A Business Case for Restorative Justice and Policing

ACC Garry Shewan, ACPO Lead on Restorative and Community Justice

1. Restorative Justice – The Background

1.1. There is widespread evidence worldwide about the positive impact that Restorative Justice (RJ) can have on both offending behaviour and upon victims. Academic evidence points to RJ being a highly effective tool for those agencies engaged in tackling crime, anti-social behaviour and other community disputes.

1.2. RJ is not a new phenomenon and has been around for a number of years. It has developed at varying degrees around the world. For example the use of restorative justice has been embedded in Aboriginal and Maori cultures in Australia and New Zealand for centuries. Through RJ, victims, offenders and sometimes families and communities collectively decide how to deal with the aftermath of the offence and its implications for the future.

1.3. Criminological theories such as Labelling and Re-integrative shaming suggest that retributive justice can make matters worse by alienating both offender and victim. Offenders stigmatized by the CJS are often drawn together to form their own sub cultures (often with higher social capital than the communities they offend). The needs of ‘communities’ when faced with law breaking and anti-social behaviour are very different from purely revenge and payback.

1.4. RJ focuses on the victim as the core element in the process, whether it is an individual, a group of people or indeed the community as a whole. Victims are not left outside the process feeling little control – it places them at the centre. It seeks to heal the responses and implications of crime and wrong-doing by meeting the needs of victims, offenders and communities.

1.5. RJ can empower communities to deal with offending according to their own values and expectations. It allows communities to re-integrate offenders back into community life and it enables communities to take some responsibility for delivering their own justice.

1.6. In 2001 Professor Joanna Shapland was funded through the Ministry of Justice to examine the effectiveness of RJ. The research was based
on adult offending in three schemes in London, Northumbria and Thames Valley. The full results of the research was published in four reports between 2004 and 2008\(^1\). The headline findings of the research was that RJ delivered 85% victim satisfaction and reduced reconviction by 27% when it is used with serious offences by adult offenders. The research drew a conclusion that the cashable cost savings to the Criminal Justice System alone delivered through these reductions in reconviction were shown to be around £6K per offender. The research suggests that the reductions in the frequency of offending indicates that for every £1 spent on delivering RJ it would lead to cost savings of £8. Whilst the Shapland work is powerful evidence, it has been argued its impact was reduced through the small sample size of each of the seven trial areas. However when taken together as one the trial numbers do allow for statistically significant findings.

2. **RJ in UK Policing**

2.1. The use of RJ in UK policing was first promoted in the 90s principally in Thames Valley. However, the expansion of its use was limited and its focus was on the relationship between the offender and victim without a full involvement of the community in the process. At that time RJ failed to find widespread support.

2.2. In 2010 the use of Restorative Justice within UK police forces is increasing at a significant pace. Restorative Justice is a key and critical part of the Criminal Justice System with evidence of its use within policing, Youth Offending Teams, Prisons, Integrated Offender Management and Intensive Alternatives to Custody, to name a few. In addition there is growing national interest in its application to develop both a victim-focused but low-bureaucratic disposal for low level offending and as a critical tool within Neighbourhood Policing to assist in problem-solving and meeting community expectations. This has emerged through both the expansion of RJ schemes and also through the expansion of the Professional Decision-Making schemes which contain a restorative element.

2.3. The term Restorative justice embraces a number of approaches to deal with offenders and those who break the ‘rules’ of communities. These include mediation, community justice schemes, reparation
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projects as well as Restorative Conferencing and Community Disposals (the two key mechanisms used in policing). It is Restorative Conferencing that provides the most gains for policing and is capable of being evaluated. There are two key types of restorative conferencing within policing namely Street and Community conferencing. ‘Street’ RJ is often referred to as Level 1 or On-street conferencing, this includes YRDs as well as the Community Resolutions/Disposals delivered in the Professional Decision-Making schemes; it deals with minor crimes on the spot and is quick and easy to utilise. The second is Restorative or Community Conferencing that is used to tackle more serious crimes and incidents, persistent ASB or neighbourhood disputes where a clear community impact is demonstrated. Often community conferences are referred to as Level 2 RJs and whilst they are more time consuming to set up and run, they offer very significant cost savings in future policing time through effective problem solving and resolution. Many forces and IOM schemes (often in partnership with Prisons and Probation) contribute to Restorative Conferencing with serious offenders post-sentence – often referred to as Level 3 RJs. Level 1 and 2 RJs are primarily used to divert offenders out of the CJS, and therefore heavily involve the use of police discretion and judgement about which offenders and offences are appropriate. They are also used to deal with both crime and non-crime incidents.

