Please tell us a bit about you....

We aim to be as open and transparent as possible, so we will publish all responses to this survey. This will include the name of your organisation, and with your permission, also your name. We will not publish personal contact details.

1. **What is your name?** (Required)
   
   Lucy Jaffé

2. **Are you happy for your name to be published alongside your response?** (Required)
   
   Yes

3. **What is your email address?**
   
   Lucy.Jaffe@why-me.org

4. **What is your organisation?** (Required)
   
   Why me? Victims for Restorative Justice

5. **Is this your personal response or are you responding on behalf of your organisation?** (Required)
   
   Responding on behalf of your organisation

6. **What sector do you work in?** (Required)
   
   Academic/research (e.g student, postgraduate researcher)
   Charity and voluntary
   Business
   Journalist/Media
   Local or regional government/public organisation
   National government department/organisation
   International organisation
   Other (please specify)
   
   Please enter your selection from the list above
   
   Charity and voluntary

7. **May we contact you to discuss your response to this consultation?** (Required)

   Yes
Details of the three options

Three approaches have been identified for making the required cost savings from the CSEW in 2017/18 and future years. These are:

**Removing other questions from the survey**

The principal aim of the CSEW is to ask respondents about their experiences of a range of crimes in order to produce estimates of the trends in those crimes over time. However, it also asks questions on other crime-related issues such as anti-social behaviour, attitudes toward the police, drug use and perceptions of the risk of crime. Removing these additional questions would generate cost savings by reducing the average interview length.

**Reducing the response rate**

Over the last ten years, the CSEW has maintained a relatively high response rate of between 72% and 75% (with the exception of 2014/15 when a 70% response rate was recorded). Maintaining such a high response rate is only possible through interviewers making repeated visits, particularly to households who are difficult to contact. Making less effort to achieve such a high response rate will generate savings. We estimate that dropping the response rate to 69% will be sufficient to make up the funding shortfall.

**Reducing the sample size**

The achieved sample size is currently 35,000 households per year. Making a small reduction (of around 1,800) in the sample size will generate sufficient cost savings by reducing the amount of fieldwork required.

8. What are your views on the proposed cost-savings?

Please provide comments

| The Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW) needs to gain relevant information on victim attitudes and Restorative Justice (RJ). This is best achieved by a statistical reduction in the sample size while maintaining a random but large enough sample, rather than eliminating questions relevant to an individual’s attitudes to the Criminal Justice System (CJS) as a whole. |
9. Of the proposed cost-saving options, which would you prefer ONS to adopt? (Required)

Option A: reduce target response rate (to 69%)
Option B: reduce sample size (by 1,800 interviews)
Option C: remove additional questions from CSEW to reduce survey to core questions required to produce quarterly crime estimates
Option D: reduce target CSEW response rate to 71% and reduce sample size by 600 households

Please indicate your preferred option here: B

10. Is there a particular reason for your stated preference?

Please provide comments

A smaller (though large enough) sample size still produces a survey representative of victim’s experience of RJ and an insight into the victim’s experience of the CJS as a whole. Eliminating questions narrows the framework and removes that understanding of the public’s view of the CJS as a whole.

11. What impact would these potential options have on your use of CSEW data?

Please provide comments

As an organisation we are committed to increasing victims’ access to RJ and the CSEW data allows us to assess victim’s views of RJ. A reduced sample size would allow us to monitor progress from one year to another and but most importantly it enables victims of crime to share their experience of the CJS as a whole. If the three questions were to be eliminated then the CSEW survey would become largely irrelevant to understanding victims’ views and the effectiveness CJ agencies supporting victims of crime.

12. Do you have any other comments?

As RJ is being rolled out to more and more people in the future, it is important to collect public views. The CSEW reported in 2016 that only 4.2% of those victims going through the CJS were aware of RJ as a means of moving on from the impact of crime. We believe this figure is low and that the Government and RJ field have some way to go on improving victims’ awareness of local service provision. Without the CSEW data on RJ it could have a negative impact on victims’ access to RJ and also limit even further the public’s knowledge of RJ.