



# Barriers and Solutions to Restorative Justice delivery in England and Wales October 2015

## Contents

1. Recommendations
2. Introduction
3. Barriers and Solutions to Restorative Justice
  - 3.1. Data, statutory obligations and legislation
    - 3.1.1. Lack of reliable and secure means for facilitators to obtain victim and offender data
    - 3.1.2. Lack of reliable information and training for Criminal Justice agencies
    - 3.1.3. Underdevelopment of referral systems
    - 3.1.4. Lack of clear responsibilities for Criminal Justice Agencies
  - 3.2. Public understanding of Restorative Justice and victims of crime
    - 3.2.1. Inadequate and insufficient information and support for victims
    - 3.2.2. The difficulties in reconciling protection of victims with their right to know about Restorative Justice
  - 3.3. The impact of Transforming Rehabilitation on Restorative Justice rollout
    - 3.3.1. Challenges presented by the introduction of Transforming Rehabilitation
    - 3.3.2. Professional silo-working as a barrier to information and knowledge about RJ
    - 3.3.3. Funding-led restrictions on victim-led and offender-led RJ
    - 3.3.4. Lack of understanding in Criminal Justice agencies about working with victims
  - 3.4. The role of Police and Crime Commissioners and Police Forces
    - 3.4.1. Challenges of implementation in Police and Crime Commissioner regions
    - 3.4.2. Police Forces using Restorative Justice incorrectly as Community Resolutions
4. Conclusion
5. Background information and sources



## **1. Recommendations**

We have grouped the barriers into four main themes, which are summarised here along with associated recommendations

### **1.1 Data, statutory obligations and legislation**

#### **1.1.1 Data sharing**

For the Restorative Justice (RJ) process to start, contact details and important information about both parties is needed. This information usually needs to be supplied by offender agencies or Police Forces to the RJ provider

All too often this doesn't happen because of historical restrictions or a lack of trust between the agencies. The result? Too many opportunities to provide RJ are lost and victims miss out.

**We recommend the setting up of a national data-sharing template endorsed by the Ministry of Justice and promoted internally in major agencies, and externally by the Restorative Justice Council.**

#### **1.1.2 Lack of reliable information and training**

Sometimes Police Forces and offender agencies, which hold the data, offer to make initial contact with a victim to ask if they want to participate in RJ. While this is done with the best of intentions, evidence has shown that if the call is made by a trained facilitator, the take up rate is much higher.

**We recommend that the Ministry of Justice continue to fund third sector organisations to address this skills and awareness gap, especially in relation to the existing Victim Code and in order to leverage statutory investment in RJ.**

#### **1.1.3 Underdevelopment of referral systems**

There is a lack of understanding and clarity about what stage in the criminal justice system restorative interventions can be used. RJ can easily get "lost" resulting in inefficiency and missed opportunities.

**We propose the setting up of distinct and clear referral systems to show how RJ can be used at each stage of the criminal justice process.**



#### **1.1.4 Lack of clear responsibilities for Criminal Justice Agencies**

RJ is in danger of getting sidelined because there is no obligation on Criminal Justice agencies to refer. There is a risk that Government money and investment in RJ could be wasted.

**We recommend further research into what mechanisms can be introduced to ensure RJ is offered whether through policy changes or secondary legislation.**

## **1.2 Public understanding and victims of crime**

#### **1.2.1 Inadequate and insufficient information and support for victims**

Many bodies – including Why me? – have worked hard and with some success for increased recognition of the benefits to victims from taking part in RJ. Myths and misconceptions are prevalent and many victims are blocked, when they request it.

**We propose that the right to information about RJ be embedded in a Victims' Law, and that a sustained public media campaign is used to promote good news stories.**

#### **1.2.2 The difficulties in reconciling protection of victims with their right to know about RJ**

Some victims agencies in seeking to protect victims from further harm have been reluctant to offer RJ and have been oppositional to the process. This has especially been the case with domestic violence and sex offence cases. Without the best training and information, RJ can be viewed as a risk for victims and appear to be all about the offender's needs.

