

Collective Encounters

(dis)connected evaluation



contents

executive summary

(dis)connected	background	3
	overview	3
	aims & objectives	4
	management and evaluation framework	5

evaluation

company evaluation	recruitment	6
	participants	7
	workshop structure	8
	Open College Network	9
	mid-term sharing of work	9
	the production	9
	the tour	10
	staffing and management	11
participants' evaluation	initial responses	13
	on-going monitoring and evaluation	14
	final evaluation	16
recommendations	recruitment	17
	participants	17
	Open College Network	17
	the production	17
	the tour	18
	staffing and management	18

appendices

appendix 1	Community centres, organisations and groups used for recruitment	19
------------	------------------------------------------------------------------	----



executive summary

background

(dis)connected grew out of the research for Living Place Project, Collective Encounters' first initiative which involved two years of creative research with over 500 people in north Liverpool. Living Place identified disengagement, disenfranchisement, active citizenship and social exclusion as some of the key concerns to be addressed. It identified a lack of arts provision in the area and limited activities on offer, especially for young people. It also found an eagerness to explore imaginative ways of enabling local peoples' voices to be heard.

Through Living Place Project Collective Encounters ran two participatory training programmes: one for young people and one for third age residents. These proved to be popular and successful, and the accreditation we enabled through the Open College Network was identified as an added attraction. Both programmes resulted in participants creating their own pieces of new work using forum theatre techniques and both were performed locally. One of the most interesting outcomes of this process was the performance by young people of their piece at the Arena Housing tenant's conference. Here the audience was predominately made up of people over 60 and the resulting discussions and interaction between the two age groups led us to believe that a future inter-generational programme would be interesting and fruitful.

Following the large-scale, complex nature of Living Place Collective Encounters needed time to reflect, evaluate and plan for the future, and so a short-term bridging project was required.

These were the factors which influenced the development of (dis)connected.

overview

(dis)connected was an inter-generational participatory programme. It set out to enable up to 20 north Liverpool residents to explore their feelings, ideas and experiences in relation to the issues of disengagement, disenfranchisement, active citizenship and exclusion. It offered participants the opportunity to achieve OCN accreditation in three Level 1 units: How to become an active citizen in the community; Introduction to Acting; and Putting on a Performance. Participants were to receive training in basic drama/performance skills, with a particular focus on techniques from the arsenal of Theatre of the Oppressed. Following development workshops the group was to create a 20 minute performance piece which would stimulate debate and discussion and provide a mechanism for audience involvement throughout. In keeping with all Collective Encounters work it was to be a piece of new work played to new audiences in new spaces; and in keeping with the company's philosophy it was to be a piece of theatre for social change. The project was to enable Collective Encounters to continue its innovative arts provision in north Liverpool while allowing the company the space to reflect and plan for the future.

aims and objectives

aims of (dis)connected:

- Explore issues around democracy, disengagement, active citizenship, social exclusion
- Provide quality arts experience for an integrated group of young and third age people in north Liverpool
- Introduce participants to a range of drama techniques and processes, with a particular focus on theatre of the oppressed
- Produce a public performance of work

