Restorative Practices Ireland

Stepping Up to 2022

Legal Incorporation and Business Plan Consultation

November 2016 - January 2017

Table of Contents

Introduction

In 2011, the first meeting of the Restorative Practices Strategic Forum was convened in Dublin by the Childhood Development Initiative (CDI). The Forum developed and was renamed Restorative Practices Ireland (RPI) in 2014 and in 2016 it was decided to move to establish RPI as an independent body with it's own Business Plan, funding sources and strategy. In order for this to be achieved the RPI Steering Committee determined to take a wider range of opinions and ideas into consideration in developing the functions and structures of RPI for 2010 and beyond.

The work of consultation with stakeholders and development of both a Business plan and the legal documents required for incorporation was put out to tender and Norman Rides of Cooperation Works was appointed to undertake the work in October 2016.

Methodology

A two-stage consultation process was undertaken. Stage One was a survey by questionnaire of existing stakeholders. For this purpose the current and former members of both the RPI Steering Committee and Sub-Committees were considered to be representative of the various stakeholders within Restorative Practices in Ireland (see Appendix One). Stage Two was a series of consultation and planning workshops, with people interested in supporting and developing RP around the country, which considered the findings of the survey and discussed the priority areas of work for RPI over the coming 3-5 years.

Stage One – Stakeholder Survey

Questionnaire Design

The questionnaire was designed by Norman Rides and reviewed by the members of the Development Sub-Committee which was established to oversee the work[1]. The questionnaire was designed to elicit information and opinions in three parts. The first part was basic information about the persons and organisations actively using RP techniques. The second focused more particularly on respondent's current relationship with RPI. The third was about the future development of RPI. There were seventeen questions in total. A specific question on geographical coverage set out to establish whether RPI should have a role across the whole island of Ireland or the Republic only.

Questionnaire Consultation and Response Rate

The questionnaire went live on the 17th of November 2016. An email invitation was sent to 42 past and present members of the RPI Steering Committee and Sub-Committees. There were 16 current and 13 former members of the Steering Group and six current and six former members of Sub-Committees. A reminder email was sent to non-respondents on the 22nd of November and a "Final Call" on the 25th of November. Telephone reminder calls and one mobile text message were made to 20 non-respondents for whom numbers

---

[1] The members of the Development Sub-Committee were Claire Casey, Vera Hogan and Kieran O'Dwyer.

were available.

The survey was formally open for responses until 18:00 on Friday the 25th of November. Due to notification of intended late responses the survey was held open until 21:00 on Sunday the 27th of November. Following an RPI Steering Committee meeting on the 29th of November when a further three intended responses were notified, the survey was re-opened for those three on the 30th of November and closed following the additional responses on the 2nd of December.

A total of 22 responses (52.38%) were received. Of the Steering Committee 10 of 16 current members (62.50%) and three of 13 former members (23.08%) responded. Of the Sub-Committees five of six former members (83.33%) and four of six current members (66.67%) responded. The higher participation rate from current and former sub-committee members may indicate greater hands-on awareness and knowledge of the purpose of the survey and/or the work of RPI.

Eight responses (19.51%) were received before the telephone reminder. 11 of 20 (55%) were received following the reminder call, and three more following the Steering Committee meeting of the 29th of November. If more telephone numbers or other contact channels had been available it is likely that the response rate may have been higher.

Respondent's Profile

Twenty-two respondents completed the survey. Nineteen were completed in full and three responses were incomplete.

Ten of the respondents (45.5%) were members of organisations authorised to speak on its behalf; seven (31.8%) were members of organisations giving personal views; and five (22.7%) were individuals. The respondent group was therefore strongly organisational in nature, and also having a strong representation of organisational influencers.

The range of fields represented among the respondents was broad, with six having a holistic or generic application of RP, five in Education/Training, and four in various aspects of the Criminal Justice system. There were also representatives of children and families, children and youth, youth, primary education, and secondary education. There is no single dominant field of application, indeed the striking impression is of the breadth of application of RP across a broad range of fields.