**We recommend that the MoJ funds training and awareness courses for victim agencies and that services working with victims of domestic violence and sex offences be involved in developing best RJ practice and in deploying it. And that contractual obligations to inform and engage victims in RJ are introduced to victim agency contracts.**

## **1.3 The impact of Transforming Rehabilitation on Restorative Justice rollout**

#### **1.3.1 Challenges presented by the introduction of Transforming Rehabilitation**

New people in post in the restructured National Probation Service and Community Rehabilitation Companies may not be trained or understand about RJ referrals.

**We recommend that the MoJ commissions an annual independent monitoring report on RJ provision by the PCCs, the National Probation Service and CRCs.**



### **1.3.2 Professional silo-working as a barrier to information and knowledge about RJ**

RJ works best where different agencies collaborate. People are less likely to proceed with RJ if they feel they're being passed from agency to agency.

**We recommend that the MoJ establish guidance on success factors for RJ in PCC regions and that they provide expert advice and funding to PCCs to establish RJ partnerships.**

### **1.3.3 Funding-led restrictions on which agency can provide victim-led and offender-led RJ**

RJ money goes to PCCs for victims and to CRCs for offenders. These need to be joined up.

**We recommend that the MoJ expert group consider the consequences of this and make recommendations to Ministers on how to improve victim access to RJ.**

### **1.3.4 Lack of understanding in Criminal Justice agencies about working with victims**

Working with victims of crime is not traditionally been the domain of the Criminal Justice sector. The holistic TR approach challenges this and may yet bring innovative approaches which will address victims' needs. In the meantime, there is a danger that victims will be revictimised if not handled sensitively by trained staff.

**We recommend that targeted communications directed at professionals about dealing victims are produced and that the MoJ funds development of victim awareness RJ courses aimed at Police Forces, prison staff, CRC and probation staff.**

## **1.4 The role of Police Forces and Police and Crime Commissioners**

### **1.4.1 Challenges of implementation in PCC regions**

RJ provision is patchy across PCC regions and can be confused with Community Resolutions. Some PCCs are still at commissioning stage.

**We recommend that the MoJ continue to make the small but useful central investment in RJ implementation and awareness support for PCCs for a further year. We also recommend that the post dedicated to promoting RJ to PCCs remains filled.**

**We also recommend that multi-agency collaboration is promoted to PCCs and that senior PCC and police leadership buy-in is secured by MoJ and third party agencies.**

### **1.4.2 Police Forces using RJ incorrectly as Community Resolutions**

"Painting fences and saying sorry" . It's not RJ.



**We recommend a public awareness campaign about how RJ works (see above) and support by the MoJ for the education and awareness of PCCs and police staff.**



## 2. Introduction

In this report we start to set out the barriers to Restorative Justice in order to inform policy, stimulate good practice, and to propose workable solutions. Our intention hereafter is to develop and debate these points with victims of crime, politicians, practitioners and professionals in order to contribute to our wider aim: to increase access to Restorative Justice for victims of crime.

RJ is a good news story: both for the victims – 85% satisfaction ratings compared to low ratings for experiences in court – and offenders - up to 27% reduction in re-offending rates. Reduction in reoffending means less victims. Satisfied victims are less traumatized, and more able to participate fully in the society.

We are very grateful to the RJ professionals who have provided us with information, and whose dedication to the profession is a central reason why some victims and offenders are getting access to RJ. Our intention in the following pages, is to identify good practice and to ask how that might be made more systematically available to each victim and offender who wants to access RJ.

## 3. Barriers and solutions to Restorative Justice

Here you will find the barriers grouped into four main themes. For each identified barrier, the impact is examined and a solution offered.

### 3.1 Data, statutory obligations and legislation

#### 3.1.1 Lack of reliable and secure means for facilitators to obtain victim and offender data

**Barrier:** In order to run RJ, a facilitator requires access to contact details for both parties, information about the offence and other pertinent information, such as offender history, victim vulnerability and so on.