successful: ✓ partially successful: ♦ unsuccessful: ✘

Goal 1	Through a series of workshops explore the key themes	Objectives	i. Provide 24 drama based workshops for up to 20 participants	✓
			ii. Enhance participants' understanding of key themes	♦
			iii. Enhance participants' capacity to articulate their own experiences and ideas	✓
Goal 2	Provide high quality professionally led drama workshops for local people	Objectives	i. Over a 3-4 month period build participants understanding of drama and theatre techniques	✓
			ii. Over a 3-4 month period build participants confidence to engage effectively in these drama processes	✓
			iii. Develop specific skills in forum/legislative theatre, contemporary theatre, improvisation, devising and building character	✓
			iv. Provide opportunity for participants to work with a range of professional artists/facilitators	✓
Goal 3	Develop participants' skills at exploring theme and ideas both individually and as a group.	Objectives	i. Enhance participants' communication skills	✓
			ii. Enhance participants' capacity for team and group work	✓
			iii. Enhance participants' confidence and capacity to express considered opinions appropriately	✓
Goal 4	Present a showing of work or work in progress at a mid point in the project	Objectives	i. Produce a performance/presentation at Notre Dame School	✘
			ii. Generate an audience of young and third age people	✘
			iii. Enable learning from this showing of work to inform the final performance	✘
			iv. Promote discussion of key themes with the audience	✘
Goal 5	Produce a high quality public performance at the end of the project.	Objectives	i. Produce a 20 minute performance based on the principles of legislative theatre	✓
			ii. Generate an audience of local residences, policy and decision makers with a democracy and social inclusion brief	♦
			iii. Resource the performance appropriately, ensuring high production values	♦
			iv. Perform in a city centre arts venue and reach a wider audience in the local/regional community centres via live webcast	♦

Goal 6	Explore the possibility of live internet web cast for performance or a television broadcast	Objectives	v. Liaise with FACT to establish a partnership presentation	✘
			vi. Liaise with Toxteth TV to establish a partnership presentation	✘
Goal 7	Fully evaluate and document the project	Objectives	i. Ensure that participants are fully involved in the evaluation of the project throughout	✓
			ii. Capture photographic documentation of workshops and performances	♦
			iii. AV record performances, discussions and public discussions	♦
			iv. Monitor and evaluate the project throughout against the agreed aims, goals and objectives	♦
			v. Publish a final evaluation report to be made available to all interested parties	✓

management and evaluation framework

(dis)connected employed a part time (3/5) project co-coordinator and a part time (sessionally based) director. These staff co-facilitated workshops. Collective Encounters is committed to employing and offering opportunities to emerging artists and recent graduates and both members of staff had recently graduated from Liverpool Hope University. Both had worked previously for Collective Encounters (as project administrator and assistant director respectively for The Harmony Suite). A more experienced multi-media artist and composer were contracted to support development and performance of the final piece.

Workshops and creative development were managed by the company's artistic director, who also provided initial training and mentoring for facilitators. The project co-coordinator was managed by Collective Encounters' administrative director. All budgets and assessments were overseen by the senior management team. In addition to receiving weekly reports, the artistic director attended workshops at key points in the project.

Each workshop was evaluated with the group at the end of each session and this formative feedback was incorporated by the facilitators into planning. The facilitators then evaluated each session together and forwarded reports onto the artistic director. The artistic director attended occasional workshops at which she facilitated an on-going evaluation and monitoring process with participants. She also facilitated a final evaluation with the group, and a final evaluation with project staff.

evaluation

recruitment

The recruitment process took longer and was more difficult than we had first anticipated, with levels of interest initially lower than we had hoped for. While this is a common problem we had hoped to build on the successes of Living Place Project and attract back some LPP participants, but the gap between LPP finishing and (dis)connected beginning proved too long. As this had been a difficulty with LPP also, however, we did have a recruitment strategy in place which we built on with (dis)connected. This involved: recruiting through existing community organisations; attending existing community/youth groups to publicise the project; producing and effectively distributing print materials; widely publicizing and running taster workshops; offering flexibility to participants to negotiate the best times/days for workshops.



As well as building on existing relationships with community groups, centres and organisations we identified and approached new ones. As well as opening up new areas for recruitment this also helped to develop Collective Encounters community network. Rice Lane City Farm was a particularly welcome addition: we have had difficulty in the past working through core organisations in Walton and Rice Lane offered a welcome way in. Staff were very keen to support the project and 3 young people who access the centre completed the project. Because it was an intergenerational project it was important to ensure that we were accessing both young people and the third age generation with our recruitment but we certainly experienced more difficulty finding ways to meet potential older participants and this was reflected in the uneven balance of the final group. All our third age participants had either seen a flier or read about the project in the local paper: the groups we attempted to recruit through were predominantly for people in their 70s and 80s who were not at all interested in joining a drama group. For full details of the community groups we approached in the recruitment process please see Appendix 1.

