



DEVON &
SOMERSET
FIRE & RESCUE SERVICE

Full Evaluation Report

Participatory Budgeting (PB) Pilots

This report evaluates the use of devolving budgets through PB to develop innovative community led initiatives to improve safety in the community.

Anne Harrison-Bailey
Community Safety Support Manager

Devon & Somerset
Fire & Rescue Service

09/11/2012

Contents

Partnership/Joint Working Activity Summary	3
Subject or Issue	3
Actions Taken	3
Summary of Benefits	3
Evaluation Outcomes.....	4
Additional Information	4
Introduction and Background	5
Activity Aim.....	5
Methodology.....	7
Findings	17
Analysis and Discussion	19
Conclusion.....	21
Recommendations	21
Appendices.....	22

Partnership/Joint Working Activity Summary

Title/Partnership/Activity	Participatory Budgeting Pilots		
Topic	Participatory Budgeting		
Lead Area/Group/Dept	Service Headquarters (with support from Central East Group, Devon West Group and Somerset West Group)		
Contact	Anne Harrison-Bailey, 01392 872392		
DSFRS Ref No		Date	24/10/2012

Subject or Issue

The aim of the activity was to carry out a series of PB pilots to see what the process would offer a FRS as an engagement technique that could help improve community safety.

Actions Taken

To explore the potential use of PB for DSFRS as an engagement technique to improve community safety three PB events were carried out. The evaluation undertaken in this document examines the process and impact of PB as a whole rather than the individual engagements. Each PB pilot will undertake a separate evaluation to monitor the impact of the projects awarded money.

Summary of Benefits

- Different groups in the community are now aware of each other and in some instances working together.
- Development of DSFRS staff
- Increased local intelligence
- Wider perception of DSFRS within the community
- People focusing on improving quality of life in general and addressing not just our needs but theirs as well.
- Community capacity building

Evaluation Outcomes

The projects have only just started out so there will need to be further evaluation. However, early benefits of the PB events have been a stronger relationship in the community and between DSFRS and the community.

Additional Information

Internally;

Anne Harrison-Bailey	Coordinator of pilots
Chris Jones	Minehead Pilot
Dave Evans	Plymouth Pilot
Martin Carnell	Minehead Pilot
Nigel Deasy	Exeter Pilot
Phil Picton	Exeter Pilot
Ros Clarke	Plymouth Pilot

Externally;

Please forward any request for information on PB to aharrisonbailey@dsfire.gov.uk

Introduction and Background

What is PB?

The official definition is:

“PB directly involves local people in making decisions on the spending priorities for a defined public budget. This means engaging residents and community groups, representative of all parts of the community, to discuss spending priorities, make spending proposals and vote on them” PB Unit

The PB Unit in January 2010 identified that there are 75 PB projects in England with a range of different approaches allocating over £20 million in both urban and rural areas. Although PB models will be developed depending on the agencies involved and the makeup of the community they serve, the PB Unit has identified 3 common models across England:

- Community grant pots, where a pot of money is ring fenced for a particular area such as a neighbourhood, money is then allocated through a PB process to community and voluntary projects.
- Devolved funds, council or partnership funding is devolved to wards and can be used for public and third sector projects.
- Funding for mainstream services, the community are able to vote on which services receive additional funding.

PB, Localism and Big Society

Devolving budgets through PB can add an element of localism to decision making and meeting local priorities, as a result of this PB has been confirmed as one of the tools for Big Society. The Big Society Network is working with NESTA, CLG and the PB Unit on a project to promote local engagement on council spending priorities. The “Your Local Budget” project will be working with authorities who want to pioneer participatory budgeting in their area; especially those interested in extending their PB exercise to mainstream funding.

South West (SW) PB

Since the start of 2009/10 the South West Participatory Budgeting Development Group has been running under the guidance of Creating Excellence. Its membership includes 25 councils and organisations across the SW, along with DSFRS. The group's aim was to encourage the development of PB across the SW and in spring 2010 it was estimated that there had been 19 projects across the SW, allocating £761,000. Increasingly examples from the SW are used nationally on the PB Units website and as part of the official tool kit. In October 2010 the group ran a successful SW PB conference, sharing the knowledge of the group across local authorities and the third sector of the SW. In January 2011 the group reconsidered its scope and is now the South West Localism Group. Under its new scope the first task the group set itself was to produce 'A Guide to Localism in the South West', where PB featured as one of the main tools for delivery. A copy of the guide can be found at <http://www.creatingexcellence.org.uk/regeneration-renewal-news-497-thread-0-0.html>

FRS PB

In spring 2010 an email was sent out across the PB unit's network to see if any FRS had led or been a major partner in a PB project, there was no indication that this had been the case. This suggests that DSFRS would be the first FRS in England to be a lead or a major partner in a PB project.

Since then DSFRS have committed to developing the use of PB within the service and have:

- Regularly attended and provided funding for the South West Localism Group. Including the provision of admin support and editorial skills for the guide to localism in the south west.
- On behalf of the South West Localism Group, provided a free venue for the South West Participatory Budgeting Conference along with administration and coordination support. During this event officers from DSFRS ran a workshop to scope the potential of PB delivery options for DSFRS. As part of the event a live simulation of a PB event using delegates conference fee was carried out using four community groups related to FRS, as a result the PB unit acknowledge DSFRS as a PB leader in this area among FRSs.
(<http://www.participatorybudgeting.org.uk/news/devon-and-somerset-fire-rescue-service-the-first-to-lead-on-pb-in-the-country>)
- Supported the 2010 Sensible Spending PB event in Dulverton through the provision of a DSFRS stand and officers. Contributed financially to the 2011 Sensible Spending event, which will form part of the Big Society Network pilots.
- Attended the Big Society Networks Your Local Budget event in February 2011 to contribute to the development of the Your Local Budget Pilots.

Activity Aim

The aim of the activity was to carry out a series of PB pilots to see what the process could offer a FRS as an engagement technique that could help improve community safety.

It was decided the DSFRS pilot model for PB will be based around the business planning structure. Each station has a Local Community Plan (LCP), which details the community safety prevention and protection activities to be carried out in each local community. Traditionally, activities have been chosen based on risk analysis, using historical data and local knowledge of Officers. All activity proposed within the plan is costed and resourced to ensure the delivery of the activities will be within budget. Under the PB model the majority of the LCP would still be based on risk analysis, for example 95% of the plan. The community would then be asked to allocate the rest of the money available for the LCP through a PB process. This will allow for the use of mainstream funding and the development of a PB model to best fit the engagement needs of DSFRS.

It is important that funding in LCPs is spent in a way which maximises the impact of community safety prevention work. The scope of this work can be wide, addressing not just direct causes of incidents but also the behaviour and knowledge of a community. A concern when developing a PB model using mainstream FRS funding is that it still needs to be directed towards work which will complement the prevention work already carried out by the service. Because of this the two potential models which have been developed as pilots for DSFRS have some restrictions on how funding can be spent whilst still giving local communities the opportunity to be involved in assessing risk.

Methodology

Model 1 – Community Safety Menu

As previously discussed all activity proposed to be undertaken in LCPs is costed and resourced. As a result DSFRS is in a position to produce a menu of potential prevention activity which local communities could use to contribute to the activity already being delivered within their local community plan. This would allow communities to decide how a proportion of money is spent in their local community, whilst ensuring that mainstream funding is still directed towards prevention work.

This could be done in two ways:

- Members of the community allocating the money – Here individuals from the local community would be able to choose which activities from the 'menu' they would like delivered.
- Parish/Town councils allocating the money - Here members of parish and town councils, as representatives of the local community; would be able to choose which activities they would like delivered from the 'menu'.

Having developed this model for DSFRS, before it was piloted, it was researched to see if any other authorities had used similar models and if so how successful this had been. Tower Hamlets in 2009 used a mainstream process of PB by providing a 'top up' menu of services provided by LSP partners. Individuals in the community could then vote for the options on the menu they would like to spend the money on. At the 8 events attend by 815 residents almost £2.4 million was successfully allocated.

