housing partnership presentation and activity-excellent”
“RHP presentation-4”
“RHP 5 Excellent!! Very good to meet the support of staff!”
“Good interaction on case example”
“RHP presentation good”
“RHP=good as table discussions and interactive”
“RHP-4 Good scenario helped our understanding”

Venue and facilities

Very poor/poor-1 Satisfactory-19 Good-17 Excellent-13 No score-1

Additional comments (Each individual comment is in inverted commas)

“Inside the door of the ladies toilet-paint work absolutely filthy/cold in the hall”
“Sound could be better”
“Excellent food choice and venue”
“Very good but temperature became very cold as the day progressed!”
“Venue was cold”
“Car park space would have been useful”
“Accessible but cold”
“No heating room cold”
“Very noisy/cold”
“Very cold!!”
“Noise during presentation by staff and late arrivals”
“Room very cold”
“Very cold”
“Room was so cold, my feet were freezing. Space and tables were good”
“A little cold but probably unavoidable”
“Too cold!”
“Bad acoustics! But microphones helped”
“A bit cold today! Underside of table was dusty”

Catering

Poor-1 Satisfactory-7 Good-17 Excellent-24 No score-2

Additional comments (Each individual comment is in inverted commas)

“Very good and healthy selection”
“Excellent salmon sandwiches”
“Very good”

“1st break coffee ran out”
“Very good”
“Good variety”
“Very good”
“Very good variety and delicious”
“Hot food”
“Good selection and quantity”
“Excellent”
“Good selection of food”
“Very good and varied. No fruit juices”
“Not enough coffee and milk. Water on table not re-filled”
“Disposable cups and wooden skewers are not sustainable”
“Great to have recognisable vegetables on sticks. Labelling of food would be helpful”

Any Other Comments

(Each individual comment is in inverted commas)

“Possibly too long on presentations and not enough time for Q & A”
“Overall very good”
“Good format in general just more of the same please!”
“All tables informative”
“Generally a good day, more for networking”
“Could be a half day with more networking opportunities”
“Overall worthwhile. Too self congratulatory”
“Interesting day”
“Predominately one-way communication (presentations)-and heard most before (CPP, prev. CSP days etc)
“An eye opener”
“Not as good as previous years”
“Too much talking heads and too little scope for participation”
“Very heavy police presence. Maybe more of a support presence e.g. all the support agencies mentioned in the RHP presentation including sheltered housing managers”

What Could We Do Better?

(Each individual comment is in inverted commas)

“Some OHP writing too small and presentation-reading it out too quick”
“Heating”
“Nothing”
“Try to reduce politicians from trying to dominate the event by asking unnecessary questions and then leaving after an hour!”
“Useful day-room felt a little cold and car parking facilities would have helped. However, very useful day.”
“Heat the halls”
“Just continue as you are!”
“Explain how we can link better today and work together! Networking!”
“More interactive sessions to afternoon and heavy presentations e.g. CPS to the morning”
“Less stats”
“Very cold-heating improved”
“Shorter-sharper. Equipment to work”
“More time for questions”
“Excellent day”

“Change venue or hold in the summer!”

“Would’ve liked more opportunity for stakeholders to contribute to discussion/group work”

“Please send me a link to your presentations to Chamber of Commerce”

More interaction by attendees”

“More interactive quizzes and discussion”

“Perhaps more table discussions. Detailed presentations in advance so get beyond downloading information and into implications and discussion of wider issues”

“Maybe an ice breaker exercise for each table to introduce themselves to each other. Provide a list of participants so we know who is here”

What Would You Like The Next Stakeholder Event To Cover? **(Each individual comment is in inverted commas)**

“More round the table group discussion and reporting back as with RHP presentation”

“Whatever appropriate at the time”

“Can’t think at moment but will e-mail if I think of something”

“Also look at Local Authority intervention at family courts (e.g. baby P) as well as criminal courts”

“Youth”

“Issues for older people. Distraction burglary”

“Local Immigration Team presentations on work they are doing”

“ASB options and success stories”

“More on youth services, prevention work etc. More on work of community payback and restorative justice schemes”

“Best practice and hear what our neighbouring boroughs are doing about crime e.g. Hammersmith and Hounslow”

“Social and economic cost of crime”

“Make lettering on name badges”

“Hate crime-schools intervention/prevention work-community citizenship etc”

“Focus on action on key problem areas i.e. youth crime”

“What the CSP is going to do in the light of the Strategic Assessment”

“Reassurance for older people safeguarding vulnerable”

“More on what the police and local authority are doing. Information on work with young people lives affected by crime. NB Make it clear if there’s a theme e.g. domestic abuse. Or health e.g. Havens”

“How do we address fear of crime? Designing out crime and planning”

Overall Average Feedback Scores by Groups

	Less than 3		3-3.9		4 and above
--	-------------	--	-------	--	-------------

Area for evaluation	Venue & Facilities	Catering	Strategic Assessment Presentation	Safer Transport Team Presentation	Victim Support, Refuge & Welfare Presentation	Probation Community Service Presentation	CPS Presentation	Average Score by Group
Groups (The numbers of individuals in each group who completed a feedback form)								
Councillors (4)	3.5	3.75	3	4.3	4	4.25	3.5	3.76
Council Officers (6)	2.9	3.5	4	4	4.2	3.7	3.3	3.66
Police (16)	4	4.6	3.8	4	3.6	3.8	3.5	3.9
Residents (5)	3.8	4.6	3.8	3.6	3.8	4.2	3.2	3.86
Health (1)	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3.86
Voluntary Sector (6)	4	4.2	4.3	3.8	4	4.2	3.75	4.04
Other (10)	3.9	4.3	3.9	3.9	3.6	3.8	3.8	3.89
Unspecified (2)	5	5	4	4	4	4	3	4.14
Various (1)	4	5	4	3	5	5	5	4.43
Totals	35.1	38.95	34.8	34.6	36.2	36.95	32.05	35.52
Housing	No individual feedback responses were received							

David Noakes, Community Safety Officer,
London Borough of Richmond upon Thames