



Stirling Community Planning
Partnership
Evaluation of the Night-time Economy
Action Plan
Final Report

May 2010

Prepared by

progressive

17 Corstorphine Road
Edinburgh, EH12 6DD
Tel: 0131 316 1900 Fax: 0131 316 1901

69 St Vincent Street
Glasgow, G2 5TF
Tel. 0141 226 8895

Email: info@progressivepartnership.co.uk

Main Contact:
Alex Hilliam



Table of Contents

1.	Introduction and Objectives	4
2.	Methodology	7
3.	Perceptions of SafeBase 09	9
4.	Street Pastor Perceptions of SafeBase09	14
5.	Additional Activities and Partnership Working	16
6.	Project Learnings: Addressing Learning Points From SafeBase08 and Possible Improvements and Developments for SafeBase10.....	18
	Appendix 1: Topic Guide.....	23

Executive Summary

This report presents the findings of an evaluation of The Stirling Community Planning Partnership's SafeBase09 initiative. The SafeBase09 initiative ran in November and December 2009 in Stirling City Centre, and was targeted at enhancing community safety, reducing anti-social behaviour and reducing perceptions of vulnerability for those in the City Centre.

Having undertaken a review of a pilot of the initiative in 2008, Progressive were again commissioned to evaluate the delivery of the initiative in 2009 to explore the extent to which the learning points from the evaluation of SafeBase08 had been taken forward, explore if and how the partnership approach to the delivery of the initiative had been maintained and to highlight any lessons learned from the second running of the project. To achieve this, in February and March 2010 a series of in-depth interviews and a focus group were conducted with key partners involved in the management and delivery of the initiatives.

The analysis of findings from the research has demonstrated that SafeBase09 has successfully built upon the success of the 2008 pilot. The partners involved in the project felt better prepared and had a clearer understanding of their roles and the project's objectives. In addition, the research has shown evidence of improved relationships and partnership working between partners delivering the initiative.

The research has demonstrated that in the majority of cases, the learning points identified in the evaluation of SafeBase08 have been successfully addressed. The only outstanding issue relate to reviewing the operating hours of the SafeBase and assessing the staff allocations of the initiative. It is recommended that these issues are explored further in planning for the 2010 SafeBase. Specifically this relates to considering expanding the operating hours of the initiative to 4am and operating the scheme on other days throughout the year, along with considering reducing the staff resource required at the Base itself to offer best value.

The evaluation has also highlighted some additional concerns and areas for development for the initiative. These relate to considering the possibility of the following to maximise the benefits of the scheme:

- Reviewing radio link communications in terms of training staff to use them effectively and enhancing the feedback from CCTV and the Police
- Considering if there is a role and demand for the initiative to link more closely to wider partners and to offer wider more specialist services
- Considering the issue of staff reimbursement across different agencies

1. Introduction and Objectives

- 1.1 This report presents the findings of an evaluation of The Stirling Community Planning Partnership's SafeBase09 initiative, which forms part of the Night-Time Economy Group's Action Plan. The SafeBase09 initiative ran in November and December 2009 in Stirling City Centre, and was targeted at enhancing community safety, reducing anti-social behaviour and reducing perceptions of vulnerability for those in the City Centre.

Background

- 1.2 In 2008, The Night-Time Economy Group for Stirling City Centre piloted a number of initiatives during the festive period as part of the Stirling Night-Time Economy Action Plan. These initiatives comprised: SafeBase08 (a safe venue fed by a team of street workers – the StreetTeam); Late Night Buses; Taxi Marshals; and incorporated the existing Pubsafe radio link and CCTV facilities into these initiatives.
- 1.3 The initiatives were put in place to enhance community safety and to reduce anti-social behaviour during the festive period to make Stirling a more appealing place to visit and thus enhancing the city's night-time economy.
- 1.4 At an overall level the initiatives were co-ordinated by the Stirling City Centre Initiative and Safer Cities, with funding accessed through the Anti-Social Behaviour Team of the Stirling Community Planning Partnership.
- 1.5 Progressive evaluated these initiatives at the start of 2009 to assess their impact and effectiveness and to highlight any areas for development. Key learnings and recommendations highlighted in the evaluation were as follows:
- To place the Street Team at the centre of the delivery of the SafeBase, and use an enhanced understanding of roles of SafeBase and the StreetTeam to deliver better outcomes for vulnerable people
 - To use operational learnings from the pilot to enhance delivery of initiatives in a variety of areas including:
 - Developing guidance for Safe Base and Street Team
 - Reviewing staffing levels and roles of the SafeBase and StreetTeam (reflecting the low numbers of incidents referred to the SafeBase compared to the high number of StreetTeam interventions)
 - Enhancing safety of staff for the Safe Base and Street Team
 - Enhancing the Safe Base venue
 - Developing transport solution for Safe Base clients when required
 - Reviewing the operating hours of the Safe Base and Street Team
 - Enhancing the use of radio communications
 - Enhancing the marketing of the entire initiative
- 1.6 The initiatives were implemented again during the 2009 festive period, taking into account the above learnings. Research was required to evaluate the SafeBase09 initiative, in relation to how the project has progressed in its second year and the degree to which learning points highlighted in the evaluation of the 2008 initiative have been taken forward.