The organisational position of the respondents was quite high, with six respondents at Chief or Deputy level, fourteen at regional/unit/section head, and two as practitioners with no apparent policy input.

The range of geographic areas of operation was also varied, with four organisations or individuals working in the Republic, Northern Ireland, Rest of United Kingdom and other countries, six having an island-wide remit, eight having a local or very local focus (sub-local-authority) and four having regional remits.

The beneficiaries reported shows less variation than the range of geographic fields of operation of participating organisations, with six beneficiary groups being within the Criminal Justice system, five serving other organisations generally, three students in education, three serving families, two serving young people, and three serving the

community generally. This would suggest that there are different fields of application working with some client/user groups.

Survey Responses

Uses of RP in daily work showed strong representation of core users with 11 respondents indicating that RP was core to their work, and six reporting it was a valuable technique among others. Only two reported that RP was merely useful. The added value derived from using RP in professional work was wide-ranging.

The added value that RPI as an organisation can bring to the work of respondents is very clear, i.e. respondents believe that RPI should assist with awareness, standards and networking. Awareness saw eight respondents naming promotion, publicity, lobbying, and input into policy as the main benefits. A further six saw standards as important, with single message, quality, accreditation, and professional development as key. Networking was cited by four respondents and strength by one.

The stakeholder groups which would mostly contribute to making RPI an effective organisation were also quite widely drawn. There was no clear group emerging from the small number of "other" stakeholders cited, although victims/perpetrators, and statutory bodies were mentioned. It was also pointed out that the Restorative Justice Forum, Northern Ireland (RJFNI) has members from all categories. All of the stakeholder groups were supported for membership by at least 60% of the respondents, indicating that respondents believe that all potential stakeholder groups should be eligible for membership. As can be seen from Table 1, there was over 90% support for the top four potential stakeholder groups being afforded membership.

Table 1

To be effective RPI should be an organisation for: [tick all that may apply]		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Trainers qualified in Restorative Practices techniques and approaches	100.0%	19
Restorative Practitioners	100.0%	19
Organisations who use Restorative Practices to assist their activities	94.7%	18
Organisations whose principal activity is RP	94.7%	18
Researchers	89.5%	17
Policy Makers	84.2%	16
Advocates	84.2%	16
Anyone with an interest in Restorative Practices	73.7%	14
Anyone with a general interest in Restorative Practices	63.2%	12
Other (please specify)	36.8%	7
answered question		19
skipped question		3

The proposed structural division of the new RPI organisation is also pretty clear, with the single Ireland-Wide organisation option, a functional division, and a geographical division gaining more than 50% support. All three of these are strong options for structure. There were four responses in favour of an organisation for the Republic only. Although not a majority option it may indicate a need for care to avoid alienation of a significant minority.

Table 2

RPI should create a structure which is: (tick all which apply)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A single Ireland-Wide Organisation?	63.2%	12
An organisation with branches based on sectors, e.g. criminal justice,education, community development?	52.6%	10
An organisation based on functions e.g. trainers, practitioners, client groups, user organisations?	52.6%	10
An organisation with branches based on geographical areas?	42.1%	8
A single organisation for the Republic of Ireland only?	21.1%	4
Other (please specify)	21.1%	4
answered question		19
skipped question		3

There is support for a wide range of activities to be addressed by RPI in future. All of the suggested activities gain more than 50% support with the exception of "Consultancy Services" and "Other." The latter elicited two recommendations, i.e. that RP trainers could be registered with RPI through the RPI website, and a recommendation to develop supports and services for individual restorative practitioners as well as organisations as RPI grows.