2.4. A survey sent out to police forces on behalf of ACPO in December 2009 examined the extent that RJ was being utilised in policing. 38 forces responded of which 33 forces indicated that they are using RJ practices. Key findings include;
76.3% said their RJ initiatives involved other partners
73.7% said their RJ practices involved response and neighbourhood officers
55% said that neighbourhood officers utilised restorative conferencing as a part of the process
the survey revealed a very clear understanding of the principles of RJ with agreement that the process seeks to involve both the harmer and the harmed, seeks to establish the facts and acceptance and above all seeks to repair the harm (73.7%)²

2.5. The Flanagan review of policing led to a four-force pilot in Surrey, Leicestershire, Staffordshire and West Midlands of the use of Community Resolution (CR). CR is instinctively restorative in its approach and has been shown to achieve the benefits associated with the use of restorative justice.

2.6. In recent years, in excess of 18,000 police officers and PCSOs have received training in RJ interventions³ as well as a significant number of volunteers and partner staff. However the survey highlighted inconsistencies amongst forces as to the training standards and quality assurance processes in place to check the appropriate use of restorative justice.

2.7. Importantly there is clear evidence from the survey and from ACPO RJ Meetings that RJ is now being utilized as a problem solving tool by Neighbourhood Policing Teams, within schools, to settle long-term neighbour disputes, as a post-sentence element of reducing re-offending programmes and as a quick and effective means of tackling those crimes and incidents which have a disproportionate impact upon communities. It is clear that its application is far wider than it was in the 1990s and that its focus is one which goes beyond the goals of just reducing re-offending. Neighbourhood community engagement has highlighted the inability of the formal criminal justice system at times, to deal effectively with young first time offenders through cautions, reprimands or even final warnings where those offenders have not understood the consequences of their actions. NPTs see RJ as a tool to change that position.

2.8. The use of RJ interventions has been embraced enthusiastically by officers in participating forces. They have described its flexible and impactive capabilities as a return to ‘common-sense policing’. Officers have seen it as a return to professional decision-making after a decade of rigid performance management during which officers were encouraged to concentrate on the ‘low hanging fruit of detections’ in an effort to raise the detected crime rate – ‘performance management

² ACPO RJ Survey sent December 2009 – ACC Shewan
³ ACPO RJ Survey sent December 2009 – ACC Shewan
has brought more offenders to justice, only they are the wrong offenders’.

2.9. Whilst the ACPO survey highlighted that many forces’ use of RJ has grown ‘organically’ and has not been accompanied by clear evaluation and evidence of impact - that evidence does exist and can be seen to support a case for the continued and wider use of RJ in policing.

3. RJ – Evidence of Impact

3.1. The ACPO survey found that less than half of forces could identify the performance impact that the use of restorative justice had brought about. Some forces felt that it was at that time, too early to have had an opportunity to carry out meaningful analysis. Where impact was being measured it was specifically around the areas of First Time Entrants and Re-offending rates. Forces are developing performance frameworks around RJ that measure impact on re-offending rates, time to complete, victim/offender/officer satisfaction as well as partner involvement.

3.2. There is a growing evidence-base around RJ that already exists. We know that early results from forces are indicative of supporting the criminological evidence already in existence. We know that;

- RJ has been shown to reduce re-offending (e.g., reduces the frequency in re-offending),
- RJ has significant cost benefits, increases efficiency and use of resources,
- RJ is able to improve public confidence and satisfaction by directly engaging the affected parties in the disposal.

This paper will draw out the evidence of RJ impact in four key areas; re-offending, victim satisfaction, Value For Money and public confidence.

Re-offending

3.2.1. Many forces have only introduced RJ schemes within the last 12 months and so the evidence on re-offending is still being assessed. However, the use of RJ by police officers and working with partners such as schools and YOTs is enabling the police to see that it is contributing toward a reduction in the frequency and severity of re-offending. The evidence that follows has been taken directly from forces and has not been independently evaluated.
3.2.2. In Leicestershire between July 2008 and March 2009, 2,666 offences were resolved using Community Resolution. The re-offending rates for young people involved in the process are just 18%.