SafeBase09

- 1.7 SafeBase09 was run over a five-week period, operating on 10 nights from 20th November to 19th December (Friday and Saturday evenings only), between the hours of 10pm and 2am. The initiative comprised a safe facility (the SafeBase), housed in premises supplied by Stirling Council Youth Services and staffed by four personnel: Two supervisors (Stirling Council); and two other staff from partner agencies (St Andrew's Ambulance, Stirling Family Support, The Rock Community Project, Central Scotland Police). Staff were selected to operate on each night to ensure that all of the following skill sets were present: First Aid; Mental Health First Aid; Working with Substance Misuse; Handling difficult people/managing conflict; Occupational Health & Safety Awareness. This represented an increase in the numbers of key staff in the SafeBase when compared to 2008 (three staff members plus two security stewards). Security stewards were not used in 2009 as the venue was locked from public access, (a learning point implemented from 2008).
- 1.8 The Safe Base was again linked to the Pubsafe radio link – facilitating communication between the SafeBase, Stewards at venues in the City Centre, Taxi Marshals operating at taxi ranks, the CCTV control centre (who could then be used to alert Police if required) and the SafeBase StreetTeam.
- 1.9 The StreetTeam comprised members of Stirling Council Youth Services Streetworx youth workers (four per shift, working in pairs). These staff patrolled the City Centre during the opening hours of the SafeBase, offered immediate assistance to people in the City Centre and identified and referred people that were in need to the SafeBase if required. Their mobile role enabled them to be reactive to needs of public, and to be a visible reassuring presence. In addition, the team were tasked with engaging with public in a non-authoritative capacity – key in delivering messages of personal safety and personal responsibility. Stirling Council's Community Wardens formed part of the StreetTeam in 2008, but were not available for use in 2009.

Linked Agencies / Initiatives

- 1.10 A range of other initiatives / agencies were operating in parallel to the SafeBase09. These comprised:
- **Taxi marshals.** These were used to ease safety concerns and assist in allocating passengers to taxis during the months of November and December at the Railway Station and Murray Place taxi ranks. This approach was used to ensure people could leave the City Centre as easily as possible during the early hours (the marshals operated from 12am to 4am). Marshals were provided by staff at G4S Security, who have been providing staff for this initiative since 2004.
 - **Late Night Buses.** In order to assist in the dispersal of people in the city centre during the festive period, additional late night buses (operated by FirstBus and running from 12am to 3:30 am) were in place. In 2008 these buses had contained 'bus marshals' (also provided by FirstBus) to reassure passengers of their safety. However, based on the recommendation of the bus operator in the 2008 evaluation, these were felt to be unnecessary (and potentially could act as a target for provocation / anti-social behaviour). As a result these were not included in the 2009 service. The services were developed in partnership between First Group and Stirling Council Transport Co-Ordination Unit.
 - **Pubsafe Radiolink.** As identified above, the initiatives were linked to each other and to the CCTV operation centre through the well established Pubsafe radio link.

- 1.11 Although not a formal part of the SafeBase initiative, the Stirling Street Pastors also operated in the area on some (but not all) of the SafeBase shifts. Street Pastors have been operating in Stirling since 12th March 2009 and operate every Friday and one Saturday per month, between the hours of 10pm and 4am. The Street Pastors aims and methods complement, but do not exactly match, those of the SafeBase, i.e. they aim to support people in the city centre through providing a team of people to offer caring and listening service in city centre. The team refer clients to wider agencies if required, and are part of the Pubsafe radio link. Street Pastors were invited to, and attended, SafeBase planning meetings but, as a year round service, were not part of the formal initiative.

Research Aims and Objectives

- 1.12 Stirling Community Planning Partnership were seeking to explore the success of the initiative through examining the impressions of partners in these activities, and of the staff that delivered the services (e.g. youth workers, taxi marshals etc). Specific objectives for the research were as follows:
- Exploring the extent to which the learning points from the evaluation of SafeBase08 have been taken forward
 - Exploring how the partnership approach to the delivery of the initiative has been maintained and developed
 - Highlighting any lessons learned from the second running of the project.
- 1.13 This report describes the outcomes of this evaluation undertaken to assess the impact and effectiveness of the SafeBase09.

2. Methodology

- 2.1 The study comprised telephone depth interviews, and one focus group, undertaken in February and March 2010. This approach was used to collect detailed information from respondents from a range of agencies involved in the delivery of SafeBase09.
- 2.2 Progressive was provided with a list of key contacts from which to recruit participants for the research. In advance of contacting the respondents, all potential respondents were emailed by Stirling Community Planning Partnership to make them aware of the research.
- 2.3 All potential respondents were emailed by Progressive to request an interview, with follow up phone calls made where required. All depth interviews were undertaken by telephone. The interviews ranged in duration from 20 minutes to 1 hour.
- 2.4 A single focus group was set up to ensure that the views of a selection of the members of the 'StreetTeam' (Streetworx staff) could be gathered collectively. All representatives at this group (4 respondents) were recruited via their team leader (the team leader did not attend the groups, but was interviewed separately).
- 2.5 A topic guide for use with all of the respondents was developed by Progressive and addressed the following issues:
 - Challenges and success of delivery
 - How effectively communications between agencies / partners have been undertaken and how these could be improved
 - The extent to which transport developments have made it easier for people in Stirling to access transport options
 - Increasing perceptions of safety on or waiting for transport options
 - Perceived changes since 2008 running of the initiative
 - Perceptions of the partnership working of the initiative
 - Degree to which learning points identified in the 2008 report had been met
- 2.6 All research was undertaken in compliance with the MRS Code of Conduct and in line with ISO 20252.