Model 2 – Community Safety Innovation

DSFRS extensively evaluates the risk across Devon and Somerset and uses inputs from a wide range of sources. The information is then used to create risk profiles, which help to identify the area's most at risk and the causes of risk in that area. As explained in the previous model DSFRS has a variety of prevention activities that can be carried out to address risk. However, in areas of greater risk the activities used can sometimes need to be more innovative and develop a greater buy in from the community. To allow for this innovation the second model would again allocated up to 95% of its budget through the LCP, but the remaining funding would be made available to the local community to bid for. As the money would still come from mainstream funding, criteria would be set out for bidding to ensure that any proposed activity would be carried out within the time of the current LCP and would reduce risk to the community. Applicants would be required to submit a form including their proposal around 5 days before the vote, DSFRS would then score the bid against criteria such as ;the potential to increase knowledge, reduce risk, save lives, reduce casualties and address anti-social behaviour. All bids which successfully meet the criteria would then be given the opportunity to give a short presentation at a PB event so the local community could vote for their proposal.

Comparison of models

	Model 1 – Community Safety Menu	Model 2 – Community Safety Innovation
Level of delivery	At a LCP level, affecting village, town or city	At a sub level of an LCP, directed at specific risk areas although this could also be used at a village, town or city level.
Level of involvement	Communities will be involved in choosing how DSFRS address the risk in their local community.	Communities will be asked to come up with activities to address risk in their local community and will be involved in choosing the final activities.
Relationship with community	This model would require a medium level of relationship with the community. The community would need to be interested in helping with decision making.	This model would require a strong relationship with the community. A core of the community would need to be interested in developing and delivering community safety activities and the wider community in being involved in decision making.
Opportunities for partnership working	Events could be held with different menus for the different agencies involved. Alternatively, different agencies could come up with activities that need all agencies involved to deliver, or there could be a combined pot of money with a menu of activities delivered individually by all the agencies involved.	Partnership money could be combined and a criteria list which addresses the community safety needs of all partners could be drawn up to accept the bids against.
Resources	This model would require slightly less resource; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Menus would need to be created and tailored from standard templates. • Publicity would be needed. • An event would need to be organised for voting. 	This model would require slightly more resources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publicity would be needed • Bids would need to be assessed. • There would need to be relationship with the groups putting forward bids. • An event would need to be organised for voting.
Risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor turn out as the opportunities to allocate money is more prescriptive. • Stifling of innovation in the community, restriction in the activities that can be delivered. • Cost of organising event could turn out more than the pot of money. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern around the quality of bids and if they would adequately address the community safety needs. • Community not wanting to put together activities to address community safety's needs, wanting to leave it to DSFRS, having no appetite for such a high level of involvement. • Cost of organising event could turn out to be more than the pot of money available.
Flexibility	The model would be flexible allowing for adaption depending on the community. This will allow for different aspects of localism, including the level of engagement which can be achieved from a local community and the demand for partnership working within that community.	The model would be fairly standard, although the model itself is naturally more flexible to the scope of activity that can be delivered.

Choosing the pilot model

The model for the pilots was chosen based on the best way to address risks associated with community safety. It is felt that the Community Safety Innovation Model will most successfully allow for initiative from the community to address risks that DSFRS have not been able to fully address in previous prevention activities. Model 2, Community Safety Innovation Model has therefore been chosen.

Choosing the pilot locations

The location for the pilots was chosen based on risk. To merit the money for a PB pilot the location must have risk which needs to be addressed. When developing LCPs and the activity that will be delivered, funding for activities is allocated on the basis of risk, this will be reflected in the pilot. Each model will be used in two different locations, and for 2011/12 pilots funding will be provided in addition to the agreed LCP budget.

Area	Ward(s)	Local Authority	Why the area is of special interest
Honicknowle, Plymouth	Honicknowle	Plymouth City Council	Honicknowle ward is one of the wards with the highest numbers of higher risk households within the DSFRS area. Between 01/04/2007 and 31/03/2010 thirty two Accidental Dwelling Fires occurred within the ward. For 2010/11 the figure is at least fifteen. This puts it within the top 15 wards in Devon and Somerset for accidental dwelling fires. The ward has over 1600 households in Mosaic Type O, 550 in Type M, 500 in Type N, within the ward.
Beacon Heath, Exeter	Mincinglake Pinhoe (Western Edge of), Whipton & Barton (part), Polsloe (part)	Devon County Council	There are a large number of Deliberate fires within the Beacon Heath area of Exeter. This is linked to high levels of anti-social behaviour in what is quite a deprived neighbourhood.
Hele, Torquay	Top part of Tormohun Ward and Lower Part of Watcombe Ward	Torbay	There are a very high number of high risk households within the Hele area particularly on the Pendennis Estate. The levels of deprivation put the area in the most deprived 10% nationally. There is an existing Hele project which means the residents are used to this type of activity. Both Tormohun ward and Watcombe ward are in the top 20 DSFRS wards for numbers of accidental dwelling fires
Minehead	N/A	Somerset	Minehead has a very large number of older residents and also a number of younger people. There are also relatively high levels of deprivation within the area which can potentially cause division within the community. Roads surrounding Minehead are known for accidents involving young drivers.

The events

Event	Honicknowle – Plymouth			
Topic	Anti-Social Behaviour			
Date & Time	Wednesday 23 rd November 2011, 6.30pm			
Run by	SM Ros Clarke, CM Dave Evans, Community Centre Volunteers, local PCSOs			
Partners involved	Plymouth City Council, Devon and Cornwall Police, Plymouth Community Safety Partnership			
Funding	£5440 Devon and Somerset Fire and rescue Service £1000 Anti-Social Behaviour and Criminal Damage Group (Plymouth) £1000 Anti-Social Behaviour Group Plymouth City Council £1000 Devon and Cornwall Police			
Publicity	28 th October – press releases inviting people to find out more at the community bus, follow up radio interview 1 st & 4 th November – community bus at various locations			
Venue	Honicknowle Community Centre			
Resources	Plymouth Community Bus – free of charge Posters and flyers – designed and printed in house Community centre – free of charge Refreshments - Provided by local caterer			
Attendance	Approx 100			
Applications	Group	Details	Asked for	Awarded
	Honicknowle Play Scheme	Re-open a holiday club that had closed due to lack of funding	£3857	£1500
	Junior Youth Club (5-11yrs)	Set up a youth club for under 11's	£2500	£2500
	Mini Music Centre Project	DJ booth for the local Community Centre	£2000	£1300
	Mobile Skateboard Equipment	Mobile skateboarding ramps for the local Community Centre	£2000	£1300
	Toadstools Pre-school	New equipment for local pre-school	£1500	£500

	Residents of Butt Park	Help local residents gate off a lane behind their houses where ASB often takes place	£840	£840
	Phoenix Centre	Diversionary equipment (PS3) for a youth drop-in centre	£750	£500
Voting technique	A ballot paper whereby the voter had to name the 4 projects (in order of preference) they would like to be supported by the PB project. It was made clear on the night that papers with only one vote would not be counted. It was felt that only those that had stayed for the presentations of all of the projects and cast their votes on the information provided would be accepted.			
Useful information	This was the only pilot to secure additional funding; this was achieved through DSFRS membership on the Plymouths Anti-Social Behaviour Board. This allowed for a partnership approach to undertaking the PB pilot.			
Appendix references	B			

