

# **RESTORATIVE JUSTICE IN CUSTODIAL SETTINGS**

**Report for the Restorative Justice Working Group in Northern Ireland**

**Marian Liebmann and Stephanie Braithwaite**

# CONTENTS

<b><u>Executive Summary</u></b>	<b>1</b>
<b><u>Full Report</u></b>	
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Restorative Justice</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Community Service</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Victim/Offender Mediation</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Victim Enquiry Work</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Victim/Offender Groups</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Relationships in Prison</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Victim Awareness Work in Prisons</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Restorative Justice Philosophy in Prisons</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Issues in Custodial Settings</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Useful Organisations</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Organisations and People Contacted</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>References and useful Publications</b>	<b>27</b>

## Restorative Justice in Custodial Settings

Marian Liebmann and Stephanie Braithwaite

### Executive Summary

#### Introduction

This lays out the scope of the task. As there is very little written material or research in this area, the authors of the report have, in addition to searching the literature in the normal way, made informal contact with a wide range of professionals and practitioners working in the field of Restorative Justice. The short timescale has meant that there is still material yet to arrive. Nevertheless a good range of information has been gathered.

As part of this research, the authors undertook two surveys in April 1999, one of victim/offender mediation services' involvement with offenders in custody, one of custodial institutions reported to be undertaking Restorative Justice initiatives.

#### Restorative Justice

We have used as a starting point a definition of restorative justice by the R.J.W.G. of Northern Ireland:

“Using a Restorative Justice model within the Criminal Justice System is embarking on a process of settlement in which: victims are key participants, offenders must accept responsibility for their actions and members of the communities (victims and offenders) are involved in seeking a healing process which includes restitution and restoration.”

#### Community Service

The Prison Phoenix Trust carried out two surveys of community work and projects carried out by prison establishments, in 1996 and 1998. These surveys describe the benefits of community work for inmates, the prison and the local community. They also identify the factors likely to lead to good practice and successful outcomes. The Inside Out Trust is an organisation dedicated to providing such projects, and examples are given of their projects. Some responses from our second survey are also included here.

#### Victim/Offender Mediation

This section describes initiatives involving prisons in which offenders contact (directly or indirectly) the victims of their crimes. Some of the first programmes took place in Switzerland, USA and Canada in the 1980s and early 1990s. A current initiative from Canada is also described. In the UK there has been sporadic use of victim/offender mediation involving prisoners during the early 1990s, on the initiative of individuals. More recently three young offender institutions have been involved in the more systematic practice of victim/offender mediation. The survey of victim/offender

mediation services showed that, for established services, approximately 20 to 25% of their caseload involves offenders in custody. The section finishes with a description of an initiative in the USA which mediated between offenders in custody and their families as secondary victims.

### Victim Enquiry Work

The majority of the victim/offender mediation services who responded to our survey also undertake Victim Enquiry work, which involves contacting victims of offenders serving four years or more in prison. They are seen as appropriate professionals to undertake this work because of their experience with victims and offenders, and because a request for mediation may come out of this work.

### Victim/Offender Groups

These are groups in which victims of crime and offenders meet, where the victims have suffered similar crimes (but not the actual crimes) to those perpetrated by the offenders. They provide a forum where offenders can learn about the effects of their offending, and victims can learn about the reasons for offending. These groups often result in victims and offenders seeing each other as more human than before.

This has been one of the most popular Restorative Justice initiatives, although many of them have not survived. Projects described are from Germany, UK, Canada and USA in the 1980s and early 1990s, and from the UK, USA and New Zealand in the late 1990s. Several of these were inspired by the groups run in Rochester Youth Custody Centre by Launay (1985-1989), which are among the best evaluated. A new initiative, the Sycamore Tree project, comes from the Prison Fellowship, using volunteers who are also victims of crime; this project has been piloted in USA, New Zealand and UK, and has also been well evaluated.

### Relationships in Prison

This section covers those initiatives which aim to offer inmates new skills in handling conflict in the prison itself. These often involve voluntary organisations going into prisons, such as Alternatives to Violence Project, Leap Confronting Conflict, Prison Dialogue and Kairos-APAC Trust. There are also one or two prisons thinking about using Restorative Justice methods for handling prison complaints and adjudications.

### Victim Awareness Work in Prisons

The Howard League carried out a survey of 135 prisons in 1997, seeking information about work undertaken with prisoners on victims' issues. While many prisons said that some work was done in a variety of groups (such as offending behaviour groups), only six prisons had specialist courses dealing with victims' issues. These six overlapped to a large extent with those who responded to our survey of custodial institutions.

## Restorative Justice Philosophy in Prisons

There are a few prisons now beginning to look at Restorative Justice as a total philosophy informing all their activities. These prisons try to include a whole range of activities, covering several of the themes already identified. The examples given include two established initiatives from the USA and two just beginning in the UK. Of related interest is the fact that the current issue (May 1999) of the Prison Service Journal is devoted almost entirely to Restorative Justice.

A research project on Belgian prisons is also included, which was initiated by a policy statement by their Ministry of Justice, where the primary goal of their correctional service has been for the first time linked with the ideas of restorative justice.

## Issues in Custodial Settings

This section reflects on some of the issues involved in introducing Restorative Justice to custodial settings, and discusses standards, equal opportunities and useful resources.

## Conclusion

This research has uncovered a wealth of useful material, not all of which has been received, owing to the short time-scale. The project has created interest in this area, which is likely to grow and become more important in the near future.

## Recommendations

Given the fact that there is no obvious RJ work in prisons in Northern Ireland, it would seem that there is enormous scope for introducing such processes in a variety of ways.

Starting with the simplest kind of work, victim awareness courses are straightforward to organise, requiring only co-operation from the prison and the local Victim Support Service.

The idea of reparation to the community finds easy resonance with inmates and their local communities, and can be fairly easily organised, especially if local charities become involved.

Moving to the next level of complexity, victim-offender mediation has been shown to be successful and welcomed by victims and offenders, provided it is separated from any sentencing or parole process(although it can help negotiate release plans). It would seem from our research of the UK situation that a link with a community victim-offender service would be helpful here.

Alongside this, victim-offender groups have proved successful and relatively easy to organise. Liaison with local Victim Support Schemes is vital here.

There are also a number of procedures in prisons, such as adjudications, complaints, sentence and release planning, where an RJ approach could achieve positive results. This would be a move towards implementing restorative justice as a whole philosophy within custodial settings.

Also included in the report are lists of:  
Useful organisations, with addresses  
Organisations and people contacted  
References and useful publications

May 1999

# **RESTORATIVE JUSTICE IN CUSTODIAL SETTINGS**

## Report for the Restorative Justice Working Group in Northern Ireland

Marian Liebmann and Stephanie Braithwaite

### Introduction

This report has been completed at the request of the Restorative Justice Working group in Northern Ireland. There is very little written material on Restorative Justice in custodial settings, so while we have researched the literature in the normal way, we have also used personal contacts to access other more informal knowledge. This route has been very productive in uncovering a variety of small initiatives taking place around the world. The act of researching this area has also stimulated considerable interest in it, from both practitioners and policy makers, and this is likely to continue.

The short timescale and relative difficulty in accessing material has meant that there is still material which has not yet reached us. We hope that readers of this report will see it as the first stage of gathering material on this topic.

The material gathered reflects activity primarily in the US, Canada and the UK. We have made contact with Australia and New Zealand but, despite their innovative work in Restorative Justice in the community, discovered very little activity in custodial settings. The few European contacts we made gave us a similar impression, although there is evidence that many people are 'thinking about it'. Within the UK, we have not spent much time researching initiatives in Northern Ireland, as the Restorative Justice Working Party have assured us that there are no Restorative justice programmes within the three adult prisons.

We have not included any case studies in this report because of the constraints on length. The very wide variety of practice would also make it difficult to choose representative examples.

As part of the research, we undertook two surveys with questionnaires, one to known victim/offender mediation services to ascertain how much of their work is concerned with offenders in custody, and the second to custodial institutions thought to be involved in Restorative Justice practices.

We have presented the information in themes, so that the Restorative Justice Working Group can follow any line of practice of particular interest. Within themes, the material follows a broadly chronological order for each country.

### Restorative Justice

We will take as our starting point a definition of Restorative Justice by The Restorative Justice Working Group of Northern Ireland:

“ Using a RJ model within the CJ system is embarking on a process of settlement in which: victims are key participants, offenders must accept responsibility for their actions and members of the communities (victims and offenders) are involved in seeking a healing process which includes restitution and restoration.”

