

## Risk, Information and Decision (RID) Checklist

**Facilitators must not facilitate communication until Steps 1- 3 are complete**

RJ Case Ref		Facilitator/s	
Wrongdoer		Harmed person	

### Step 1 - Allocation

Date facilitator received notice of allocation from the RJ Hub:	
---	--

The case details will be available on ECINs. You must;

- View the RJ Referral Form, Victim and Witness Statements (MG11s) and the Case Summary - available within the Docs tab.
- Review the 'Key Contacts' report within the Reports tab to identify the case workers that are pertinent to the case and make contact with them for further information. Facilitators should continue to update the list of contacts as further Case Workers are identified. Key Contacts may include:
  - Offender Manager (Probation)
  - Offender Supervisor (Probation / HMP)
  - Officer In Case (Police)
  - Victim Support Case Worker
  - Witness Care Officer (Police)
  - Local Police Community Team
  - IOM Team (Police / CRC)
  - PACT / Fulfilling Lives etc
- Once this scoping is complete, discuss the allocation of a co-facilitator with your RJ lead if one has not already been assigned.

### Step 2 - Suitability Assessment



Suitability  
Assessment Guidance

For guidance on completing the Suitability Assessment, click here:

This checklist provides a prompt for Facilitators to consider the most common factors that affect suitability and risk of re-victimisation during the preparation or delivery of an RJ process. It should be completed in advance of any direct or indirect Restorative Process, taking the Best Practice Guidance for Restorative Practice into account.

Details of how and when factors have been reviewed must be recorded on the Case Log report on E-CINS.

Factor	Yes/No	Date
<b>Offence</b>		
Is there evidence of targeting, harassment or ongoing tension between the wrongdoer/s and the harmed person/s?		
Is there significant disparity between the wrongdoer/s and the harmed person/s accounts of the offence?		
Are there any difficulties that may arise from ongoing contact between the wrongdoer/s and the harmed person/s?		
Are there any co-defendants who will not be present? If so, will their absence impact adversely on the RJ conference?		
<b>Wrongdoer</b>		
Are there any factors which make it difficult for the wrongdoer/s to take part in the RJ process (e.g. mental health, language, disability etc)		
Does the wrongdoer/s deny causing at least some of the harm?		
Are there any reasons why the wrongdoer/s could pose a risk to the harmed person/s?		
Is the wrongdoer/s likely to conduct him / herself in a way which could be detrimental to		



the RJ process?		
Is the wrongdoer/s likely to conduct him / herself in a way which could be detrimental to any of the participants?		
Will the wrongdoer/s be supported during the RJ process?		
<b>Wrongdoer Supporter</b>		
Are there any factors which make it difficult for a supporter to take part in the RJ process (e.g. mental health, language, disability etc)?		
Are any supporters likely to conduct themselves in a way which could be detrimental to the RJ process?		
Are any supporters likely to conduct themselves in a way which could be detrimental to any other participant?		
<b>Harmed Person</b>		
Are there any factors which make it difficult for the harmed person/s to take part in the RJ process (e.g. mental health, language, disability etc)?		
Are there any reasons why the harmed person/s could pose a risk to the wrongdoer/s?		
Is the harmed person/s likely to conduct him / herself in a way which could be detrimental to the RJ process?		
Is the harmed person/s likely to conduct him / herself in a way which could be detrimental to any other participant?		
Will the harmed person/s be supported during the RJ process?		
Are the harmed person/s expectations of the RJ process reasonable?		
<b>Harmed Person Supporter</b>		
Are there any factors which make it difficult for a supporter to take part in the RJ process (e.g. mental health, language, disability etc)?		
Are any supporters likely to conduct themselves in a way which could be detrimental to the RJ process?		
Are any supporters likely to conduct themselves in a way which could be detrimental to any other participant?		
<b>Venue (If face to face conferencing is being considered)</b>		
Has the venue been visited?		
Have any issues been identified with the facilities provided by the venue (consider space for parties to wait separately, break-out room, refreshments, noise, disabled access etc)?		
Are there any safety issues arising from the location of the venue?		