Event	Beaconheath – Exeter			
Topic	<p>Making Beacon Heath Safe</p> <p>Supporting the Safer Devon Partnership & the Exeter Vision projects goals of reducing anti-social behaviour and building community cohesion.</p>			
Date & Time	Monday 12th March 2012 at 6.30 pm			
Run by	SM Nigel Deasy, SM Phil Picton. CM Sean Cooke			
Partners involved	None			
Funding	£5440 Devon and Somerset Fire and rescue Service			
Publicity	<p>Prevention team carried out information gathering activities with statutory agencies, local government and community groups involved in the Beacon Heath area.</p> <p>Also to find out about local priorities attended community forums, C2 connecting communities workshop hosted and sought to engage with local churches, Guides, Park Watch, Sure Start and the Knights Centre, youth club.</p> <p>We advertised and distributed the PB application forms amongst the residents and groups in Beacon Heath gaining help and support from those community groups previously mentioned.</p>			
Venue	Beacon Heath Church			
Resources	<p>Beacon Heath Church – free of charge</p> <p>Refreshments - £6</p>			
Attendance	25			
Applications	Group	Details	Asked for	Awarded
	Beacon Heath Church	For various “kids club” materials, juice maker and youth visit.	£470	£470
	Sure Start Parent Forum	Starting up of a residents forum as part of the C2 project (connecting communities)	£500	£500
	Knight Club	Decorating a disused room at the youth club and refitting it	£1500	£1700 Bid

				combined
	Knight Club	Buy equipment for general use at the club. Pool cues, basket balls, projector bulbs etc.	. £1700	
	39 th Exeter Guides	To take Girl Guides who have never been to London (some never outside of Exeter) on a trip to include visiting the Crown jewels	£362	£362
	Arena Park Residents Association	To organise play activities in the Easter and Summer holidays	£560	£560
	Knight Club	To build 1 of 4 sides to the new MUGA at Arena Park	£1200	£1200
	ISCA Church	To run events in the Beacon Heath area, including pub quizzes, barbeques and a Jubilee event	£450 (plus any extra for on-going pub quizzes)	£450
	Parks Watch	Wildlife club, youth worker for holidays	£2000	£0
	Exeter Football Club	Extend Soccer Safe project	£2000	£0
Voting technique	After the presentations the residents voted on a scale of preference and DSFRS applied a 1st past the post process, deducting the amount of funding requested from the total amount available until there was none left.			
Useful information	The work undertaken to get the community interested in the event lead to a much greater understanding of the local community groups operating in the area.			
Appendix references	C			

Event	Minehead			
Topic	Road and Community Safety			
Date & Time	Monday 27 th February 2012, 7.00pm			
Run by	GM Martin Carnell, WM Chris Jones, PB consultant Leslie Silverlock			
Partners involved	Minehead Eye			
Funding	£5000 Devon and Somerset Fire and rescue Service			
Publicity	<p>Following emails and calls made to a number of groups in Minehead, there was an initial awareness evening to gauge feelings and have an open floor discussion. A second session was set up to help those who were unable to attend the first session.</p> <p>Electronic flyers were also sent to local free press and community groups.</p>			
Venue	Minehead Eye			
Resources	Posters and flyers – designed in house and circulated electronically Minehead Eye– free of charge			
Attendance	50 on the night			
Applications	Group	Details	Asked for	Awarded
	St Michaels School PTA	Funds towards the replacement of the school swimming pool to help teach children swimming skills	£2500	£2500
	Minehead Eye	Scootability Road Safety sessions and equipment and location hire for the Children's Summer Holiday sessions, also to share some equipment with Clown's (Creating Learning Opportunities in Western Somerset)	£2500	£1150
	Minehead Cycling Club	Replacement of the club jerseys and safety equipment	£1500	£500

	Clowns (Creating Learning Opportunities in Western Somerset)	Survival Skills training for children and Road Safety Training equipment	£1000	£750
	Exmoor Coast Federation of Schools representing a total of 6 primary schools.	Early Learning Fire Safety resource box for reception classes throughout all the schools.	£600	£600
Voting technique	After the presentations score cards were used by all groups attending and those groups unable to attend. Own group voting was not allowed.			
Useful information	Using the Minehead Eye as a venue has increased engagement with some groups that had not previously been linked into this community hub.			
Appendix references	D			

Torquay

Although initial meetings were held in Torquay to start looking at carrying out a Participatory Budgeting exercise, due to the available resources at the time the exercise was not carried out. The funding for the Torquay pilot is still available during 2012/13 a Participatory Budgeting exercise will be carried out by DSFRS in the Watcombe area.

Findings

The aim of the activity was to carry out a series of PB pilots to see what the processes would offer a FRS as an engagement technique that could help improve community safety. As such the evaluation undertaken in this document will examine the process and impact of PB as a whole rather than the individual engagements. Each PB pilot will undertake a separate evaluation to monitor the impact of the projects awarded money.

To undertake the evaluation of the pilots it was decided to bring together the people who had carried out the pilots as part of a facilitated meeting. The meeting was facilitated by a PB consultant and the aims for the meeting were set as;

- Evaluate the process of setting up and running a PB event
- Evaluate the PB event itself
- Evaluate projects which resulted from the event
- Recommend a PB model for future use by the Service

Full details of the outcome of this meeting can be found in Appendix E. It was found that input from the community allows for specific risks to be addressed and the money is immediately available to have an impact. There is no bureaucracy involved and the process has a direct and tangible outcome. The community are fully in control of the decision taking responsibility for their own risk. To further examine how DSFR can take this technique forward in the future the findings can be divided into two main themes; the community impact and how to move PB forward in DSFRS.

Community Impact

The projects have only just started out so there will need to be further evaluation. However, earlier benefits have been a stronger relationship between the community and DSFRS.

Engagements with the public started as the 'same old people' but as further work was carried out within the community and knowledge was gained of the event and what it was about this snowballed to include a wider membership of the community.

Having pre-events to build up skills worked well as it helped people apply for funding and get the confidence to put together their presentations.

An important aspect of the engagement was to get people who were not directly impacted in the projects to attend and talking to each other.

The events raise the profile and understanding of DSFRS and improve its image and relationship with the community.

The events made people aware of the importance of self-reliance and sufficiency generating the realisation that the community needs to do things for themselves to help the level of resilience within their community.

It increased awareness within different groups of the community as to what they do and how they can work together.

DSFRS gained some useful and unexpected contacts with different groups.

How to move PB forward in DSFRS

Training:

Those that had attended the original training felt it had been useful as it had covered a range of topics and ended with practical application. It was noted that the training needed to be given in time to practically apply it to organising the PB process. It was felt that during the first round of training the majority of people who had attended were from a strategic perspective and that the training need to be delivered to those who would actually be carrying out the PB project.

It was suggested that it should be the Group Support Teams (GST) who are trained specifically in PB techniques as they could then identify risk and work with local staff with more general knowledge in engagement techniques. This would encourage a downward push of risk information and targeting and a feedback mechanism up from the communities to the GSTs.

It was agreed that: The content for the training was appropriate but that next time it needed to be aimed at the people carrying out the project: there needs to be enough people trained to offer an element of business continuity to ensure commitment to the community, as part of the process, and there would be opportunity to 'bounce ideas' when organising the event. It was also discussed that online resources through a forum such as SharePoint could be used to cascade training or as a refresher.

Helpful resources and contacts:

Literature from the PB unit including their webpages and main PB manual were found to be useful. Examples of other organisations on the PB Unit website were useful as they allowed other organisations to be contacted for advice. The Localism in Action publication and advice from the South West Localism Group provided a good point of advice taken from previous lessons learned.

It was suggest that to raise awareness in the future it would be good to add a PB area to the DSFRS SharePoint so people could find out about PB and link through to all resources on the portal. It was suggested that short video clips of events and testimonials from those who had received funding would help to capture the atmosphere PB creates and help to encourage people to plan their own PB events.

It was felt it was important to get partners and Councillors buy in by including them in the planning and carrying out of events. It was suggested one way of doing this would be to ensure Officers were strategically placed on the right forums.

Lessons learnt:

One of the issues that had arisen during the planning of the event had been the local perception of what DSFRS does and why it is involved in PB. However, PB was found to be a good tool to educate the local community that DSFRS does more than just attend emergencies and why it's important for them to be involved in this kind of community activity.

