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Introduction

This report is an output from the Desistance Knowledge Exchange (DesKE) project led by Fergus McNeill (University of Glasgow) and funded by the ESRC. The project team also includes Stephen Farrall (University of Sheffield), Claire Lightowler (IRISS) and Shadd Maruna (Queens University Belfast). For further information about the project see: http://blogs.iriss.org.uk/discoveringdesistance/.

The report is based on the contributions of those who attended two workshops about “Discovering Desistance” in Glasgow, on 10 April and 16 May 2012. Attendees were a mixture of policy-makers, criminal justice social workers, current and previous service users, people who have offended, family members of people who have offended, service providers and researchers. The workshops followed an appreciative inquiry methodology, focusing on the positive and what works well. There were four key stages involved in the process - Discovery, Dream, Design and Destiny – details of each stage are provided in the relevant section of the report. The Glasgow workshops were facilitated by Fergus McNeill (University of Glasgow) and Claire Lightowler (IRISS).

The report presents the outputs and notes from the two days without offering analysis or comment. For this project workshops have also taken place in Belfast, London and Sheffield, between April and June 2012. The project team will be analysing the data emerging across the workshops and producing a more analytical and thematic report, to be made available here: http://blogs.iriss.org.uk/discoveringdesistance/. Via this link you will also find copies of the slides used at the workshops.

Report contents

Glasgow workshop 1 (10 April 2012) .............................................................................................................. 3
  Workshop Structure ........................................................................................................................................ 3
  Reflections on the film .................................................................................................................................. 3
  Discovery phase: What supports desistance? ................................................................................................. 5
  Dream Phase: Provocative propositions ....................................................................................................... 10

Glasgow workshop 2 (16 May 2012) ............................................................................................................... 13
  Workshop Structure ....................................................................................................................................... 13
  Reflections on the first workshop ............................................................................................................... 13
  Prioritising provocative propositions ........................................................................................................ 14
  Design Phase ............................................................................................................................................... 16
  Destiny Phase ............................................................................................................................................... 21
Glasgow workshop 1 (10 April 2012)

Workshop Structure
10-10.10 Welcome, introduction to project and workshop
10.10-11.00 Film Viewing
11.00-11.30 Group discussion: Reflections on the film
11.30 – 12.00 The desistance evidence base – based on Insight paper - 'How and why people stop offending: discovering desistance'.
12.00 - 12.45 Lunch
12.45 - 2.00 Discovery phase
2.00 - 2.15 Tea/coffee
2.15 - 3.45 Dream Phase
3.45-4.00 Sum-up and close

Reflections on the film

Following a screening of the film ‘The Road from Crime’ – see http://blogs.iriss.org.uk/discoveringdesistance/documentary/ - attendees were invited to offer any comments or reflections.

• Message came through need for hope (societies acceptance) and need to improve through care. Count the number of time the word hope comes up.
• "Excellent but missing media’s portrayal of offending and how that shapes public perception of crime and how people respond to that" - shapes attitudes and creates barriers ("Red tops are always going to be an issue" "always going to be up against this”).
• "Volunteer role is massively helpful"
• Reformed offenders - we see the value reformed offenders but you are up against - the voluntary road, which is massively helpful.
• Volunteers are not bound in the same legal requirements etc. so can be a bit more flexible, think outside the box a bit
• Voice and experience of reformed offenders is a critical asset but as professionals we are not usually quite sure how to use it.
• Ayrshire - are looking at peer mentoring. At very early stages.
• I'm a peer mentor and it works. Limited numbers but 100% successful. Contagious Desistance.
• How can you stop society thinking that they'll do it again? When do you get to the point when you are going to trust? How do you regain the trust within families and in society when there are failures along the way?
• The system lets people down as well. Lack of trust that side too.
• Perhaps you have to physically move away from the area - otherwise always faced with a decision you’re not yet strong enough to face. People shouldn’t have to move away but perhaps they do.
• The lack of housing stock for people coming out of jail is a major issue, there are issues bigger than criminal justice
• Are you transitioning into accommodation or creating a home and a sense of belonging? There is great importance related to finding a home, can be linked to a new identity
• "Raymond is me” I’ve been to college, no one will employ me because of my conviction. It's the law. To declare - the disclosure scheme. Sits on your record
for 40 years. The disclosure check is almost universally used; none of the sheriffs even knew this sits on your record for 40 years.