3.2.3. In Norfolk they are reporting a re-offending rate for children and young people of just 10.4% and adults of 16%. These compare favourably with the re-offending rates for PNDs of 18%, Cautions of 24% and Reprimands of 23%.

3.2.4. In North Wales the re-offending rate for the recipients of YRDs stands at 5%. In Bristol the re-offending rate is higher at 15.9% but this compares to a rate of 30.2% for those receiving a reprimand. In Derbyshire the re-offending rate for RJs is 2.3% compared with 12.5% for the formal CJS.

3.2.5. In Cheshire their evaluation found that the use of RJ resulted in a fall in the re-offending rate for FTEs from 26% to 12%.

3.2.6. North Yorkshire identified that their re-offending rate within 3 months fell from 7.8% before their RJ pilot to 2.2%, and re-offending within 6 months fell from 14% to 6.2%.

3.2.7. In his resignation from his post with the Youth Justice Board in February 2007, Rod Morgan stated that the criminal justice system had become “swamped” because of the increasing criminalisation of young people. In Cheshire the number of under 18s being brought into the CJS for the first time increased between 2002 and 2007 by 95% as the drive for more detections targeted young offenders. The use of RJ interventions is delaying and preventing entry into the formal CJS. Cumbria have noted a fall last year of First Time Entrants (FTEs) of 27% and Cheshire a fall of 20% as RJ replaces reprimands and final warnings.

3.2.8. Dorset indicate that their ‘restorative reprimand’ scheme has reduced first time entrants to the Youth Justice System by 44%.

**Victim Satisfaction**

3.2.9. The Shapland research compared their findings that 85% of victims were satisfied with the RJ experience to the British Crime Survey (04/05) finding that only 33% of victims felt that the CJS met their needs. Shapland also identified that 74% of offenders and 78% of victims would definitely or probably recommend RJ to others, and that over half of victims said that the process had
provided them with a sense of closure. Further research on victims has also demonstrated that participation in RJ reduces the post-traumatic stress symptoms often experienced by victims of crime. Taken together there does appear to be a positive effect of participating in RJ.

3.2.10. The 2007-08 performance indicators for Youth Offending Teams show that victims who have participated in restorative processes were 85% satisfied, rising to 97% satisfaction where the RJ involved a face-to-face meeting.

3.2.11. In Norfolk the proportion of victims ‘very’ and ‘completely satisfied’ with the whole experience of being dealt with through restorative justice is 87% compared with 67% for conventional justice disposals. 92% of victims said that they would recommend it to another victim.

3.2.12. In Dorset victim satisfaction for those involved in their RJ scheme rose to 98%.

3.2.13. In Cheshire 78% of victims felt that restorative justice was a better way of dealing with the crime and 91% would recommend it to a friend.

3.2.14. Before the restorative conference in Cheshire 54% of victims felt traumatized by the incident and felt anger towards the offender, only 9% understood why the crime had happened and as a result 18% felt scared of the offender and only 45% felt safe in the local community. At the conclusion of the conference, the results were very different. Following the conference, 73% of those involved felt they were now able to put the incident behind them. One of the reasons behind this could be that 45% now understood why the incident had happened to them. The fact the victim was able to give closure to the incident meant that now only 18% felt anger towards the offender, as opposed to 54% before. An interesting fact was that following the conference, none of the participants felt scared of the offender and 73% now felt safe in their community. The impact of all this was that 72% of the victims views of the local police had now improved.
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5 Restorative Justice Consortium website
6 Youth Justice Board (2008) 2007-08 Performance YJB Youth Offending Teams Quarterly returns
7 Norfolk Annual Statistical Return 2009/10
8 Cheshire Evaluation of RJ Pilots
Value For Money

3.2.15. The use of RJ is allowing a more proportionate and efficient use of the resources employed within the CJS. Some forces have costed the utilization of RJ and compared it with the cost of alternative disposals.

3.2.16. Herfordshire have evidenced that the average time taken by officers dealing with Level 1 RJs (YRDs) is 36 minutes. The nearest equivalent disposal method for a FTE youth offender was a reprimand – the average time for a reprimand is 5 hours 38 minutes. The cost as calculated by Hertfordshire for a Level 1 RJ is £15.95 compared with the cost of a reprimand of £149.79 – a saving of £133.849.