Table 3

Which if any, of the following, should RPI provide: (tick all that apply)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Networking and dissemination events	94.7%	18
Advocacy of RP with Policy Makers	89.5%	17
Continuing Professional Development events	84.2%	16
Registration (accreditation) of RP trainers	78.9%	15
Research on Restorative Practices	78.9%	15
Promotional Activities	73.7%	14
Resource Bank for RP practitioners and organisations	73.7%	14
Accreditation of RP practitioners	68.4%	13
Accreditation of organisations using RP	57.9%	11
Training in RP	57.9%	11
Consultancy Services	26.3%	5
Other (please specify)	15.8%	3
answered question		19
skipped question		3

The question about the things that RPI should NOT do threw up some interesting responses as follows:

- Take on work and allocate it out to members;
- Restrict the field by professionalisation;
- Provide training direct, provide consultancy;

- Over-regulate member organisations;
- Allocate work to practitioners;
- Assume authority about recommending and accrediting RP practitioners. This should be left to the training 'Provider' unless, in the future, it is decided that the RPI should take on a dual role i.e. Training Provider AND National Representative Committee of RP in Ireland. If, in the future a training provision is funded, it should be a separate entity as otherwise this could pose a conflict of interest;
- It should not focus solely on the justice system;
- Become commercial;
- It should not be a profit-making organisation. It should not compete with member organisations; and
- RPI should not become a political animal or a government Quango. It must stay true to the nature of our work, our aims and objectives.

When asked about how they or their organisations could contribute to the work of RPI, a wide range of possible contributions were cited by respondents, which is generally unsurprising as the respondents are already advocates of RP and active in developing RPI. Possible contributions from individuals included voluntary time on committees and working groups; and voluntary work in facilitating restorative processes and making presentations in various settings to promote RP. Respondents were more cautious about possible contributions from their organisation as only 10 respondents were in a position to speak on behalf of their organisation. Those that were cited provision of meeting space, office facilities and administrative support as possible contributions.

The question on sources of income yielded overwhelming support for grant funding for RP activities i.e. 89.5% of respondents cited grants as a funding option, although only three respondents were able to suggest sources, even in general terms. The RPI Steering Group may wish to consider how realistic the grant-funding option is under these circumstances. There was however 78.9% support for income from services to members, and 63.2% support for income from services to organisations. These three options total to 231.6% averaging 77.2% therefore it is clear that these are seen as compatible parts of a revenue package rather than either/or options. A mix of revenue streams may therefore be indicated.

Table 4

RPI should draw its income mainly from: [list 1-4]		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Grants from public sector and charitable bodies? (Please specify which ones under "Other" below:)	89.5%	17
Fees, commissions and subscriptions from members of RPI?	78.9%	15
Fees and charges for services to organisations using RP?	63.2%	12
Other (please specify)	31.6%	6
answered question		19
skipped question		3

Analysis of Survey Responses

The respondent group showed broad representation from a wide range of professional fields and user/beneficiary groups. Respondents were strongly concentrated in what could be termed "middle-management" or self-managed roles with only 5 at Chief or Deputy level, and two at the level of practitioner within an organisation. Geographic areas ranged from international to the very local. Respondents generally indicated that RP was core to their organisations activity, or a significant technique in their armoury.

The added value of RPI to an organisation falls into the three areas of Awareness, Standards and Networking. These are worthy of consideration as key functions of the new RPI.

There are a wide range of stakeholder groups supported with what appears to be a presumption of inclusivity rather than exclusion. Indeed some of the additional comments specifically warn against the creation of a professional-dominated elitist organisation.

There is majority support for a wider range of activities, with only consultancy services having a majority against. Combined with the recommendation to avoid allocation of work to members there is a clear implication that the role of RPI is to support and facilitate development of RP rather than compete with its members for scarce resources.

The implication of the responses to potential income streams is that no one source of income was favoured; rather that RPI will need to mix income from members with grant-aid. There is willingness for members to pay for services received from RPI, and a willingness to make charges to organisations using the techniques and practices. The similar response for sources of start-up capital is more realistic, with many organisations prepared to make one-off grants to enable the foundation of an organisation which will be sustainable in the long-term.

Stage Two – Consultation Workshops

Introduction

Following the questionnaire survey of stakeholders held between 17th November and 2nd December 2016 there were three workshops held to consult more widely with the RP community in Ireland. These were in Waterford and Dublin in December 2016 and again in Dublin in January 2017. Sixty four people attended these workshops, ten of whom had been invited to take part in the survey; therefore at least seventy six people took part in the consultation process.