People didn't have an understanding of what PB is about, however using activities such as the local community bus and local radio allowed for awareness to be raised amongst the community where the event was being held.

More time was needed for planning and the right staff support was needed. Planning the event and getting people interested took more time than a normal engagement event and staff with the right skills were required.

Vote fixing on the evening could have become an issue, in one instance a group developed a sort of petition to collect signatures of their friends to count as votes even though these people would not be attending the event and watching the other presentations. This was not counted during the voting.

It was good to have the projects submitted beforehand allowing groups to get any help required to put a submission and presentation together. This allowed DSFRS to check if the projects were feasible and meet the criteria of the event.

It's better to have the event with partners such as the Police as this increases the pot of money and spreads the workload also enabling access to different parts of the community that are engaging with multiple agencies.

Value for Money

The aim of the activity was to carry out a series of PB pilots to see what the processes would offer the FRS as an engagement technique that could help improve community safety. As such the evaluation undertaken in this document will examine the process and impact of PB as a whole rather than the individual engagements. Each PB pilot will undertake a separate evaluation to monitor the impact of the projects awarded money and include evaluation of value for money. However, it is worth noting that it has already been identified that in the communities where pilots have taken place DSFRS staff have developed a closer relationship with other .

Analysis and Discussion

Community impact

Understanding – The events were not just about reducing risk in a more innovative way they also gave the public a greater understanding of the FRS as many still have an old fashioned view of the service.

Greater Impact - The awarded projects will be carried out in a meaningful way within the community. These are projects the community have asked for rather than something that is 'being done to them' and so it is hoped will have a greater impact on the community and address not just a statistical risk for us but a 'real' risk in the community.

Capacity building – The awarded money will allow for the community to take responsibility for itself, the resulting skills people learn from undertaking presentations as part of the process and the skills they use to carry the work on within the project can then be utilised in the community to make further improvements in other ways.

Networks – New networks have been created between community groups themselves. DSFRS now has additional networks that the community can go to with different issues and risks using them to start accessing the more hard to reach and vulnerable within the community.

Address real community risk –The risk that has been identified as a 'real risk' to the community therefore we can use the community knowledge along with our risk data to fully address issues within the community. As our data is historical using actual events, the community can be made aware of potential risks that have yet to happen and start showing on the statistics.

How to move PB forward in DSFRS

Training – training should follow a similar format to the initial event. However it should focus on those people who will be carrying out the events rather than the strategic lead. It should be the Group Support Teams (GST) who are trained specifically in PB techniques as they could then identify risk and work with local staff with more general knowledge in engagement techniques.

Resources - a PB area should be added to the DSFRS SharePoint so that people could find out about PB and link through to all resources on portal. If this were to include short video clips of events and testimonials from those who had received funding it would help to capture the atmosphere PB creates and encourage people to plan their own PB events.

Carrying out an event – training and resources should give advice on the timing and resources required for the event. A PB SharePoint site should provide standard templates and timescales and detail lessons learned in areas such as voting.

Model – each Pilot that was carried out took a slightly different approach, those involved felt that there should not be just one model available as each community is different and the level of engagement required will differ.

Conclusion

We didn't know if PB would work from an emergency service and risk based approach. In the past PB had been used often from some softer decisions but this was for events that would impact on the levels of risk and safety in the community. Innovative projects that were and relevant to the community, that we had not thought of came forward to address risk.

The feedback and thanks we got from community was overwhelming for Officers and has given a new life to community work and engagement in the areas of the service that were involved. It gave a big element of job satisfaction seeing the impact on the community and how pleased they were.

Overall the benefits that have been identified through the PB pilots can be summarised as;

- Different groups in the community are now aware of each other and in some instances working together
- Development of DSFRS staff
- Increased local intelligence
- Wider perception of DSFRS within the community
- People focusing on improving quality life in general and addressing not just our need but theirs as well
- Community capacity building

Recommendations

1. To fully evaluate all the activities that resulted from the PB pilots.
2. To report the evaluation to Service Delivery Group and Community Safety Committee.
3. For PB to form part of the Community Safety Engagement Tool Kit. (As part of the corporate community engagement blue print and corporate activity to get people more involved in decision making.)
4. To make funding available as part of the LCP process to carry out PB activities.
5. To develop a SharePoint site to raise awareness of PB, provide training documents and downloadable resources.

Appendices

A. Training Paperwork

Participatory Budgeting(PB) Training
19th August 2011
Conference Room A

9.30	Coffee	
10.00 – 10.15	Introductions & reasons for today's training	AHB
10.15 - 10.45	What is PB and why do it?	LS
10.45 – 11.15	The DSFRS model of PB (including parameters for the events)	AHB
11.15 – 11.30	Coffee	
11.30 -12.30	Things to consider when arranging PB events:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Venue • Partners • Resources • Generating Interest • Processing applications • Voting options • Running the day • Evaluation 	AHB & LS AHB & LS AHB & LS AHB & LS LS LS LS KV
12.30 – 1.30	Lunch	
1.30 – 3.30	Facilitated planning of events (including break for coffee)	AHB: Exeter – Beaconheath GA: Minehead RB: Plymouth - Honicknowle LS: Torbay - Hele
3.30 – 4.00	Next Steps	AHB

A Checklist of Facilitators, Organisers and Helpers for a PB event

In a perfect world you might need some or all of these:

Facilitator who understands the aims of the event or a pair of facilitators who share the responsibility for keeping the event on track, people understanding and involved, and maintaining cohesion.

Back-up facilitator (if only one is booked)

Timekeeper with sounding gong, whistle, or bell

Technician to ensure microphones, PowerPoint projectors and laptops, all work smoothly, if you are using technology

Tellers people to count votes

Board writer or IT typist for calculations, changes in amounts bid for, or messages during the event

Returning officer some organisations have used this as an opportunity to involve the police, especially a neighbourhood beat officer where the event is held in a specific community

Caterers, waiters, as needed

Meeters and greeters at the door (young people, community reps, professional partners), briefed to answer questions

Chaperone for senior councillors and officers

Media liaison person

Publicist to gather quotes throughout

Evaluator

Leslie Silverlock, Localism and PB advisor, lesliesilverlock@groupswork.com, 07831 711380

Initial planning sheet for a PB event

Participatory Budgeting Project Name	Why/What for?
---	---------------

Who is it for?	
Partners – see separate list	
Community	
Planning Group	
Sources of Money	
Subject or General	
Inviting Ideas/Bids/Projects	
Shortlisting/Prioritising	
Voting	
Review & Monitoring	
Evaluation	
Timescale How long/How much?	

Leslie Silverlock, Localism and PB advisor, lesliesilverlock@groupswork.com, 07831 711380

Partners – don't do it alone

Benefits:

- better publicity, networking, applications, attendance, engagement;
- fresh ideas, innovation, lateral creativity;
- education about your service;
- matched funding.

