

Model monitoring framework

Background

The aim of this monitoring framework is to help RJ schemes develop an effective monitoring system to:

- internally assess and improve the quality of service offered;
- quantify resource use and prioritise resources;
- provide evidence which demonstrates benefits of the service;
- collect data which allows formal, comprehensive research and evaluation in future if need be.

It sets out some suggestions, based on the experience of some existing RJ schemes, on what information could be collected and in what format, and why. Agencies and Local Criminal Justice Boards are under no obligation to collect this information, they may find the model invaluable in assessing and demonstrating the value of RJ to their staff and communities.

Individual schemes can adapt the framework to meet their own needs and to fit their own existing data collection and monitoring processes. The framework could also be adapted as a basis for case management. If used as a case management tool. If used consistently across different agencies, it would allow LCJBs to compare data across their areas and through time.

Important note: In its current form, the framework includes identifying personal data about the victim and offender (for example, name, Police National Computer number). These are not essential for monitoring ongoing performance, and may be omitted; but to record them allows the possibility of future follow-up research with the participants in the RJ process. If identifying personal details are recorded, it is essential that victim and offender data are kept separately, to avoid any possibility that any participant could gain access to information about the other through looking at their own files/data.

Monitoring framework of suggested data to collect

Suggested data to collect	Suggested format for collecting responses	Purpose of collecting information
Time and resource use		
Which agency referred the case?	Tick box list of responses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agency 1 • Agency 2 • Other agency (pls specify) • Self referral 	<i>To check where referrals are coming from and prioritise any necessary work to increase referral rates.</i>
Who initiated referral?	Tick box list of responses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Victim • Offender • Triggered by CJS process [specify which, eg caution; conditional caution; Community Order activity requirement] • Agency staff • Other (pls specify) 	<i>Allows analysis of whether outcomes depend on who first wanted the RJ process to take place</i>
Stage if Criminal Justice System of referral	Tick box: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caution • Conditional Caution • Pre-sentence; • Pre-sentence (with deferred sentence) • Part of sentence • Post sentence (voluntary for offender) • Other [specify] 	<i>Partly overlaps with previous questions, but may be a useful formulation for agencies or partnerships offering RJ processes at several points in the CJS process.</i>
Attrition	If no RJ process took place after referral, why not?	<i>Helps identify how to maximise the proportion of referrals that lead to a</i>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No victim consent (or victim consent withdrawn, or victim drops out) • No offender consent • Case unsuitable after suitability assessment • Risk assessment shows risk of harm during the process too high. • Other (pls specify) 	<p><i>successful RJ process, and to check suitability of referrals from other agencies.</i></p> <p><i>It may be useful to expand 'case suitability' category to identify why cases are unsuitable - eg disagreement about facts of the case; no personal victim; offence type unsuitable according to scheme criteria; etc. See Section 3.5 for more information about suitability and risk assessment.</i></p>
Time and resource use		
<p>Date of initial referral?</p> <p>"Go ahead" date (ie date of completion of suitability/risk assessment and victim and offender consent obtained)</p> <p>Completion date of RJ process (eg date outcome agreement reached)</p> <p>Completion date of any offender follow-up (eg reparation)</p>	<p>Record date as dd/mm/yyyy</p> <p>dd/mm/yyyy</p> <p>dd/mm/yyyy</p> <p>dd/mm/yyyy</p>	<p><i>Recording critical dates allows monitoring of which parts of the RJ process is taking most time, allowing an assessment of the efficiency of the scheme and where any delays are occurring.</i></p>
<p>Approximate number of hours spent by staff at each stage of the RJ process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparation, prior to "go ahead", incl organising practicalities etc • RJ process (direct or indirect) • Monitoring and follow-up (eg contacting victim, supervising 	<p>Approx no of hours, for each bullet</p>	<p><i>For assessing efficiency and resource planning (eg calculating staff time required to match a predicted workload).</i></p> <p><i>It may be useful to record what kind of staff time is used under each heading, eg administrator time; trained paid RJ facilitator time; trained volunteer RJ facilitator time; etc</i></p>