Aims of Workshops:

- To inform participants of the ideas for developing RPI that were generated by the survey;
- To ask participants what RPI should be doing over the coming 3-5 years;
- To ask participants what RPI should do to attract membership; and
- To provide participants with an opportunity to network (lunch!).

In order to meet the second and third aims the following questions were posed:

- How might RPI add value to existing services over the next three-five years?
- What should RPI offer to attract members?

Eleven people attended the workshop in Waterford on 6th December 2016, 12 people attended the workshop in Dublin on 7th December 2016, and thirty-one people attended the workshop in Dublin on 17th January 2017 also at the Carmelite Community Centre (see Appendix Two for attendances). Following a presentation of the findings of the stakeholder questionnaire, attendees broke into groups to consider the above questions. Two questions were asked at the Waterford and second Dublin workshop but only the first question at the first Dublin workshop. This was based on feedback from the first session that there was a lot of overlap between the two questions. This perceived overlap itself implies that there is an understanding among consultees that RPI is and will be a member-focused organisation where adding value and serving members are seen as core activities.

The workshops split into groups to consider the questions in detail. This generated a number of suggestions. This was followed by a plenary session at which the responses were considered and five priorities selected. (Due to time pressure this was omitted at the second Dublin workshop.) All the responses are set out in Appendix Three.

Findings

There was a good deal of consistency in the findings from the small groups in each workshop and from the three workshops overall.

A clear response from the workshops was that RPI should proceed urgently to incorporation and the establishment of an organisation with a clear structure and "robust governance." Points to note on the structure are that it should be "the centre, not the top" and that organisation should be based primarily on a geographical basis.

The workshops yielded clear majority support for a number of activities to be undertaken by RPI with the overall aim of building the capacity of practitioners, trainers and organisations to implement and promote RP. Specifically, the following activities were identified by all three workshops as strong priorities for the work of RPI in the next 3-5 years:

- Setting standards of best practice and developing systems of quality assurance for restorative practitioners, trainers and organisations;
- Developing a system for registering and recognising practitioners, trainers, training courses and organisations;
- Providing Continuing Professional Development;
- Developing a membership base;
- Developing a national voice for promoting and advocating for RP and for engaging with policy makers to have RP adopted in various settings;
- Building evidence of the effectiveness of RP and documenting case studies of RP in action; and
- Supporting networking.

There were a number of suggestions about membership including one about various levels or categories of membership. There were also clear views on accreditation going so far as recommending that RPI take responsibility for regulation of professional standards, which would require a robust regulatory system.

The main area of contradiction in feedback from those consulted was in terms of direct provision of training or consultancy services by RPI. Thus, while there is strong feedback indicating that RPI should ensure it is not competing with existing organisations, practitioners or trainers there is also strong feedback recommending that RPI provide continuing professional development and accreditation of practitioners and trainers.

The point was also made that RPI must be a Restorative Body in its own practices and procedures, to promote "equality and inclusion of RP in different settings." These are all points that will need to be considered in determining the legal form and drawing up the constitutional documents.

Conclusions and Recommendations

There was broad agreement between the responses to the survey questions and the discussions and feedback at workshops about both the structure and work priorities for RPI over the next 3-5 years.

Overall, the added value of RPI to organisations falls into four overarching objectives that can be outlined as Capacity Building, Awareness, Standards and Networking. These are considered by those consulted to be key functions of RPI into the future.

Both survey respondents and workshop participants are clearly keen to ensure that as wide range as possible of stakeholder groups be eligible for membership, demonstrating an emphasis on inclusion. Indeed some of the additional comments specifically warn against the creation of a professional-dominated elitist organisation.

Generally, the feedback for the consultation process points to an intensive development strategy of filling in the gaps, strengthening and reinforcing existing operations, dotting the i's and crossing the t's of existing activities, rather than an extensive strategy of expansion which may lead to organisational overstretch.

An immediate challenge for moving forward will be to address the contradiction inherent in feedback recommending that RPI provide CPD and quality assurance mechanisms and that it not provide training or consultancy services. This challenge needs immediate attention because in business terms, the ability to offer training and consultancy is a key potential source of finance.