It is often the case that agencies, such as The National Probation Service and Local Community Rehabilitation Companies (CRCs), the Police, and Victim Support, are not in a position to share that information because of historical data protection restrictions. At times, even though they are permitted legally and operationally to share information, they do not. The reasons for this can either lack of time, or lack of trust of the recipient agency, or lack of understanding about victims' rights under the Victim Code (See Victim Code (2013) Chapters 1 and 2, Parts A and B, section 7).

#### Impact

- Overall, RJ delivery is slowed down and opportunities for RJ are missed
- Potential participants are less likely to take up the offer of RJ and so miss out on the benefits of the restorative process.



- Organisations with offenders or victims who want RJ are finding it difficult to refer cases to third parties.
- Professional time is diverted to sorting out data-sharing issues.

### **Solution**

1. Set up a national data-sharing template for Information Sharing Agreements, which can be used by any Criminal Justice agency and adapted. This needs to come from the highest level, i.e. the Ministry of Justice, in order to have the impact it needs.
2. The national data-sharing template to gain the endorsement of senior leadership bodies and executives, such as National Police Chiefs' Council (formerly ACPO) and the Association of Police and Crime Commissioners. There is a recent precedent in data-sharing set up by ACPO for Hate Crime cases (see examples here [www.report-it.org.uk/information\\_sharing\\_agreements](http://www.report-it.org.uk/information_sharing_agreements)).
3. This data-sharing template should be promoted, take-up monitored and guidance produced by the Ministry of Justice and possibly the Restorative Justice Council (RJC)
4. Criminal Justice agencies should be encouraged to establish a transparent and low administration means for third parties to sign up to their Information Sharing Agreement.

### **3.1.2 Lack of reliable RJ information and training for Criminal Justice agencies**

#### **Barrier**

Agencies, such as Police Forces and CRCs, whose systems hold the data, sometimes offer to contact the victim or offender to ask them if they want to get involved in RJ. This approach can prove fruitful, but RJ delivery organizations have evidence to show that take up rates are higher when victims and offenders are contacted directly by the trained facilitator who is going to take on their case. There are a number of skills deployed when making first contact, for example being able to put the process in context, and to explain the voluntary nature of RJ to potential participants (see Victim Initiated Restorative Justice, Thames Valley report, 2015).

Why me? had a recent enquiry from a family member of a victim of homicide and the offender has refused an invitation put to them by their probation officer to participate. We do not know if they would have gone through with the process if we had talked to them directly, but anecdotal evidence we have gathered from practitioners with whom we work indicates it would have been far more likely.



### **Impact**

- Potential participants are less likely to take up the offer of RJ and so miss out on the benefits of the restorative process.
- Offenders or victims asking for RJ are less likely to succeed in obtaining access to RJ services.
- RJ delivery organisations are blocked from contacting participants and the efficiency and effectiveness of their service is jeopardised.

### **Solution**

1. The Ministry of Justice has funded third sector organisations to promote RJ to Criminal Justice Agencies, PCCs, the Judiciary and others. We would recommend that funding for this type of work is continued and increased in order to address this skills and awareness gap.
2. We advocate the continuing MoJ endorsement, promotion and funding to support the Restorative Justice Council's training and practice standards would help to ensure quality.
3. We recommend that the MoJ RJ Experts' Group review the RJ information available to CJ Agencies, especially on their duties to share data under the Victim Code.

### **3.1.3 Underdevelopment of referral systems**

#### **Barrier**

The number of cases where an offender has been convicted and a victim has been identified is in the many thousands each year. This is an impossible number for RJ providers to tackle in one go. Where the offer is general across all criminal cases, at any point since the crime was committed and to all victims, RJ can get lost among the other competing demands for professionals' time. In addition there is a lack of clarity about precise points in the Criminal Justice system where RJ interventions can be used.

#### **Impact**

The lack of clarity about systems and responsibilities can lead to inefficiency and missed opportunities to use RJ.