or monitoring offender)		
Number of facilitator meetings with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Victim (and their supporters) • Offender (and their supporters) • Victim and offender together 	No of meetings, for each bullet	<i>Allows assessment of how facilitator time is being split between direct RJ work, and preparatory and indirect RJ work. Allows assessment of relative amount of work going into victim and offender work.</i>
Who facilitated/mediated the restorative justice process?	Name Alternatively, tick box (more than one box if co-facilitated): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paid facilitator • Volunteer 	<i>This information may be useful for internal workload monitoring purposes, for rewarding staff and for identifying support and training needs.</i>
The RJ process		
What kind of RJ process was used?	Tick box: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct only • Indirect followed by direct • Indirect only 	<i>Allows assessment of whether a full and appropriate range of RJ processes are being offered, involving a full range participants as necessary, to provide a flexible, high quality service to victims.</i>
Who was involved in the RJ process aside from victim and offender?	Tick box: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Victim friends/family/supporters • Offender friends/family/supporters • Community representatives • Representatives of other agencies • Observers • Others (pls specify) 	
What kind of RJ process was used?	Tick box: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restorative conference • Face to face • Indirect mediation • Family group conference • Youth offending panel • Other (please specify) 	<i>Less flexible and less comprehensive alternative formulation to the previous two questions.</i>

Participant and case information		
Type of offence/main offence?	Please specify	<i>To identify whether RJ is being used for particular offences more than others. If this is the case, it may be necessary to explore how and why particular cases/offence types are being excluded.</i>
Offender details	Name: including Forename, Other names and Family/Surname Date of birth dd/mm/yyyy, Sex M/F Ethnicity categories: White; Mixed; Asian or Asian British; Black or Black British; Chinese or Other Ethnic Group Date of arrest or date of conviction, if available. PNC number	<i>Allows you to examine whether RJ is being used for particular groups more than others (e.g. young female offenders).</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Recording the DOB is preferable to age as this provides more accurate and precise information and could also be used for future research on reconviction rates.</i> <i>Using the categories noted will also ensure that consistent data is recorded, and can ultimately be compared across LCJBs.</i> <i>Recording the arrest date and PNC number may allow future research to be conducted on the impact of the RJ scheme on re-offending (the date of arrest/conviction will aid this process).</i> <i>NB: see note in introduction about storing victim and offender personal data separately and securely.</i>
Is this the offender's first offence? If No, has this person been identified locally as a prolific and other priority offender?	Yes/No/Don't know delete as appropriate Yes/No delete as appropriate	<i>Enables agencies to obtain an idea of the type of offenders (in terms of criminal history) being referred, and ultimately whether this influences the 'outcomes' achieved.</i>

Victim details	As above	
Were the victim and offender known to each other prior to the offence?	Yes/No If Yes, please state how?	<i>Allows assessment of whether prior knowledge may affect outcomes. May be expanded to include "if yes, state how."</i>
Outcomes and follow-up		
What kind of outcome agreement was formed as a result of the RJ process?	Tick box: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formal written outcome agreement • Informal agreement • No agreement reached 	<i>Agencies will be able to identify the proportion of cases that result in an outcome or informal agreement.</i>
What items were included in any outcome agreement?	Tick box: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial compensation to victim; • verbal apology; • written letter of apology to the victim; Other reparation to victim [specify]; Community reparation; • Other rehabilitative activity [specify]; Other [specify] 	<i>Allows agencies to assess the type of conditions typically agreed through the RJ process, and of the benefits of RJ processes to participants and the wider community. May provide useful material for communications strategy on the scheme.</i>
To what extent did the offender complete the agreement?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All • Most • Part • None • Don't know - no monitoring put in place • Don't know - monitoring didn't provide information 	<i>Agencies will be able to determine the number of offenders who complete their outcome agreement (and ultimately what factors make offenders more or less likely to complete agreements, e.g. age, conditions of agreement, offence type and presence of victim). This may help give some indication of which offenders RJ can be most effectively targeted towards.</i>

<p>If the agreement was not completed, what action was taken?</p>	<p>Tick box:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prosecution or other formal CJS breach proceedings [if applicable]; • Follow-up work with offender; • Inform victim; • Other (please specify) 	<p><i>Where compliance is a legal requirement, this data is particularly important. It also allows monitoring of whether non-compliance has been adequately followed up. May provide useful evidence for building credibility of the RJ process and victim satisfaction.</i></p>
---	---	--