Marshall lists the primary objectives of Restorative Justice as:  
to attend fully to victims’ needs - material, financial, emotional and social (including those personally close to the victim who may be similarly affected)  
to prevent re-offending by reintegrating offenders into the community  
to enable offenders to assume active responsibility for their actions  
to recreate a working community that supports the rehabilitation of offenders and victims and is active in preventing crime  
to provide a means of avoiding escalation of legal justice and the associated costs and delays (Marshall 1999, p.6)

Thus Restorative Justice includes several strands, and we have gathered together our findings under different headings to include these.

### Community Service

The **Prison Phoenix Trust** (which helps prisoners to undertake meditation and yoga) has carried out two surveys of community work and projects carried out by prison establishments, in 1996 and 1998, the second to fill in the gaps in the first. The total number of prisons surveyed was 84, which was a 60.8% response rate, and covered most types of custodial institutions (Prison Phoenix Trust 1998b). Examples of projects include the Prison Charity Shops Trust Scheme (selling prisoners’ craftwork in aid of good causes), Encounter Schemes working with youth at risk, coffee mornings to buy wheelchairs for children with special needs, helping autistic children to use prison gym facilities, creating a sensory garden for a special school (Prison Phoenix Trust 1998a) and placements of prisoners with community projects outside prisons. Benefits of community work are cited as:

- the rehabilitative effect on inmates
- increased good relations between inmates and prison staff
- the better atmosphere in the prison
- meeting the needs of the local community
- the improvement of good public relations between prisons and the general public

The following factors were identified as likely to lead to good practice and successful outcomes:

- firm commitment
- involvement of local agencies
- staff and inmates working together
- combining education and community projects

- maintaining motivation
- determination to overcome obstacles
- respect for inmates
- taking part in award schemes

The types of prisons surveyed included male and female, adult prisons and young offender institutions; and remand, local, closed and open prisons, including dispersal units and resettlement units.

The **Inside Out Trust** was founded in 1993 to provide prison inmates with skills likely to contribute to their reintegration into the community and especially employment, via projects to make goods and services available to people in need. In 1998 they had 589 places for prisoners in nearly 70 prisons (including male and female prisons, adult prisons and young offender institutions), with another 20 prisons waiting to take part (Inside Out Trust 1998). Projects include making clothes for orphaned children in West Africa, renovating typewriters, bicycles and artificial limbs for poor countries around the world, designing Christmas cards sold in aid of UK charities, braille transcription work for visually impaired people and craftwork for fundraising sales for other charities (including Victim Support). A new project is the Jerwood Prison community art award 1999 for prisoners to design and produce artistic work for installation in community organisations, hospitals, schools and day centres.

They list the benefits for prisoners as learning new skills, learning to work with others, developing concentration, thinking about how other people live and what they need in order to survive. The benefits to people in need are goods and services they would otherwise not receive (Carey 1998).

There were some comments (Grindrod 1999) that community service projects outside prisons have become more difficult in recent years, with increased restrictions on licences, home leave and temporary release. This has resulted in some cases of community projects moving into prisons.

Our survey of custodial institutions provided evidence of community service projects which went one step further, involving Victim Support volunteers and also victims of crime. **HMYOI Aylesbury**, a male young offender establishment, runs a charity workshop with victims of armed robbery. Offenders are at the mid-term or towards the end of their sentence, and victims are selected by prison psychologists. All offences are included and staff who run the workshops are also trained by prison psychologists.

At **HMP Springhill**, an adult male establishment, about 70 men work in the local community for prison wages, and charities like Time and Oxfam benefit from workshop activities and a clothes sorting service. Victim Support volunteers visit and run victim awareness workshops. The offenders involved are those convicted of violent or property offences, and on long, medium or short sentences. The prison is currently developing restorative justice systems to help offenders take responsibility for their crimes and to look at the consequences of them from the victim's perspective.

## Victim/Offender Mediation

The information in this section is presented in chronological order for each country. It is not known whether the older initiatives described are still in existence.

At **Saxerriet Prison in Switzerland**, a small open prison for first-time offenders, rehabilitative efforts have included both debt regulation and contacts with victims, with the aim of reconciliation. Social workers investigated the suitability of reparation in individual cases, and if appropriate, workers caring for victims initiated contact between the victim and offender. This was done carefully, with empathy and a reconciling attitude. The project workers felt that, important as the material reparation was, the discussion of the offence was more so (Dunkel 1985)

Dave Cook, VORP (Victim Offender Reconciliation Project) Co-ordinator from the **University of Wisconsin Law School**, helped to run a project which included about 25 cases a year, where a suitable offender and volunteer victim met with a trained mediator in a minimum or maximum security prison in the area. Offences involved burglary and assault, and mediation focused on reconciling relationships and addressing the feelings resulting from criminal activity and victimisation. These meetings usually took place a few months before release and could be followed up with further meetings in the community after release. (Cook 1989 in Immarigeon 1994)

A six month Victim-Offender Pilot Project (VOMP) took place in **Langley, British Columbia**, (Gustafson 1992), in which staff worked with offenders at a federal penitentiary for offences such as armed robbery, rape, serial rape and murder (where offenders were related to victims). Mediation meetings were considered or held with multiple victims in each case. The evaluation noted that “highly significant results can occur for both victims and offenders who start the process but may not complete it.” Both parties were impressed that someone cared about their case (Immarigeon (1994) 1994). It was often found that communication with the victim(s) or offender were powerful, difficult and exhilarating. It also concluded that programme participation should not be used for parole consideration, and that the programme should not be viewed as a form of treatment, but rather as ‘a process parallel to treatment’ that might be appropriate for some offenders.

At **Genesee County Jail in Batavia, NY**, Dennis Whitman expanded the community services in restitution and other victim-offender services to include victim-offender reconciliation, victim impact statements and pre-sentence conferences, among other options (Immarigeon 1994). Cases dealt with include many of violence. Genesee Justice was also exploring community conciliation programmes where the offenders came before

their community for conciliatory, restorative justice responses in appropriate child sexual abuse cases.

The Restorative Community Reintegration Project (formerly Restorative Parole) operates in two institutions, **Stony Mountain and Rockwood near Winnipeg**. The two facilities together house approximately 600 inmates of minimum to medium security rating (Grier and Reddoch 1999).

The three-year pilot is currently in the implementation phase, and is for all but the most serious offenders. There is positive community acceptance, with victims taking the opportunity to identify themselves and become involved.

The objectives of this project are:

- to increase public knowledge of the parole process
- to increase public participation and satisfaction regarding the release process
- to help victims understand the release process
- to help victims in reducing their fears and apprehensions regarding the release of the individual who victimised them
- to help inmates develop insight and awareness of the offence impact on victims
- to provide victims with a meaningful role in release planning for offenders
- to develop culturally appropriate community support referrals for victims and offenders
- to reduce the likelihood of offenders re-offending

Very briefly, the process is as follows:

Victims are contacted, told about the project and about Restorative Justice principles on a group or individual basis, then assessed for suitability and introduced to volunteers who will tell them about the release planning of offenders.

If both victim and offender are willing, a face to face meeting is arranged and carried out by trained RCR facilitators. If willing, the victim will attend the offender's parole hearing, where they will have a voice. Regardless of the outcome of the hearing, ongoing support and access to counselling will be available to the victim.

Offenders are made aware of the RCR model for release planning and the potential for interaction with the victim of their offence. They will then make an informed decision about participation in the RCR, after group workshops on Restorative Justice principles. They are then assessed for suitability and prepare a plan that meets the needs of the victim and is acceptable to the offender's parole officer. The offender then meets his victim or a surrogate one, where he reflects on the progress he has made to address the harm caused to his victim(s), and agrees plans to make further amends on release. He is then committed to following the agreed release strategy and remains under the authority of the Correctional Services of Canada Parole Services. The community agencies and volunteers will support his release plan.

Community volunteers are given details about the project and Restorative Justice principles, and assess the suitability of victims and offenders for victim/offender mediation and will provide support for the victim and/or offender. They will be there at the parole board hearing to provide support for the victim and again provide support to victim and/or offender on release.

In the **UK**, victim/offender mediation has taken place in prisons on a sporadic basis for many years, usually on the individual initiative of probation officers. Reports of two such cases, both involving **sex offenders** and looking to mediation as a part of the healing process for some victims, appeared in *MEDIATION* journal (Lynch 1993; Monk-Shepherd with Nation 1995a) and *Probation Journal* (Monk-Shepherd with Nation 1995b).

An interesting series of letters between a victim of an aggravated burglary and her offender (serving a prison sentence of seven years) appeared in the *Guardian* in 1996 (Robinson and Thompson 1996), helped by one of the West Yorkshire probation service victim/offender mediation services.

At **HMYOI Stoke Heath**, a male young offender establishment, despite a severe shortage of staff, direct and indirect mediation is carried out between offenders and their victims. Prior to this, victim/offender mediation training sessions are run over a three-day period with about eight offenders at a time, facilitated by a trained prison officer mediator with support by local mediation services. Offenders, mainly in custody for burglary or assault offences, can take part at any stage in their sentence and are selected individually by interview as part of their sentence planning process. Outside agencies help by training victims and training staff. No evaluation has yet been completed, but 20% of inmates make contact with their own victims.

