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On 10th January 2017 Tower Hamlets Together facilitated a staff engagement event at Merchant Street Community Hall. Staff from All Tower Hamlets Together including the voluntary sector and the CCG were invited to attend.

There were 70 attendees at the event. There may have been more people who attended but failed to sign in on the day. A total of 36 attendees returned completed feedback forms at the end of the event.

**Attendee breakdown**

**Organisational backgrounds of participants who indicated their organisations:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Barts** | **ELFT** | **LBTH** | **CCG** | **GPCG** | **THT** | **CSU** | **Other** |
| 9 | 7 | 11 | 12 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 3 |

**Staff who completed the evaluation form came from the following services:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Public Health** | **Primary Care** | **Social Care** | **CCG** | **Secondary Care** | **CH** | **MH** | **Other** |
| 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 5 |

**List of roles of participants who attended:**

* Acute Transformation Manager x 1
* Community Development Officer
* Deputy Director of Corporate Affairs x 1
* Deputy Borough Director
* Director CHS & MEH
* Diabetes Service Manager
* Engagement Manager
* GP x 1
* Head of Children’s SLT x 1
* Lead Nurse
* Manager CHT
* Organisational Development Manager x 1
* PC Liaison Officer
* PDF Community Adults x 1
* Practice Development Facilitator x 1
* Professional Development Officer
* Programme Manager x 3
* Project Manager x 2
* Public Health Strategist
* Service Manager x 2
* Strategic Commissioning
* Transformation Officer
* Transformation Manager x 3

The information below is collated from the returned feedback forms.

1. **When asked what their overall impression of the day was, participants replied as follows**

Overall Impression of the Day

Response from Participants

**2. When asked to evaluate each part of the day, using the following scale**

5= excellent 4= good 3= average 2= fair 1= poor

**participants responded as follows:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| TOPIC | **Average score:** |
| **Update you on THT developments** | 3.75 |
| **Showcase local success stories** | 3.5 |
| **Help you understand different roles better** | 3.2 |
| **Facilitate conversations to support the development of THT** | 3.6 |

**3. When asked what participants found particularly useful, they responded as follows:**

“Talking to other Staff” x 6

“Communication and learning” x 4

“Useful for networking and getting an overall feel of direction” x 5

“Knowledge of the other projects” x 10

“The opportunity to speak with workstream leads and managers” x 2

“Finding out opportunities for joint work” x 1

“Neighbourhood Care Team and its benefits”

“Community Research Network. They may be able to help in my project and have some very useful information for my QI”

“The existence of THT is very useful at first place. The background information puts the projects into context”

“MECC as an enabler”

“The development of the digital map”

“Finding out about the different services that are out there”

“Finding out about social prescribing project and innovation fund”

“The market place was fantastic”

“To put faces to names”

Less useful:

“not enough time to visit all the projects”

“it was a bit busy/noisy to really capture a good sense of what each project is doing”

**4. When asked if participants had any ideas how to improve the event, they responded as follows:**

“To bring Yearly Years services attending (x 2) and GPs, there is a need to review who is invited to these events”

“Would like to see more frontline staff engaged/attend event”

“Better planning with table leads so that they have a better understanding of the aims before session”

“It would have been nice to have printed summaries of each project so we could have made better choices about which project to visit as from the titles it was not clear”

“Further updates on THT projects. Brief 5 min update will help understand which projects are happening”

“Reduce the volume of microphone” x 3

“Bell was enough to move people on”

“A summary of each workstream/project to aid understanding of THT x 2

“Involve patients reps”

“More information about the various projects, their status, where to get more information and key contacts”

“Each table to have a flyer”

“More opportunities for questions at placards”

“It was hard to get enough detail in short conversations. Also difficult for staff at low knowledge base e.g. from an unfamiliar service to get to an evaluation of achievements”

“Create an event with a wider scope”

“Different venue as the event is so interactive, the acoustics was very poor, it was difficult to hear what the table leaders were trying to explain”

“More pragmatic and useful, people should have actions”

“The placard idea was good although some individual conversations developed at the tables and it was difficult to join in as a group”

“More 2-way conversations as being with placard limited the interactions”

“The layout of tables made it hard to circulate and a more descriptive idea of the session would work in advance”

“This is the first of these meetings I have heard of via a colleague”

“What can be done to improve the joint working/communication to be covered in the next session”

“The project appears to be predominantly health focused with social care ‘bolted on’, particularly by social work practitioners’

“To have more time around the tables to be able to speak to all organisations”

“Showcase what resources we have in Tower Hamlets and how to use them”

“A more regular event inviting more people offering people and projects to present, discuss and have a stall at the next event”

“Ironically slightly longer presentation on THT developments”

“Involve residents and patients”

“Nice networking and engaging, well done!

**5. When asked if participants had any further feedback, they responded as follows:**

“Overexpectations of services + underestimate of amount of work involved”

“Could have more understanding of connections between the range of projects – putting them together rather than in isolation”

“Thank you for lunch and refreshments”

“Single point of access for all that is going on in TH”

“An open roadshow to raise more awareness”

“Updates and changes should be on East End Life. Best way to impress communities”

“I am pleased with the amount of things that were showcased to us”

“Emailing people job title, contact details’

“The digital map will be helpful but still relies on people visiting the website”

“The comms regarding the event is still an issue”

“Really good representation across the agencies”

“Be good to understand how the preventative aims will link with integration of complex/high need”

“Food could be labelled for vegetarians”

“Better focus on projects info and what audience + what want to communicate-standard format + electronic versions would be good”

“Announce at forums/sector meetings – i.e. GPs Practiced Learning.”

“Thank you”

“It would be helpful to invite all front line staff to the next meeting”

“May be more time to see each project or only have a limited number of projects, may be separate projects Early Years, Adults, Elderly, Whole Population Approach”

“Consider a larger venue to accommodate market stalls discussions”

“The project leads need to communicate as there is quite a lot of overlap”

“Please distribute contact details of project table individuals”

“Enjoyable and informative event, feel need to be more ‘curious and explore’ what is happening and where they are with developments”

“More notice of events, I wasn’t informed till the day before”