• In Britain we love our prisons being full but what a symbol of failure that is
• Housing, food, emotional and financial poverty - female offenders needs are so complex. Need to feel safe etc.
• Stigma, labelling - this can last a lifetime.
• Is there something in society that people enjoy the power of being better than other people - is that where so much of the persistent negative labelling comes from?
Discovery phase: What supports desistance?

This session focuses on exploring and appreciating ‘the best of what is’. Attendees were asked to identify good examples from their experience of desistance/ supporting desistance. They were then asked to think about what were the factors that supported desistance. Attendees were asked to record on post-it’s these good examples and there ideas about what supports desistance. They also explored this as a group, identifying further suggestions. Below is a list of all the factors identified, and immediately below is a word cloud which helps to visualise the key issues emerging. The size of the words in the diagram below relates to how many times the word was recorded at the workshop.

What supports desistance: Frequency of words mentioned

List of all notes about what supports desistance (from post-it and group work exercises)

Learning to listen
Going to the Scottish Government - feeling like I had a voice, I was being seen and heard
Going to college - self-belief, aim high, expectations
Being a mentor for women in focus
Becoming a good father
Seeing the change in peoples eyes - the butterfly emerge. It's really magical.
Got agreement with women to work together on common issues which wasn't offence focused
Peer mentors
treating people as people, treating people with respect.
Not playing out power games
Solution focused practice - strengths based focus - look for strengths
(looking at strengths - individuals and societal)
community
Providing support with genuine commitment/care
Motivational interviewing for change
Engagement with the person- where they think they are
Proper understanding of terminology - risk levels
Circle - take people out / put you in contact with other people - peer support
Gran - went to school to work through support
School (guidance teacher)
Social work
Economics / cost-effectiveness arguments work
The social element - coffee / tea
Accommodation / timings - fitting around schools - dealing with practicalities
Coproducing support (social work, vol sector etc) joint working.
Benefits for the individual.
Mindset - the forces impacting on someone probably a society that doesn't care
resilience
Individual focused support - Relevance
empowerment
Personal motivation - preparing people, doing work with people before
programmes etc
Kids, services to support it (reducing stress)
Social work knowledge
They listen to the individual
having time with people
Modelling behaviour (admitting when you've made mistakes)
Honesty, being authentic
Vocation - value base
Relationships
Developing compassion and conscience (seeing other people as valuable)
Being recognised as a person not as a conviction
Recognising people's skills, experiences and strengths
Using people as resources to promote change
Being a role model - self as a resource to help others
Treat people as individuals
“I believe in you”
Connect people to services
Be there for people
Positive expectations
Volunteering
Knowing there but for the grace of god (we are them and they are us)
Keeping people out of prison
Standing up to media
New community sentences
Education - shift in identity (view of self as viewed by others)
Fatherhood
Seeing potential
Finding solutions
Talents, skills, supports, attitudes
Nurturing, counseling skills
Voice, listening, trusting
Non judgmental
Internal thought process
Coaching - working with someone to find their own solutions
Social work interventions, relationships and interpersonal skills
Developing connections
Starting where people are at
Good will (staff go beyond what is currently expected)
Understanding (of issues for the individual)
Positive contacts, networking
“You must want it yourself”
Recognising the needs of individuals
Having experience
Continued education (of staff, society)
Relationships - role models and good communication
Kinship carers
Partnership working (which we are getting better at!)
Voluntary engagement
Structure - people know what is expected of them
meet people where they are comfortable
Organic and flexible programmes
Utilising resources of people who have experience of communicating and desistance
Time to build relationships with people (recognise this is a strength of the voluntary sector)
Thinking differently outside the statutory guidelines (strength of the voluntary sector)
Engaging with one another
Sharing knowledge (practitioners, families, reformed offenders etc) - recognising that people have different skills, knowledge
Bringing prisoners back into jail (role models, positive future, routes out of prison service)
Meet prisoners at the gate
Planning prior to prisoners release
Throughcare team (aware of the whole process)
Recognising that services cannot do it alone, do not work in silos
Pre release planning that works (focused on change not risk management)
NHS connections (physical health, mental health, substance use)
User-friendly benefits system
Housing (fair and equal allocations, safe places, supported accommodation when needed)
Realistic training for freedom (life skills, tackling institutionalism, dealing with trauma)
Family and community commitment, dedication and engagement
Others believing in me and giving me a chance
Social work relationships
Persistence
My drawback is bridging the generation gap and patience by learning from them
Working with great people who believed I could do it
Legislation - making the change happen
Teachers
Work
Relationships
Support from family re childcare, general enthusiasm and encouragement
Friends
Belief I could do it
All the right people involved in developing change
Taking time
Hope to support families
Viability
Approachability
I’m not what you expect in my professional role
Partners (sometimes!)  
Parents  
Faith  
Hope, belief, recognition  
Caring for them when they’re crying  
trust in people that have been in and out of jail  
Optimism  
Keep at it (persevere)  
Keep coming back (stickability)  
Focusing on the opportunities  
Explore options  
Networks  
Advocacy  
Demonstrate you’re there for them  
Families  
See the wider picture (not just the offending)  
Having a conscience  
Respectful dialogue  
Inter-linking knowledge  
Timeliness of input  
Willingness to invest  
Focus on self-esteem, isolation (not solely on offending issues)  
Advocating to gain agreement in a group setting  
Social Work  
My gran helps me understand  
Supporting individuals to recognise their strengths and state these against CJSW’s risk averse views  
Believing I could do it  
Trust  
Stretching knowledge and skills - being open to change  
confidence to express values  
People sharing experiences and helping each other  
Being honest and realistic with people  
Whole family - work in the family's house  
Recognition  
Belief in change  
Enjoyed the learning process  
Staff giving me positive reinforcement and understanding me  
Being recognised as a person and not as an offender  
Long term appropriate support  
A personal contribution by using skills outwith the expected  
Time to allow for changes to take place  
Staff goodwill, enthusiasm and commitment  
Positive engagement of clients  
Showing respect
Dream Phase: Provocative propositions