Sample

- 2.7 A single focus group was undertaken with four members of the StreetTeam and 10 telephone depth interviews were undertaken with representatives of the following organisations / positions:
 - Central Scotland Police (2 interviews)
 - Stirling Council (4 interviews: Anti-Social Behaviour Team, Marketing Team, Youth Services, Economy, Employment & Youth – Head of Service)
 - First Transport Group
 - Group 4 Security (taxi marshals)
 - Street Pastors
 - St. Andrew's Ambulance
- 2.8 The interviews and focus group were conducted by a team of two Progressive staff, and analysis undertaken exclusively in house.

2.9 It should be noted that, due to the small sample sizes involved and the methods of respondent selection, qualitative research findings do not provide statistically robust data. This type of research does, however, facilitate valid and extremely valuable insight and understanding, and as a result is ideally suited to this form of evaluation.

3. Perceptions of SafeBase 09

- 3.1 This chapter of the report will discuss in detail the perceptions of the success of the SafeBase09 initiative overall and of its key component elements: the SafeBase venue and the StreetTeam.

SafeBase09 Overall (StreetTeam and SafeBase)

- 3.2 Overall, the SafeBase09 initiative was felt to be a success by all respondents. In particular many respondents commented that the experience of the 08 pilot enabled partners to deliver an enhanced operation. The experience enabled partners to build from existing relationships, both in terms of the planning and delivery. Those who were working in the SafeBase and in the StreetTeam felt they were much clearer on how the initiative should run and how the different stakeholders should interact and work together.
- 3.3 Respondents also indicated that they were able to plan further in advance, and also to learn from their experience in running the initiative in 2008. In particular this led to a closer examination of health and safety issues, and formal risk assessments were undertaken in advance of operation – applying both to staff in SafeBase and in the StreetTeam. In addition, additional training, set-up meetings and briefings were undertaken for the team members. This resulted in a situation that meant, overall, partners felt better prepared than in 2008.

Importance of Enhanced / Increased Training and Briefing

- 3.4 The increased training (risk assessment and health and safety sessions) and briefing opportunities (prior to the initiatives beginning and also in the SafeBase at the start of each session) were mentioned by a number of respondents as being valuable in assisting the SafeBase and StreetTeam members' understanding of their own and each other's roles and responsibilities.
- 3.5 The risk assessment and health and safety training was viewed positively and respondents indicated that it helped to build the confidence of the team, and gave more structure to the delivery of the initiative. The training was felt to clearly outline what could and could not be done and provided greater awareness of what could happen and how certain situations should be approached or tackled. A side issue of this was that this did raise anxiety for some by causing team members to consider some of the potentially risky situations that they could be involved in – although respondents were, on balance, happy that these issues had been raised. For a small number of respondents, the detail of the training was felt to be potentially excessive and unnecessary.
- 3.6 Importantly, the training also demonstrated that the processes for SafeBase09 were being formalised, giving the initiative greater credibility amongst its members. The inclusion of the StreetTeam in the planning and training sessions also gave a greater sense to the Team that they were a key part of the initiative (in 2008 the StreetTeam were brought in at a late stage of the development of SafeBase and as a result could not be included in all training / planning sessions).
- 3.7 The more detailed risk assessment training also gave wider, added value for partners, with the SafeBase risk assessments now being incorporated into Youth Service's Streetworx practice.

- 3.8 Sessions were also offered on Pubsafe Radio training (resulting from concerns raised in the 2008 evaluation over the ability of partners to use the radiolink effectively). This training was also well received, giving partners (in particular the StreetTeam who do not normally use a radio link) more confidence in operating radios, and a better understanding of who was linked to the scheme and who could be reached.
- 3.9 However, not all StreetTeam members were able to attend the training and as a result not all received the benefit of this element. This resulted in a situation where some members of the team were still lacking in confidence in terms of using radios. In particular the following issues / concerns were raised by members of the StreetTeam in relation to radio communications:
- Is there an official way of talking? (e.g. should messages be communicated in a particular way)
 - How do you identify that you are speaking specifically to someone? (e.g. how do you know who is listening?)
 - How do you know if your communication is being acted on? (An issue echoed by security staff)
- 3.10 There is therefore some scope to further develop training to build confidence in radio use and to ensure a higher proportion of the team can access these sessions.

StreetTeam: Detailed Findings

- 3.11 Unlike 2008, there was no involvement from Community Wardens in the StreetTeam and the Stirling Council Youth Services Streetworx team exclusively staffed the StreetTeam. The members of the StreetTeam indicated that they felt they were part of a more effective and better co-ordinated team in 2009 – perhaps reflecting the fact that only one agency was providing the staff for the StreetTeam. There was also a strong sense from StreetTeam respondents that they felt they had a more centralised role in the delivery of the initiative – helped by the enhanced communication across partners achieved at training and also through briefing meetings at the SafeBase prior to shifts. These briefings were felt to be good for information sharing, nurturing relationships between partners, strengthening the sense of working in a team and enabling the team to feel prepared going into shift. Some also felt that it was good to have a more informal forum to chat through any issues arising from previous shifts.
- 3.12 The StreetTeam’s relationship with other agencies was also felt to be better than in 2008. Overall, StreetTeam respondents felt there was a greater degree of understanding and appreciation of their role, and that the understanding of their skills by the wider partners was better in 2009. One StreetTeam respondent reflected that their experience in 2008 had highlighted that ‘public order’ requests were being routed to Community Wardens and door staff in preference to them, whereas in 2009 it was felt that wider partners had the confidence and understanding to be able to refer these issues to the StreetTeam.
- 3.13 The StreetTeam in particular indicated that they worked well with venue security / door staff, with one respondent describing them as *“like our big brothers”*. Communication between these partners was felt to be comfortable and effective, and the team felt that a good relationship existed. The Team also felt that the Police were better informed of initiative in 2009 and more supportive of this year’s Team.