3.2.17. Cheshire undertook a similar analysis utilising Operation Quest analysts from KPMG. They found that issuing a Level 1 RJ takes approximately an hour to complete and costs approximately £20.21 of a police officers’ time. They calculated that in contrast an officers spends an average 8 hours and 44 minutes dealing with a detainee, saving the force £157.09 for each Level 1 RJ intervention used as opposed to an arrest. Cheshire calculated that in 2007 they could have dealt with 8% of shoplifting arrests, 13% of damage arrests and 2.8% of assault arrests by RJ that would have produced savings of 6,137 officer hours for those offences alone – a saving of £125,671 per year. When they factored in the total cost of the reprimand or caution process including the custody costs the saving for officer time and process amounts to £226,903 per annum10. When RJ was launched they found that it was being used more often than they had projected and so re-calculated their projected annual savings to £497K per annum.

3.2.18. North Wales have examined the potential cost saving generated by the problem solving nature of RJ. In September 2009 they calculated the police costs for dealing with 100 RJ conferences (which had been a repeat problem) at £107,058 and costed out the time taken to resolve the matters using an RJ conference at £5,803. One example to illustrate the argument is as follows; police received 234 calls to a repeat ASB problem with on average of each call consuming an hour of police time at a cost of £7,188. Following a restorative conference (Level 2) which took 4.83 hours to organize and run there were no further incidents.

9 ACPO RJ Survey sent December 2009 – ACC Shewan
10 Cheshire Operation Quest 2 / KPMG
3.2.19. Norfolk have 457 police officers trained in RJ and in 2009/10 they dealt with 1,384 RJ disposals – more than 3 per officer.

3.2.20. Other examples of how Level 2 RJs can contribute significant savings;
Two neighbours in a street had been in dispute for some time over the noise and general anti-social behaviour caused by one of the parties. Over a period of 7 months, the police were called to deal with the dispute on an average of 4 times per week (total 121 calls) but were unable to resolve the issue. It was decided to convene a restorative conference directly involving the parties involved. During the conference an agreement as to the future conduct of the party causing harm was agreed and since that time there have been no further calls to the police. It was estimated that each call to the police involved attendance and administrative time of 1.5 officers, totaling approximately 1 hour of police time per call. This has been costed at £3,717.28. The total time in setting up and delivering the conference was 2 hours 50 mins. This has been costed at £87.15. Assuming that the situation would have continued at the same rate for another 12 months the total time of the police in dealing with the incidents would have been 171 hours and at a cost of £5,266.13.

Two teenage boys were engaged in the persistent bullying and harassment of two younger girls living within the same community. Over a period of 18 months, their behaviour became more regular and widespread, eventually taking place not only in public places but within the local school. Parents from all families became involved and the situation was beginning to escalate. Police were called a total of 234 times. A restorative conference was held and since that time there has been no further police involvement. It was estimated that each call to the police involved attendance an administrative time of 1.5 officers totaling approximately 1 hour of police time per call. This has been costed at £7,188.80. The total time in setting up and delivering the conference was 4 hours 50 minutes. This has been costed at £157.37. Assuming that the situation would have continued for another 12 months at the same level of intensity, the total time for the police in dealing with the incidents would have been 156 hours and at a cost of £4,792.53. It is reasonable to assert that the restorative intervention saved this amount of overall resource. If the incidents had been addressed after 3 repeat calls then savings could have amounted to £14,285.12 over the same total time period.\footnote{Restorative Solutions (2009) RAiN – using Restorative Approaches to Reduce Police Costs for Dealing with Repeat Call Outs}
3.2.21. These interventions do not only deliver the benefits (when correctly applied) to victims, offenders and communities but also allow those engaged within the CJS to re-invest time saved on other activities. Police officers and PCSOs can focus time and investigative skills on more serious offences, on victim and witness care, on problem solving activity or on intelligence led visible patrol. Youth Offending Teams are reporting a greater emphasis upon prevention work.

Increasing Public Confidence

3.2.22. A recent Home Office review of the evidence of how to improve confidence in the police identifies RJ as one of the four interventions that work\textsuperscript{12}. The report states that both victims and offenders who participate in RJ are very positive about the experience. Quoting Shapland they identify that 34\% of victims had become more positive about the CJS with views about policing showing the most improvement.

3.2.23. Collecting data on RJ and public confidence is less mature and difficult to demonstrate but here too there are signs that supports the view that RJ processes have a lasting impact on community confidence in policing.