The fliers were a welcome recruitment tool and proved to be very useful when posting out information or door to door canvassing but were not sufficiently striking and effective when advertising in post offices, libraries and community centres. A poster would have been more useful in those contexts.

The taster workshops were met with a mixed response. Some were very successful with up to 8 people attending while others attracted no participants. There seems to be no connection with specific days being more popular as these varied but we did not hold any on a weekend which may possibly have attracted more young people. The workshops that did have good attendance were normally after a visit into an organisations or school, again highlighting the importance of visiting groups as well as meeting with leaders or teachers.

participants

9 participants completed the project: 7 15-18 year olds and 2 over 55's. They became a very strong group who worked hard together, gelled very effectively and supported each other well. While the balance between the two age groups could have been more even, both age groups enjoyed working with the other and commented in evaluation that this was one of the strengths of the project (see Appendix 2). Co-facilitators worked very successfully to overcome initial barriers to participation and anxieties on behalf of several participants. Their process supported the group to reach a point where members could explore issues and ideas in a very open and safe environment. This was aided by the length of the project: running over a five month period enabled people to build strong relationships.

While we were very happy with the quality of the groups' participation and the quality of the experience we were able to offer them, we were concerned about the small number of participants: we had hoped to see up to 20 people through the project.

24 people did sign up for the project, of that 24: 18 attended taster workshops and said they'd like to join the group but did not appear at project sessions; 5 extra people started the course but dropped out before the first show. 3 joined the project after the taster workshops had finished so joined phase 1 of the workshops and went onto complete the project.

There were a range of reasons for the retention problems, some entirely personal and unavoidable, but others we may be able to avoid in future. We possibly lost some participants because of the changes in workshop days and lack of clarity about times/dates from the outset. At the beginning of the project we met twice a week and after a month lost a couple of members as they found it tiring and were unable to commit to twice a week. We took this on board and changed the sessions to once a week with the group's agreement that this would increase again once we approached the final performance. However, the participants who had left did not return to the project as they did not feel able to commit.

Within the group there were some access requirements. One participant suffered from epilepsy, another was undergoing chemotherapy and a young single mum had childcare problems. None of the participants' issues affected the project but there were times when people had to leave early or not attend due to child care or hospital appointments. Although the participants completed the project and we arranged the rehearsal schedule around people's requirements, we could possibly do more in future to accommodate the diverse and pressing needs of participants.

workshop structure

Workshops lasted two hours and typically began with warm up games/exercises and ended with group evaluation of the session. The project was broken down into three phases which aimed to ensure the group developed a very strong working relationship in the early stages to enable them to create work effectively in phases two and three.

Phase One

The emphasis was on team building and getting the group used to working together; building confidence and creating a safe environment. The subject matter was introduced to the participants but not explored in great depth at this stage. Phase one took longer than initially planned as three new members joined the group late and additional development work was required to fully integrate them into the group.

Phase Two

Once the group was established the workshops became more focused on the theme, subject matter and different performance techniques. Participants were exploring their experiences and understanding of the core project themes whilst learning new performance styles and presentation techniques. Due to waiting for confirmation on funding we had to extend this workshop period until we knew what money would be available for the production and tour. The group started to become anxious about developing the work that would be in the final piece. Ideally this phase of the project could have been reduced by 4 weeks, to enable us to begin working on the final material earlier.

Phase Three

This was the rehearsal period in which the group further developed existing material and created additional new scenes under the director's guidance. Time was limited and this mean a lot of extra work, not only for the participants, but everyone who was involved in the project. Ideally in future projects we would allow a greater amount of time on section 3 and less on section 2.



Open College Network

Collective Encounters is an approved centre for learning with Merseyside Open College Network (MOCN). The company wanted to enable participants to complete 3 MOCN units each and for the assessment requirements of these to be fully integrated into the workshop and performance process: enhancing the programme plan rather than being added on top. Putting on a performance; Introduction to acting; and How to become an active citizen in the community, were selected.

