

**Please cite the Published Version**

Meadows, Linda, Kinsella, Rachel, Ellingworth, Dan, Wong, Kevin and Senior, Paul (2014) Mapping Restorative Provision in England & Wales: Nottinghamshire. UNSPECIFIED. Hallam Centre for Community Justice, Sheffield Hallam University, Restorative Justice Council and Ministry of Justice.

**Publisher:** Hallam Centre for Community Justice, Sheffield Hallam University, Restorative Justice Council and Ministry of Justice

**Downloaded from:** <https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/622171/>

**Enquiries:**

If you have questions about this document, contact [openresearch@mmu.ac.uk](mailto:openresearch@mmu.ac.uk). Please include the URL of the record in e-space. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our Take Down policy (available from <https://www.mmu.ac.uk/library/using-the-library/policies-and-guidelines>)

# Mapping Restorative Provision in England & Wales

## Nottinghamshire

Linda Meadows, Rachel Kinsella,  
Dan Ellingworth, Kevin Wong and  
Paul Senior

Hallam Centre for Community Justice  
Sheffield Hallam University

October 2014

## Introduction and Background

The Restorative Justice Council (RJC) commissioned researchers at the Hallam Centre for Community Justice at Sheffield Hallam University to undertake a mapping exercise of Restorative Justice (RJ) provision within the criminal justice sector in England and Wales. This exercise was one element of a larger programme funded by the Ministry of Justice.

The aim of the mapping project was to provide (in a consistent format) a snapshot of the current availability of Restorative Justice throughout the country and, in doing so, to provide a resource to inform future commissioning of services. In addition to reports for each Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) area, the outputs from the project are: a database of services working in the Restorative Justice field; and a national report which provides an overview of activity across England and Wales.

The aim of this report is to give a high level overview of activity in the area. More detailed information on the availability of RJ at each stage of the Criminal Justice System (CJS) is available from the Restorative Justice Council.

The format of the report is as follows:

- A methodology and approach section outlining the way the mapping activity was undertaken
- An overview section which gives a summary of activity in the area
- An activities section which gives a one page snapshot of activity for each organisation delivering in the area

## Methodology and Approach

The mapping activity took the form of an electronic survey which was emailed to:

- All PCCs
- Restorative Justice providers (VCS and private sector organisations)<sup>1</sup>
- Governors/directors of all prisons/Young Offender Institutions (YOIs)
- Chief Constables of all police forces
- National Probation Service (NPS) directors and Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC) Chief Executives
- All Youth Offending Team (YOT) managers
- Staff and managers from probation services and local Authorities, including Community Safety Partnerships<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> This was mainly drawn from the RJC mailing list with additional providers identified by the research team

Links to the surveys were also included on the RJC website and the Community Justice Portal<sup>3</sup>, in the No Offence bulletin, and in the Clinks newsletter (Light Lunch) which is circulated to VCS organisations and others delivering services within the CJS. Additional support for distribution was also provided by the Ministry of Justice who sent out details of the survey via their Senior Leaders Bulletin. The survey was also "tweeted" by both the RJC and Sheffield Hallam University.

In order to encourage responses, preparatory work was undertaken by RJC with the statutory agencies to garner support for the survey. During the survey period, two reminder emails were sent and follow up phone calls were made to **all** statutory agencies who had not replied within the first three weeks. To ensure that the online access was not a barrier to completion we offered the option for respondents to complete the survey by telephone. We also extended the initial deadline to give respondents more time to respond. The survey opened on 14<sup>th</sup> July 2014<sup>4</sup> and was closed on 1<sup>st</sup> September 2014.

### Design of the survey

Three different surveys were designed to capture data from providers, referrers and commissioners of RJ services. Full details of all the survey questions are at Appendix 2. The referrers' and commissioners' survey responses were primarily used to verify and supplement provider information included in this report. Information was collected at an organisational level<sup>5</sup> and detailed information captured for each service delivered by the organisation<sup>6</sup>. For the purposes of the survey, a service was defined by the stage of the CJS at which it occurred. The survey was designed in conjunction with RJC and Ministry of Justice and was piloted with two provider organisations prior to being distributed.