The implication of the responses to potential income streams is that no one source of income was favoured; rather that RPI will need to mix income from members with grant-aid. The response for sources of start-up capital is encouraging, with some organisations prepared to make one-off grants to enable the foundation of an organisation which will be sustainable in the long-term.

The survey and workshops have reaped a rich harvest of ideas, suggestions, priorities and consensuses for the future direction of RPI. There is broad agreement on the core activities and "direction of travel" with a wide range of possible activities built around the core theme of "capacity and support for RP practitioners, trainers and organisations".

The structure of the organisation needs to be quite flexible in order to accommodate the range of activities which the members would support, and the broad range of groups welcomed into membership, within a simple structure which has a single-Ireland-wide structure in the first instance, segmented either by function or geographical area, with the

alternative geographical or functional dimension being added as the organisation grows and develops.

Given the wide range of activities and fee-earning services which would be supported by the respondents to this consultation process, the Business Plan will need to be structured in such a way as to identify the different "products" for the different "markets" within different "cost centres." Grant-making bodies will need to be identified to supplement income from members and user-organisations.

Next Steps

There is clear agreement among those consulted on the need to establish a National body for the support and promotion of RP in Ireland. The RPI Steering Committee will now move forward to:

- Circulate this report to those who contributed to the consultation and make it available to the public on the RP website;
- Incorporate RPI as a legal entity;
- Develop a five-year business plan for the growth of RPI as an organisation; and
- Source start-up funding for RPI.

Appendix One: RPI Steering Committee Members Past & Present

(Present Members in Red)

First Name	Surname	Organisation
Yvonne	Adair	Youth Justice Agency NI
Catherine	Ashe	Consultant
Shannon	Baker	Young Community Leaders
Andy	Bray	Le Chéile
Hugh	Campbell	University of Ulster
Claire	Carroll	Le Chéile, Dublin
Tim	Chapman	Ulster University
Ingrid	Colvin	PACE CoSA Project
Carol	Conway	Consultant
Mairead	Doran	Young Community Leaders
Ursula	Fernee	The Probation Service
Barbara	Hammond	Dublin Dun Laoghaire ETB
Vera	Hogan	Mediators Institute of Ireland
Martina	Jordan	RJFNI
Michaeal	Kelly	Irish Youth Justice Service
Caitlin	Lewis	Céim ar Chéim
Tina	MacVeigh	Rialto Youth Project
Harry	Maguire	CRJI, RJFNI
Margaret	McGarrigle	Mediator/RP Practitioner
Jim	McGrath	Netcare
Janette	McKnight	Quaker Service, RJFNI
Aileen	O'Brien	Midland Travellers Conflict Mediation Initiative
Catherine	O'Connell	Facing Forward
Kieran	O'Dwyer	Consultant
Des	O'Shea	Irish Prison Service
Marian	Quinn	CDI (Chair RPI)
Richard	Roche	Irish Prison Service
Delma	Sweeney	NUI Maynooth
Andy	Tuite	Garda Siochána
Derick	Wilson	Corrymeela Community

RPI Sub-Committee Members Past & Present

First Name	Surname	Organisation
Claire	**Casey**	CDI
Tim	**Coughlan**	Facing Forward
Siobhan	Cullen	Letterkenny IT
Jacinta	**De Paor**	Facing Forward
Niamh	Fowler	St Marks Senior Naitonal School
Jean	Gilmore	School Completion Programme
Mary	**Henihan**	Le Chéile, Limerick
Leanne	**Keely**	Le Chéile, Limerick
Liam	Purcell	Nenagh Community Reparation Project
Pat	Teehan	Dublin City Council
Richie	Walsh	St Marks Senior Naitonal School
Barbara	**Walshe**	Facing Forward