Organisation	Help and research	Applications	Matched funding
<i>The Community</i>			
Youth participation groups			
Youth clubs			
Youth programmes			
Tenants & residents groups			
Neighbourhood Watch			
Victim Support			
Black & minority ethnic groups			
Gay & lesbian support groups			
Parent & family support groups			
Faith/church reps			
Businesses/retailers			
Voluntary sector workers			
Counselling services			
Local radio/TV/papers			
Sports centres			
Neighbourhood Wardens			
<i>Police and Justice</i>			
Community safety inspector			
Community beat officer/manager			
Sector sergeant/inspector			
Crime reduction officer			
Crime prevention officer			
Community support officer			
Probation officer			
Youth Offending Team manager/officer			
Youth Inclusion Support Panel worker			
<i>Fire and Rescue Service</i>			
Area fire officer			
Community fire safety officer			
Youth worker			
<i>Council/Local Authority/Housing</i>			
Community safety co-ordinator			
ASB co-ordinator			
Housing officer/manager			

Housing association/Tenant participation			
Leisure services officer/manager			
Neighbourhood/street/parish warden			
Community development worker			
Environmental services/Health			
Cleansing/parks staff/manager			
Councillors			
Parish/town clerks			
Elected members (parish & town councils)			
Youth worker			
Regeneration worker			
Connexions adviser			
Learning disability social worker			
Young people's support services			
Child/family social worker			
Education welfare officer			
Gipsy/traveller liaison officer			
Racial Equality Council			
Trading standards officer			
Transport planners			
Libraries and IT centres			
Connexions			
Schools/Colleges			
School & college heads			
Teachers with pastoral responsibility			
Citizenship specialists			
Behaviour support staff			
Catering staff			
Workers with excluded pupils			
Health			
GP			
Health visitor			
Practice nurse			
Mental health social worker			
Drug & alcohol support workers			
Health promotion manager			
Regional & National			
MP			
Government offices			
Learning and Skills Council			
Neighbourhood Resource Centre			

Processing applications - DSFRS

1. Decide the boundaries for expenditure:
 - increased local and/or service knowledge
 - reducing risk
 - saving lives
 - reducing casualties
 - tackling antisocial behaviour
2. Publicise the opportunity clearly and succinctly
Which media?
 - Newspapers and magazines?
 - Radio and TV?
 - Leaflets?
 - Posters?
 - Presentations at local group, partners, and council meetings?
3. Involve local people and partners from the outset, and in as many tasks as possible. Consider forming a team and conducting a briefing on PB and what you are hoping to achieve. Do this either to a group which you form for the purpose or an existing organisation.
4. Allow enough time for applicants to organise their bids and presentations; one month unless you want to minimise applications or target specific groups which you might invite to apply personally. Reduce the risks of negative publicity from disappointed groups/organisations you have excluded.
5. Provide support in bid writing/applications/developing ideas; consider using partners, to minimise your workload and spread understanding about what you are hoping to achieve.
Many groups need help with their bids; some of the most promising will not come from experienced bid writers or presenters. Many people are terrified of making presentations but don't let them duck this – the most natural and 'real' will win support. Allow time and support for rehearsals, and materials for displays. Allow time for emails and phone calls to you or your team to answer questions. Appoint a named contact(s). PB is novel to most people. Introduced and explained as simply as possible people are easily fired up to participate.
6. Don't be too prescriptive about the community safety limitations you place on bids if community engagement is your priority.
7. If possible do not filter applications unless totally inappropriate. Include all applicants and their proposals in the voting event if possible so that the community genuinely votes on all the options without prior professional filtering - only shortlist if absolutely necessary and if that can be explained successfully to all concerned.
8. Pitfalls;
 - enticing inappropriate bids and disappointing people, groups, organisations

either

- prior to the event
- at the event
- after the event
- promote networking and beware gossip and disaffection from fall out.

9. Ensure community development support throughout the process; leave no communications to chance.

10. The integrity of engagement:

Test all your actions for their inclusiveness. Always measure the risk of exclusion; the smallest exclusion can damage your reputation and standing in the community, including with partners, councils, and elected members. They can be cynical initially about PB and what you are trying to achieve - and always value the process once they have witnessed it in action.

Leslie Silverlock, Localism and PB advisor, lesliesilverlock@groupswork.com, 07831 711380

A sample timetable for a simple, grant making PB event

3pm Prepare venue and make it ready and welcoming so that organisers can talk to and reassure early arrivals, provide rehearsal space for presenters, time for presenters to check equipment/layout etc

5pm Doors open one hour before the official start of the event for refreshments and networking

6pm Expert introduction to the event, why it is being held, what the issues are, the voting procedure and timetable

6.10pm 3 minute presentations, with seven minutes for questions and deliberation by small groups gathered at tables

7.10pm First ballot - either individuals or group
Break for light refreshment (and networking)

7.25pm Announce results of trial ballot

Continue break for deals between groups, and lobbying

7.45pm Announce any changes and deals

7.50 Final vote, ballot counting

8pm Announcement of results

Refreshments served again for up to an hour after the formal event is concluded to encourage networking, cohesion and action.

Leslie Silverlock, Localism and PB advisor, lesliesilverlock@groupswork.com, 07831 711380

PB - Voting Options

After hearing presentations about different priorities and projects for spending a grant pot, participants can be asked to vote using a variety of methods:

- 1. Hands up:** open voting with a show of hands for each project according to participants' wishes to place which proposal first, second, third etc
- 2. Sequential ballot:** everybody votes for their first choice in a secret ballot. Once the first choice has been announced, participants vote for their next choice, and so on until the pot is spent.
- 3. Ballot paper:** one ballot paper is distributed, on which all bids are listed for prioritising by each participant.
- 4. Group voting:** small groups, 5 to 8 participants, sitting together are asked to rate each bid against three criteria:
 - Is it good value for money?
 - Is it workable?
 - Are the benefits wide enough?

Each criterion is voted on a scale 1 to 5 enabling bids to achieve a maximum of 15 points. The small groups vote for one another's bids but not their own.

At a closed event only the bidding groups vote. At an open event other attendees are asked to either join bidding groups, or form fresh small voting groups, mixed in order to avoid cartels. Ideally everybody will be involved; no bystanders even among visiting councillors and professionals. Being 'watched' or supervised is not attractive to participants at this kind of event, and undermines the concepts inherent in PB.

5. Trial vote: using any of the above techniques participants cast their votes in a practice run; this is followed by a break, with refreshments, for organisations/groups to negotiate, having seen the trial results, to adjust their bids, amalgamate with others, withdraw, donate to others etc.

Groups or MC announce the results of the deliberation, and any changes that they want to make, at the end of the break and participants move to the **Final Vote**.

Deliberation is important in every PB process. Time needs to be built in for this, either after each presentation or when all the presentations have been heard.

5. Mainstreaming Events

Authorities, public services, or partnerships can involve their constituents in prioritising either

- those parts of their budget which are open to some flexibility, or
- separate parts of specific services, with or without budget.

Again, presentations can be invited from constituent groups, made by the services themselves, or by community groups, for the public to vote on priorities. Deliberation is also an important part of this process.

Leslie Silverlock, Localism and PB advisor, lesliesilverlock@groupswork.com, 07831 711380

B. Honicknowle - Plymouth



**DEVON &
SOMERSET**
FIRE & RESCUE SERVICE



in partnership with



Devon & Cornwall Police
Building safer communities together



How would you spend £8000 on reducing anti-social behaviour in Honicknowle?

For more information jump aboard the Community Bus which will be making the following stops:

Tuesday 1 November

9am - 2pm Tesco, Transit Way
2pm - 4pm West Park
4pm - 6pm Honicknowle Green

Friday 4 November

12pm - 6pm Tesco, Transit Way

Information evening:

Wednesday 9 Nov 2011 - 6.30pm

Vote night:

Wednesday 23 Nov 2011 - 6.30pm

Come to Honicknowle Community Centre and help to make a difference.

Contact our Community Safety Department
t. 01752 333600 e. firekills@dsfire.gov.uk.



Press Release

Release date 28 October 2011

Media Invite

Devon & Somerset Fire & Rescue Service (DSFRS) are asking local people to jump aboard the Plymouth Community Bus and explore ideas on how they would spend £8,000 on reducing anti-social behaviour within the community of Honicknowle?

DSFRS are piloting a Participatory Budgeting (PB) project which has been chosen by the Fire Authority within the Plymouth area. The event is the first stage of the PB project, designed to empower local people in deciding directly how public money is spent on projects and services.

The public and the media are invited to this community engagement event on Tuesday, 1 November, from 9am - 2pm at Tesco, Transit Way in Plymouth. Local people can learn more about the project and will be encouraged to put together an application and bid for the money or part of.

What is participatory budgeting?