- 3.14 There was however, some limited evidence of confusion from other agencies over the extent of their role. For example, StreetTeam respondents described one incident where Taxi Marshals asked the Team to assist with ‘problem’ people who were refusing to co-operate whilst sitting in taxis - a task that was felt to be outwith their role. This highlights the potential to develop understanding of roles further across the partners.

Relationship with the Public

- 3.15 The sense of the central role of the StreetTeam in the initiative was enhanced by the higher visibility of the team and resulting increased awareness by the public. This was assisted by both marketing initiatives in the local press and also through the use of uniforms. Interestingly the uniforms were not particularly liked at first by the Team, but upon use were found to make them more easily recognisable (both by the public and by CCTV) and resulted in supportive comments by the public.
- 3.16 The StreetTeam members also indicated that they were very comfortable dealing with the public as part of SafeBase – an extension of the type of work they ‘normally’ undertake. However one respondent indicated that it was “psychologically different” due to it being later at night and across a different age range. As a result some members felt a little more vulnerable. However these respondents also indicated that they felt they knew their limits (an awareness that was helped by training) and indicated that they would not get involved in a situation unless they were comfortable doing so.

Key Challenges

- 3.17 Although there were few key challenges to delivery that the StreetTeam could identify, communications was a notable problem. In addition to the concerns with radio communications highlighted above, feedback from StreetTeam respondents highlighted a need to specifically improve communications to and from CCTV. In particular this related to CCTV acknowledging requests and informing the team that action was being taken or assistance (i.e. Police) had been requested. As a result the team members expressed a clear need for more efficient or effective ways of communicating with the Police if required. N.B. It is important to note that, at present, when CCTV pass a message on to the Police, they may not be made aware if any action is able to be taken, as a result communicating actions back to the StreetTeam may not always be possible.

Street Team: Summary

- 3.18 Overall, the developments in the StreetTeam have been welcomed, and there was a strong sense from respondents that the initiative had progressed from the previous year. In particular this related to:
- Better clarification in roles overall for the Streetworx team
 - Better preparation leading to greater confidence in delivery
 - Feeling more involved in the process, particularly at the preparation stages
 - Better sense of belonging to a team, rather than a separate entity
 - Stronger relationships between some partners– e.g. the Police, door security
 - Better appreciation that they were a key part of the initiative
 - Feeling safer, supported and in control

- 3.19 The one key area of consideration and concern in terms of taking the initiative forward related to enhancing the understanding of the StreetTeam role by other partners, with some evidence suggesting that expectations of what the StreetTeam are able to do by partners, at times, can exceed their responsibilities.

SafeBase Venue

- 3.20 Overall, all respondents felt the SafeBase venue to be a valuable resource, well managed, and an effective central focal point / hub for the SafeBase09 initiative.
- 3.21 Both respondents working in the SafeBase and those in the StreetTeam indicated that it was important for the initiative to have a place to enable those in greatest need to recover - particularly during the cold, winter months during which the initiative operated. The SafeBase was also felt to be important as a place for meetings in advance of shifts, as a central location for the supervisor to oversee the evening's activity, and an effective base to be used during the shifts for the StreetTeam to get warmed up, rest and catch-up with the rest of the SafeBase team.
- 3.22 The StreetTeam also indicated that the Base was important to them psychologically, as it provided them a haven to which clients could be referred if required – rather than having to deal with the prospect of managing difficult or unwell clients out on the street.
- 3.23 There were limited comments in the research in relation to the venue itself (i.e. layout, facilities etc). Those that did comment indicated that it was better equipped and prepared than in 2008 (when some respondents had raised concerns).
- 3.24 The key area of concern for respondents in relation to the SafeBase was the low level of use. The Base received six clients across the 10 sessions, making it difficult to assess effectiveness and value of the SafeBase venue. Given the increase in number of staff at the SafeBase in 2009 (four key staff in total compared to three, all with particular expertise), there were some concerns that resources could be better allocated to support the initiative more effectively. This could include, for example, reallocating SafeBase staff to the StreetTeam – indeed on one occasion a member of the St. Andrew's Ambulance based in the SafeBase went out with the StreetTeam to see if he could help on street, as there had been no activity in the Base that evening. Other respondents suggested that a reduction in the number of staff at SafeBase could free resources to extend the operating hours of the initiative.
- 3.25 These concerns over the use of resources in the SafeBase were amplified, for some, as staff in Base were not felt to provide anything significantly different to the skills of the StreetTeam:
- “all they were doing was sitting them down, giving them a drink, calling a taxi or ambulance – any of us could have done this”* (StreetTeam member)
- 3.26 However, others felt that, although additional skills were not used, the availability of the wider skill mix of staff in the Base was valuable (First Aid, Mental Health First Aid, Working with Substance Misuse, Handling difficult people/managing conflict, Occupational Health & Safety Awareness). The presence of the supervisor in the Base to co-ordinate the session, brief the teams and issue and reassure the team on the use of radios in advance of each session was also felt to be useful. In addition, the research also highlighted to some evidence of wider benefits to the initiative from having diverse mix of staff in the Base (e.g. closer links to Police provided by

presence of civilian Police staff – particularly useful given the indirect link to the Police via CCTV).

- 3.27 Despite these benefits, the research suggests that there is a need to re-evaluate the staffing of the SafeBase to explore if resources can be more effectively allocated in the future.