Where the process involves more than one wrongdoer, harmed person or supporter, please copy the relevant part of the suitability assessment and paste below for each additional participant.

**Step 3 - Facilitator Declaration**

**For Face to Face RJ conferences complete Section A only**

**For indirect RJ processes (exchange of letters / shuttle RJ) complete Section B only**

**A) Face to Face RJ Conference**

Venue			
Venue Contact Name		Tel:	
Date of Conference		Time:	
Refreshments Ordered	Yes / No		
Notes			



**Cases cannot proceed to face to face conference until all of the below statements are confirmed complete by the Lead Facilitator, their agency RJ lead & the Police RJ Co-ordinator.**

RJ Consent Forms have been signed and uploaded to E-CINS.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Participants have had the SRJP complaints procedure explained to them.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Inviting observers to the conference has been considered and arranged where consent given.	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Case Log on E-CINS has been reviewed today and is considered accurate and up to date.	<input type="checkbox"/>
The RJ Suitability Assessment Checklist has been reviewed today and is considered accurate and up to date.	<input type="checkbox"/>
A seating plan has been considered. (Save to E-CINS if a hard copy is produced).	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ground rules have been discussed and agreed between all parties where necessary.	<input type="checkbox"/>
An Outcome Agreement Form has been prepared. (This may not be required but should be taken).	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accessibility considerations have been taken into account (e.g. disability, learning difficulty, health).	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provision of refreshments has been arranged and detailed in Section A above.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provision of name labels, Do Not Disturb signs, tissues etc has been considered and arranged where necessary.	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Where the venue is a prison</b> , I confirm that the relevant prison management team have been made aware of the conference and given details of all participants.	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Where the venue is a prison</b> , participants are aware of prison management team procedures and have been given the Attending Prison Information sheet (The Prison Act 1952).	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Where the wrongdoer is in the community</b> , their offender manager is aware of the conference date.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Details of services that may provide post-conference support to participants have been considered and are to hand to be provided following the conference where necessary.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Participants have been made aware of post-conference contact they can expect from the facilitator/s, including the opportunity to complete feedback questionnaires.	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Entering names & dates below confirms the above is correct and this case is ready to go to conference:**

Role in Case	Sign (or print name electronically)	Date
Lead Facilitator		
Police RJ Co-ordinator		
Facilitator's Agency Lead		

## **B) Indirect RJ Process**

**Cases should not proceed until the below statements are confirmed complete by the Lead Facilitator.**

RJ Consent Forms have been signed and uploaded to E-CINS.	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Case Log on E-CINS has been reviewed and is considered accurate and up to date.	<input type="checkbox"/>
The RJ Suitability Assessment Checklist has been reviewed and is considered accurate and up to date.	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Best Practice Guidance for facilitating indirect Restorative Practices has been taken into account.	<input type="checkbox"/>
All accessibility considerations have been taken into account (e.g. disability, literacy, health).	<input type="checkbox"/>
Where letters are due to be exchanged, the Exchanging Letters Guide has been taken into account.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Details of services that may provide support to participants after the RJ Process is complete have been considered to provide to participants where necessary.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Participants have been made aware of contact they can expect from the facilitator/s after the RJ process is complete, including the opportunity to complete feedback questionnaires.	<input type="checkbox"/>

## **Step 4 – Finalisation**

Summary of the RJ process / outcome has been recorded on the E-CINS Case log.	<input type="checkbox"/>
If an Outcome Agreement Form was completed – it has been uploaded to E-CINS.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Where the wrongdoer is a prisoner, the prison have been advised to follow up care plan procedures	<input type="checkbox"/>
All necessary follow-up contact with participants and Key Case Workers has been completed and recorded on E-CINS.	<input type="checkbox"/>



Where a positive RJ outcome was achieved, feedback questionnaires have been completed by all participants and uploaded to E-CINS.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Where a positive RJ outcome was achieved and consent given, a media release has been completed, in line with the RJ Communications Protocol.	<input type="checkbox"/>
The RJ Hub has been tasked to archive the case.	<input type="checkbox"/>