PB directly involves local people in making decisions on the spending priorities for a defined public budget. This means engaging residents, community groups and representatives of all parts of the community, to discuss spending priorities, make spending proposals and voting on them.

The PB Unit's description is: "PB directly involves local people in making decisions on the spending priorities for defined public budget. This means engaging residents and community groups, representative of all parts of the community to discuss spending priorities, make spending proposals and vote on them." Communicating the project to the community and encouraging them to put together their applications and bid for the money."

The community bus will stop at the following stops:

Tuesday 1 November

9am – 2pm Tesco, Transit Way

2pm – 4pm West Park

4pm – 6pm Honicknowle Green

Friday 4 November

12pm – 6pm Tesco, Transit Way

The information evening will be held at Honicknowle Community Centre on Wednesday 9th at 6.30pm

The consultation evening where the voting will take place will be held at Honicknowle Community Centre on Wednesday 9th at 6.30, Wednesday 23 Nov.

Ends

Note to newsdesks

Please can media confirm with Suzie Izzard if they will be attending Tesco, Transit Way on the 1 November.

For more press information or interviews please contact

Suzie Izzard

t. 01392 872296

m. 07812 148426

sizzard@dsfire.gov.uk

Keep up to date and follow 'dsfireupdates' on twitter and Devon & Somerset Fire & Rescue Service on Facebook



Press Release

Release date 10 January 2012

Media Invite

The media are invited to a cheque presentation at Honicknowle Community Centre in Plymouth, 19 January at 2.00pm. The presentation is a result of the successful completion of Devon & Somerset Fire & Rescue Service first Participatory Budgeting event in the Honicknowle area of Plymouth.

Participatory Budgeting is essentially about letting local people decide how they would like a defined amount of public budget money spent within their communities. Local people present their proposed projects and the local community through means of a vote decide how the money is to be divided. The event in Honicknowle focused specifically on projects that would reduce anti-social behaviour in the area.

Community Safety Officer from Plymouth, Ros Clarke who has been involved with the project from the start said: "I enjoyed organising and running the event and gained a lot from the whole experience. It was a nice feeling knowing that we were able to help people make their communities safer and empower them to make a difference."

The voting evening took place on 23 November with eight funding bids presented to the audience.

A total of £8000 was donated to this event; £1000 from the Anti- Social Behaviour and Criminal Damage Group in Plymouth, £1000 from the Anti-social Behaviour unit in Plymouth City Council, £1000 from the Police and £5440 from Devon & Somerset Fire & Rescue Service.

Breakdown of the projects and funding awarded as follows;

£2500 – set up a youth club for under 11's (awarded full amount)
£1500 – re-open a holiday club that had closed due to lack of funding
£1300 – DJ booth for the local community centre
£1300 – mobile skateboarding ramps for the local community centre
£840 – help local residents gate off a lane behind their houses where anti-social behaviour often takes place (awarded full amount)
£500 – diversionary equipment (PS3) for a youth drop-in centre
£500 – new equipment for local pre-school

All seven of the projects were successful in receiving funding, two were awarded full funding and the other five were part funded. Ros added: "That all parties went away from the evening happy and enabled to progress with their chosen projects."

Ends**Note to newsdesks**

The cheque presentation takes place on 19 January at the Honicknowle Community Centre in Plymouth at 14.00.

For more press information or interviews please contact

Suzie Izzard

t. 01392 872296

m. 07812 148426

sizzard@dsfire.gov.uk

Keep up to date and follow 'dsfireupdates' on twitter and Devon & Somerset Fire & Rescue Service on Facebook

Best wishes

Suzie Izzard



Press Release

20 January 2012

Local community get their say in how to spend public money

Devon & Somerset Fire & Rescue Service's first Participatory Budgeting event is hailed as a success as the Service, along with partner agencies, donated £8,000 of their funding for the community to decide on how it should be spent.

The partners donated the budget for community projects and invited local groups to bid for the money. Representatives from the public were then asked to decide which initiatives should receive the funding.

Participatory Budgeting directly involves local people and communities in making decisions on the spending and priorities for a defined public budget. The aim is to provide greater power to communities in how money is spent as well as increasing transparency, accountability, understanding and inclusion. It allows communities to have influence over projects, budgets and new services in a more democratic and transparent way.

Community Safety Officer for Plymouth, Ros Clarke has been involved with the project from the start, she said: "We held the event in Honicknowle in November last year, and made sure we advertised it as much as we could throughout the local area. It has been rewarding knowing that we were able to help people make their communities safe and empower them to make a difference."

Ros continued to say that, "in practice, local people present their proposed projects and the local community vote on how the money should be divided. The event in Honicknowle focussed specifically on projects that would aim to reduce anti-social behaviour in the area."

The voting evening took place on 23 November with eight funding bids presented to the audience.

A total of £8000 was donated to this event; £1000 from the Anti- Social Behaviour and Criminal Damage Group in Plymouth, £1000 from the Anti-social Behaviour unit in Plymouth City Council, £1000 from the Police and £5440 from Devon & Somerset Fire & Rescue Service.

Breakdown of the projects and funding awarded as follows:

£2500 – set up a youth club for under 11's (awarded full amount)
£1500 – re-open a holiday club that had closed due to lack of funding
£1300 – DJ booth for the local community centre
£1300 – mobile skateboarding ramps for the local community centre
£840 – help local residents gate off a lane behind their houses where anti social behaviour often takes place (awarded full amount)
£500 – diversionary equipment (PS3) for a youth drop-in centre
£500 – new equipment for local pre-school

All seven of the projects were successful in receiving funding, two were awarded full funding and the other five were part funded. Ros added: "It was great that all parties went away from the evening happy and enabled to progress with their chosen projects."

Ends

Note to newsdesks

Photographs available from the press office please contact:

Ends

For more press information please contact:

Paul Slaven

PR Officer

01392 872259

pslaven@dsfire.gov.uk

Keep up to date and follow 'dsfireupdates' on twitter and Devon & Somerset Fire & Rescue Service on Facebook

Consultation Evening



Cheque Awards



B. Beaconheath - Exeter

The Event



Cheque presentations

Girl Guides



Arena Park residents



D. Minehead



DEVON &
SOMERSET
FIRE & RESCUE SERVICE

minehead
eye

I'd like to purchase
some new road safety
equipment for our
playgroup

I'd like to teach
children in my
school how to be
safer on the roads

I'd like to keep my
club members safer
in the community



How would you spend £5000 on improving road and community safety in the Minehead area?

For more information

Find our page 'Minehead Fire Station' on Facebook



Like us on
Facebook

Also see local press for details.

Vote night:

Monday 27th February 2012
7.00pm at Minehead Eye.

Come along and help make a difference in your community.

Contact Watch Manager Chris Jones
t. **07854 830832**
e. cjones@dsfire.gov.uk

Cheque presentations



To help communicate the event a pilot Community Facebook page was set up for Minehead Station.



Alan Coxon
 Group Commander Community Safety Prevention
 Service Headquarters
 The Knowle
 Clyst St George
 Exeter
 Devon
 EX3 ONW

10th September 2012

Dear Mr Coxon

I am writing to you regarding the £750 grant that we received from you in May.

We have now used the grant in the following way:-

Large Roadway Kit plus Fire Tabards	£282.00
Traffic Signs, Lights, Emergency Tabards	£143.82
Traffic and Emergency Tabards (two sets required)	35.94
Survival Bushcraft Tuition for Summer Playschemes	£139.20
Woodland Tuition	£160.31

TOTAL	£761.27
-------	---------

Please find attached invoice to validate this information. The difference of £11.27 has come from other donations we have received.

We would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your support.

Kind Regards

Kathy Morton
 Manager



Creating Learning Opportunities in Western Somerset for children and adults



CLOWNS SUMMER PLAYSCHMES 2012

CLOWNS provided 12 days of playschemes for school age children to 13 years of age in 11 different venues across West Somerset from 25th July – 13th August.