3.2.24. In Norfolk where specific confidence survey questions are evaluated, 94\% of victims who have experienced RJ say that they are confident that the police and partners can deal with crime and ASB. 91\% stated that they are confident that RJ itself can deal with crime and ASB and 81\% believe that RJ can change offending behaviour\textsuperscript{13}.

3.2.25. Since RJ was introduced into the Norfolk RJ landscape over 12,000 people have been involved in RJ conferences. Given the clear evidence that RJ raises victim satisfaction, it is understandable to suggest that this size of exposure can lead to increased confidence as participants tell others about their positive experience.

3.2.26. In Greater Manchester the early indications from victim surveys show that 38\% said their confidence in policing had improved as a result of the RJ experience.

\textsuperscript{12} Home Office Research Report 28 (2009) Improving public confidence in the police : a review of the evidence
\textsuperscript{13} Norfolk Annual Statistical Return 2009/10
3.2.27. Confidence is often displayed very well through the words of those who have experienced RJ. Shapland quoted victims extensively – an example such as "I was really pleased with what the offender said. He was sincere. There were some tools taken and I discovered where they were. He owned up to it". The power of such words is reflected across all forces who collate the experiences of their RJ victims. One example from GMP is as follows, "I was really impressed with PC Collins, she was ‘brilliant’. I actually felt sorry for the offender at the end of the meeting – this is a great way to deal with this sort of crime and I’ve been telling people about it!"

The Youth Restorative Disposal

3.2.28. The Youth Restorative Disposal (YRD) was piloted in eight police forces between April 2008 and September 2009. It was developed by the Youth Justice Board in partnership with ACPO, the MoJ and the DCSF. It aimed to offer police officers and PCSOs more discretion and a quick and effective means of dealing with low level, anti-social and nuisance offending.

3.2.29. Over four thousand YRDs were issued during the pilot with shoplifting, assault and criminal damage being the main offences dealt with.

3.2.30. The YRD was evaluated and this found that police satisfaction with the scheme was high. This was due to giving police officers greater discretion over choosing the most appropriate way of dealing with low level incidents; by raising public confidence in policing through giving victims a say in how offenders should be dealt with; and, in most cases YRD were less time consuming than alternative CJS disposals.

3.2.31. The evaluation found that victim satisfaction was high, that YRDs did not increase the work rate for YOTs and there was a high level of agreement that YRDs represented a more appropriate and proportional response that did not result in young people being caught in the CJS net.

3.2.32. The evaluation found that when compared with a Reprimand the cost of administering a YRD was a saving of £426 or £393 if a RJ conference was used.
4. **RJ and Neighbourhood Policing**

4.1. Victims of crime want (more than anything) not to have been a victim in the first place - and certainly do not want to be a victim again. They have an investment in seeking the reduction of re-offending rates. Victims also want to understand why they were ‘victimised’, want to seek closure, take away the pain and feel safe and confident in going about their business within their neighbourhood. Traditional means of dealing with first-time and low-level offending cannot always offer a way of meeting these needs yet RJ can.

4.2. Embedding RJ within Neighbourhood Policing is the best way of ensuring that the full impact and benefits will be accrued as local teams and communities look for ways in which local offending behaviour can be dealt with in a more constructive way. It is the involvement of communities that sets aside the current development of RJ within policing from those that have gone before. Community based RJ builds upon the role of local neighbourhood officers and staff to understand local values, priorities and needs and equips them with a new flexibility to design interventions to meet them. This enables police and communities to work together on behalf of victims and the community itself, turning conflict into co-operation enabling the achievement of real and lasting resolutions. The application of RJ has set a clear agenda for public services; invite people to get engaged, support their involvement and engage them in proper conversations, and then levels of citizen activity will increase.

4.3. RJ is not policing done to people but returns to the ideals of policing as part of a true community partnership. It is clear that done well RJ cannot be done to or even for victims it must be done with them. Many forces, led by Norfolk, are now training community volunteers in the use of restorative justice, to both act as community ‘victims’ but excitingly to organise and administer restorative justice themselves – communities taking responsibility for and working with the police to deal with their ‘own’ offenders and the way that justice is applied.