#### **Solution**

Proper RJ can be initiated or provided at separate stages of the criminal justice process. Distinct and clear referral systems and rules should exist for each stage, with clarity about the different professionals and procedures involved.





There is an opportunity now that the legislative foundations are laid and are 'bedding in' for Central Government to take a lead in establishing clear case referral routes for RJ. They are absolutely central to the successful delivery of RJ across England and Wales.

1. The MoJ could provide a small pot of funding to develop and promote RJ systems and responsibilities across distinct stages of the CJ process. This would identify precise points of intervention at which RJ could be offered to either victim or offender.

### **3.1.4 Lack of clear responsibilities for Criminal Justice Agencies**

#### **Barrier**

Despite national legislation, we are still not seeing the numbers of case coming through to referral agencies. From our contact with agencies working with offenders and victims, it is apparent that there are many potential beneficiaries but as there is no obligation to refer, RJ is getting sidelined. This starts before and at sentencing with the judiciary and referral order panel members not understanding the potential for the use of RJ and goes right through to post-sentence work with offenders. The most developed RJ referral routes are in the Youth Offending Service.

#### **Impact**

Government money is at risk of being wasted, as the investment in RJ training and preparedness is being under-utilised. Staff who are motivated and trained do not have the authority to act and can be frustrated in their efforts to enable RJ.

#### **Solution**

Where a systematic approach has been taken, such as cases coming to court with a guilty plea (pre-sentence programme) or burglary and assault (London CRC), or in Youth Offending Services, where RJ is often part of an out-of-court disposal order, there is a higher chance of success.

1. We recommend that further research is undertaken to identify what mechanisms would be most effective in overcoming this barrier, whether through policy or perhaps secondary legislation. That this research takes into account the disparity in RJ use for victims of adult and youth crime.



## **3.2 Public understanding and victims of crime**

### **3.2.1 Inadequate and insufficient information and support for victims**

Thanks to the hard work of dedicated people, including the founder of this charity, but also many practitioners and managers, RJ policy and practice over the last 15 years has developed and improved. More people are aware of RJ than a five years ago, when Why me? was set up. In the last two years alone, there has been an 8% increase in the number of people who understand the concept of RJ (Ipsos MORI Poll 2013, RJC).

The commitment of the Government to funding RJ is making a huge difference. However, many people still do not know about it or think that it is a soft option for the offender. What is striking from the RJC poll in 2013 is that when the concept was explained, 77% of people asked said that victims of crime should have the right, if they want to, to meet the offender and tell them about the impact of the crime.

#### **Impact**

We are concerned that agencies routinely don't fulfil their responsibilities under the Victim Code when it comes to RJ. We are aware of victims who contact us about it having not being told that it is a possibility or even being blocked from pursuing it. Victims of crime are very limited in their options in moving forward from the trauma of their experience and RJ is one proven method which can be offered to them.

Many victims of crime are not even aware that it is a possibility or that it is their right to be told about it. When victims are offered it they do not understand the benefits to them.

#### **Solution**

1. We recommend that the right to information about RJ be embedded in a Victims' Law, which would give it more impact than the existing Victim Code.
2. We advocate that victims have a right to certain preparatory steps to RJ be being taken, elevating it from a soft law in Code to something more binding on agencies. More consideration is required about how this might be achieved.
3. A sustained public media campaign to promote RJ is required to challenge myths and promote good news stories to all sections of society but particularly those most likely to become victims.



### **3.2.2 The difficulties in reconciling protection of victims with their right to know about RJ**

#### **Barrier**

As victim agencies are not homogenous, we are careful to make generalisations here, but we have found victim agencies may be reluctant to inform victims about RJ or even to advise them against taking the first steps. Some of the reasons for this approach include, hostility to the concept of a victim meeting the person who harmed them; legitimately protecting a victim from cycles of harm; concern about revictimisation, perceived pressure from statutory authorities to participate.