This year funding came from West Somerset Council, Parish Councils, Garfield Weston Foundation, Magna Housing Association, Somerset County Council Short Breaks, Devon and Somerset Fire and Rescue Service and booking fees. We would like to take this opportunity of thanking all of the above for their support.

231 different children attended 522 days between them, an average of 43 children per day.

Children had the opportunity to take part in the following activities:-

Cricket Coaching

Circus Skills with Hannah Aitken

Woodland Adventure with Kurt Luty

Artsy Workshops with Dan and Sally Bryant

Outside day at Nutcombe Bottom with the National Park and the Crown Estate, which included den building, signal fires and toasted marshmallows.

Stream dipping, woodland adventure and insect hunting at Nettlecombe Field Study Centre.

Kayaking, climbing wall, archery and woodland adventure at Wimbleball, many thanks to South West Lakes.

Water week with slides and water based games

Sports, games and different weekly arts and crafts.

Feedback from the childrens evaluation forms has been extremely positive confirming that the activities provided surpassed their expectations.

Feedback from parent/carers evaluations has also been positive and very constructive:-

“Myself and my daughter would like to thank you and your wonderful staff for running these summer playschemes, my daughter has had further integration with pupils from Danesfield which is making her transition from 1st school much smoother – thank you”

“My son enjoys coming even when he does not know anyone so you obviously manage the “single” children well otherwise he would not want to come”

“Clowns is great, especially for working mums the children always have a good time and you know they are happy and safe”

“Absolutely brilliant , I don’t know what we would do without CLOWNS in the summer”

“My daughter loves coming to CLOWNS. It is a shame you have to struggle to get funding each year for what is a well run brilliant scheme”

“Shame it couldn’t go back to 4 weeks! When my child was hurt information and care was really good, thank you”

“My son really loves CLOWNS (as do I!) more funding and more playschemes, thanks for another great summer”

Kathy Morton said “I would like to take this opportunity to thank all the staff team for all their hard work with preparation and delivery and volunteers for helping to make this such a successful year. Also to parents/carers who have written in to say how much their children have benefited from the schemes, this does help with future funding and I would like to say what a delight the children were to have on the schemes.

Regarding the Road Safety Equipment, Minehead Eye has used some of the equipment but the larger parts did not arrive until recently. We intend to start advertising that we have this available for hire.

Article in School newsletter

Devon and Somerset Fire and Rescue Service Participatory Budgeting Event - Monday February 27th - 7.00pm

At 7.00pm on Monday February 27th our school will be leading a bid on behalf of the Exmoor Coast Federation group of schools at a Participatory Budgeting event at Minehead Eye that is being organised by the Devon and Somerset Fire and Rescue Service.

We will be bidding for £600 to buy an Early Learning Fire Safety kit for teaching young children about fire safety. Over the past few weeks we have borrowed this resource from the Fire and Rescue Service and our Reception Class have been using it to learn about fire safety.

We have been so impressed with this resource that we would like to purchase an ELFS kit that can be shared by the schools in the Exmoor Coast Federation; that is Minehead First School, St Michael's First School, St Dubricius First School, Cutcombe First School, Timberscombe First School and our own school. It would be a resource that would help to teach approximately 150 Reception Class children a year about fire safety.

At the Participatory Budgeting event in Minehead there will be a number of other organisations and groups bidding for sums of money from the £5000 that will be on offer. When the presentations have been made by all of the organisations and groups making a bid it will be up to a vote of those attending the meeting to decide where the money goes.

We therefore need as many parents and carers to come along and vote for us at this event on Monday February 27th.



Tel: 01643 821254

Fax: 01643 821243

office@dunster.somerset.sch.ukwww.dunsterschool.org

13 St Georges Street
Dunster, Minehead
TA24 6RX



Creating Learning Opportunities in Western Somerset for children and adults



Alan Coxon
Group Commander Community Safety Prevention
Service Headquarters
The Knowle
Clyst St George
Exeter
Devon
EX3 0NW

10th May 2012

Dear Mr Coxon

I am writing on behalf of CLOWNS to thank you for the grant of £750.00.

This grant will enable us to purchase Road Safety Equipment to hold in our Toy Library and rent to groups within West Somerset, it will also enable us to hold survival workshops during our summer playschemes.

Please pass on our thanks to all concerned.

Yours sincerely

KATHY MORTON
MANAGER

E. Evaluation Meeting

**Devon and Somerset Fire and Rescue Services
PB Pilot Projects Evaluation
Thursday 31st May
9:30-2:00**

Aims for the day

Evaluate the process of setting up and running a PB event
Evaluate the PB event itself
Evaluate projects which resulted from the event
Recommend a PB model for future use by the Service

10.10 – 11.10

Evaluate the process of setting up and running a PB event

1. The PB Training. What we covered: PB, its origins, and models; processing applications; planning an event; voting techniques and options; partners; matched funding; staffing/helpers; timetabling; councillors; community responsibility, expertise, ownership, engagement; young people; West Country casestudies; the political context; localism and decentralisation;

1. How helpful was it to you?
2. Did it cover the right issues?
3. Were the right people there?
4. What changes would you suggest next time?
5. Central or cascade training – which would work best in our Service?

2. PB

1. What did you know already about PB?
2. Did you find any resources that helped – people, ideas or materials?
3. How do we raise awareness in F&R, and with our partners, of this type of inclusion, localism and devolution method?

3. Event Planning

1. What was the need for the event?
2. Things that went well & things that didn't in the planning?
3. SHQ support – how little/much needed?
4. Contact with the public and their engagement – what worked best and why?
5. How did you make it accessible to everyone/your target audience/the optimum number of people?
6. What's different from running other engagement events?
7. Better organised on your own or with partners?
8. Any success with matched funding or resources in kind?

11.30 – 12.30**Evaluate the PB event itself**

1. Location, venue?
2. Who came?
3. How many?
4. Were they the people you expected/targeted?
5. What did they think of it?
6. What was your timetable like?
7. Helpers, staff involved, right ones?
8. Prioritising, Voting and Deliberation – what worked/what didn't?
9. Impacts for F&RS?
10. Impacts on F&RS?
11. Before and after relationships – changes?
12. Costs and benefits?
13. Partners - with or without?
14. Unexpected benefits, surprises?
15. Anecdotes – cohesion, capacity building, reputation?
16. Benefits to the community (if not covered above)?

12.30 – 1.00pm**Evaluate projects which result from the event**

1. Which F&RS priorities or needs will they address?
2. What have projects achieved so far?
3. Speculate about future developments from the projects?
4. Any measures of success? What could be counted easily?
5. Feedback/quotes/stories/feelings/positive and negative changes/media/film/photos/writing/artwork?
6. Increased knowledge or understanding by the project?
7. Wider engagement of individuals, vol.orgs, statutory orgs, politicians/budget holders/decision makers?
8. Consequences for the project group: relationships, recognition, further developments, views on F&RS?
9. Added value/unexpected benefits likely from projects funded?

Feedback from facilitated evaluation event

1. The PB Training.

What we covered: PB, its origins, and models; processing applications; planning an event; voting techniques and options; partners; matched funding; staffing/helpers; timetabling; councillors; community responsibility, expertise, ownership, engagement; young people; West Country case studies; the political context; localism and decentralisation.

How helpful was it to you?

Those that had attended the original training felt it had been useful as it had covered a range of topics and ended with practical application. Although it was noted that the training needed to be given in time to practically apply it to organising the PB process.

Were the right people there?

It was felt that during the first round of training the majority of people who had attended were from a strategic perspective and that the training need to be delivered to those who would actually be carrying out the PB project.

It was suggested that it should be the Group Support Teams (GST) who are trained specifically in PB techniques as they could then identify risk and work with local staff with more general knowledge in engagement techniques. This would encourage a downward push of risk information and targeting and a feedback mechanism up from the communities to the GSTs.