4. Street Pastor Perceptions of SafeBase09

- 4.1 This chapter presents feedback from the Street Pastors on their work alongside the SafeBase09 initiative. It is important to note that, although the Street Pastors worked alongside the SafeBase09 teams and were invited to planning meetings, they were not a formal part of the initiative. They also operate all year round, and operated later (to approximately 4am) than SafeBase09. As a result of this, the views of the Street Pastors provide an important, external perspective on the operation of the initiative. These views were accessed through an interview with a co-ordinator of their scheme.

Impact of SafeBase09 on Street Pastors

- 4.2 The Street Pastor respondent felt that SafeBase09 did have a marked impact on their work, through providing additional assistance on-street to help with those that required it. In particular, the Pastors felt that they were able to spend less time dealing with 'humanitarian' or public order issues and more time on advisory / caring work – a role that they feel is more central to their work.
- 4.3 The Street Pastors have regular communications with CCTV via the Pubsafe Radio link on all their shifts and indicated that they felt that CCTV viewed the 'humanitarian' or public order work as more of a SafeBase / StreetTeam role, rather than a Street Pastor role. Indeed the respondent commented that:

*"I was surprised at how much work CCTV were finding for them to do...
I would hope that CCTV would pass things on to us when they are not there"*

- 4.4 This shows that the different partners were aware of the differences in roles, but perhaps highlights a need for a verification of the understanding of the roles of the Street Pastors by CCTV when the Safe Base is not operating – i.e. that the Street Pastors would be willing to assist with this work.
- 4.5 The Street Pastor respondent felt that taxi marshals were extremely helpful and made the comment that the marshals were valuable in assisting them with their work. As a result of the StreetTeam / SafeBase sessions finishing at 2am (two hours before the taxi marshals finished their shift), the Pastors had less contact with the StreetTeam and the Street Pastors did not refer any clients to the SafeBase.

Developments to SafeBase09

- 4.6 Although not a formal part of the initiative, the Street Pastor respondent was asked to give their opinion on how the SafeBase initiative could be developed in the future. The key improvement related to extending operating hours beyond 2am and opening on additional dates throughout the year.
- 4.7 It was felt that approximately half of the Street Pastors' contact with clients happens after 2:30am – by which time the SafeBase initiative has finished – and can go on until 5am due to demand (e.g. waiting for taxi rank to clear). In addition, the majority of the 'humanitarian' or public order work, the longest taxi queue and the highest levels of alcohol consumption were felt by the respondent to occur during this post 2:30am period. There were also suggestions that the Pastors would have referred some clients to SafeBase during these later hours if the Base had been open.

- 4.8 The respondent also indicated that running SafeBase during the festive period was valuable. However, based on their year round experience, that there were also other times of year that were busy, such as Halloween, University freshers' week and 'Old Firm' games where running SafeBase could be beneficial in enhancing community safety in Stirling.

5. Additional Activities and Partnership Working

- 5.1 This chapter of the report discusses the additional linked or supporting activities of the overall SafeBase09 initiative – the transport solutions and marketing, and makes comments on the overall partnership working of the project.

Transport: Taxi Marshals and Late Night Bus Services

- 5.2 The transport element of the initiative remained unchanged from the 2008 pilot – with the exception of the removal of the stewards on the late night buses.
- 5.3 The taxi marshals were well received by all respondents and felt to be an easily recognisable and important presence in terms of reducing anti-social behaviour at the taxi ranks and increasing the rate at which taxis were able to disperse people from the city centre. Some StreetTeam respondents reported that, when compared to 2008, there was an increasing understanding of role of StreetTeam by taxi marshals – creating a better team atmosphere and more effective team working. There is however some evidence of learning to be done, especially in relation to understanding / clarification of roles of the StreetTeam in relation to assisting the Taxi Marshals with difficult clients.
- 5.4 The bus routes stayed the same as 2008 and there were fewer reported issues from FirstBus (the operator) in terms of operating the services or problems on buses. Importantly the decision to remove stewards on buses did not have negative results in terms of anti-social behaviour.
- 5.5 Unfortunately, passenger levels on the services were perceived to be low – but patronage did rise throughout the initiative and anecdotal evidence suggests fewer people were active in Stirling over festive period – particularly early in December. In addition, it is important to note that awareness of new services takes time to build, and as a result there may be some scope to run the services for a longer period up to festive period to provide better chance of building up patronage, or to undertake some more targeted marketing in destination towns to build awareness.

Marketing

- 5.6 There was clear evidence of enhanced marketing of the SafeBase initiative in 2009, in particular through the provision of extensive local press coverage, greater penetration in pubs through posters / leaflets, and the use of uniforms by the StreetTeam.
- 5.7 This enhanced activity (compared to SafeBase08) resulted in a more consistent identity and more consistent messages, which were received positively across partners. This was primarily made possible as a result of the longer lead times available in advance of running the initiative in 2009.
- 5.8 Anecdotal evidence from respondents suggests that messages seem to have reached the public, that the initiative and staff on street were more readily recognised, and that the communications materials were well received by wider stakeholders such as pub managers. It is important to note that the impact of marketing was not measured, so there is no way of understanding true its effect.

- 5.9 Despite the increased lead-times, respondents did report some limited problems in developing the marketing materials as some details were not confirmed until late in the planning process (including particularly the non-involvement of Community Wardens in the StreetTeam and the late night bus times). There was also one comment that the beer mats that promoted bus time-tables were perceived as difficult to read.