In the planning stages it seemed that the MOCN learning outcomes would compliment the work we had planned, but in actuality this was not the case and juggling assessment requirements with a full exploration of the project themes and development of a performance piece was a lot for the co-facilitators (who had no prior experience of MOCN assessment) to manage.

Some participants had already completed the Introduction to Acting and Putting on a Performance units and we were unable to accommodate them completing alternate drama based units so they just entered into the Active Citizen unit. All participants did fully and successfully complete all units they entered for.

mid-term sharing of work

Initially we had planned to undertake a mid-project sharing of work at Notre Dame College. Due to a restricted budget and difficulties in liaison with the school, however, this aspect of the project was cut.



the production

The final production was a high quality piece of inter-active theatre, which reflected the ideas and anxieties of the participants. The director and the group worked effectively with a professional multimedia artist and sound designer; and the director and facilitator worked closely with the artistic director to find interesting ways of enabling the audience to intervene in the action. These processes ensured an exciting piece of theatre which fused multimedia with live action and actively engaged the audience throughout.

The participants performed very well and were clearly very confident in their roles – a great deal of good work was evident. This was particularly noticeable in how confidently the cast handled the audience interaction and were able to improvise and respond.

While the piece did accurately represent the ideas of participants, it did, however, lack a political maturity and sensibility that more experienced facilitators may have been able to draw from the group. The notion of 'theatre for social change' was not something that directly informed the development of the piece, so when it came to identifying particular agents of change to invite to the final performance there was a lack of clarity as to where this change could come from. The piece explored generalized stereotypes and widely held assumptions, rather than identifying specific, identifiable problems and did not really get to the heart of disengagement. So while the process of exploring these ideas, creating work and performing was an empowering process for participants, it was not politically as empowering for them as we would have hoped. It was, however, still a strong piece of theatre which certainly did stimulate debate and provoke some audience members to re-think traditional and ageist assumptions.

Another difficulty with the piece was in the development: due to a much delayed decision on a substantial funding application from Liverpool Culture Company we were unable to make certain key decisions about the production until a very late stage. This hindered the production process and led to frustrations amongst staff and participants. Unfortunately this was not something that could have been anticipated by the company and was a problem faced by many Liverpool based organisations in this period.



the tour

Initially we had planned to perform in one city centre venue with live webcast link up to community centres in north Liverpool and beyond. Unfortunately however, we were unable to negotiate an arrangement with FACT or Toxteth TV or secure sufficient funding to enable this idea to go forward. Consequently we decided to undertake a live tour to community venues and do one city centre performance. We wanted to reach at least 6 community venues and to reach an audience of mixed ages, offering the piece free of charge. We planned to play to existing groups within the community and use the city centre venue to play to friends, family and an invited audience of key policy makers, councilors and local leaders.

Although we have developed a lot of strong working relationships with many different groups and organisations in north Liverpool very few have suitable performance spaces. For this reason we had to carefully plan which centres had the facilities to house the show and ensure that we covering all our target areas: Walton, Kirkdale, Everton, Anfield, Vauxhall, Marybone and Breckfield. The main difficulties in arranging the tour involved centres not returning calls, double bookings and one centre mis-quoting the cost of space hire then changing it to a much higher rate at the last minute. This led to one performance having to be cancelled. We therefore performed at:

- West Everton Community Centre
- Croxteth Communiviersty
- Rice Lane City Farm
- Shrewsbury House Youth Club

Our city centre venue was Liverpool Hope University’s Cornerstone Theatre. Audience numbers were as follows:

Venue	Total Audience	Under 14	15 - 25	25 - 50	50 +
WECC	10	3	0	2	5
Croxteth Communiviersty	36	0	18	4	13
Rice Lane City Farm	28	5	16	5	2
Shrewsbury house	21	0	18	2	1
Hope University	58	(Data not recorded)			
Total Audience	153				

With the exception of the performance at Liverpool Hope all the other shows were to groups that already used the performance venues: given the late stage by which we were able to produce the flyers and advertise the tour (given the delayed funding announcement) the company decided that playing to specific target groups in these venues would be the most productive way of ensuring an audience. Consequently we worked with centre managers to identify groups and provided them with flyers and information to pass on. The Liverpool Hope performance was publicly advertised, through a targeted mail shot, but the delay in being able to issue the invites meant that many (councilors in particular) were unavailable. In future we would aim to publicise productions at least a month in advance.