This phase draws on the examples of innovation or good practice/experiences that have been discussed in the discovery phase. Attendees were asked to develop ‘provocative propositions’, aspirational statements that realistically sum up ‘what could be’, if services, practices, policies were redesigned to support desistance.

Within groups attendees identified provocative propositions are were asked to record those they identified as being the most important.

Provocative propositions:

- Supervision works to challenge inequality and promote equality; equalising life chances and social justice (pursuing both substantive and process equality)
- Supervision services are designed and available to support individual needs and develop the individual’s strengths; supervision is holistic, engaging with all aspects of service users’ lives
- Public investment in supervision is allocated on the basis of evidence around supporting positive change and outcomes (not on the basis of meeting targets)
- Our systems and practices of supervision learn from the best of international practice and are ourselves a beacon of international practice
- Sentences include a skills, volunteering or educational component
- There is preparation undertaken prior to release from prison and a requirement on the individual being released to reflect on what they’ve done and demonstrate this (written piece, video etc)
- Everyone coming into contact with the criminal justice system has a mentor who is a reformed offender
- Those supporting the desistance process are paid for their contribution (including families and volunteers)
- Everyone coming out of jail has accommodation (which they can consider a home) and people’s houses are not taken away from them when they go to jail
- There is better public understanding that people are capable of change
- There is a presumption against sentences of less than a year alongside reinvestment in community rehabilitation approaches which are regenerative, reparative, redemptive, reintegration, restorative and responsive
- Criminal justice policy, practice, services are co-produced (between policy makers, reformed offenders, practitioners, current service users, researchers, communities and families)
- Criminal justice services are part of a cooperative of public and third sector services that have a DUTY to provide or offer accessible universal services tailored to the individual
- Through a consistent approach criminal justice services are fair and equitable for all individuals
- Criminal justice services act swiftly, going to court shortly after the offence is committed
- Criminal justice has positive media management
Following the first workshop the project team amended the provocative propositions slightly to reduce duplication and thematically order them.

