



Business Services Directorate

Adding Value to the Frontline

Learning & Development

RESTORATIVE JUSTICE EVALUATION REPORT

RESTORATIVE SOLUTIONS
Training Provider

Prepared by: Sarah Bridge
Project Sponsor: A/Insp Taylor
Version Number: 1.0
Date: September 2007

CONTENTS

1. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE	3
2. METHODOLOGY	3
3. COURSE STRUCTURE	4
3.1. Day One	4
3.2. Day two	5
3.3. Day three	5
3.4. Role Plays	6
3.5. General comments	6
3.6. Trainers	6
3.7. Students comments	6
3.8. Training aids/packs	7
4. CONCLUSION:	7
5. RECOMMENDATIONS:	7

1. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The purpose of this Learning & Development Evaluation Report is to:

- Confirm whether the investments made in learning and development have provided a positive return for the Force in terms of improved performance;
- Provide recommendations to enable the Force to develop appropriate strategies to equip people with the knowledge, skills and attitudes to perform effectively in the future.

This report is put forward as a highlight report of one of three, three day training packages delivered on Restorative Justice by the provider known as Restorative Solutions. Evaluation of this course was important to quality assure the delivery and to ensure any development needs still outstanding were identified to enable us to make any necessary changes. Any recommendations for the development of this training will be outlined at the end of this report.

2. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation was carried out by the force Evaluator from Performance & evaluation. The method used for evaluation was by means of direct observation of the course and with some participation. Therefore the evaluator was able to pick up direct feedback from the participants as to their opinions on the course delivery and confidence levels in carrying this training forward into the work place.

Project aims, specifically for Restorative Justice;

- “to equip staff within the Constabulary with necessary skills befitting their respective roles, enabling them to have an adequate understanding of restorative approaches in order that we can bring victims, offenders and communities together to decide on a response to a particular crime,”
(Restorative Justice Client Request Form, Sgt Jez Taylor).
- “The process of RJ is administered by means of a conference attended by both the offender and the victim and managed by a trained facilitator”,
(Restorative Justice Client Request Form, Sgt Jez Taylor).

3. Course structure

The course started at 9:00 and was opened by ACC Shewan. There was a good mixture of delegates, with police officers, PCSO's and other partnership staff, such as housing association representatives, ASBO workers etc.

The trainers introduced themselves, with an explanation of their professional background (One Ex-inspector the other Sgt in Kent). This was followed by the delegates introducing themselves and the use of some ice breakers.

Objectives were then clearly laid out for each day of training and a timetable was put up in the classroom at the start of each day. This is an important aspect of training as it can help identify student needs/expectations of the course. In addition regular breaks were included which is also important in maintaining concentration levels.

3.1. Day One

It was outlined by the trainers that day one was basic awareness of Restorative Justice and the processes, with practical application in relation to low level scenarios.

Definitions of Restorative Justice were delivered and talked through. The lead trainer asked questions to the group to encourage discussion with delegates and to get them thinking about the subject area. They were split into groups to answer the following questions;

- What Restorative Practises look like?
- What is being 'restored' in Restorative Practises?

The group's answers were then talked through, discussing any issues delegates had. The trainers then gave examples of what you can use restorative practises for and allowed time for questions from the delegates.

Trainers then lead a session around the skills needed in order to facilitate Restorative practises. It was made interactive, with students writing different skills on different boards around the room, followed by a discussion and the opportunity for questions.

The day then went onto exploring the associated 'risk's' related to restorative justice. There was detail also on the importance of, and how to risk assess before you run any form of restorative conference/practises. Trainers also talked about ways in which you can reduce possible risk factors.

The morning was theoretically based, however the afternoon moved onto the trainers explaining the training packs each student was issued with and then onto some role play in small groups of approximately three.

To finish the day the trainers explained the importance of recording restorative conferences and how to do this. It was evident that delegates needed some guidance from the organisation as to what Cheshire would be using.

Students were tasked with writing some statements and actions in relation to a restorative justice scenario, which they then read out and discussed within the group.

To end the day was summarised and all students left 'level one' trained in restorative justice.

3.2. Day two

The second day started with any questions from delegates. Then trainers ran through the timetable for the day. Students were then put into groups and tasked with some group work. The groups then fed back to the class and the exercise was de-briefed by the trainers.

Students were tasked with doing role plays, which reflected the preparation stages to a Restorative Justice conference in pairs.