### Response rates

The following tables show the response rates for the statutory agencies<sup>7</sup>. These tables indicate whether we received a response from the agency. Where agencies did not respond, this does not necessarily mean that they do not deliver RJ.

---

<sup>2</sup> Again, these were mainly drawn from the RJC mailing list

<sup>3</sup> The CJP is an internet portal, operated by the Hallam Centre for Community Justice providing information and knowledge for professionals and staff across the CJS

<sup>4</sup> Excluding Youth Offending Service and Secure Training Centres which were delayed until 23<sup>rd</sup> July pending YJB approval

<sup>5</sup> Type of organisation, name and address, numbers of practitioners, quality marks, qualifications and training of staff/volunteers and multi-agency partnerships

<sup>6</sup> Format, participants, type of RJ, funder of service, throughput, geographical location, referral sources, eligibility criteria

<sup>7</sup> It is not possible to accurately reflect response rates from the VCS and private sector providers as organisations in this group came from a variety of sources, not just our initial mailing list.

**Table 1: Response Rates: Police, CRCs, NPS**

Agency	Responses
Police	No response received
CRC	Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire, Leicestershire and Rutland CRC - response received
NPS	NPS Midlands - no response received

**Table 2: Response Rates: YOTs and Prisons**

Agency	Number of responses received	Number of organisations within the PCC area	Response rate %
YOTs	2	2	100%
Prisons <sup>8</sup>	2	3	67%

## Overview of PCC Area Activity

The following tables are intended to give a snapshot of RJ activity within the PCC area based on responses to the survey. As indicated above, not all agencies responded to the survey but this does not necessarily mean that they are not delivering RJ. The tables indicate:

- The total number of organisations which are delivering RJ within the area (Table 3);
- The numbers of organisations of each type delivering in the area (Table 3), some of these may be located outside the area and therefore may not be included in the response rate count (Table 1 and 2);
- The numbers of RJ practitioners within the organisations which are delivering in the area<sup>9</sup> (Table 4); and
- The numbers of RJ services at each stage of the CJS and the total of these (Table 5).

**Table 3: Organisations delivering RJ within the PCC area (by type of organisation)**

Type of Organisation	Number
Prison	1
Youth Offending Team	1
Voluntary and Community Sector	5

<sup>8</sup> These are prisons which are geographically located within the PCC area.

<sup>9</sup> Note: as data on practitioners was collected at an organisation level, this is the total number of RJ practitioners in the organisation. Where an organisation is delivering across multiple areas, this is therefore the total number of practitioners, not necessarily the number of practitioners in the PCC area. This also applies to the data in the organisation detail sheets.

Multi agency partnership	1
Total number of organisations	8

**Table 4: Numbers of RJ practitioners within these organisations**

Type of staff	Numbers
Number of Staff RJ Practitioners (FTE Equivalent)	123
Number of Volunteer RJ Practitioners	5,125
Number of Sessional Staff RJ Practitioners	95

**Table 5: Number of RJ services by stage of the CJS**

Stage of the CJS	Number of RJ services
Diversion from the CJS	3
Out of court disposals	1
Magistrates court pre-sentence RJ	2
Crown court pre-sentence RJ	2
Community order	3
Custody RJ	6
Prior to release from custody	1
Other	2
Total	20

## Constraints

The timescale for conducting and analysing the survey was very short. This has necessarily limited the time available for all stages of the research. The reports were originally due to be completed in August but approvals from NOMS and the Youth Justice Board had to be gained before the survey could be sent out. This resulted in the survey being sent out 4-6 weeks later than originally planned<sup>10</sup>. In order to give the YOTs time to respond, we did keep the survey open for longer than originally intended which was particularly helpful given that the revised timeline meant that the survey was sent out during the summer period.