Partnership Working

- 5.10 Overall, at a strategic and operational level, the partnership approach to delivery has been maintained from the 2008 running of the initiative. All respondents indicated that the process was more straightforward than in 2008 due to building on established relationships and using the experience of the 2008 pilot.
- 5.11 As a result of this, the wider strategic steering group were required to spend less time pushing the development forward. At individual initiative level, partners felt better prepared and better informed as a result of experience and the additional briefings, communications and training delivered – resulting in more effective relationships.
- 5.12 The evidence of some limited misunderstandings or uncertainties in relation to roles of partners (in particular the uncertainties in the CCTV / radio / Police link and the limits to which the StreetTeam can assist with the Taxi Marshals) reflect the need to continue to build upon these partnership building activities in the future.

6. Project Learnings: Addressing Learning Points From SafeBase08 and Possible Improvements and Developments for SafeBase10

6.1 This chapter explores the extent to which the learning points from the evaluation of SafeBase08 have been taken forward, along with highlighting learning points and developments for SafeBase10.

Addressing Learning Points from SafeBase08

6.2 Table 1 below presents the learning points from the review of SafeBase08, details where these individual learning points have been successfully addressed, and describes where additional work would be required should the project run in again 2010. The table shows that in the majority of cases the learning points have been successfully addressed, with the only major issue still requiring development relating to the operating hours and staff allocations of the initiative. These issues are also discussed further in the recommendations for 2010.

Table 1. Success in Addressing Learning Points from 2008 Evaluation

SafeBase08 Review Learning Point	Successes	Areas Still Requiring Development
<p>Placing the Street Team at the centre of the delivery of the SafeBase, and using an enhanced understanding of roles of SafeBase / StreetTeam to deliver better outcomes for vulnerable people</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • StreetTeam felt better prepared and a more central part of the team in 2009 • Additional training and briefings very helpful in this regard • Team felt more comfortable with their roles and responsibilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As Community Wardens not part of team this year, this may have acted to create a more comfortable environment for Streetworx. Should StreetTeam be built from multiple agencies in future, additional team building may be required • Level of resource allocated to SafeBase increased, whilst StreetTeam resource maintained, resulting in perception that this may not have been cost effective due to low use of SafeBase
<p>Enhancing safety of staff for the Safe Base and Street Team</p> <p>Developing guidance for Safe Base and Street Team</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SafeBase and StreetTeam staff all felt better prepared and aware of safety and roles than 2008 due to risk assessments and training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure all members of team attend training • Further develop guidance to clarify roles and responsibilities of different partners

SafeBase08 Review Learning Point	Successes	Areas Still Requiring Development
<p>Enhancing the Safe Base venue</p> <p>Developing transport solutions for SafeBase clients when required</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited comments on SafeBase venue – but lack of complaints compared to 2008 reflects improvement (and low use) • Transport options developed, but not used. Staff had clarity on options available to them 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<p>Enhancing the use of radio communications</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training assisted staff, but some missed training and others not comfortable with use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure all members of team attend training • Communications on actions taken by CCTV (and referalls to Police) in response to communications could be improved if possible
<p>Enhancing the marketing of the entire initiative</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marketing more effective, with whole initiative perceived by respondents to be more visible to public - assisting interactions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scope to enhance bus promotion; suggestion that buses were not as well promoted in destination areas or places needed most – e.g. bus station, venues etc
<p>Reviewing staffing levels and roles of the Safe Base and Street Team (reflecting the low numbers of incidents referred to the SafeBase compared to the high number of StreetTeam interventions in 2008)</p> <p>Reviewing the operating hours of the Safe Base and Street Team</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staffing levels of SafeBase increased from 3 to 4 (in direct response to Health & Safety concerns) • StreetTeam staff and operating hours maintained at 2008 level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results suggest that an increase in SafeBase resource was unnecessary and that resource could be redirected away from the SafeBase venue to offer best value in terms of maximising benefits of the scheme through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Extending operating hours (echoing 08 recommendation) ○ Providing a bigger or more flexible StreetTeam (echoing 08 recommendation to focus more on StreetTeam) ○ Operating Safe Base at different times of the year

Possible Improvements and Developments for SafeBase10

- 6.3 Respondents identified a range of possible improvements across the initiatives, should SafeBase be run in 2010 and these are summarised in the following section.

SafeBase Development

- 6.4 As highlighted in the recommendations in the 2008 review, there is a clear need to explore the possibility of extending the operating hours of SafeBase beyond 2am and of running the initiative at different times of the year to maximise benefits of scheme.
- 6.5 Extending hours or days of operation will impact on the resources required. However, there may be some scope to reduce the level of staff resource allocated to the SafeBase-based team and as a result free up resources for a larger StreetTeam, longer operating hours or additional sessions.
- 6.6 The findings suggest that although the SafeBase had limited client use in 2009, maintaining a physical base is important both to provide a warm environment for clients to recover and to provide a place for StreetTeam staff to take a break – a factor that could be even more important should StreetTeam operating hours be extended.
- 6.7 Some respondents suggested that the StreetTeam role could be extended to include accompanying clients into SafeBase to offer First Aid and as a result remove need for additional SafeBase-only staff (although in order to maintain a presence in street the size of the StreetTeam may need to be increased should this approach be taken). Indeed, the additional specialist staff (beyond the StreetTeam) may be unnecessary unless the SafeBase staff are required to provide additional expertise.
- 6.8 There is therefore a clear need to re-consider what (if any) additional expertise is necessary for the initiative overall and offers best value in terms of the overall project aims. At present the SafeBase initiative effectively deals with problems as they occur, and seeks to ensure that immediate community safety issues are addressed. Should there be a strong desire to extend this remit to link clients into wider health and social care related agencies, and to offer a wider service (e.g. counselling, linking to wider services for sign-posting/ referrals, providing expertise in health-based brief interventions/ advocating safer drinking etc.) then the additional expertise of the SafeBase-based team may need to be enhanced or utilised in a different way. However, given the limited number of referrals to the SafeBase and lack of clear demand for these additional services, it would appear that at present this additional expertise may not be necessary. Resolution of this issue will determine how much of this expertise could be offered by a StreetTeam, along with who is needed and what skills are required for the StreetTeam.
- 6.9 In parallel to these issues, the necessity for a project supervisor to be based on site in the SafeBase should also be considered. Although the supervisor is required at the start of the shift to brief the team and distribute radios and clothing, once the briefing has been undertaken, the role may be able to be undertaken remotely on an on-call basis (using the radio link) – thereby further reducing resources required to operate the scheme.

