

## **Evaluation conclusion for Safe and Secure. This was one of the 12 projects which formed part of Five Borough Alliance's 'prevention' and 'reassurance' workstreams in 2008/09.**

The following is an excerpt taken from the full length evaluation produced by Catch 22 and Analytica Consulting. This is the final '*conclusion*' part of the report only. If you wish to see this conclusion in the context of the complete full report please contact us by email.

### **12. The "Safe and Secure" Project**

At this stage evaluation of what the project is achieving has to be limited to assessment of implementation rather than impact, which will not be evident for some time. However, even a process evaluation is problematic, since there is no project 'blueprint' to follow setting out the work programme with a timeline.

To some extent this is understandable and indeed appropriate. It is an innovative project and a flexible approach is needed. However, there might be benefits in having a plan that sets out objectives, activities, timetable and the other usual plan components, even if this requires regular revision. It would provide a framework that could guide development, help build a common understanding with partners and provide a basis for monitoring progress.

Our current evaluation is therefore largely limited to describing and commenting on what we understand has happened. Our information is based on consultation with the Project Manager and a review of a range of project documents, most of which relate to the rehousing arrangements.

The project is undoubtedly dealing with a serious and sensitive problem. If successful, there will be a substantial payoff for the individuals involved, the local community and public services. However, the risks to many stakeholders are also considerable. So, in progressing the project, management of risk has had to be given the highest priority.

The work programme has also necessitated developing new relationships and new processes. Specifically, a way has had to be found to integrate the FBA project with the work of Safer Southwark Partnership, rather than duplicate what SSP was planning to do. Issues related to project leadership have had to be addressed.

The above points indicate the need for a carefully managed implementation with an extended 'set up' period. This is what has been happening over the past four months and, as the narrative above shows, considerable progress has been made. The project is now at the point where delivery arrangements are in place and the first participant has entered the scheme.

Even at this stage however it is likely that significant further revisions will prove necessary as experience is gained, some existing issues still need to be resolved and new issues are still emerging. Matters already recognised include:

- the provision of suitably qualified 'on call' officers round the clock, a matter already discussed above; and
- clarification of arrangements at the end of the relocation period. If participants decide to go back to Southwark, they risk being drawn back into their previous situation. If they decide not to return, they may have to give up their tenancy but find it difficult (practically and financially) to find alternative accommodation.

- impact upon the family and family members of individuals within the programme. Are they to be offered support?
- whether Victim Support is able to meet the need for specialised services if demand increases and individuals are spread across a wider area
- Whether capacity can be expanded if demand rises beyond the small number of places currently available
- how to manage 'transition', which will involve finding ways to accommodate and support participants after their 12 weeks in temporary rehousing ends
- how to sustain the scheme and extend it to other FBA boroughs, which will require funding and other support.

The implementation of this project has been approached carefully and thoroughly as was appropriate given the nature of its work. It remains to be seen whether the processes can be made to work with a larger cohort. Perhaps more important, questions about the impact and cost effectiveness of this type of intervention in providing safety and reducing gang involvement still need to be answered. This will require a more complex assessment and considerably more time.