The timing of the survey also meant that it was impacted by the significant changes being experienced as a result of the reorganisation of probation under Transforming Rehabilitation (TR). This affected: our ability to identify the people with primary responsibility for RJ within NPS and CRCs; the ability of staff within those organisations to

---

<sup>10</sup> 4 weeks for all except the Youth Offending Service where the delay was 6 weeks.

complete the survey where services were in transition and responsibilities still unclear. Similarly, PCCs were moving towards responsibility for commissioning of RJ but at the time of the survey were still in the scoping and development phase and again, this impacted on response rates.

It was recognised by the commissioners and funders of the research that it would be challenging to achieve adequate response rates within the short timescales and during a period of considerable changes within the CJS. We indicate in the methodology and approach section above how we used multiple methods of contacting respondents in an attempt to mitigate this risk.

It is impossible to know if we have directly contacted all the providers involved in RJ, though our approach and communications strategy was designed specifically to address this risk. Inevitably, there will be providers who have not seen or have not completed the survey but it is hoped that these reports will provide an impetus for further input from providers. Any provider whose details are not included should contact RJC by email to: [enquiries@restorativejustice.org.uk](mailto:enquiries@restorativejustice.org.uk) or by telephone on 0207 831 5700.

We deliberately limited the number of mandatory fields in the survey so that this did not become a barrier to completion. We also recognised that some respondents might prefer not to answer some questions - e.g. on throughput or funding and again, sought to avoid this becoming a barrier to completion. This inevitably means that not all fields have been completed by all respondents. We identified a small number of priority questions and, where these were not completed, we contacted respondents for additional information.

The purpose of this report is to provide an overview/snapshot of provision within the PCC area. We have not, therefore, included all the data on services which was captured within the survey. The full dataset has been provided to RJC in electronic format and further information is available from them (contact details as indicated above).

The survey captured details of RJ provided by each stage of the CJS. A significant number of respondents indicated that they deliver RJ across multiple stages. This has limited the extent to which we can aggregate information (for example on throughput) for inclusion in this overview.

This report focuses primarily on the responses to the provider survey. The purpose of the referrer survey was to enable us to triangulate the returns to pick up any additional providers. This was also, in part, the purpose of the commissioner survey. Had we achieved significant numbers of commissioner responses, we also intended to report on commissioning activity. However, we received a very small number of returns from commissioners and in triangulating this data back with the funders of service, it was clear that this represented a very partial picture of commissioning. Furthermore, the PCC areas

will clearly be major funders of this activity in the future but have, in many cases, not yet started any commissioning and thus could not be included.

The survey was only intended to capture services which were actually being delivered, rather than those which were planned or in development. Some respondents expressed concern that this risked understating their activities. It is recognised that a survey such as this can only ever be a snapshot of availability at a specific point in time and that the survey took place at a time when significant changes in the delivery of RJ in the CJS were underway. It is intended, however, that the results of the survey will provide a benchmark of activity which can be updated in the future and against which any future mapping can be compared.

## About the reports

The reports on the following pages are split into two sections. On the right hand side of the page is the information about the organisation<sup>11</sup> and on the left hand side is information about the services the organisation provides. For usability and readability, the service information is aggregated so that it indicates, for example, all the stages of the CJS at which RJ activity occurs and all the different types, formats, funders, referrers and participants involved at any stage.<sup>12</sup> If information was not provided then the section has not been included in the report, though where respondents indicated answers of "none" or "zero" - this has been included as a response. This means that the amount of information provided for each organisation may differ depending on the response received.

---

<sup>11</sup> Note: the organisational information relates to the organisation as a whole and is not specific to the PCC area. For example, where an organisation provides services across a number of PCC areas, the staffing numbers relate to total numbers of staff within the organisation rather than the staff involved in a single PCC area.

<sup>12</sup> Note: not all data will be applicable to all stages of the CJS listed. For example: if an organisation delivered indirect RJ in custody and direct RJ at pre-sentence magistrates court, both indirect and direct RJ would be ticked. This more detailed information on the specifics at each stage of the CJS is available via RJC on request.