Enhancing Training

- 6.10 The respondents also identified that there is still some scope for additional training to take place amongst the team. This related to the following issues:
- Radiolink use/ training (to both enhance use and understanding of roles and capabilities of linked agencies, and to develop new protocols to ensure better feedback from CCTV when requests made, i.e. reassuring the team that a response is being made or actioned)
 - Additional conflict resolution / interaction training (to further help the StreetTeam to be prepared to deal with varied situations)
 - Awareness raising training of connected services (e.g. being aware of when and why to refer clients to other services such as social work – should this be viewed as a role for SafeBase)

Consider Issue of Reimbursement of Staff

- 6.11 A final issue, raised by one respondent, is the issue of staff reimbursement. Staff participated in the initiative as part of their own organisations (and not as employees / volunteers of SafeBase09). This resulted in different staff being reimbursed for their work at vastly different rates, in line with their existing overtime rates (if applicable). For example, Council staff and civilian Police staff were paid at their standard / overtime rates, St. Andrew's Ambulance staff worked on a voluntary basis (in return for a donation to the organisation) and the Street Pastors (although not formally part of the initiative) provided their services entirely voluntarily.
- 6.12 Although the research did not identify any concerns from the different agencies in relation to this issue, pay could potentially become a concern between staff or agencies in the future. It is important to note that it would be extremely challenging, given the current partnership delivery approach, to standardise rates of pay. That said, this issue should at least be considered in future planning to ensure that it does not become a barrier to continued effective partnership working across agencies.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Topic Guide

progressive

17 Corstorphine Road, Edinburgh, EH12 6DD
Tel: 0131 316 1900 Fax: 0131 316 1901
info@progressivepartnership.co.uk

Stirling Council: Night Time Economy Group Action Plan Review Discussion Guide for Depth Interviews January 2010

Research background and objectives:

The Night-Time Economy Group for Stirling City Centre ran their Safe Base initiative for the second year in 2009, and is seeking to evaluate the running of the initiative. Safe Base ran as part of a 'suite' of initiatives designed to enhance community safety in the city centre. Specifically these initiatives comprised: SafeBase 09; Late Night Buses; Taxi Marshals; and PubSafe radio link.

The Group are interested in evaluating the SafeBase initiative, particularly in relation to assessing if the project has progressed in its second year and assessing if learning points highlighted in the evaluation of the 2008 initiative have been taken forward.

Specific objectives for the research are as follows:

- Exploring the extent to which the learning points from the evaluation of SafeBase08 have been taken forward

SafeBase08 Recommendations:

- **Placing the Street Team at the centre of the delivery of the initiatives, and using an enhanced understanding of roles of Safe Base / Street Team to deliver better outcomes for vulnerable people**
- **Using operational learnings from the pilot to enhance delivery of initiatives in a variety of areas including:**
 - **Developing guidance for Safe Base and Street Team**
 - **Reviewing staffing levels and roles of the Safe Base and Street Team**
 - **Enhancing safety of staff for the Safe Base and Street Team**
 - **Enhancing the Safe Base venue**
 - **Developing transport solutions for Safe Base clients when required**
 - **Reviewing the operating hours of the Safe Base and Street Team**
 - **Enhancing the use of radio communications**
 - **Enhancing the marketing the entire initiative**
- Exploring the how the partnership approach to the delivery of the initiative

<p>has been maintained and developed, and;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highlighting any lessons learned from the second running of the project. 	
<p>Introduction/Warm Up (5mins)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction by moderator and explanation of research and Market Research Society Code of Conduct • Reassurances; no right or wrong answers; honest views; reminder that the Night Time Economy Group are keen to hear the experiences of key stakeholders in relation to the action plan developments. • Explore respondent role in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Position; experience; length of time in post and links / responsibilities in relation to the initiatives
<p>Partnership Working (senior respondents only)</p>	<p><i>This section targeted at those with strategic level understanding – may not be relevant to all respondents</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What was trying to be achieved by each partner in the partnership? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Probe on safebase / taxis / buses / cctv/ lighting • Was the work of the partnership similar to your normal role / the normal role of your organisation? • Was the partnership effective overall / for each partner organisation? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What sort of things were you / your organisation seeking to identify as indicators of success of the partnership at the start? ○ Did the result match expectations? ○ Was / were the partnership(s) a success? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At strategic / delivery level? • How was each partner contributing to the partnership? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Did this meet your / their expectations? (why / why not?) • Were partnership agreements set up – did these meet your / other organisations needs? • How did the partnership approach help delivery of objectives (if at all)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What was added through the partnership approach? ○ What would have happened if it would have been delivered through a single agency? • What did you feel worked particularly well? • Do you feel there was anything else that partners could have delivered or could deliver if this were to be repeated? • Were there examples and instances where partners found it difficult to work collectively? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Or where resources could not be provided / were limited? • What would change / what would you like to change if