Overall, there was a very positive response to the production. Audiences gave very positive feedback; funders and partners were pleased with the outcomes; and key community workers/centres are keen to work with us again.

staffing and management

Collective Encounters is committed to employing and providing opportunities for emerging artists and recent graduates, and was very pleased with the work carried out by staff on this project. Through (dis)connected, however, we have learned that relatively inexperienced professionals will receive a better quality of experience if working alongside a more experienced professional; and that projects would benefit from the combination of experienced and emergent practitioners. We had anticipated that the artistic director would be able to mentor and support the project in such a way as to provide this more experienced voice throughout but due to personal circumstances (she had a baby half way through the project) she was not as fully engaged as had been planned.

Another difficulty was budget related: because we were so late in hearing about one significant application and two smaller applications were unsuccessful we were not able to

employ all the project staff we had originally hoped. In particular the project would have benefited from a Stage Manager – in this case the multi media designer had to take on this role as well, which meant that he was very stretched. There were also some difficulties about roles and responsibilities not being clearly defined and the balance of work between the co-facilitators was not always equal.

remote management

This is the first project Collective Encounters has delivered using remote management. Half way through the project the company's Artistic Director moved to Edinburgh leaving Fiona Thompson to day-to-day manage operations on a local basis. Mid way through the project also the Artistic Director was on maternity and the Administrative Director attended a conference in Australia on behalf of the company, taking her out of the country for a noticeable period of time. Remote management happened through using free internet based telephone service such as Skype and Instant Messaging in order to keep the lines of communications, open, frequent and free. Frequent visits by both senior managers were made to ensure the progression of the project. One of key learning curves is with regards to the information that is provided to freelancers, with specific skills, who are brought into project.

It became clear half way through that freelancers did not have a grasp on how the company and project were being run and managed, and the company wishes to put systems into place to ensure clarity next time around.



Participants' Evaluation

Participants were engaged in evaluation and monitoring processes throughout the project. This happened in several different ways:

- On-going group evaluation at the end of each session which was incorporated into the planning of subsequent sessions by the co-facilitators
- More formal personal evaluation undertaken through completing monitoring forms
- A final structured evaluative discussion

Below are notes from the individual evaluation and monitoring processes and the final group evaluation.

initial responses

In the first session the group were asked to respond anonymously to three stimuli. Here are the results:

One thing you'd like to get out of the project:

- Learn new drama/acting skills (3)
- Build confidence
- Acting experience
- Self satisfaction
- "Express my opinions to other generations and make them understand"
- Empathy and understanding across generations
- Group strength
- Something for my CV

One thing you're anxious about in the project:

- 'Oh my God, will I freeze'
- 'I'm worried my opinions won't be accepted'
- Having to sing
- Having to dance
- Not enough people coming
- Politics might be boring

One thing you could bring to the project:

- Drama/Acting skills (3)
- Innovation and humour
- Help others find their words/voice
- Communication

on-going monitoring and evaluation

The group were asked to complete monitoring and evaluation forms at three points in the project (an early workshop, at a mid-point and at the end)

What are you enjoying most about the sessions?

Session 1	
Trying out new things	2
Learning new skills	2
Learning about different forms of theatre	2
Meeting new people	
Theatre games	2
Session 2	
Theatre games – they are fun and we learn to work together	3
The opportunity to work with young people and learn from them	
Devising a new piece of theatre	4
Learning new theatre techniques and skills	3
Meeting new people	
Group getting more comfortable with each other	
Session 3	
The performances	6
Rehearsing for the performances	2
Team work	
Working with the older members of the group/younger members of the group	2
Performing in different venues	
Real sense of achievement	

What are you enjoying least about the sessions?