What changes would you suggest next time?

It was agreed that that content was appropriate but that next time it needed to be aimed at the people carrying out the project. Also, there needs to be enough people trained to offer an element of business continuity to ensure that commitments to the community as part of the process could be met and there would be opportunity to 'bounce ideas' when organising the event. It was also discussed that online resources through a forum such as SharePoint could be used to cascade training or as a refresher.

Central or cascade training – which would work best in our Service?

Central training of GSTs with online support resources to cascade to those involved in the projects but not leading.

2. PB

What did you know already about PB?

Central departments had become aware of PB through the South West Localism Group and the PB Unit. This had developed an understanding of the potential of PB for DSFRS and the possible options for holding events. Group Support Teams had become aware of PB through LGA forums, Total Place and the training provided.

Did you find any resources that helped – people, ideas or materials?

Literature from the PB unit including their webpages and main PB manual were found to be useful. Examples of other organisations on the PB Unit website were useful as they allowed other organisations to be contacted for advice. The Localism in Action publication and advice from the South West Localism Group also provided a good point of advice from previous lessons learned.

How do we raise awareness in F&R, and with our partners, of this type of inclusion, localism and devolution method?

It was suggest to raise awareness in the future it would be good to add a PB area to the DSFRS SharePoint so people could find out about PB and link through to all resources from on portal. It was suggested that short video clips of events and testimonials from those who had received funding would help to capture the atmosphere PB creates and help to encourage people to plan their own PB events.

It was also felt it was important to get partner and Cllr buy in by including them in the planning and carrying out of events. It was suggested one way of doing this would be to ensure Officers were strategically placed on the right forums.

3. Event Planning

What was the need for the event?

The need for the events had been determined by risk and the need to reduce it. It was suggested that in the future the need should be based on risk but also the need to use a specific tool to bring about change and cohesion in a community.

Things that went well & things that didn't in the planning?

One of the issues that had arisen during the planning of the event had been the local perception of what DSFRS does and why it is involved in PB. However, PB was found to be a good tool to educate the local community that DSFRS does more than just attend emergencies and why it's important for them to be involved in this kind of community activity.

People didn't have an awareness of what PB is however using activities such as the local community bus and local radio allowed for awareness to be raised in the community where the event was being held.

More time was needed for planning and the right staff support was needed. Planning the event and getting people interested took more time than a normal engagement event and staff with the right skills were required.

Vote fixing on the evening could have become an issue, in one instance a group developed a sort of petition to collect signatures of their friends to count as votes even though these people would not be attending the event and watching the other presentations. This was not counted during the voting.

It was good to have the projects submitted beforehand which allowed groups to get any help required to put a submission and presentation together but also allowed DSFRS to check if the projects were feasible and meet the criteria of the event.

SHQ support – how little/much needed?

Support from central departments is mainly needed for training, communications and advice.

Contact with the public and their engagement – what worked best and why?

Engagements with the public started as the 'same old people' but as further work was carried out in the community and knowledge was gained of the event and what it was about this snowballed to include other members of the community.

Having pre-events to build up skills worked well as it help people apply for the funding and get the confidence to put together their presentations.

An important aspect of the engagement was to get people who were not directly impacted in the projects to attend and talking to each other. Incentives such as cake were used to do this.

How did you make it accessible to everyone/your target audience/the optimum number of people?

To make the events accessible they were held in buildings that were already accessed regularly by the community so they were already physically accessible but the community were also comfortable in the building. Pre events were also held to give people the support in applying and communications were carried out in a range of different mediums to communicate to all areas of the local community.

What's different from running other engagement events?

Input from the community allows for specific risks to be addressed and the money is immediately available to have an impact. There is no bureaucracy involved in the process there is a direct and tangible outcome. The community are fully in control of the decision and start to take responsibility for their own risk.

How well it is received compared to other events, the difference that the funds make and development opportunity for staff and their relationships with the community. As a result people in that community are more open each time you see them.

To raise the profile and understanding of DSFRS and improve its image and relationship with the community.

Better organised on your own or with partners?

It's better to have the event with partners such as the Police, it increases the pot of money and spreads the workload but also enables access to different parts of the community that are engaging with different agencies.

Any success with matched funding or resources in kind?

See event summary tables in main part of report

4. Evaluate the PB event itself

Location, venue?

See event summary tables in main part of report

Who came?

Engagements with the public started as the 'same old people' but as further work was carried out in the community and knowledge was gained of the event and what it was about this snowballed to include other members of the community.

How many?

See event summary tables in main part of report

Were they the people you expected/targeted?

Yes based on the groups that were bidding
Yes, community representatives already engaged in running support activities

What did they think of it?

They thought it was a great idea bringing both the bidders, community groups and the service together
Happy to have opportunity to get money

What was your timetable like?

A paper based format that was distributed on the evening to allow visitors to see how long the process would take.

Helpers, staff involved, right ones?

Yes. The use of a national expert was a great asset and very informative and helpful throughout.
Yes but took a major part of management time to deliver.

Prioritising, Voting and Deliberation – what worked/what didn't?

Even though initially some groups did not succeed the other community groups offered to step in and share funding.
Community decided on sliding scale of 1 – 5 based on listening to groups presenting their ideas.

Impacts for FRS?

Overall very positive.

Impacts on FRS?

Staff felt some guilt over whom got the perceived first place, even though all groups walked away with money.

Huge PR opportunity, it gave esteem beyond heroism and enhanced the service reputation.

Before and after relationships – changes?

Better relationships with the groups locally with often unofficial updates to how the money is being spent.

Some direct contact before PB with some of these groups No after contact due to other priorities. This will be addresses by returning for evaluation purposes.

Costs and benefits?

Demonstrates new direction to FRS as a truly local champion, gave development opportunities for staff, and had a positive impact on recipients.

Partners - with or without?

See event summary tables in main part of report

Unexpected benefits, surprises?

Lack of previous insight into some groups in the community

Anecdotes – cohesion, capacity building, reputation?

Undoubtably boosted our reputation amongst these groups.

Very positive, good way of raising FRS profile and working in local areas, just need the staff posts to maintain this connection

Benefits to the community (if not covered above)?

The events made people aware of the importance of self-reliance / sufficiency and generated the realisation that community needs to do things themselves to help the level of resilience in their community.

Increased awareness of different groups in the community to each other, what they do and how they can work together.

DSFRS gained some useful and unexpected contacts with different groups.

5. Evaluate projects which result from the event

Which F&RS priorities or needs will they address?

Antisocial behaviour, deliberate fires, fire safety, road safety, water safety, youth engagement, community capacity building,

What have projects achieved so far?

The projects have only just started out so there will need to be further evaluation. However, earlier benefits have been a stronger relationship in the community and between DSFRS and the community. A well as an increased awareness of DSFRS as more than just responding to emergencies.

Speculate about future developments from the projects?

The projects have only just started out so there will need to be further evaluation

Any measures of success? What could be counted easily?

Through the ELFs package 150 children will be delivered our package for the price of the box.

The addition of the gate in Plymouth immediately increases the quality of life and the enthusiasm for the classes that turned up for the Cheque presentation in Plymouth show the backing for the projects.

Some of the outcomes are hard to measurer due to the early year's intervention for future benefit.

Increased knowledge or understanding by the project?

New perception of the work DSFRS does in in the community.

Wider engagement of individuals, vol.orgs, statutory orgs, politicians/budget holders/decision makers?

The events brought the community together, reduce gaps between groups and gave groups appreciation of each other. The Minehead event sold the idea of PB to three West Somerset District Councillors.

Consequences for the project group: relationships, recognition, further
Added value/unexpected benefits likely from projects funded?

- The Minehead Eye & Cycling Club now work together
- DSFRS are able to use the pool for Swimsafe
- Development of staff
- Increased local intelligence
- Wider perception of DSFRS within the community
- We helped to people focus and improve quality life in general addressing not just our need but theirs as well.