At **HMYOI Brinsford**, a male young offender establishment, direct or indirect mediation takes place between offenders and their actual victims. This scheme is run in conjunction with Sandwell Mediation Service, by trained prison officers and prison probation officers who refer suitable offenders aged 15-21 for mediation. Letters of apology are also written and carefully monitored, together with feedback reactions of both victims and offenders. Direct mediation takes place using a youth justice worker as mediator, trained by Sandwell Mediation Service. This project is organised by a trained senior prison officer, and inmates are selected at the induction or sentence planning stage. Offences include a range from burglary of a dwelling to arson. It is a good example of co-organisational working and won a Butler Trust/ Lord Woolf Award for innovative work in a custodial setting. There is no evaluation available as yet (Sandwell Mediation Service 1998).

As part of the **Thames Valley** initiative (see section on Restorative Justice philosophy), **HMYOI Huntercombe** has undertaken mediation between offender and victim in suitable cases, for instance between two young men who were part of the same community in North London, taking the inmate out to the local probation office for the meeting (Jeffrey 1999).

**Victim/offender mediation services survey.** As part of this piece of research, questionnaires were sent to all victim/offender mediation services known in the UK (a total of 44), to ascertain whether they include cases involving prisoners. 13 questionnaires were returned, 30%. This low rate may indicate that the non-responders were not involved in prison work - and this is borne out by the fact that seven of the responses were from 'diversion from court or prosecution' schemes. However, the remaining six responses included useful information on work involving prisoners. A seventh response was picked up from the questionnaire for custodial institutions.

**Table 1 Victim/offender mediation services' work with offenders in custody**

	<b>Number of cases in 1998</b>	<b>Number of cases involving prisoners</b>	<b>Age range</b>
Leeds Victim Offender Unit	302	20-25%	All
Wakefield & Kirklees V/O Unit	208	45	All
West Midlands Victim Unit (Coventry)	91	20	All
Sandwell Mediation Service	Not known	39	All
Doncaster V/O Service (new)	5	2	All
Maidstone Mediation	20	1	12-23
Norwich Legal Services	22	1	10-17

Types of Restorative Justice practice used in cases involving prisoners

All six use direct mediation (face to face meetings), indirect mediation and letters. Two of these use financial reparation as well. Four are involved in Victim Enquiry work, and two are involved in Victim Awareness work in local custodial institutions.

Conclusion

It seems that, where victim/offender mediation is well established and covers all ages of offender, approximately 20 to 25% of cases involve prisoners, and often take place in prisons. The main methods used are direct mediation, indirect mediation and letters. Victim/offender mediation services are also involved in Victim Enquiry work and Victim Awareness work in local custodial institutions.

The second survey, of custodial institutions, will be described in the section on Restorative Justice philosophy.

We conclude this section with an initiative in victim/offender mediation where the victims were interpreted as the families of the offenders. At the **Waterloo Detention Centre**, a maximum security facility in **Cambridge, Ontario**, a Community Justice Initiative established a mediation programme at the pre-release stage, between offenders and their families. It recognised the fact that offenders' families are often indirect victims of their criminal behaviour, that in many cases significant and unaddressed disputes or issues exist between families and offenders, and that imprisonment puts additional stress on these situations. The objective of the programme was to bring offenders and their families together to resolve concerns that might prove harmful to offenders' successful reintegration into the community. Victims, employers and others were also be involved and the programme also provided support counselling, parole and discharge planning, and post release support. Follow up mediation was offered for offenders and their parents. (Immarigeon 1994) (Cleland-Moyer 1990)

### Victim Enquiry Work

The Victim's Charter (1991) made provision for probation services to contact victims (or their families) of life sentence prisoners to see if they had any anxieties about the offender's release, and later extended this to victims of offenders serving four years or more for violent offences. In areas where victim/offender mediation is established, probation services have often seen it as appropriate to ask mediation services to do this work because of their experience with both victims and offenders (Wood, Wynne and Hudson 1996). This also allows for the subsequent possibility of victim/offender mediation if it is requested, agreed by both parties and deemed to be safe. In the survey of victim/offender mediation services, four of the seven schemes were involved in Victim Enquiry work (Leeds, Wakefield & Kirklees, Coventry and Maidstone), and others in the West Yorkshire and West Midlands are also known to be involved in this way.

### Victim/ Offender Groups

These are groups in which victims of crime and offenders meet, where the victims have suffered similar crimes (but not the actual crimes) to those perpetrated by the offenders.

The groups described here are in strict chronological order, as initiatives in one country influenced others.

In **Hamelin Prison in West Germany**, victim related therapy for sexual offenders has taken place. This was run by prison psychologists as a 'sexual role seminar' with voluntary female non-professional therapists. The aim was "to lead young rapists to sexuality experienced as a partnership in which the female partner does not have to fulfil the function of an object". The therapy programme aimed to achieve respect for female sexual self-determination. The offender was confronted with tapes of lay helpers (from the women's movement), and in exceptional cases met his own victim. The intention was for the rapist to experience the effect of his action on the total life of the victim and to develop inhibitions against repetition. During the observation period of three and a half years, there was no recidivism from participants in the programme (Gers et al 1986) (Tugel and Heibemann 1987)

An exceptionally well designed, controlled and evaluated project was that at **Rochester Youth Custody Centre** (now an adult prison) by Gilles Launay ( Launay 1985; Launay 1987; Launay and Murray 1989)

The offenders concerned were aged between 15-21, convicted of burglary offences, and had a long history of offending. The victims were selected by Victim Support and the local Crime Prevention Office, and were often victims of unsolved burglaries. Offences of commercial and domestic burglaries were separated, as were the victims accordingly. The process consisted of three sessions, attended by victims, offenders, organisers, Victim Support and police representatives (to support their referrals). At the first session, victims described their reactions and feelings about being burgled to give offenders some understanding of their distress. The offenders then had to accept the responsibility for their crimes and the effects it had on such victims. It was significant that in this type of group, offenders would discuss their views and feelings, whereas if victim's rights group representatives gave the victims view - very little discussion took place. The second and third session involved role plays and exercises which served to cement the relationships between victims and offenders. They could enact a mediation/reparation meeting where a victim and his own offender tried to agree a reparation contract; they were then asked to reverse roles, which was difficult for them. They acted as a team to help some of the difficulties that arose, and it was often difficult to part at the end of the session.

For a discussion of some of the issues that arose, see Launay and Murray (1989). The evaluation was well done and involved questionnaires before and after, and attitude scales for both victims and offenders so that changes could be measured (Launay and Murray 1989). Some of the findings are reported below:

Victims rated themselves as less anxious and angry after meetings, and rated burglars more positively, friendly and likeable.

Offenders rated victims more positively afterwards, and had a better understanding of victims' attitudes and the impact of burglary on them.

In **Manitoba, Newfoundland and Saskatchewan**, face to face meetings took place, based on the British VOIC programme. Each prison followed the VOIC outline of three meetings, but Newfoundland added a fourth meeting to include a judge and prison system officials. The Face to Face programme asked groups of offenders to meet with random groups of victims to deal with the impact of the crime in more general terms than is normally the case when offenders meet their actual victims, as in the VORP model. (Immarigeon 1994) Sawatsky (1988) evaluated the Manitoba programme and found that “the telling of personal stories had a way of bringing about an identification with the inmate and an understanding of his feelings even though the circumstances were somewhat different from their own.” Victims also reported that it was helpful to learn of the broken lives experienced by many offenders. Loewen (1989) who evaluated the Newfoundland programme, suggested specific qualities for people interested in similar programmes: “Those willing to tackle a problem such as this must be prepared to ground themselves in a reconciliatory philosophy which lays the footing for Face to Face. This restorative framework, coupled with time, energy and administrative supports necessary for its implementation, are critical to the accomplishment of the stated goals and objectives.”

Mark Bitel (1991) described the victim/offender workshop at **Sing Sing Correctional Facility in Ossining NY:**

“The victim/offender workshops offer a forum for dialogue between offenders and surrogate victims of crime, or their family members in the case of homicide. The groups are loosely facilitated by two volunteer psychologists. We have secured funds to pay the victim’s transportation to the prison and we provide a simple lunch. Prior to the victims coming into the prison, the offenders undergo a period of readiness to help them understand victim issues and to orient them about what to expect. The meetings have proved to be very successful and transforming for both victims and offenders. Offenders are encouraged to accept responsibility for their actions and to become sensitive to crime from the victim’s perspective - particularly the domino effects set into motion following the crime. Meanwhile, victims are offered insight into crime which may help them to protect themselves from future victimisation and to learn the reality of what prison does and does not achieve. Often it allows victims for the first time to feel that they are getting a chance to participate in the criminal justice system rather than being used by it. Both groups report that often for the first time they are able to see the humanity in the other. The aim of the workshops is to create a safe space for healing and growth. We believe that the combination of therapy and job skills training will address the moral and economic deficits that play a large role in crime. Ultimately, it is our hope that the restorative justice program will reduce recidivism and serve as a bridge back to the community”.