General
1. Criminal justice policies, practices and services are co-produced (between policy makers, reformed offenders, practitioners, current service users, researchers, communities and families).

Supervision, release and reintegration
2. Supervision works to challenge inequality and promote equality; equalising life chances and contributing to social justice (pursuing both substantive equality and equality in the CJ process)
3. Supervision services are consistently designed and available (across the country) to support the individual's needs and develop the individual's strengths
4. Supervision is holistic, engaging with all aspects of service users’ lives
5. Supervision includes a skills, volunteering or educational component to help people develop their abilities to make a positive contribution in communities.
6. Everyone under supervision has access to a mentor who is a reformed offender.
7. Preparation is undertaken prior to release from prison and the individual being released is encouraged to reflect on what s/he has done and to provide tangible evidence of this (written piece, video etc).
8. Everyone coming out of jail has accommodation (which they can consider a home) and people’s houses are not taken away from them when they go to jail.
Resources, systems and processes
9. Public investment in supervision is allocated on the basis of evidence around supporting positive change and outcomes (not on the basis of meeting targets)
10. Those supporting the desistance process are paid for their contribution (including families and volunteers)
11. Criminal justice services are part of a cooperative of public and third sector services that have a DUTY to provide or offer accessible universal services tailored to the individual
12. Criminal justice services act swiftly, going to court shortly after the offence is committed
13. There is a presumption against custodial sentences of less than a year alongside reinvestment in community rehabilitation approaches which are regenerative, reparative, redemptive, reintegrative, restorative and responsive
14. Our systems and practices of supervision learn from the best of international practice and are themselves beacons of best practice.

Public attitudes and media engagement
15. There is better public understanding that people are capable of change
16. Criminal justice agencies demonstrate positive media management
Glasgow workshop 2 (16 May 2012)

Workshop Structure
10-10.20 Welcome and film re-cap
10.20 -10.40 Reflections on first workshops;
   - Have you done anything differently as a result of the first workshop?
   - Update from all stage 1 workshops
10.40- 11 Voting for Provocative propositions to be prioritised
11-12.30 Design Phase
2.30 – 1.30 Lunch
1.30 - 2.30 Destiny Phase
2.30-3.15 Tea/coffee
3.15-4.00 Sharing reflections from, and about, the process and sum-up

Reflections on the first workshop

| Attendees were invited to reflect on the first workshop and think about whether they had started to do anything differently as a consequence of being involved in the project. |

- Put the link to the blog on the front-page of the prison service intranet
- Through talking with a couple of people who had offended about how they had changed it made me think about how people can change.
Prioritising provocative propositions

Each attendee had six votes to cast for the provocative propositions they thought were most important. See the Dream Phase section above for a full list of provocative propositions. People could allocate their votes as they wished, i.e., they could allocate all six votes for one proposition or split their votes across several.

Percentage of votes cast for the provocative propositions created in Glasgow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provocative propositions</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>% of votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Criminal justice co-produced</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Supervision works to challenge inequality and promote equality</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Supervision services consistently designed and available</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Supervision is holistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supervision includes skills, volunteering or educational</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Access to a mentor who is a reformed offender.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Preparation is undertaken prior to release from prison</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Everyone coming out of jail has accommodation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Supervision on the basis of evidence around supporting positive change</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Those supporting the desistance process are paid for this</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Duty to provide universal services tailored to the individual</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Criminal justice services act swiftly</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Presumption against custodial sentences less than a year</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Supervision learns from international practice and is beacon of best practice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>173</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Design Phase

The third stage in the appreciative inquiry process focuses on designing a more ideal approach to supporting desistance, based on the examples that have emerged from the successes and achievements of the past. Attendees were required to think about what policies, practices and services might look like if they were designed in such a way as to better support desistance and to achieve the provocative propositions developed in the dream phase.

