

## **Communities In Transition**

### **Participatory Design Process – Reporting Template**

Please complete this report following each participatory design session (i.e. one per session) to record the key of the discussion. Please use the sections below to structure the report. If any area was not covered during the discussion, please note that in the relevant section.

Please return the completed report to [cit@cooperationireland.org](mailto:cit@cooperationireland.org) within one week of each participatory design session.

*Area:* Brandywell & Creggan

*Theme:* Restorative Practices

*Date:* 21/01/19

*Number of attendees:* 23

#### **1. Proposed interventions discussed to address the issues identified in Phase 1 fieldwork?**

- Training and capacity building for youth and community workers, schools, parents, residents and churches to mainstream restorative practices within the community.
- Increase awareness of restorative approaches among housing providers, including NIHE and housing associations.
- Measures to improve coordination and signposting to connect existing services and provide clear referral pathways for key target groups.

#### **2. Comments on current community capacity to address issues identified?**

Participants noted the Prevent and Deter programme, a PSNI-led multi-agency programme designed to identify young people who have come into the criminal justice system and are at risk of becoming increasingly involved in criminality. The challenges associated with this were said to be twofold: that the programme is wholly statutory focused with little community input; and that it does not address the need for early preventative work or the need to reach other marginalised groups.

There are two main restorative schemes in the area – one accredited and the other non-accredited – alongside a range of services that could be seen as complementary. While there is some need to plug gaps in restorative practices within a community setting, the key is that the intervention establishes connectivity with the resources that are already there.

Some work has been done in capacity building within one school and the accredited restorative scheme has an existing OCN Level 2 programme that has been delivered to youth workers. This work could serve as the basis for further and deeper capacity building.

There have also been moves to establish Derry as restorative city and expanding understanding of and capacity to use restorative approaches would contribute to such a process.

**3. Outcomes that participants suggested these interventions would achieve?**

The proposed interventions would help to mainstream the restorative practices within the community.

**4. How did participants suggest will we know if these projects/interventions have succeeded? (indicators/measures)**

- Increased use of restorative approaches in diverse settings;
- A long-term reduction in the number of people entering the criminal justice system;
- A long-term reduction in the incidence of criminality;
- A reduction in the number of paramilitary style attacks.

**5. Target beneficiaries/participants of the suggested interventions?**

- Schools, youth workers and young people;
- Parents who would be engaged through schools or community networks;
- The harder to reach 20+ age group who are liable to become involved in criminality or fall under the influence of paramilitarism;
- Community workers and residents;
- Individuals who are transitioning away from paramilitary activity and wish to play a role in promoting the use of restorative practices within the community.

**6. How did participants suggest these projects/interventions will build the capacity/capability in the community?**

- Will strengthen to collaboration and signposting between community organisations, providing better support for those who need it;
- Will help to encourage hard to reach families to re-engage with community services;
- Will increase understanding of alternatives to violence in dealing with disputes and criminality;
- Will involve wider sections of the community in promoting restorative practices as a means of addressing the issues raised during Phase 1.

**7. How did participants suggest these projects/interventions will support the overall objectives of the Tackling Paramilitarism Executive Action Plan...?**

**a. Paramilitarism has no place.**

The proposed intervention would seek to ensure that there are early, preventative measures, alternative pathways and community support mechanisms in place for those who are liable to become engaged in criminal activity and/or fall under the influence of paramilitarism. It would also help to ensuring that those victims who might be inclined to seek immediate redress feel that their needs and rights are been addressed within a community setting.

**b. Citizens and communities feel safe and confident.**

Citizens will feel safer and more confident when there is a tangible reduction in the incidence of anti-social behaviour and criminality in the area, where are a range of supports available to victims and where there are alternative pathways and community support mechanisms in place for those who are liable to become engaged in criminal activity.

**c. The public support and have increased confidence in the justice system.**

The proposed intervention would strengthen and enhance existing provisions to build the confidence of residents to engage with the criminal justice system, directly or initially through the linkages established between community based restorative practices and the PSNI.

**d. Support is available for those who wish to move away from paramilitary activity and structures.**

The proposed intervention would seek to support those who are transitioning away from paramilitary activity by strengthening their understanding and capacity to promote the use of restorative practices within the community.

**8. Any dependencies identified by participants?**

Participants agreed that the efficacy of proposed intervention would depend largely on the buy-in of different sections of the community. One of the big challenges may come in terms of securing the support and participation of schools in the area. More broadly, the success of the intervention may depend on better linkages with the statutory sector.

**9. Any risks identified by participants?**

Participants generally agreed that there is a need for greater integration of services within the community and better partnership working with statutory agencies. At the same time, it was recognised that the proposed intervention should account for the need to engage with harder to reach groups who may be averse to dealing directly with statutory agencies, particularly social services and the PSNI.

It was also suggested that the proposed intervention should not fall into the trap of focusing entirely on young people, as it would fail to reach the other key – and often overlooked – target groups.

**10. Any other comments made by participants?**

Participants engaged in a discussion around the efficacy of accredited and alternative forms of restorative practice. There is no consensus around this issue, but it was suggested that the two approaches share broadly the same objectives and could be employed in a more complementary fashion for the benefit of the community.

Ensuring appropriate standards of practice are maintained remains important.

**11. Is a further follow-up workshop required? Please provide details.**

N/A