**Avon Probation Service** held a series of weekly group sessions in **HMP Bristol** for offenders who had held up banks and post offices with guns. One of these sessions was a meeting with victims of robbery, and was filmed by the BBC for the programme Crime Limited (BBC 1992).

In **Graterford State Correctional Institution in Pennsylvania**, there was a three- phase programme run by volunteers, designed to encourage offender accountability and to assist the prison by promoting good public relations and a cost-free programme. Offenders were serving sentences for serious offences including murder (Immarigeon 1994).

The first two phases consisted of weekly sessions to help inmates understand the effects of crime on victims and take responsibility for their actions. In the second phase, the group followed different tracks on alternate weeks. In one track, the offenders met and interacted with actual crime victims (not involved in their own cases). On the other weeks, they worked on a letter to their own victims, or the victim's survivors in the case of murder. In the third phase, these letters were put on deposit with a co-operating victim assistance program. They attempted to contact the victims and survivors to let them know the letter was available, if they wished to receive it. Exchanges of letters or actual encounters were then facilitated between the victim and the offender, if the victims/survivors wished to do so.

The project was evaluated by Hall (1993). He found that Phase One was a successful period of awareness of crime's impacts and emotional sensitivity and growth. While recognising the pain of revisiting one's crime and the difficulty of sharing personal feelings, often never before disclosed, the men felt the process was a powerful one whose value outweighed its difficulties for them. Group solidarity seemed to support the participants as evidenced by greater willingness for self-disclosure and mutual respect and the preservation of confidentiality. The evaluation also stated "the name of the program suggests the goal of bringing [victims and offenders] together in some way to assist both in the interest of restorative rather than retributive justice and to enhance the healing process of those impacted directly by the crime. We recognise the fact that because individuals differ not only in how they cope with the trauma of crime but also in the time needed to reach each stage in the process, it is quite possible that a victim may not be ready for a reconciliation at the same time that the offender needs to express remorse, or ever". (Hall 1993).

At **Washington State Reformatory** in 1997-98, a pilot study took place to explore ways in which a restorative justice model may be practically applied in a custodial setting. The goals of the project included: to provide a safe environment for inmates to make amends for their crimes and for victims to heal; to facilitate constructive communication between groups; and to encourage participants to develop creative ways of thinking about justice and strategies for dealing with crime.

The project consisted of the development, implementation and evaluation of three sequential courses on Restorative Justice, involving victims, offenders and citizens as participants. The first two courses were ten weeks long each, and dealt with issues such as: what is Restorative Justice? how can you repair the harm to victims? is it possible with violent crimes? what does it mean for offenders to be held accountable for their crimes? what can they do in prison to repair the damage? what does the public want of

their offenders? The sessions moved on to more concrete solutions as the second course came to an end. The third course was 12 weeks long and involved more criminal justice officials, while covering similar issues to the previous ones. Methods of covering these issues are fully detailed in Helfgott (1998).

The participants were 27 offenders, serving sentences from five years to life without parole, and having spent between three and 33 years in prison. 20 were convicted of murder, three of whom were also convicted of rape, three of attempted murder, two of multiple robberies, one of burglary and one of drug offences. The victims, 18 in all, consisted of five family members of murder victims, six victims of rape or sexual assault, one family member of a kidnap/rape victim, one victim of aggravated assault, three of burglary and one of domestic violence. The time since the offence ranged from six months to 43 years. 15 citizens also took part.

A detailed evaluation was done (Helfgott 1998) and a few of the findings are mentioned below:

- 81% of offenders felt that if such seminars were offered on a regular basis, it would have a positive impact on prison subculture.
- Most offenders had rarely, if ever, recounted their crimes while in prison and they wanted to do so.
- The terms 'responsibility' and 'accountability' became more real for offenders.
- Victims felt it had been a healing experience and they found it easier to discuss the gruesome details of the offence with offenders than with members of their family or friends.
- 100% of citizens felt it had been a positive experience.
- Citizens had a more realistic and reasonable understanding of victims.
- Victims had less fear of re-victimisation and felt less ashamed.
- Victims had a greater willingness to accept murderers as neighbours.
- Citizens had a greater awareness of how they could help victims and offenders.
- A number of victims and offenders said they would be willing now to meet their actual victim or offender
- There was agreement that victims and citizens should play a greater role in the justice process and that the existing criminal justice system needed an overhaul.

The recommendations for the future were that the project should continue on an ongoing basis and should be extended to other prisons in the area, in particular Washington Correctional Centre for Women and the Minimum Security Camp in Monroe.

**HMP Long Lartin.** The psychology department ran several courses for robbery perpetrators, who often think their crime is against an institution, or a victimless crime. The course facilitators included a secondee from a bank who was the victim of three bank robberies, and the scheme had a victim liaison officer for robbery victims who seek help. There were also plans to take this course to other prisons. Although this service was known to be in recent existence, attempts to make contact have not resulted in any response.

**Sycamore Tree Project.** This project was pioneered by the **Prison Fellowship**, and is based on the Biblical story of Zacchaeus who climbed a sycamore tree before meeting Jesus and making restitution to his victims. It has been running in **New Zealand and the USA (Houston, Texas)**, and the first one in the UK took place at the end of 1998 at The Mount Prison in Hertfordshire. In this project, a small group of inmates is challenged to think about the impact of crime on their victims, and discuss how victims might feel. Volunteers from the local Prison Fellowship group also attend the course, including victims of crime, and tell their stories of pain and distress. The final session ends with a celebration with invited guests, in which inmates are encouraged to acknowledge that their actions have hurt others and the need to do something about it. Guests then witness inmates making symbolic acts of restitution, such as small home-made gifts to the volunteers who have been victims (Prison Fellowship 1999a). The outlines of the programme structure and sessions are available from the Prison Fellowship (Prison Fellowship 1999b).

The pilot programmes in Jester 11 prison, Houston (Rea 1998) and Arohata Women's Prison, Tawa, Wellington, New Zealand (Taylor 1998) have been evaluated by Prison Fellowship directors in each location. The programmes had the following goals and objectives:

Offenders and victims will participate voluntarily

The project is to be 'church-based'

There are direct encounters between offenders, crime victims (not necessarily the victims of the offenders) and the community

Some repayment for their crime, direct or indirect, will be made by the offenders

The project will draw attention to Biblical standards of justice

The project will end in a celebration

The evaluations concluded that the programmes fulfilled these objectives and also the overarching goal to "bring together victims and offenders to discuss how crime affects victims and communities, and to consider a number of issues that are raised by crime and victimisation." The evaluations then made some suggestions for improvements to procedure.

### Relationships in Prison

Several projects consider Restorative Justice as a philosophy which can offer inmates new skills in handling conflict in the prison, whether with staff or other inmates.

**Alternatives to Violence Project.** AVP is based on the belief that everyone has inside themselves the creative power to transform violent situations (AVP 1998b). The workshops (usually three days) build on everyday experiences to move away from violent or abusive behaviour by developing other ways of dealing with conflicts. The Level One workshop covers:

-building self-esteem, affirmation, trust and co-operation

-exploring methods of communication

-learning about creative resolution of conflicts

Level Two workshops focus on the underlying causes of violence, such as fear, anger, stereotyping, power and powerlessness. They take a deeper look at ways of resolving conflicts, including communication and forgiveness. Some people can train as facilitators by doing a third workshop. All facilitators work as volunteers. It is open to prison inmates to participate in AVP in the same way as others, so that they can both learn and teach others the skills of non-violence. Inmates must attend voluntarily and not be under any compulsion to attend.

Between the years 1991 (when AVP started in the UK) and 1998, AVP ran 183 workshops, of which 131 were in the community and 52 were held in prisons (AVP 1998a). Over this period of time, 13 prisons have received workshops, with 721 prisoner participations. The prisons where AVP has been active are: Buckley Hall, Coldingley, Cookham Wood, Everthorpe, Grendon, Nottingham, Onley, Pentonville, Rislely, Spring Hill, Swaleside, Wormwood Scrubs, Wymott. This list includes prisons for young offenders and women. These prisons are the ones that have expressed an interest (and can make the necessary practical arrangements) and where there are enough local volunteer facilitators to run the programme, often with some help from facilitators who travel from other parts of the country.