In Glasgow given the similarity of some of the provocative propositions, and the closeness of support across several of the provocative propositions, at the design phase we split into three groups, which focused on groups of provocative positions. One group focused on public attitudes and media engagement (propositions 15 & 16), the other two groups both focused on the propositions related to supervision (propositions 2, 3, 4 and 5).

In addition all groups considered the proposition with most votes (proposition 1).

Proposition 1. Criminal justice policies, practices and services are co-produced (between policy makers, reformed offenders, practitioners, current service users, researchers, communities and families).

- Personalisation involves the individual as a decision maker and people having a voice/ being involved in designing services
- Co-production defined as everyone being involved in the system to work together to design the system.
- There is a lack of mechanisms for engaging across different stakeholders (service users, communities, sentencers, police).
- There are levels of co-production, a spectrum ranging from engagement to co-production, and from the individual to the community
- We identified 4 mechanisms, ranging from engagement to co-production:
  1) Personal budgets: housing, employment etc. People choose but probation officers struggle with choices made.
  2) Voucher system: not necessarily control over budgets, but can be around decisions about choosing the number of hours support
  3) Service user voting: for different service options which can be provided
  4) User forums: representative bodies

- User forums: We can learn from re-entry councils about recruitment and representation. Who is there and who is absent. Who sponsors it is critical. There needs to be co-ownership to reduce democracy deficits, operate as an independent committee, as this requires authority it will need a legal or statutory basis to regulate. We also need resources and structures of accountability, which is important for ensuring it results in tangible outcomes. This might mean rotating chairs and fixed term membership and democratic election to the group. Need some people with power and resources to make and take change.
- Challenges of consensus, even within interest groups (i.e. victims groups). Another challenge about community engagement.
• When a case goes wrong it impacts on regulations and guidelines, fear driven practice not enough time for creative practice. Need to change this to make it a bottom up approach.
• Discussion about who would be involved, only those who work on the ground from a range of sectors organisation not managers. However others thought managers, sheriffs etc. should be involved.
• Some thought co-production is impossible – inherent power dynamic that needs to be changed first. People need to be free to say what they want, sacred of biting the hand that feds you at the moment. Others think things are always changing – we need to focus upon for the same or less money we can make it better.
• Before coproduction takes place there need to be a massive shift in mindset as the approach challenges entrenched power dynamics.
• Thought that a first step would be pilots – creative pilots that are able to show social return on investment, prove that there is social and monetary benefit in working this way.
• Funding needs to not drive the practice (i.e. budgets) things need to be bottom up. Example given from NHS around ‘Time to Care’ where 60% of workforce’s time is spent face to face. The coproduction process itself needs to be produced.
• Ideas around pilots, think tanks, a center for court innovation (like one in America) and user involvement where power needs to be challenged and people need to listen.
• Media need to be stakeholders in this process so they can learn to as well as report on these groups working together to make a co-productive approach happen. A TV programme show the reality of this process would help change and influences societies understanding, perception, empathy and learning with the issues and ways of approaching them.
• Long discussion about user involvement – who we mean - ex-offenders who are at the right stage in their own journey to take part, people should be involved depending upon how they learn, what their communication preferences are and that schools and families and children need to be involved too.
Supervision, release and reintegration

Proposition 2. Supervision works to challenge inequality and promote equality; equalising life chances and contributing to social justice (pursuing both substantive equality and equality in the CJ process)

- Human rights
- Advocating amongst partners and other services
- Treating people fairly, respectfully, with value, hope (individual relationship)
- Creating access to opportunities (can be just one opportunity sometimes)
- Challenging risk assessments and assumptions.
- Encouraging people to focus on where those who have offended are now
- Myth busing, through justice task force, about how regulations are not necessarily restricting access to housing, education etc
- Resource distribution equally within and beyond services, means access to opportunities, shouldn’t be based on risk levels.
- Equity of opportunity
- Questioned access to resources should be based on broad sense of need or equal opportunities irrespective of need and risk.
- In relation to social justice we thought there’s a need to advocate for community change - perhaps using a collaborative forum to decide where and how much money should be spent in community development.
- Within criminal justice services resources should be provided not on levels of risky people managed but on population sizes managed.