Session 1	
Not everyone comes all the time	
Some people don't get involved enough	
Too much comedy, not enough serious scenes	
Too much improvisation, would like more script work	
Need more participants	2
Session 2	
Improvisation – I'm not good at it	
Theatre games	2
Worried there's not enough time to get it all done	
Evaluations because I hate writing	
Session 3	
Kids coming into the workshops	
Performing to a difficult audience	3
Not getting a run through before performances	
Last minute changes	2

Would have liked more performances	
Too time consuming	

What new skills do you feel you have developed/what new things have you learned?

Session 1	
New improvisation skills	
New character development skills	
New forms of theatre	3
Learned more about myself	
Session 2	
Socialising – we are getting to know each other better	
My confidence is getting better	4
Communication	2
Improvisation	
New forms of theatre	2
General acting skills	3
Session 3	
Interacting with the audience	
Confidence	3
Learning from difficult experiences and mistakes	
General performance skills	4
Teamwork	
Greater understanding of younger people	

What skills do you feel you need to develop further to aid your final performance?

Session 1	
Contributing more to the group devising process	
Focus more rather than playing around	
Be less self conscious	
Session 2	
I need more confidence	5
Observation	
Listening	2
Concentration	
Self discipline	
Skills in changing characters	
Session 3	
Concentration	
Punctuality	
Confidence	2



final evaluation

A full group discussion was facilitated by the artistic director. The following points were made:

strengths of the project

- The group: it was a mixed group, all members were willing and 'up for it', the group gelled well and developed mutual respect
- Intergenerational aspect: this was a real strength, developing empathy for others' perspectives, but would have been enhanced further if a greater balance between young and third age participants had been achieved
- Facilitators: had good sense of humour and camaraderie, very supportive, approachable and 'made you feel welcome and wanted'
- Professionalism and real sense of confidentiality
- Interesting form of theatre – learning something new and unusual
- Evaluation – the facilitator's listened and took on board evaluation points and it was clear to see how they included this in their planning
- Hospitality: Food was provided during the tour and expenses were being paid (although still not enough to cover)
- Working with additional professional artists who responded well to the ideas of the group

weaknesses of the project

- Would have benefited from a better balance between young and third age participants
- Don't always feel in control of the piece – ideas are not always fully incorporated
- Last minute changes were a problem
- WECC – rehearsal venue was a problem – attitude of the staff there was bad (except Eddie) – it was not a safe or protected space – staff and centre users came into the room all the time unannounced, staff were rude etc. Also, it was in a problematic location with poor access via public transport and feeling 'unsafe' to approach
- Devising came too late – too long spent on initial work and not enough time focussed on creating material
- Not prepared to play to difficult audiences
- Not allowed to do a run through before performances
- Last minute production schedule, changes made frequently and new dates put in at last minute
- Sometimes different messages were coming from the two facilitators

what would you like to be different next time?

- Have a tour bus or a way of travelling to venues all together
- More venues
- Would like to do script work or at least have a script arising from the devising process
- Different rehearsal space

- No unexpected meetings – to be clear in advance about the workshop/rehearsal timetable and stick to it – also facilitators to be more understanding about participants time commitments
- More information on qualifications and more openness and detail about them

recommendations

recruitment

- have a longer lead in time to make contact with group leaders, establish a relationship with them and furnish them with information about the company prior to recruitment
- work through group leaders to go into groups to talk about up-coming projects and ascertain interest
- run the majority of taster workshops through existing groups and secure participation at those tasters in advance
- run one or two widely advertised open taster workshops, with plenty of time to advertise in advance – ensure that this appears in local press and on local radio
- produce posters to advertise in libraries, post-offices and community centres and extend this advertising to local shops, sports centres and police stations
- find alternative ways of accessing potential third age participants such as line dancing, over 50's aerobics, or reading groups
- work more closely with housing association partners to recruit through their databases, groups and networks

participants

- run projects once weekly over longer time periods, with some additional rehearsals (one day at weekends for instance, or two to three days during holiday periods) as we approach performance
- produce a very clear workshop/production timetable at the beginning of the project and stick to it
- over-recruit in the first instance to allow for inevitable drop off
- find ways of supporting individual needs more effectively (child care etc.)
- enhance participants expenses