The AVP programme was evaluated by a team of volunteer interviewers led by Mark Bitel (Bitel 1998). The evaluation found that the programme was very successful at developing conflict resolution skills and recognising other people's point of view, although less successful at helping inmates deal with actual conflicts in the prison. Another useful publication summarises the lessons learned about working with AVP in prisons, based on nearly 5 years' work in London prisons (Hinds 1998).

**Leap Confronting Conflict.** Since 1995, Leap has been running the Feltham Leadership Programme, three day intensive workshops for young men in the YOI to develop strategies of conflict resolution. Over the year April 1998 to March 1999 the programme delivered eight workshops reaching 94 young men, of whom 70 completed the course successfully (Leap 1999). This programme was evaluated in 1995 by the Psychology Department at Feltham (Russ 1996), showing significant reductions in hostile attitudes and social avoidance, and a significant increase in self-esteem. Moreover, the participants all felt they benefited in the areas of personal development, thinking skills, future choices and relationships with others.

**Prison Dialogue** is another organisation working in prisons since 1993, running Dialogue Groups to provide 'an open forum where all may give their views and enquire into what really matters to them, but with the additional responsibility of taking others seriously even when they don't agree' (Prison Dialogue 1999). Weekly meetings are open to anyone living or working in the prison, including staff and other officials. The aim is to foster a new basis for forming relationships within the institution. Dialogue Groups have been running in HMP Whitemoor (Cambridgeshire), HMP Long Lartin and HMP Blakenhurst (both in Worcestershire), and also in the community in Cambridge, in conjunction with Cambridgeshire Probation Service.

**The Kairos-APAC Trust** runs (as part of its activities) an 18-week course for inmates, including several strands of evening meetings (Jones 1997). One of these strands focuses on communication skills, conflict resolution, building respect, sharing and caring. Another strand is more overtly Christian, and includes in this sessions on forgiveness, healing and reconciliation. The origins of this programme come from a remarkable prison project in Brazil, filmed by Penelope Lee, based on the work of a group of Christian volunteers (Burnside and Lee 1997). Prisons where Kairos-APAC works include Brixton, Swaleside and the Verne, and there are plans to expand to other prisons.

**The Relationships Foundation** also pays great attention to relationships in prison. Two articles in their new Relational Justice Bulletin (May 1998) are concerned with this, one by Tim Newell, Governor of Grendon and Spring Hill Prisons, and one by Libby Tomey, Relational Auditor.

HMP Grendon is thinking about the use of Restorative Conferencing for their adjudication process (see also section on Restorative Justice philosophy for more details of Grendon).

The work of '**KAIROS...a time for healing**' (not related to Kairos-APAC above) is also based on relationships developed in prisons, using Restorative Justice as a philosophy of working. This project grew out of work in the Maze prison in NI where relationships were at the heart of the physical improvements introduced. Respect for prisoners and their families led to trust being built up, which in turn led to the project being used as an intermediary to enable conflict resolution (Rafferty 1999).

At the **William Head Institution in Victoria, British Columbia**, a medium security establishment, a weekly study circle is held at which offenders and members of the community discuss restorative justice. It is also open to correctional staff, programme staff and parole officers (Hough 1999).

### Victim Awareness Work in Prisons

The Howard League carried out a survey in April 1997, in which it wrote to each of the 135 prison probation department seeking information about the work which was being undertaken in their establishment with prisoners on victims' issues (Howard League 1997). 61 (41%) responded. The results were:

-52 (85%) of those who responded stated that some of this kind of work was undertaken, but several prisons said that no groupwork was possible because of cuts in probation staffing.

-The most common form of groupwork concentrating on victims' issues occurred during: (1)Offending Behaviour Courses including Violent Offender Programmes (29 prisons)

(2)Alcohol and drugs courses (9 prisons)

(3)Thinking skills courses such as Cognitive Skills Programmes, Reasoning and Rehabilitation Courses (8 prisons).

(4)SOTP - Sex Offender Treatment Programme - courses (11 prisons). These are the only courses with really structured work to address victims' issues, by enabling offenders realise the impact their offence has had on others. At some point in the programme, offenders are helped to write a letter to the victim (which is never sent), and are also asked to write an account of their worst offence from the victim's perspective, and use victim role- play. It is hoped that such experiences will act as a motivator not to re-offend.

-Only 6 prisons had specialist courses dealing with victims' issues. These prisons are:  
**Stoke Heath YOI** - three-day course on victim/offender mediation and other issues relating to victims of crime, led by prison officers (already described in Victim/Offender Mediation section).

**Brinsford YOI** - indirect mediation programme, using mainly letter writing, and run in conjunction with Sandwell Mediation Service (already described in Victim/Offender Mediation section).

**Featherstone** - being developed, similar to Brinsford.

**Long Lartin** - course for robbery perpetrators, already described in Victim/Offender Groups section.

**Spring Hill** - groupwork programme which focuses on victim awareness, using a variety of approaches.

**Swaleside** - victim awareness group using multi-faceted approach developed by West Yorkshire Probation Service.

Our survey of custodial institutions thus confirmed the Howard League survey, and also extended the list. One of the additions is **HMP Wealstun**, helped by **Leeds Victim-Offender Unit**. Others are listed in the section on Restorative Justice philosophy.

The **Thames Valley** criminal justice services have produced a joint statement by the Crown Prosecution, police, prison and probation services (1998), with a section outlining the approaches being adopted by the prison service. These include offending behaviour programmes with substantial victim empathy content, assessing risk to victims, community work, increasing understanding of personal relationships, dealing with bullying and race issues in prisons.

The situation in prisons may change with the recent appointment at the Home Office of a member of staff in charge of Victim Policy.

In **West Germany**, there are 11 social therapy institutions (covering only 2% of custodial capacity), where they work through an offender's guilt using social/practical training and individual or group therapy. This can include face to face discussions with the victim but this takes place only exceptionally (Egg 1983) (Dunkel & Rossner 1989)

Restorative Justice Philosophy in Prisons

There are a few custodial institutions which try to look at Restorative Justice as a total philosophy informing all their activities.

**California Medical Facility in Vacaville, California**, operated a weekly Victim-Offender Reconciliation Group (VORG) which consisted of victims, victim advocates, volunteer offenders, prison staff, a programme manager, a chaplain and members of victim rights groups (Immarigeon 1994). These sessions were attended by various victims groups (e.g. Vanishing Childrens' Alliance, Bay Area Women Against Rape, Sacramento Crisis Center, Mens' Violence Prevention Workshop) in order to teach and to learn from inmates. Rev. Janarius E. Rodrigues, programme co-founder, stated that these meetings were "normally centred around one of the types of crimes VORG has identified: domestic crime, drug-related crime, gang-related crime, violent crime, hate crime and property crime...the meetings are loosely structured in order to allow and promote a free exchange of feelings and experiences." He also stated that "while participation in the programme itself is a form of restitution, the inmate members have also conducted several product sales in the institution in order to raise money that has been donated to some of the victim rights groups who have supported the programme. Also, inmate artists in VORG have produced a series of anti-drug and anti-alcohol abuse colouring books and safety posters for distribution in area schools. These restitution projects have contributed greatly to the self-esteem of the inmates and help the offender to recognise the very positive feelings of reconciliation and forgiveness."

A more recent example is **Minnesota Correctional Facility - Shakopee**, the women's prison in Minnesota. Their programme includes:

- Developing offender awareness of injury to victims

- Involving the offender in repairing the harm

- Involving the community in holding the offender accountable

- Increasing offender competency

- Increasing offender connections to conventional community members

This includes many of the aspects of Restorative Justice outlined in the other sections, including the use of mediation and conferencing to sort out conflicts within the prison (Angeles 1999).

**Survey of custodial institutions.** We sent questionnaires to prisons and young offenders institutions where we had heard that Restorative Justice processes had been practised, were in practice or were being considered for the future. Of 28 prisons surveyed, only seven replies were received. Five of these have been described in previous sections, and the remaining two are described below.

**HMP Wellingborough**, an adult female establishment, currently has community service projects making goods for charity. The prison is also setting up a working group to see how they can introduce restorative justice methods into their existing processes to deal with problems such as bullying and procedures such as adjudications.

At **HMP Grendon**, an adult male establishment, and the only therapeutic prison in the UK, direct victim/offender mediation, workshops in victim awareness, and the writing of

letters of apology (which are not sent to victims) have taken place. The offenders involved are often lifers, many with personality disorders, convicted of violent offences. Actual and surrogate victims are involved and selected by Victim Support and the prison's probation officers. Offenders are selected by the same group, with the agreement of their treatment team. Some members of the offender's families have also been involved. Although no formal evaluation has been done, offenders have found it very useful in the context of their treatment. At present, Grendon is developing protocols to develop contact with victims and hoping to use Restorative Conferencing with adjudications and complaints procedures. The prison officers who participate in the scheme are trained by the Thames Valley Police Restorative Justice Unit, and the work is part of the multi-agency commitment to Restorative Justice in the **Thames Valley** area.