Proposition 3. Supervision services are consistently designed and available (across the country) to support the individual's needs and develop the individual's strengths

- The issue here is one of flexibility but not inequity. Need to ensure services dependent on local needs. Consistency around process, but not services. The way to achieve this is through consultative and co-production processes, as outlined in discussion about proposition 1.
- Is consistency required? As a baseline would require equal funding and resource provision nationwide. Perhaps the first step would be a national resource audit. Requires a balance between consistency nationally and local responsivity.

Proposition 4. Supervision is holistic, engaging with all aspects of service users’ lives

- What does holistic mean? - whole of person or all aspects of life or both.
- Supervision needs to focus on offending behavior - this needs to be the limit to the compulsion element of supervision. The voluntary element then needs to be based on the person being supported, based on their consent.
- This could be about multi-agency service provision beyond public sectors. This might require developing information sharing protocols and either partnership facilitating protocols to facilitate the emergence of localised and responsive networks.
- It means that services and practices need to be embedded in communities and underpinned by a broader theoretical rationale (as does policy) to facilitate change.
- Wider strengths based orientation to practice.
- Discussion turned to need to develop a nationalised professional identity and clarification of role and extent of autonomy.
• It may be that we need to return to a patch work approach to allocation of clients i.e. by territory working in community buildings with other people i.e. victim advocates, voluntary and community groups as opposed to simply offices populated by Probation officers.

• Other people suggested a hybrid approach to this i.e. having central social work office but being freed up to spend more time engaging with communities as per the patch work ethos.

Proposition 5. Supervision includes a skills, volunteering or educational component to help people develop their abilities to make a positive contribution in communities.

• Prisons partnering with colleges and job centres

• Are we compelling people to attend? Discretion (room for innovation), room for negotiation (but power balance)

• Giving people choice, promoting motivation rather than any specific activity

• Design and develop services in such a way that they utilise resources in and beyond own services in a collaborative partnership. This might mean, for example, paying colleges to provide training and qualifications to service users who deploy this in a project that produce goods that could be sold on to the community. Such an approach could generate income to pay for training and professional support. This is then self-sustaining, could also recruit people to help deliver, thus sustaining their employment if desired. Services need to develop people's social capital.
Public attitudes and media engagement

Proposition 15. There is better public understanding that people are capable of change
Proposition 16. Criminal justice agencies demonstrate positive media management

- Most of discussion around the media – tended to be local and national newspapers. They need to get their facts right and there needs to be a change away from bad new sells. There could be a push legislation wise to get a balance of positive and negative stories. Are we missing a trick? Other countries in Scandinavia manage to have the media ‘on their side’
- Positive approach – how can we make things better for the media? – find ways of telling them good news. Need to provide them with stories that point out social return on investment for desistance projects and show the evidence of how public money is being spent.
- Desistance TV channel – needs to address how we see punishment, religion’s involvement in this
- Use Facebook.
- Stories need to come from charities, organisations and services themselves using media like Facebook, blogs, social networking, blackberry messaging, twitter.
- Could create an award system here ex-offenders are awarded for desistance. This would help with better public understanding, education and publicise things.
Destiny Phase

This session is about ‘making change happen’. Here we focused on what needs to be done to achieve the vision of the future established in the dream and design phases. Attendees focused on identifying what participants can do to move towards better practices, services and policies, and identified what others also need to do to make this happen.