Appendix Two: Workshop Attendances

Edmund Rice Heritage Centre Waterford 6th December 2016	
NAME	**ORGANISATION**
Aisling Rossiter	Wexford RP Partnership
Tommy Somers	Cornmarket Project
Roseanne Cahill	Cornmarket Project
Helen Rafferty	Waterford & Wexford Education & Training Board
Aine Whelan	Waterford & Wexford Education & Training Board
Mary Upton	Waterford & Wexford Education & Training Board
Sinéad O'Hara	Waterford & Wexford Education & Training Board
Sarah Lavan	Waterford & Wexford Education & Training Board
Ken Sauvage	Treo Port Lairge
Maeve O'Byrne	Wexford Local Development
Rita Comeford	Foróige Kilkenny

Carmelite Community Centre Dublin 7th December 2016	
NAME	**ORGANISATION**
Tim Coughlin	Facing Forward
Dolores O'Neill	Ballyfermot Social Intervention Initiative
Aoife Slacke	St Ultan's Primary School
Pat Teehan	Dublin City Council
Susan Kavanagh	RJS Volunteer/RP Trainer
Rosalind Duke	RJS Volunteer/St Patrick's College
William Holland	Kevin Street Garda Station
Callie Zinsmeyer	Release Prison Partnership
Marina Jordan	Restorative Justice Forum NI
Siobhán Connolly	St. Dominic's Secondary School SCP
Sharon Cleary	St. Dominic's Secondary School SCP
Catherine O'Connell	Facing Forward/RPI Steering Committee

Carmelite Community Centre Dublin 17th January 2017	
NAME	**ORGANISATION**
Catherine Ashe	Coaching Consultant / RPI Steering Committee
Ruth Breen	Community After Schools Project
Ingrid Colvin	CoSA
Geraldine Conlon	Community Activist Tallaght
Eva Doyle	Foróige North Fingal GYDP
Ursula Fernée	The Probation Service
Edel Flynn	Foróige North Fingal GYDP
Niamh Fowler	St Marks SNS
Jean Gilmore	SCP Sta Marks & St Maelruins
Eoin Houlihan	Teacher / RP Trainer
Dan Hurley	DRA CDC Ltd. (Galway)
Ann Marie Keane	Probation Service
Denise Kearns	St Aidan's Primary School
Raymond Lambert	Trauma Releasing Exercises Ireland
Mick Levens	RP Consultant / RJC Trustee
Pilar Loring	Ferns Dioceses Youth Service
Eileen Maguire	St Ultan's NS Cherry Orchard
Louise Marshall	The Kings Hospital
Mary McCormack	Oberstown Children's Detention Campus
Rory McEvitt	Kylemore CTC
PJ McGowan	Facing Forward & SDMS
Martin Moloney	Garda Siochána, Store Street
Aileen O'Brien	Midland Travellers Community Mediation Initiative
Terry O'Neill	WRPP / Slaney GYDP
Alex Petrovics	Ferns Dioceses Youth Service
Nicola Reeves	St Killians German School
Aoife Slacke	St Ultan's NS Cherry Orchard
Richie Walsh	St Marks SNS
Emma Wheatley	Early Learning Initiative
Carmen Yeates	St Aidan's Primary School

Appendix Three: Feedback at Workshops

(Legal form = Blue, Business Plan = Red)