	<p>this was repeated next year?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Organisationally ○ Financially ○ At a planning level? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● What additional resources would be required? ● What other funding streams could be used? – would you be able to offer any finding? ● What implications does this have for other programmes and/or activities that could occur in Stirling in the future? ● What lessons can be learnt from working as a partnership for these initiatives?
<p>Safe Base 09</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Could you please describe to me the aims of the safe base? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Who is it designed to help and how? ○ What do you understand as your role / the role of other organisations involved in SafeBase <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Who is the lead partner? ○ Which staff are involved and how? ● Has your involvement in the project changed your role / normal work? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If so, how (<i>probe on hours / responsibility / services delivered etc.</i>) ● What support / contribution have you and your organisation made towards safebase? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ E.g. financial, organisational, resource, planning etc. ● What support did you receive from other partner organisations involved? ● What do you think have been the main benefits of safe base for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The community / members of public ○ You / your organisation ○ Others / other organisations (incl. police, A&E, other orgs) ○ The environment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Probe on (safety, reducing / increasing burden on staff and resources, anti-social behaviour, criminality, perceptions of vulnerability, networking between organisations / venues)</i> ● How have these benefits been realised? – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What or who has been the most important factor in the success of safebase ○ What were the limitations of safebase? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Probe on radio link, range of organisations, project duration, staffing, opening hours, building, open-door policy, responsibility when people leave safebase etc)</i>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What were the challenges to delivery for you and other organisations? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Is there anything else that you / your organisation could have contributed? • How effectively have communications between agencies / partners involved in safebase have been undertaken? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ...and how these could be improved? ○ <i>Probe on contact across all agencies involved plus external agencies</i> • Would you be in favour of this running this service again / all year round? (and, why?) • What worked particularly well? • What would you change / improve? • What support would you / your organisation be willing to provide to deliver this? (if any?)
Taxi Marshals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could you please describe to me the aims of the taxi marshal scheme? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Who is it designed to help and how? ○ What do you understand as your role / the role of other organisations involved in the taxi marshal scheme <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Who is the lead partner? ○ Which staff are involved and how? • Has your involvement in the project changed your role / normal work? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If so, how (<i>probe on hours / responsibility / services delivered etc.</i>) • What support / contribution have you and your organisation made towards the taxi marshal scheme? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ E.g. financial, organisational, resource, planning etc. • What support did you receive from other partner organisations involved? • What do you think have been the main benefits of the taxi marshal scheme for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The community / members of public ○ You / your organisation ○ Others / other organisations (incl. police, A&E, other orgs) ○ The environment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Probe on (safety, reducing / increasing burden on staff and resources, anti-social behaviour, criminality, perceptions of vulnerability, networking between organisations / venues)</i> • How have these benefits been realised? – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What or who has been the most important factor in the success of the taxi marshal scheme

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What were the limitations of the taxi marshal scheme? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Probe on perceptions / needs of taxi trade/ funding / managing queues</i> ● What were the challenges to delivery for you and other organisations? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Is there anything else that you / you organisation could have contributed? ● How effectively have communications between agencies / partners involved in the taxi marshal scheme have been undertaken? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ...and how these could be improved? ○ <i>Probe on contact across all agencies involved plus external agencies</i> ● Would you be in favour of this running this service again / all year round? (and, why?) ● What worked particularly well? ● What would you change / improve? ● What support would you / your organisation be willing to provide to deliver this? (if any?)
<p>Late Buses / Bus Marshals</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Could you please describe to me the aims of the late bus / marshal scheme? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Who is it designed to help and how? ○ What do you understand as your role / the role of other organisations involved in the late bus / marshal scheme ○ Which staff are involved and how? ● Has your involvement in the project changed your role / normal work? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If so, how (<i>probe on hours / responsibility / services delivered etc.</i>) ● What support / contribution have you and your organisation made towards the late bus / marshal scheme? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ E.g. financial, organisational, resource, planning etc. ● What support did you receive from other partner organisations involved? ● What do you think have been the main benefits of the late bus / marshal scheme for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The community / members of public ○ You / your organisation ○ Others / other organisations (incl. police, A&E, other orgs) ○ The environment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Probe on (safety, reducing / increasing burden on staff and resources, anti-social behaviour, criminality, perceptions of</i>

	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>vulnerability, networking between organisations / venues)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How have these benefits been realised? – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What or who has been the most important factor in the success of the late bus / marshal scheme ○ What are the limitations of the late bus / marshal scheme? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Probe on staffing, anti-soc behaviour on board and waiting for buses, costs etc</i> • What were the challenges to delivery for you and other organisations? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Is there anything else that you / you organisation could have contributed? • How effectively have communications between agencies / partners involved in the late bus / marshal scheme have been undertaken? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ...and how these could be improved? ○ <i>Probe on contact across all agencies involved plus external agencies</i> • Would you be in favour of this running this service again / all year round? (and, why?) • What worked particularly well? • What would you change / improve? • What support would you / your organisation be willing to provide to deliver this? (if any?)
<p>Summary and wrap up</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Briefly sum up • Any other ideas / advice / recommendations about the initiatives at current time? <p>Thank respondent and close discussion</p>