The forthcoming issue of the **Prison Service Journal** (May 1999) is devoted almost entirely to Restorative Justice. There are articles on most of the Restorative Justice practices described above, and a more general article 'Restorative Justice in Prison?' (Edgar 1999) outlining a general approach to include all the elements.

In Belgium, a research project, financially supported by the Ministry of Scientific Policy and carried out by the Research Group Penology and Victimology of the Catholic University of Leuven in collaboration with the Free University of Brussels and the University of Liege, has been initiated entitled 'Key stones for a coherent restorative and victim-oriented justice policy'.

"One part of the research concentrates on the development of a restorative and victim-oriented correctional service. The project refers to the correctional policy statement of the Minister of Justice of June 19, 1996, in which the primary goal of the correctional service (safe and humane corrections aiming at the social reintegration of the convicted person) has been for the first time linked with the ideas of restorative justice (restitution, redress and reparation). Social reintegration is dependent on the recognition of victims and/or the acceptance of responsibility for restorative actions. "Restorative justice becomes a lever for the action to reintegrate the offender in society" (Aertsen & Peters 1998)

It concentrates on the development of concrete restorative actions in six correctional facilities where practitioners see what can be done in each of the institutions. "They have to take into account the specificity of the ... setting, the different categories of inmates in place, the opinions and attitudes of the staff, the openness for the ideas of restorative justice, relations with the social surroundings, the presence and concerns of victim assistance and the victim movement." (Aertsen & Peters 1998) It also looked at complex issues like financial compensation, how to obtain adequate information on which to base decisions and to victims and victim services about the correctional programmes. The involvement of prison staff, outside victim assistance agencies and offender support is seen as a major point in the development of restorative and victim-oriented corrections. Aertsen and Peters state "there is clearly a need for a complete shift in thinking about crime and the new problem-solving approaches to restorative justice". This research project has led to a number of small innovative initiatives in these six prisons. "They have to be seen as a first move to find out to what extent traditional correctional policy can be changed into a restorative practice". A report describing the

results of the first year was completed at the end of 1998, but we have been unable to obtain a copy in time.

A recent international penal reform conference ('Penal Reform: A New Approach for a New Century' 13-17 April 1999), with 120 people from 50 countries in all five continents, produced **A New Agenda for Penal Reform**, listing nine strategies for penal reform. The first of these is Restorative Justice, because it 'strengthens the social fabric and is likely to lead to a reduction in levels of imprisonment' (International Centre for Prison Studies 1999).

### Issues in Custodial Settings

Immarigeon (1994) raised problems or issues in developing victim/offender mediation or reparation programmes in prison settings, which are worth consideration. Some of these issues are raised below:

1. Getting started - programmes can be started by a wide range of people: victims, offenders, prison workers, boards of visitors, lawyers, chaplains or members of the local community. Suspicion and resistance are not unusual responses and need to be recognised and allayed.
2. Gaining entry to prison facilities - it is important to recognise that most prison facilities are security orientated, and to accept this and work within such rules. Most prison staff come to recognise the usefulness of Restorative Justice programmes in time.
3. Vagaries of prison schedules - changes and interruption of schedules may occur, so it is best to design programmes with limited schedules in mind. Prisoners may also be transferred at short notice. Having a good working relationship with prison staff can allay many of these problems.
4. Fear and doubts - victims, offenders and prison staff are frequently dubious of new programme initiatives, particularly ones that 'humanise' the penal process, but are often converted by the experience.
5. Clarity and openness of purpose - it is essential to be clear about aims and objectives, values and philosophy in developing the programme.
6. Counselling and preparing victims and offenders - considerable preparation is necessary for both victims and offenders prior to meeting/mediation. Areas such as motivation, benefits and process must be clear to all. This assessment procedure should enable the programme workers to select those who are suitable and those who are not, or not yet.
7. Gender - in most countries there are far fewer programme opportunities for female inmates. It is important to establish such programmes for women too.
8. Feedback and evaluation - it is vital that process evaluation and outcome studies are conducted with empirical data and critical perspectives. This information can be used to improve programmes, and to establish whether they achieve their aims and objectives.
9. Acceptance - although victim/offender mediation and reconciliation is more than 20 years old, it is still new to many people. People can be sceptical or downright resistant to such ideas. However, once begun, most practitioners' experience is that acceptance will

come later, and staff who are often most resistant to begin with, will end up participating in such schemes.

Immarigeon (1994) concludes his report “prison based victim-offender mediation is a powerful and practical method of healing some of the harm done by violent as well as non-violent crime. In Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States, hundreds of meetings have occurred without negative consequence. In fact, these meetings have been heralded by victims and offenders alike as a successful forum in which victims gain an important measure of control over events they did not fully understand and offenders learn firsthand the consequences of their past actions”.

**Standards in Restorative Justice.** There is understandably concern from many practitioners that, as this field expands, standards of good practice are upheld, for the benefit of victims and offenders. The inclusion of initiatives in this report is not to be taken as confirmation of high standards of practice, as we are not in a position to make any judgements concerning quality of service.

There are two sets of standards which may be useful: Mediation UK Practice Standards (Mediation UK 1998) and Standards for Restorative Justice (Restorative Justice Consortium 1999). The national Youth Justice Board for England and Wales (at the Home Office) has also published guidelines for Restorative Justice projects it may fund Guidance for the development of effective restorative practice with young offenders (1999). Standards in Restorative Justice apply as much in custodial settings as in the community.

**Equal Opportunities.** As referred to earlier, the question of equal opportunities was raised in the prisons questionnaire and the only replies received were in terms of standard EO policies. One of the ways of achieving equal opportunities was by providing open access, which of course in a custodial setting needs to be tempered by an inmate’s suitability and security/safety considerations.

**Resources.** Two particularly useful documents in our research have been the collections of initiatives by Immarigeon (1994) and Miller-Ashton (1998). Their addresses are listed in the references section.

### Conclusion

Although there is as yet no comprehensive literature on Restorative Justice in custodial settings, this report demonstrates the range of activities already being practised. Some of these have been evaluated and found to meet their objectives. Others have yet to be evaluated in a more systematic way.

Of all the countries covered in this report, only Belgium carries out restorative justice policy in a custodial setting as a result of national policy. Initiatives elsewhere are carried out by a wide range of interested and dedicated individuals or groups such as

prison officers, prison governors, probation officers, psychologists, boards of visitors (CACs in Canada), chaplains or citizens.

As can be seen in the report, a variety of RJ processes can be carried out at different stages of a prison sentence and in a variety of prison procedures, e.g., adjudications, parole hearings and complaints.

The interest raised by this enquiry suggests that there will be more activity and published material in this area in the near future. The information gathered together should provide a starting point for groups wishing to engage in Restorative Justice practices in custodial settings. In the research brief, it was requested that the options for Northern Ireland be addressed and the report has been set out in such a way as to make it possible for the Committee to select which strand(s) of restorative justice would be appropriate to follow up.

### Recommendations

Given the fact that there is no obvious RJ work in prisons in Northern Ireland, it would seem that there is enormous scope for introducing such processes in a variety of ways.

Starting with the simplest kind of work, victim awareness courses are straightforward to organise, requiring only co-operation from the prison and the local Victim Support Service.

The idea of reparation to the community finds ready resonance with inmates and their local communities, and can be fairly easily organised, especially if local charities become involved.

Moving to the next level of complexity, victim/offender mediation has been shown to be successful and welcomed by victims and offenders, provided it is separated from any sentencing or parole process (although it can help negotiate release plans). It would seem from our research of the UK situation that a link with a community victim/offender service would be helpful here.

Alongside this, V/O groups have proved successful and relatively easy to organise. Liaison with local Victim Support schemes are vital here.

There are also a number of procedures in prisons, such as adjudications, complaints, sentence and release planning, where an RJ approach could achieve positive results. This would be a move towards implementing restorative justice as a whole philosophy within custodial settings.