It would appear that the inadequate involvement of victim groups in the development of RJ and its implementation and that therefore oppositional rather than collaborative working has emerged at times. This is especially true in relation to crime involving sexual and domestic violence.

Without the appropriate training and information, RJ can be viewed as a risk for victims and appear to be all about the offender's needs.

#### **Impact**

Agencies and the individual volunteers and workers may introduce RJ to a victim in a way which will reduce the likelihood of them participating or victims may simply be left uninformed.

#### **Solution**

It is very important that victims receive information about RJ in a way which ensures that it forms part of their recovery journey and does not revictimise them.

Where Police and Crime Commissioners have integrated RJ provision into their newly commissioned Victim Services, there may be opportunities for RJ to be introduced in a positive way. This change may offer opportunities, much as the Transforming Rehabilitation changes might, for the RJ offer to be integrated into victims' services in a completely new and transformative way (although splitting the victim and offender offer can present its own problems – see point 3.3.3 below).



1. We recommend that MoJ to fund a series of RJ training and awareness course for victim agencies, their staff and volunteers in RJ, how it works, benefits for victims and cooperating with third party organisations.
2. We recommend that contractual obligations to inform and engage victims in RJ are introduced to victim agency delivery contracts.
3. It is essential that organisations and services working with victims of domestic violence and sex offences be involved in developing and refining RJ best practice and deployment in these type of cases.
4. We recommend that the MoJ monitor the performance of RJ delivery by PCCs, including the success of different models of how victims hear about RJ, and report back to the Minister and also the APCC.

### **3.3 The impact of Transforming Rehabilitation on Restorative Justice rollout**

#### **3.3.1 Challenges presented by the introduction of Transforming Rehabilitation**

##### **Barrier**

The TR changes in the criminal justice system have caused disruption to everyday work and delivery of services. To give just one example, splitting the Probation service into Local CRCs (now privately run) and The National Probation Service has meant that previously shared responsibilities, such as RJ, are now split along with all associated data and files. This can mean also that RJ-trained staff with have either left the service completely or have been redeployed. This can necessitate retraining and, more importantly, in terms of RJ delivery, time to re-establish professional relationships.

##### **Impact**

- New people in post may not be trained or understand the system about RJ referrals
- Restructuring has diverted staff from delivering RJ.
- The potential for new entrypoints for RJ in the CJ system.

##### **Solution**

The TR programme has started to unfold in prisons, probation and CRCs and the Police, and professionals are establishing themselves in new roles and understand their statutory responsibilities in relation to RJ and, over time, TR changes may have positive benefits for RJ (see Jon Collins, Probation Journal, Summer 2015).

1. MoJ commission annual independent monitoring report on RJ provision by PCCs, Probation and CRCs, including a national and transparent audit of quantity and quality of RJ across the UK.



2. MoJ to ensure that the senior leadership teams of the National Offender Management System integrate RJ into their systems.

### **3.3.2 Professional silo-working as a barrier to information and knowledge about RJ Barrier**

Offenders, but mostly victims, can get passed from agency to agency with competing interests, at times, 'fighting' over cases. This is partly due to the competitive tendering process where ability to corner the market can dictate against sharing information and clients.

#### **Impact**

The value of shared learning and resources across a region may be lost. For example, it may be more cost effective if the facilitator lives nearby the victim and/or the offender but they may not be from the agency which is 'in principle' responsible. This can lead to inappropriate and inefficient use of resources and the individual not getting access to RJ.

#### **Solution**

Where multi-agency partnerships operate, such as in Gloucestershire, there has been good progress in data-sharing, understanding the regional spread of the RJ offer and roles within that.

1. A clear understanding of the factors influencing success in a region is established by the MoJ so that they might be replicated across the country. (see point 3.4.1 about role of PCCs).
2. MoJ to provide expert advice to PCCs setting up RJ partnerships both written and in person and to provide ring-fenced funding for their formation.

### **3.3.3 Funding-led restrictions on which agency can provide victim-led and offender-led RJ Barrier**

RJ money is being distributed to PCCs for victim-initiated RJ and to CRCs for offender-initiated work and these two pots of money are not joined up.