Open College Network

- Collective Encounters should produce a guidance pack to facilitators and offer more formal training in MOCN assessments
- Units should be more fully integrated into programme and workshop planning

the production

- ensure that the directors we employ are politically minded and have an understanding of how to foster a growing political awareness amongst participants
- ensure that the notion of theatre for social change is something that informs all development process
- do not embark upon a project again until at least 90% of the funding is in place

the tour

- give a public performance in the rehearsal venue prior to commencing the tour to enhance cast confidence
- where performances are not on consecutive days ensure run-throughs prior to performance
- develop the participants understanding of the nature of live performance, the unpredictability of audiences and the possible difficulties of playing to a young non-traditional theatre going audience
- publicise all events at least a month in advance, utilizing local press and radio as well as posters and flyers
- specifically target and lobby key potential audience members throughout future projects and prime them to expect invitations
- Continue to provide participants with the opportunity to play in both traditional and non-traditional theatre spaces
- provide a tour bus to take participants to venues as a group

staffing and management

- where using two members of staff, employ one experienced professional and one emergent practitioner
- clarify roles and responsibilities
- provide generic and management information about Collective Encounters to freelancers working on project



appendix 1:

community groups, centres & organisations used for recruitment

Contact name	Organisation	Number
Alf Bordessa	sea merchants @ eldonians	207 0560
Alison Lovelady	Streets Project	07908096640
Bob Blanchard	BNEC	2888400
Christine Banks	Marybone	2363865
Clare Corran	Positive Futures	2332024
Colly Whitty		07812943375
Dave Litherland	Arena	
Eddie Bowman	WECC	282 0303
Elaine Neary (Drama Sec)	Notre Dame School	263 3104
Ellen	Kirkdale neighbourhood centre	330-0452
Emily Matthias	Maritime housing	4825268
Ester Doolan	Maritime housing	4825268
Heidi Francis	Albion House	2609804/ 2631335
Irene Hanratty	Mazinod Court	
Jackie Boylan	The Loop	3305576
John Hording	Century Boys Club	2633856
Julie Tomlinson	Pinehurst Estate	264 6287
Julie Jenkins	Arena	
Kerrie Preston	BNEC youth worker	2888400
Lesley Black	League of Welldoers	207 1984
Libby McCabe	Rotunda College	
Linda Perry	Walton new century halls	2341254
Liz	Active Age Centre	287 1329
Lucy Brown	Croxteth Communiversiy	5465514
Maria Hornsby	Rice Lane City Farm	5301066
Maria Suku	Shewsbury group	2070725
Marie McGiveron	Vauxhall millennium	298 1544
Nicola	Regeneration building	2074612
Nikki Bonner	Liverpool Film Academy Trust	9338282
Noreen Fallon	CDS	4825813
Pauline	VNC	2981544
Rachel Littlewood	Everyman + Playhouse	
Rachel Strahan	Walton youth Project	5254832
Robbie Quinn	Councillor	263 5857
Ron Formby	Scottie Press	330 0213
Ruth Little	ABCC	2600022
Sharon Jordine	Breckfield YP project	2606172

Sheila McCormack	Lighthouse	476 2342
Tom Cleary	Positive futures	207 6003
Tony McGan	Eldonians	207 3406
Val O'Donnall	GYRO	7096660
Winston Douglas	David Lewis Youth Centre	7095724
Head of Performing Arts	Liverpool Comm College	252 4360
	Detached project in Vauxhall	07883313612
	Walton youth Project	5254832