The lead trainer then performed a demonstration of a conference, using some of the students to role act different parts. This was really useful for students to see how it could work and the role of the facilitator.

After lunch students were then split into 2 groups, with one trainer assigned to a group. Each group was allocated three facilitators and the rest of the students were tasked as being role actors within the conferences. This was a very useful way of letting students practise facilitating a conference. Trainers did stop the conference if it digressed and gave pointers to students. In addition once it had finished it was debriefed in depth, with input from the entire group.

The rest of the afternoon continued with practise in facilitating in the above manner.

3.3. Day three

To begin with trainers ran through the timetable and the course aims and objectives and made time for questions. Following this, the trainers delivered a session on roles of participants at an RJ conference, which also covered disruptive behaviours and how to deal with them.

After this session the group were again split in two for more role play conferences. Again these were debriefed in depth.

Later in the morning after a break trainers went on to talk about the different needs of individuals which need to be considered throughout the RJ process, such as social and personal issues. They used good personal examples from their own experiences.

The afternoon commenced with a further role play, which again was debriefed highlighting the positives and any development points.

The final session went over the main points in relation to RJ, further experiences of the trainers when using RJ and any questions from delegates.

3.4. Role Plays

All role plays scenarios were provided by the trainers, with a brief for each participant about their part. They worked well and students although at first found it daunting, relaxed into it, and it was obvious that it was a very useful tool in helping to apply their learning from the course.

3.5. General comments

- Delegates were able to challenge/question the trainer's throughout the course if they were unsure about something. Sometimes questions would be lengthy and difficult to answer however the trainers coped very well with this and satisfied students with their answers.
- It was identified that some people were already using restorative practises within their roles; however this training would help to formalise the processes used.
- Clarity from Cheshire Constabulary was needed on issues of recording any RJ practises they went on to facilitate. In addition when they were to start using this initiative.
- Delegates seemed positive about the course and reasonably confident in taking their learning forward into the workplace.

3.6. Trainers

Trainers were very knowledgeable and used lots of personal experiences and examples to help students to apply what they had learnt into the work place and actual scenarios, which was well received by the group.

The trainers also structured the course well settings clear aims and objectives, and a course timetable. However they recognised the importance of being flexible with the timetable to meet student needs, which demonstrated good practise in training delivery.

Sometimes discussion was not easy to facilitate as there were very strong personalities within the group, however the trainers managed this very well.

In addition the trainers were good at de-briefing role plays and giving feedback to students, and were careful to include lots of positive reinforcement.

3.7. Students comments

One of the only things that the evaluator was able to pick up from students was how more real examples of actual RJ practises would have been useful e.g. more videos. Further comments as previously mentioned centred round the processes of recording RJ for Cheshire Constabulary members.

Generally attitudes were very positive in relation to the course and students displayed confidence in the practical role plays in facilitating a conference, which is in line with the Constabulary's aims from the training.

3.8. Training aids/packs

The packs given to each student were of good quality. Also the video of a restorative conference was very effective and useful for students as it helped to show how the process can work.

4. CONCLUSION:

Restorative Justice is a difficult area in which to train and it is difficult to measure how much learning took place. However when looking at the constabulary aims for the training, we can try and measure if these have been met.

- “to equip staff within the Constabulary with necessary skills befitting their respective roles, enabling them to have an adequate understanding of restorative approaches in order that we can bring victims, offenders and communities together to decide on a response to a particular crime,” (Restorative Justice Client Request Form, Sgt Jez Taylor).

It is evident from the report that the course has equipped staff with the necessary skills in understanding restorative approaches and the confidence to facilitate conferences between victims and offenders.

In addition the training delivery methods and aids were of a good standard, assisting students in their learning. The trainers had a wealth of knowledge in restorative processes and used a lot of examples from their own experience which helped students apply the learning into the work place.

It should be noted that particularly staff from within the constabulary do need guidance on how they are to record any restorative work they do. However, it is evident that the course was a successful in achieving its aims.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommendation Matrix:

The below matrix should be addressed and the actions implemented to ensure progression of this course for future intakes.

No.	Recommendation	Ownership	Status (Accepted, Actioned, Deferred, Declined)	Actions Arising
1	Guidance from constabulary re recording RJ processes.	Project lead		
2	Follow up evaluation with level 3 3-6 mths after training	Performance & Evaluation	Accepted	