#### **Impact**

A situation has arisen whereby the local PCC funded RJ service is advertising RJ to victims and cannot take offender enquiries and local CRCs are doing the reverse. The impact of this is that victims and offenders may be disappointed if the delivery body cannot deal with them because they are from the wrong side of the equation. Individuals are less likely to proceed, if the hurdles are too great, i.e. being passed from one agency to another.



## **Solutions**

There is also a question, which will need to be more closely examined, about whether there are cost savings to be made by amalgamating RJ funding in an area and establishing one agency to provide RJ, whoever requests it.

1. We recommend that the MoJ expert group consider the consequences of the split in provision in time for the next Government spending round and make recommendations to Ministers based on the outcome of their discussions.

### **3.3.4 Lack of understanding in Criminal Justice agencies about working with victims**

#### **Barriers**

When the request for RJ comes from an offender, the professional then has to contact the victim. Frequently we have found that they may not know how best to handle it, partly because there is a particular skill in making the first approach (see above) and partly because they have less or, in the case of prison staff, no experience in working with victims. Staff, who are aware of their lack of experience in this area, are often stuck about what to do next and how to take action.

#### **Impact**

The reduction in crime levels which can be achieved through introducing RJ systematically are not being achieved. There is a great opportunity to change the attitude of offenders who participate and to change their lives forever by facilitating a meeting with one of their real victims – not just a piece of paper – a real human being.

#### **Solution**

Many professionals who have attended victim awareness RJ courses have found them very helpful in providing clear guidance but also in improving their confidence levels. There are a few courses on offer across the country, including our own one day course, which supplements the standard Level One RJ training.

1. We recommend that targeted communications materials and information directed at professionals about dealing with victims in RJ are produced, possibly by the RJC.
2. MoJ to fund development of Victim awareness RJ courses aimed at Police, Prison and CRC and Probation staff, who are dealing with offender-led enquiries.

### **3.4 The role of Police Forces and Crime Commissioners and Police Forces**

#### **3.4.1 Challenges of implementation in Police and Crime Commissioner regions**

##### **Barrier**

Under the last Government and in this spending round, PCCs had £29 million made available



over a period of 3 years to fund RJ activity. Some, such as Gloucestershire, have acted quickly, employing established organisations, such as Remedi, Restorative Solutions or Victim Support to set up RJ in their region. Others have set up their own Victim Service which intends to incorporate the RJ offer, such as Cambridgeshire, Avon and Somerset and North Wales. And there are other PCCs, such as London MOPAC and Wiltshire, who, at the time of writing, are deciding on how to commission the service or in the process of doing so.

### **Impact**

A few victims of crime are being referred to RJ services and receiving the benefits. We are hopeful that more people will start to get access to RJ once the PCC services get established.

### **Solution**

The solution lies in a combination of action by both the MoJ and PCCs.

#### **1. Central MoJ support for PCCs**

The Why me? promotional work (2 hour awareness sessions with up to 40 people in a PCC area) which covers the above points and re-enacts an RJ conference using participants, is effective in communicating what is required for successful RJ and receives excellent feedback from participants. These opportunities are also used by us to point to good practice used by other PCCs. We share good practice and demonstrate that it is possible, albeit often slow, to get started. IARs and RJ Working are also funded by the MoJ this year to disseminate knowledge about RJ to PCCs.

We recommend that the Ministry of Justice

- a. Continue to fund RJ implementation and awareness sessions for PCCs (by third party organisations including Why me?) and the Police for a further year from 1<sup>st</sup> November.
- b. Continue to fund a post dedicated to promoting RJ to PCCs, such as that filled by Ellie Acton at present.
- c. Additionally fund the promotion of RJ at the Association of PCCs, the National Police Chiefs Council and the College of Policing. Demonstrate how RJ works to senior leadership teams through expert role play and Q&A session as well as through a series of formal meetings and seminars where senior staff can share good practice.