May 1999

Useful Organisations

**AVP Britain (Alternatives to Violence Project)**

547 High Road  
Leytonstone  
London E11 4PB  
Tel: 0181 558 3336  
Fax: 0181 558 6040  
e-mail: [ros@avpbrit.globalnet.co.uk](mailto:ros@avpbrit.globalnet.co.uk)

**Howard League**

708 Holloway Road  
London N19 3NL  
Tel: 0171 281 7722  
Fax: 0171 281 5506  
e-mail: [howard.league@ukonline.co.uk](mailto:howard.league@ukonline.co.uk)

**Inside Out Trust**

108 High Street  
Hurstpierpoint  
West Sussex BN6 9PX  
Tel: 01273 833050  
Fax: 01273 833744  
e-mail: [iotrust@pavilion.co.uk](mailto:iotrust@pavilion.co.uk)

**International Centre for Prison Studies**

King's College London  
8th Floor  
75-79 York Road  
London SE1 7AW  
Tel: 0171 401 2559  
Fax: 0171 401 2577

**KAIROS - a time for healing**

45-47 Donegall Street  
Belfast BT1 2FG  
Tel/fax: 01232 314444  
e-mail: [martie.kairos@dnet.co.uk](mailto:martie.kairos@dnet.co.uk)

**Kairos-APAC Trust**

57 High Street  
Wyke Regis  
Dorset DT4 9NZ  
Tel: 01305 774882

Fax: 01305 774890  
e-mail: khnews@clara.net

**Leap Confronting Conflict**

The LAB  
8 Lennox Road  
Finsbury Park  
London N4 3NW  
Tel: 0171 272 5630  
Fax: 0171 272 8405

**Mediation UK**

Alexander House  
Telephone Avenue  
Bristol BS1 4BS  
Tel: 0117 904 6661  
Fax: 0117 904 3331  
e-mail: mediationuk@mediationuk.org.uk

**Mennonite Central Committee USA**

Office of Crime and Justice  
PO Box 500  
Akron  
PA 17501-055  
USA

**Minnesota Correctional Facility - Shakopee**

(Julie Kruse Angeles, Director of Special Services)  
1010 West Sixth Avenue  
Shakopee MN 55379  
USA  
Tel: 001 612 496 4941  
Fax; 001 612 496 4476  
e-mail: angelesj@smtp-shk.doc.state.mn.us

**Penal Reform International**

Unit 114, The Chandlery  
50 Westminster Bridge Road  
London SE1 7QY  
Tel: 0171 721 7678  
Fax: 0171 721 8785  
e-mail: pri@pri.org.uk

**Prison Dialogue**

PO Box 4  
Chipping Campden

Glos GL55 6YN  
Tel: 01386 438099  
Fax: 01386 438033  
e-mail: [pjtgarrett@compuserve.com](mailto:pjtgarrett@compuserve.com)

**Prison Fellowship (England and Wales)**

PO Box 945  
Essex CM9 4EW  
Tel: 01621 843232  
Fax: 01621 843303  
e-mail: [fi34@dial.pipex.com](mailto:fi34@dial.pipex.com)

**Prison Fellowship International**

Sycamore Tree Project  
(Lisa Rea)  
PO Box 1838  
Loomis  
CA 95650-9215  
USA  
Tel: 001 916 652 7040  
Fax: 001 916 652 8013  
e-mail: [lrea@mindsync.com](mailto:lrea@mindsync.com)

**Prison Fellowship International**

Pacific Region  
Graeme Taylor  
PO Box 40270  
Upper Hutt  
New Zealand  
Tel/fax: +64 4 528 7341  
e-mail: [gtaylor\\_pfinz@ibm.net](mailto:gtaylor_pfinz@ibm.net)

**Prison Phoenix Trust**

PO Box 328  
Oxford OX1 1PJ  
Tel: 01865 798647

**Prison Reform Trust**

15 Northburgh Street  
London EC1V 0AH  
Tel: 0171 251 5070  
Fax: 0171 251 5076

**Prison Service Journal**

Prison Service College  
Newbold Revel  
Rugby  
Warwickshire  
CV23 0TN

**Relationships Foundation**

Jubilee House  
3 Hooper Street  
Cambridge CB1 2NZ  
Tel: 01223 566333  
Fax: 01223 566359  
e-mail: r.f@clara.net

**Restorative Justice Consortium**

c/o National Council for Social Concern  
Montague Chambers  
Montague Close  
London SE1 9DA  
Tel: 0171 403 0977  
Fax: 0171 403 0799  
e-mail: info@social-concern.demon.co.uk

**Restorative Justice and Dispute Resolution Unit**

Correctional Service of Canada - NHQ  
340 Laurier Avenue West  
Ottawa  
Ontario  
K1A 0P9  
Canada  
Tel: 001 613 992 2017  
Fax: 001 613 943 2172

**Thames Valley Police Restorative Justice Unit**

Police Headquarters  
Kidlington  
Oxfordshire OX5 2NX  
Tel: 01865 846000

**Organisations and People Contacted**

Ivo Aertsen, Dept. of Law, Catholic University of Leuven  
Kate Akester, Justice  
Rob Allen, NACRO

Bill Beaumont, Department of Social Policy, Bristol University  
Mark Bitel, AVP and Sing-Sing Prison, New York  
Prof. John Braithwaite, Australian National University  
Jonathan Burnside, Relationships Foundation  
Joe Campbell, Mediation Network NI  
Margaret Carey, Inside Out Trust  
Helen Carmichael, Leap Confronting Conflict  
Paul Cavadino, Penal Affairs Consortium and NACRO  
Andrew Coyle, International Centre for Prison Studies  
Wilme Derkser, Mennonite Central Committee, Winnipeg  
Jim Dignan, Sheffield University  
David Doefler, Criminal Justice Dept., Texas  
Kimmett Edgar, Oxford Centre for Criminological Research  
Ray Fishbourne, Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire Probation Service  
Frank Flynn, HMP Grendon  
Nick Flynn, Prison Reform Trust  
Judy Fowler, RJ Co-ordinator, Halifax, Nova Scotia  
Roger Graef, Films of Record  
Edward Graham, Director, St. Leonard's House, Ontario  
Bronwen Gray, HMP/YOI Askham Grange  
Andy Grier, John Howard Society of Manitoba  
Mark Grindrod, Criminal Justice Consultant  
Stephanie Hayman, Institute for the Study and Treatment of Delinquents (ISTD)  
Jaqueline Helfgott, Ass. Professor of Criminal Justice, University of Seattle  
Karen Ho, Office of Victim Services, Ohio  
Home Office Prison Dept. Officials and Press Office  
David Hough, Chair of Citizens Advisory Committee, William Head Institution, BC  
Russ Immerigeon, Mennonite Central Committee  
Stewart Jeffrey, Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire Probation Service  
Ken Jones, Kairos-APAC Trust  
Ros Kane, AVP (Alternatives to Violence Project) Britain  
Gilles Launay, Senior Psychologist, Rochester Prison  
Joe Levenson, International Centre for Prison Studies  
Rob Mackay, Dundee University  
Barbara Maines, Lucky Duck Publishing  
Tony Marshall, Restorative Justice Consortium  
Guy Masters, Crime Concern  
Gabrielle Maxwell, Institute of Criminology, Victoria University of Wellington  
Nicholas McGeorge, Restorative Justice Consortium  
Jane Miller-Ashton, Correctional Service of Canada, Ottawa  
Mike Nellis, Birmingham University  
Dan van Ness, Prison Fellowship International  
Tim Newell, HMP Grendon and Spring Hill  
Una Padel, Institute for the Study and Treatment of Delinquency  
Kelly Pribyl, RJ Co-ordinator, Red Wing, Minnesota  
David Price, Chaplain, Correctional Service of Canada

Philip Priestley, Positive Justice  
Martie Rafferty, KAIROS...a time for healing  
Teresa Reynolds, Victim Support  
Lisa Rea, Sycamore Tree (US)  
Fran Russell, Howard League for Penal Reform  
Robin Scott, Prison Fellowship NI  
Paul St Amour, HMP Woodhill Probation Department  
Andrew Sinclair, Victim Policy, Home Office  
Vivien Stern (via Joe Levenson), Penal Reform International  
Anne Strahan, Suzy Lamplugh Trust  
Rev. Donald Thompson, "Le Parrain" Foundation, Quebec  
Mark S. Umbriet, School of Social Work, University of Minnesota  
Eithne Wallis, Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire Probation Service  
Peter Wallis, Prison Phoenix Trust  
Peter Walker, Prison Fellowship (England and Wales)  
Ann Warner Roberts, School of Social Work, University of Minnesota  
Tessa West, Criminal Justice Consultant  
Jollien Willemsens, Catholic University of Leuven  
Martin Wright, Restorative Justice Consultant  
Louise Wolfgramme, AMICUS Project, Minnesota  
Howard Zehr, Mennonite Central Committee

### References and Useful Publications

- Aertsen I. & Peters T. (1998) 'Mediation and Restorative Justice in Belgium' European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research 6,507-525.
- Angeles, J. (1999) 'Restorative Justice in Prison.' in Minnesota Corrections Association Newsletter, February issue.
- Annis L.V., Mathers L.G. & Baker C.A. (1984) 'Victim Workers as Therapists for Incarcerated Sex Offenders' Victimology, 9, 426-435
- AVP (1998a) Annual Report 1997-1998. London: AVP Britain.
- AVP (1998b) Leaflet. London: AVP Britain.
- BBC (1992) Crime Limited. Television programme 30.6.92.
- Bitel M.D. (1991) A Study of the Attitudes of Incarcerated Men Toward Victim-Offender Reconciliation and Reparative Schemes New Paltz: N.Y. Masters Thesis..