How might RPI add value to existing services over the next 3-5 years?		
Waterford 6th December	**Dublin 7th December**	**Dublin 17th January**
Establish organisation with structure	Identifiable Core group (*an Lar/the Centre*) that is the centre, not the top, and easily accessible	Supporting regional areas
Establish the organisation.		Ensure RPI has robust governance and a sound business model
Build the national organisation with local and regional structures	Paid employee (part-time?) to do administration, connecting groups up	Regions/networks should be geographically organised rather than sectoral – promote integrated networking
5-10 year strategic plan	Build capacity (funding, membership)	
Standard setting (including CPD in an Irish context)	Funding – no strategy without funding	Give national assurance that local services will continue, i.e. backing for local services (like, e.g. the GAA)
Standard setting before awareness	Training – to roll out RP.	
Aim for best practice	Accreditation – people trained but not accredited, standards in RP	Facilitate Communities of Practice (CoP's) and reflective practice.
Identify standards of practice		
Support RP in an <u>Irish</u> context	Code of best practice and ethics.	Provide refresher courses.
CPD	Ethics committee.	Have responsibility for standards and Quality Assurance.
Pathway for CPD	CPD / Supervision commitment from practitioner members (linked to RPI accreditation).	
Tailored whole-staff CPD		Accrediting RP Courses, Trainers and Practitioners.
Database/members list and resources including how RP fist [fits?] policy and has legislative links (could have regional distribution of tasks)	Learning & sharing groups for practitioners (linked to RPI accreditation)	Hosting national, regional and sectoral events
	Membership:	
	Annual fee	Provide information.
Database of Trainers/Facilitators	Levels, e.g. Associate, organisation (once-off fee per organisation)	<u>Document it!!</u>
More pilots (evaluated, build evidence)		
Task – conduct research	Website.	Identify key groups outside the justice and education sectors i.e. national representative bodies for community, youth, sport, etc.
Do not exclude community involvement through unreachable standards or costs – make RPI services available through local networks.	Regulatory body re	
	o accreditation – have both QQI and RPI accreditation and include a 'Grand parenting' clause (experiences people get recognition)	Promoting equality and inclusion of RP in different settings
Resources for community groups, not just staff		Raising awareness and promotion of RP
	o School, community, organisation flags	Spreading and sharing stories
Reach out to hidden/isolated practitioners		Advocacy, act as a lobby group
Funding – multi-organisational, i.e. spread		Influence policy nationally to support

of funding sources
Lobby to embed RP into undergraduate education and training
Credibility – being attached to a national organisation will build credibility
Opportunities for networking
	o Recognition of standards and particular organisations
	o Membership have a clear path for development
	o Having a regulatory body is considered important for practitioners in Northern Ireland so that service users can expect high quality, consistent Restorative Practice in every context
	Practitioners get paid work through membership – advertise as RPI practitioners and on RPI website
	Documentation/Evidence based (leads to funding)
	Training
	Accreditation
	Become prominent, being used in organisations
	Communicate evidence back to policymakers
	Consolidation
	Make RPI a Restorative Organisation
	RPI has to be a restorative organisation (walk the talk)
	Develop a "Journal of Restorative Practice" (to share stories and evidence
	Access to information = change in mind set
	Communication with policy makers.
	Linking with education – HSCL – JLO – Gardaí:
	  o beginning early
	  o language
	input from children – shared ownership, can't be precious
	RPI creating an "identity" so it's more prominent on the national/international
		embedding RP locally
		Building buy-in
		Public relations – especially in relation to RJ activity
		Collate evidence and stories
		Support and services
		Have a Funding Officer who informs membership of potential sources of funding (including small grants at local level that could be used for training courses)
		Be a national voice that adds weight and lends credibility
		Be a conduit to Government
		Facilitate networking
		Provide support for cooperation and collaboration between RP organisations
		Focussing on early intervention and prevention
		Attract high profile patrons and influencers that resonate with our audiences, including corporate patrons
		Resources – social media
		Associate RPI with the concept/practices of ACE's (Adverse Childhood Experiences)

	scene – being visible Networking Help line – guidance to way forward	
	What should RPI offer to attract members?	

Memberships should be specific RP organisations. Develop membership criteria
 	
Support network, toolkits, resources, newsletter
Establish and maintain standards, monitoring standards, possibly selective audits
Access to training
CPD – clear and standard
Is there funding? What Department? Justice? Education? (Link to Wellbeing agenda at Junior Certificate).
Support (e.g. like NALA):
   o Conferences
   o Resources
   o Website
   o (Avoiding replication/duplication)
Standardised "brand", recognisable
Identifiable Refreshers, help people practice, everyday use of RP.
Help us promote our RP work – newsletter.
Currently pay external trainers – need to become "self-sufficient" and independent
Promotion, funding – lobbying for national strategy and funding.
		• Develop tiered membership, e.g. organisations, trainers, practitioners, associates, and have different fees for different categories of members. Have concession fees for people on limited incomes.
		• Develop a database/register of Trainers and Practitioners that can be referred to people looking for training or facilitation services.
		• Providing a bursary for individuals and a grant fund for organisations/groups looking to get training would be one of the nice things to have.