4.4. The true value of RJ is yet to be fully realized. RJ offers a holistic approach to rule-breaking and wrong-doing. It can be utilised to deal with simple and complex offending, as a diversionary tool or as a means for offenders to understand the consequences of their actions. It can solve problems yet heal communities suffering from the pain of harm. Where delivered in conjunction with schools there is a consistency in how young people are dealt with at school and then on the streets removing the sometimes contradictions which can exist.
The development of Restorative Communities is gathering pace.

5. **RJ – What Is Needed?**

5.1. Both RJ and Community Resolution have been shown to be able to reduce bureaucracy, achieve efficiency savings, at the same time as delivering on performance targets.

5.2. Level 1 RJ conferencing and Community Resolutions offer the same opportunity to achieve the outcomes offered from giving police officers and PCSOs discretion to divert appropriate offenders and by putting the victim at the centre of decision-making. Above all this is delivering sensible and appropriate responses to low level crime and offending which produces significant cost and efficiency savings. It is important that the shared benefits and processes between RJ and Community Resolution are promoted and that agreed standards (training, quality assurance, recording) are developed.

5.3. The more restorative the intervention is – face to face, conferencing with the involvement of family/supporters, involving the community in the problem, process, solution and outcome – then the evidence points to the greater the level of impact in areas such as re-offending, victim satisfaction and improved confidence. RJ conferencing takes into account the three stakeholders of justice in neighbourhoods – victim, offender and community. There is an increasing public and media understanding of RJ and it is increasingly providing a recognisable reference point – when we say we will be delivering RJ, it is being understood what that is and why and is recognised as something ‘official’.

5.4. Whilst the cost of training for Level 2 RJs is double the cost of Level 1 and there is a recognition in the evidence provided that organising and running a conference takes on average four times as long, there are still significant cost and time savings from Level 2 RJ conferencing over the cost of the arrest, custody and administrative process associated with many out-of-court disposals. What RJ offers is a very significant level of visibility and transparency for the victim and community as well as the benefits evidenced above. Justice is done, is seen to be done and involves the stakeholders in the outcome.

5.5. The *Safe and Confident Neighbourhoods Strategy* published earlier this year by the Home Office contained a section specifically on RJ. It contained 3 recommendations:

5.5.1. Work with RJC to develop national accredited standards for RJ and a national register
5.5.2. Take forward the findings of the YRD evaluation

5.5.3. Develop a standard approach for RJ across forces – building on existing practice and the professional decision-making pilots (Community Resolution) – and work with HMIC and the HO to ensure it is appropriately reflected in performance assessments

ACC Garry Shewan is taking these recommendations forward on behalf of ACPO with Home Office, MoJ, YJB and Restorative Justice Consortium (RJC) partners.

5.6. The recent Coalition Programme for Government made specific reference to RJ when it set out its intention to “introduce effective measures to tackle anti-social behaviour and low-level crime, including forms of restorative justice such as Neighbourhood Justice Panels”.

5.7. We must never sacrifice the need to protect our communities and bring offenders to account for their crimes through the CJS where appropriate. Diversionary RJ will not be appropriate in the majority of criminal offending (though may well be appropriate in addition to the formal CJS for serious offences – Level 3 RJ). However, a restorative model of dealing with crime and offending which seeks to repair the harm to victims and communities, seeks to reduce re-offending and bring offenders to accept responsibility for their actions and help build strong, vibrant and active communities is worthy of pursuit.

5.8. What would an ACPO policing commitment to RJ deliver? Forces will be empowered to develop their own programmes recognising and defining when officers are to use their discretion; when they are to apply a response to offending and behaviour which seeks to apply the principles of the criminal law and justice and when to apply a common sense and community focused restorative resolution. What this RJ will allow (when appropriately trained) is for officers to work with their communities recognising where there is a clear ‘community imperative’ to seek the community’s own involvement in the resolution of appropriate crimes; to provide a common language and process which will become recognisable and consistent; and, to deliver a victim focused but formal response to crimes and offending which promotes discretion whilst adopting a safe level of bureaucracy.

5.9. There are three key goals for the development of RJ in policing;

5.9.1. Clear and consistent standards and processes which recognise the need for clarity, quality and consistency without adding to the bureaucratic burden
5.9.2. Recognised training standards to ensure the well-being and needs of victims are paramount when delivering RJ

5.9.3. Home Office and HMIC recognition of RJ disposals as a key part of tackling crime and offending

5.10. Each of these goals are under development through the working group set up in response to the Home Office strategy.