Bitel, M. et al (1998) AVP as an agent of change: the pilot evaluation of the Alternatives to Violence Project in three British prisons. London: AVP Britain.

Burnside, J. and Lee, P. (1997) Where Love is Not a Luxury. New Life magazine, no. 13.

Carey, M. (1998) A voluntary organisation in the prison system... Inside Out Trust. In Prison Governors Association Magazine.

Cleland-Moyer K. (1990) 'Face to Face in Canada' Kitchera Ont.: The Network: Interaction for Conflict Resolution.

Cook D. (1989) Victim-Offender Reconciliation Project at the Legal Assistance to Institutionalised Persons Programme (LAIP): The First Four Years' Madison, Wisc: LAIP Jan 9th 1989

Dunkel F. (1985) 'Victim Compensation and Offender Restitution in the Federal Republic of Germany: a Western European Comparative Perspective' International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice, 9, 29-39

Dunkel F. & Rossner D. (1989) 'Law and Practice of Victim-Offender Agreements' in M. Wright & B. Galaway (eds) Mediation and Criminal Justice London: Sage 152-177.

Edgar, K. (1999) 'Restorative Justice in Prison?' in Prison Service Journal, May 1999, No. 123.

Egg R. (1983) 'Social Therapy Treatment of Criminal Offenders: a Survey of Pilot Institutions' International Journal of Applied Criminal Justice, 7, 49-60

Gers et al (1986) 'Women give therapy to rapists' Psychologie Heute, 52-55

Grier A.F. & Reddoch G. (1999) Restorative Community Reintegration Project (formerly Restorative Parole). Pilot project of John Howard Society of Mannitoba, Inc. The Justice Resource Centre, 583, Ellis Ave, Winnipeg.

Grindrod, M. (1999) Telephone interview with authors of report.

Gustafson D. (1992) 'Face to Face Survivors Meetings : an Offender's Perspective' Interaction, Summer 1992

Hall (1993) Final Report: The Victim-Offender Reconciliation program, The State Correctional institution at Graterford Pa, May-December 1992 Akron Pa. MCC Office on Crime and Justice.

Hawkins H. (1986) 'The Treatment of Rapists: Groups and Victims' NASPO News, 6,(3), 6-7.

- Helfgott J., Lovell M.L. & Lawrence C.F. (1998) Citizens, Victims and Offenders Restoring Justice: A Final Report Available from Dept. of Sociology and Criminal Justice, University of Seattle.
- Hinds, K. (1998) Working in Prisons (a report on LEAP/AVP's 4.5 years work in London prisons). London: Leap Confronting Conflict.
- Home Office (1991) The Victim's Charter - Life Sentence Prisoners. CPO 41/1991. London: Home Office.
- Hough, D. (1999) Personal communication to authors of report.
- Howard League (1997) Are Prisoners Challenged on Victims of Crime? Prisons' work with prisoners on victims' issues. London: Howard League.
- Immarigeon R. (1993) 'Victim-Offender Reconciliation in a Penal Setting' Corrections Compendium, Vol XVIII, No 8, Aug. 1993, 5-7.
- Immarigeon R. (1994) Reconciliation Between Victims and Imprisoned Offenders: Program Models and Issues Mennonite Central Committee USA, Office of Crime and Justice, PO Box 500, Akron. Pa, 17501-055.
- Inside Out Trust (1998) Annual Review. Hurstpierpoint: Inside Out Trust.
- International Centre for Prison Studies (1999) A New Agenda for Penal Reform. London: International Centre for Prison Studies.
- Jeffrey, S. (1999) Personal communication to authors of report.
- Jones, K. (1997) The Kairos-APAC Projects: Challenging to Change. Dorset: Kairos-APAC Trust.
- Larkin T. (1986) The Development of an Attitude Scale to Measure the Willingness to Accept Excuses for Crimes Unpublished Thesis, Brunel University.
- Launay G. (1985) 'Bringing Victims and Offenders Together: a Comparison of Two Models' Howard Journal, 23(3), 200-212.
- Launay G. (1987) 'Victim Offender Conciliation' in B. McGurk, D. Thornton & M. Williams (eds) Applying Psychology to Imprisonment: Theory and Practice. London: HMSO.
- Launay G. & Murray P. (1989) 'Victim Offender Groups' in M. Wright & B. Galaway (eds) Mediation and Criminal Justice London: Sage, 113-131.

Loewen R.J. (1989) Face to Face : an Evaluation : Toward Reconciliation and Responsibility St Johns Nfld: Community Initiatives of Newfoundland.

Melvin K.B., Gramlin L.K. & Gardner W.M. (1985) @A Scale to Measure Attitudes Towards Prisoners' Criminal Justice and Behaviour , 12, 241-253.

Miller-Ashton J. (1998) Inventory of Canadian Events and Initiatives Related to Restorative Justice Correctional Service of Canada.

Monk-Shepherd, R. with Nation, D. (1995a) 'Dialogue aids healing process in incest cases' in MEDIATION, Vol 11 No.1, Winter 1995.

Monk-Shepherd, R. with Nation, D. (1995b) 'Mediation in Prison following Incest' in Probation Journal, Vol 42 No. 1, March 1995.

Newell, T. (1998) Building Relationships into the System. Relational Justice Bulletin, Issue 0.

Prison Dialogue (1999) About Prison Dialogue. Leaflet from Prison Dialogue.

Prison Fellowship (1999a) Prison Fellowship News. Spring issue.

Prison Fellowship (1999b) The Sycamore Tree Project - A model for Restorative Justice. London: Prison Fellowship (England and Wales).

Prison Phoenix Trust (1996a) Prisons that Serve the Local Community. Oxford: Prison Phoenix Trust.

Prison Phoenix Trust (1996b) Survey of Community Work - Statistical Information. Oxford: Prison Phoenix Trust.

Prison Phoenix Trust (1998a) The Role of Prisoners in Community Work (Summary). Oxford: Prison Phoenix Trust.

Prison Phoenix Trust (1998b) Directory of Community Projects carried out by Prison Establishments (Part 2). Oxford: Prison Phoenix Trust.

Prison Phoenix Trust (1996a) Prisons that Serve the Local Community. Oxford: Prison Phoenix Trust.

Prison Phoenix Trust (1996b) Survey of Community Work - Statistical Information. Oxford: Prison Phoenix Trust.

Prison Phoenix Trust (1998a) The Role of Prisoners in Community Work (Summary). Oxford: Prison Phoenix Trust.

Prison Phoenix Trust (1998b) Directory of Community Projects carried out by Prison Establishments (Part 2). Oxford: Prison Phoenix Trust.

Prison Service College (1999) Prison Service Journal (Restorative Justice issue), May 1999, No. 123.

Rafferty, M. (1999) Telephone interview with report writers.

Rea, L. (1998) Sycamore Tree - Houston pilot evaluation. Unpublished report. Available from Prison Fellowship International (see address list).

Restorative Justice Consortium (1999) Standards for Restorative Justice. London: restorative Justice Consortium.

Robinson, E. and Thompson, C. (1996) 'A time to forgive' in the Guardian, 3 January 1996.

Russ, C. (1996) An Evaluation of Feltham Approaches to Conflict Training (FACT) Leadership Workshops. London: Psychology Department HMYOI & RC Feltham.

Sandwell Mediation Service (1998) Brinsford Project; April 1996-March 1998 available from Sandwell Mediation Service, 79, Birmingham Road, West Bromwich, West Midlands, B70 6PX.

Sawatsky L. (1988) Face to Face: An Evaluation Criminology Research centre, University of Manitoba.

Taylor, G. (1998) Sycamore Tree Pilot Evaluation New Zealand. Unpublished report. Available from Prison Fellowship International (see address list).

Thames Valley partnership (1998) Restorative Justice in the Thames Valley: Joint statement by the Crown Prosecution, police, prison and probation services. (leaflet). Oxford: Thames Valley Police.

Tomey, L. (1998) Measuring Relationships; Assessing Justice. Relational Justice Bulletin, Issue 0.

Tugel H. & Heilemann M. (eds) (1987) Women Alter Rapists Frankfurt.

Wood, A., Wynne, J. and Hudson, K. (1996) 'The Victim's Charter and the release of Life Sentence Prisoners' in MEDIATION, Vol 12 No. 2, Spring 1996.

Youth Justice Board (1999) Guidance for the development of effective restorative practice with young offenders. London: Home Office.

**Special thanks to:**

Julie Angeles

Bill Beaumont

Paul Cavadino

Stephanie Hayman

Jacqueline Helfgott

Tim Newell

Lisa Rea

Annie Roberts

Peter Walker

Howard Zehr