## 2. PCC Regions

It is apparent from our contact with PCCs and in discussions with RJ delivery services, that the ingredients which lead to successful implementation of RJ by a PCC and its Police Force are as follows:

- Multi-agency collaboration – across the Police, The National Probation Service, CRCs, The youth offending service, Courts and the judiciary and third sector organisations – working together to make RJ work and sharing cases and information about cases freely.
- Senior PCC and Police leadership buy-in and support to officers and staff delivering RJ – where RJ is always on the agenda and is incorporated into everyday work; and where the people managing it are of high enough rank to make it work and that delivery staff have enough time to do it.
- Targeted communication to the public and victims of crime about how to get RJ – good website signposting; clear leaflets and information about what it is, the benefits and how it works; promotion to local people through media – good news stories.
- Information Sharing Agreements – clear ISAs for third parties so that case information can be shared with them.
- Good training of front-line staff to understand how to tell people about RJ, understand what is and is not RJ and to know where to refer people to who want it.

### 3.4.2 Police Forces using RJ incorrectly as Community Resolutions

#### Barrier

We are aware of RJ being used by Police Forces or them applying the term 'RJ' to resolve a case when it isn't actually RJ which is happening. For example, taking a shoplifter back to a shop and forcing them to say sorry. Often pressures to achieve targets and achieve an outcome can lead officers to dispense with RJ basics, such as voluntary participation on both sides.

#### Impact

There is a danger that RJ will be associated with the soft option for low level offences, which will not be popular with the public. For the victims, it does not necessarily give them the opportunity to get their questions answered. It is of particular concern that they may feel that they are being used to reduce crime rather than gaining benefit for themselves (see RJC poll about RJ affecting sentence). Equally, remorse on the offender's part may not be as genuine and therefore the opportunity to have a positive effect on their attitude may be missed.





## **Solution**

1. Continuing MoJ endorsement, promotion and mandating of the Restorative Justice Council's training and practice standards would help to ensure quality.
2. See previous section for recommendations about supporting the education and awareness of PCCs and Police staff.
3. A public awareness campaign about how RJ works and its benefits for victims and the impact on crime rates to run throughout the year, building on the RJ Awareness Week activities undertaken by MoJ and RJC.

## **4. Conclusion**

There are examples of excellent RJ work across the country and some committed individuals and PCCs who want to RJ to be integrated in their service. But mostly good practice depends on the motivation and huge efforts of individuals to break through barriers in their service or region. This cannot be sustainable nor is it desirable. We recommend targeted action to support the systematic rollout of RJ in order to build on the statutory investment made in recent years.

## **5. Background and information sources**

Why me? has written this report based on a number of different sources of information, including our regular conversations with host Restorative Justice (RJ) agencies, our meetings with local and national decision-makers, contact with operational staff at Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs), Prisons, and local Community Rehabilitation Companies (CRCs).

As part of the organisation's work in setting up observations of RJ conferences by decision-makers, Why me? staff are in touch with over 30 host agencies across England and Wales on a monthly basis. Information from these agencies has informed much of what is written below. In addition, we have had in-depth conversations with 36 out of the 43 Police and Crime Commissioner offices since April as part of our offer of RJ Awareness sessions to senior leadership teams. In the course of this activity, we have gathered intelligence about the challenges faced by each region and what they are doing to overcome them. Our RJ partnership with HMP Onley since November 2014 also provides us with a case study on which to draw experience and information.



### **Reference Documents**

Victim Initiated Restorative Justice, Restoring the Balance, Thames Valley Probation, Thames Valley Partnership, June 2015

The Code of Practice for Victims of Crime, 2013,

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-code-of-practice-for-victims-of-crime>

Ipsos MORI Poll by RJC 2015

[https://www.restorativejustice.org.uk/sites/default/files/news/files/Ipsos%20MORI%20polling%202015\\_0.pdf](https://www.restorativejustice.org.uk/sites/default/files/news/files/Ipsos%20MORI%20polling%202015_0.pdf)