Organisation snapshots here

# Appendix 1: Survey details

## Mapping Restorative Justice in the Criminal Justice System across England and Wales: Provider Survey

### SECTION A

#### **Organisation details**

Organisation name  
Address line 1  
Address line 2  
Town  
Postcode  
Twitter handle /  
username  
Website address

#### **Your contact details**

Name  
Job role / title  
Phone number  
Email address

#### **Type of organisation** *(please select one of the following)*

National Probation Service  
Community Rehabilitation Company  
Prison  
Police  
Police and Crime Commissioner  
Young Offenders Institution  
Youth Offending Team  
Secure Training Centre  
Secure Children's Home  
Local Authority  
Voluntary and Community Sector  
Neighbourhood Justice Panel  
Other  
If other please specify

#### **How many RJ practitioners do you have in your organisation?** *(please insert as a number)*

Staff *(full time equivalent)* -

Volunteers -

Sessional staff *(staff not on permanent or continuing contracts, including zero hours contracts)* -

**For each of the following types of RJ training, please indicate the total numbers of current staff / volunteers / sessional staff who have received each type of training.**

Awareness training -

Training for managers and supervisors -

Introduction to RJ training -  
Facilitator training -  
Training of trainers training -  
Sensitive and complex cases training -  
Other training -

**If any of the training was external, please provide details of who provides it.**

**How many staff / volunteers / sessional staff in your organisation have RJ qualifications / accreditations?** *(please insert as a number) -*

**For each of the following types of RJ qualifications / accreditations, please indicate the total numbers of current staff / volunteers / sessional staff who have received each type of qualification / accreditation.**

Direct Accreditation by the Restorative Justice Council -  
Level 4 Diploma in Restorative Practice -  
University of Ulster Certificate in Restorative Practice -  
University of Greenwich Level 5 Certificate in Restorative Practice -  
BTEC Level 3 Advanced Award Practitioner Training for Restorative Approaches -  
Other qualifications /accreditations -

**How many staff / volunteers / sessional staff in your organisation are working toward RJ qualifications / accreditations?** *(please insert as a number) -*

**Please provide details of any service quality marks for RJ services that your organisation holds.**

**Is your organisation working towards or interested in achieving a quality mark?**

Yes  
No  
Don't know

**Are you involved in an RJ multi-agency partnership or practitioner network?**

Yes  
No

**Please provide details of the partnership / practitioner network**

Partnership / network name  
Name of other organisations involved

## **SECTION B**

***You will be asked to complete the following questions for each RJ service that you provide. For the purposes of this survey, please count services as separate if they occur at a different stage of the criminal justice system. At the end of this section you will be given the option to add further service(s) and/or submit once you have completed the number of services you deliver.***

**At what stage in the criminal justice system is the RJ service that you provide delivered?** *(please select ONE of the following)*

Diversion from the criminal justice system (e.g. through a neighbourhood justice panel)  
Out of court disposals (e.g. conditional caution, referral order, street RJ)

Court pre-sentence RJ (magistrates)  
Court pre-sentence RJ (crown court)  
Community order of the court (e.g. Youth Rehabilitation Orders, Rehabilitation Activity Requirement, Youth Referral Panels)  
Custody RJ  
Prior to release from custody RJ  
Post release / reintegration RJ  
Other  
If other please specify

**What is the mode of delivery for the RJ services you provide? (please tick all that apply)**

Direct (e.g. victim offender conferencing)  
Indirect (e.g. video recording, shuttle mediation, letter)  
Victim awareness programmes based on restorative principles (e.g. surrogate victim programmes)

**Who is involved in the direct RJ service? (please tick all that apply)**

Victim and offender  
Victim, family of victim and offender  
Family of victim and offender  
Victim, community member(s) and offender  
Community member(s) and offender  
Other  
If other please specify

**What format is used for the direct RJ service? (please tick all that apply)**

Victim offender conferencing  
Family group conferencing  
Community conferencing  
Community mediation / community justice panels  
Restorative circles  
Live video  
Level 1 street RJ  
Other  
If other please specify

**Who is involved in the indirect RJ service? (please tick all that apply)**

Victim and offender  
Victim, family of victim and offender  
Family of victim and offender  
Victim, community member(s) and offender  
Community member(s) and offender  
Other  
If other please specify