General actions (across multiple provocative propositions)

1) Reports from the workshops to go to SG policy makers and ministers.
2) All to share with our colleagues and service users details of blog and film.
3) Mobilise a workforce committed to supporting change, a campaign for service reforms (a voice for criminal justice social workers)
4) Establish desistance/stopping people offending champions
5) Use the film as part of the community payback order
6) Produce a manifesto for desistance activists – perhaps two: one for peers and one is more to policy
7) Exploration of the evidence of different mechanisms for co-production (whether its budgets, vouchers, user forums, voting)
8) Produce a report analysing the social justice issues which affect reintegration – focused on what to do about it, how some of the barriers can be removed, got around
9) Professional training and development reaches out to other agencies – BUT WHO NEEDS TO DO WHAT?
10) Nominate Allan Weaver from an OBE!
11) Encourage local authorities to think about establishing social enterprises offering people who have offended work (and cover costs), and allowing people to take responsibility for running the social enterprise
12) Campaign about the fact that volunteering people should be able to claim benefits
13) Need to influence sentencers ....(how?)
14) Be clear about the voluntary and compulsory elements of supervision
Supervision proposition actions

Proposition 2. Supervision works to challenge inequality and promote equality; equalising life chances and contributing to social justice (pursuing both substantive equality and equality in the CJ process)

- Exchange learning from workshop with organisations about collaborative practices: trickling KE up and downwards – probation
- Explore gender differences in desistance in research to inform practice – diversity
- Build in access route to resources for those who otherwise would be excluded with complex needs - desistance and diversity - about people not programmes needs.
- Hold a meeting inviting community organisations and third sector to publicise what they do so social work can advocate for clients and know what's out there to link them into services
- Survey service user experience to inform future action - perhaps recruit extant service users to speak to other service users
- Currently surveying prisoner experience of service provision and processes and develop ideas for enhancing resources and services provided for marginalised groups in prison or those with lesser access to resources due to length or nature of sentence.
- Talking, networking, conduct a survey and hold a meeting are key themes in this stage.
- Challenging more risk averse and restrictive practices as they surface

Proposition 3. Supervision services are consistently designed and available (across the country) to support the individual's needs and develop the individual's strengths

- Develop mentoring and other services that can promote strengths
- Enlist services users to design a feedback sheet to inform service design.
- Facilitate consultation groups with practitioners and their probationers to inform localised service design and delivery
- To reinforce collaborative formulation of service users action plans
- Write interventions that reflect new models of change i.e. strengths based
- Scottish government show film and hold workshops with CJA officer who in turn do this with chief officer groups who in turn do this with team managers etc

Proposition 4. Proposition 4. Supervision is holistic, engaging with all aspects of service users’ lives

- Examine case managements ensure tailored to individual and strengths based and individualised manager - will invite more community organisations to meeting to highlight what they can contribute and increase networks at practice level.
- Will suggest customer service training among admin and reception services.
- Training for social workers to understand the difference between positive and protective factors to instill confidence in promoting innovative practices
- Promote a learning organisation culture - discussion groups among team
- Pre-habilitation - diversion into structured deferred sentence - communicating with Sheriffs in criminal justice social work reports

Proposition 5. Supervision includes a skills, volunteering or educational component to help people develop their abilities to make a positive contribution in communities.

- Need to identify and tap into extant resources that can facilitate it - mapping services of what's out there, what they do and where exist - online resource
directory inform ground level practice - accessing service and higher level service development
• Identify a spokesperson to progress - a champion
• Identifying potential structures and opportunities beyond public sector provisions
  - identify potential collaborators.
• Identifying potential funding streams for innovative practices

Public attitudes and media engagement
Proposition 15. There is better public understanding that people are capable of change
Proposition 16. Criminal justice agencies demonstrate positive media management

• Need champions (Scottish Courts service, Scottish Government)
• Ideas around pilots, think tanks, a center for court innovation (like one in America)
and user involvement where power needs to be challenged and people need to listen
• Media need to be stakeholders in this process so they can learn to as well as report
on these groups working together to make a co-productive approach happen. A TV
programme show the reality of this process would help change and influences
societies understanding, perception, empathy and learning with the issues and
ways of approaching them.