**What format is used for the indirect RJ service? (please tick all that apply)**

Recorded video  
Letters  
Shuttle mediation  
Recorded audio  
Victim led reparation  
Other

If other please specify

**Approximately what proportion of the RJ service is provided via direct and indirect modes?**

Direct (%)

Indirect (%)

Victim awareness (%)

**What (if any) are the eligibility criteria for the RJ service you provide? (please include details of any specific specialisms or exclusions)**

**What is the estimated annual case throughput of the RJ service you provide? (please estimate for current year or last full year of operation)**

1-5

6-10

11-20

21-30

31-50

51-100

101-500

501-1000

1001-2000

2001+

**Where do you receive referrals from for this service? (please tick all that apply)**

National Probation Service

Community Rehabilitation Company

Police

Prisons

Youth Offending Team

Sentencers

Local Authorities

Voluntary and Community Sector organisation

Police and Crime Commissioner

Non-Criminal Justice Service Organisation (e.g. Fire Service, Health, Schools)

Do not receive referrals for this service

Other

If other please specify

**Who funds the RJ service? (please tick all that apply)**

Police and Crime Commissioner

Youth Justice Board

National Offender Management Service

Ministry of Justice

Home Office

Community Safety Partnership

Grant making foundation

Charitable donations

Other

If other please specify

**Please provide details of the start and end dates for your funding.**

Start date - MM/YY

End date - MM/YY

**If multiple funders for one service, please add additional start and end dates here.**

**In which Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) area(s) is the RJ service that you provide delivered?**

*(please tick all that apply)*

Avon and Somerset	Leicestershire
Bedfordshire	Lincolnshire
Cambridgeshire	London - MOPAC
Cheshire	Merseyside
City of London	Norfolk
Cleveland	North Wales
Cumbria	North Yorkshire
Derbyshire	Northamptonshire
Devon Cornwall and the	Northumbria
Isles of Scilly	Nottinghamshire
Dorset	South Wales
Durham	South Yorkshire
Dyfed Powys	Staffordshire
Essex	Suffolk
Gloucestershire	Surrey
Greater Manchester	Sussex
Gwent	Thames Valley
Hampshire	Warwickshire
Hertfordshire	West Mercia
Humberside	West Midlands
Kent	West Yorkshire
Lancashire	Wiltshire

**In which of the following Local Authority area(s) is the RJ service that you provide delivered?**

*(please tick all that apply) Respondents selected from a list of local authorities relevant to the PCC area(s) selected above*

**If any of the questions above (e.g. eligibility criteria, throughput, referrer, funder) differ by geographical area, please provide details here.**

**Please provide contact details for the service (If different from your contact details)**

Name of service *(if applicable)*

Name of contact

Job role / title

Phone number

Email address

Address line 1 *(if different from organisational address)*

Address line 2

Town

Postcode

**Add another service if it is delivered at a different stage of the criminal justice system**

**SECTION C**

**Please provide details of any evaluations of your RJ provision here** *(If known, please include information on who completed the evaluation, when completed and report details if published)*

*Thank you for taking the time to complete the survey. If you have any questions regarding the survey please contact the research team on [rjcmapp1@shu.ac.uk](mailto:rjcmapp1@shu.ac.uk) or 0114 225 2975*

## Acknowledgements

We would like to thank all the organisations who took the time to complete the survey. We would also like to thank: Robert Lawman and Emily Pemberton at the Ministry of Justice and the Youth Justice Board for their support in getting the necessary approvals and helping us with mailing lists and communication of the survey; Clinks for including it in their newsletter mailings; and Restorative Solutions for their assistance in raising awareness amongst their networks. Thanks also go to Linda King of Thames Valley Partnership and Steve Jones and Nicola Bancroft of Remedi for their assistance in piloting the survey.

At Sheffield Hallam University, thanks also go to Sarah Ward, Louise South and Emma Smith for their assistance with designing and compiling the reports and to Mike Foden, Katherine McCulloch, Alix Porter for assistance with survey design, data collection and analysis.

We would also like to acknowledge the support of the Restorative Justice Council, in particular, Dani Gover, Peter Wilkinson, Jon Collins and Chris Igoe.