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## Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACE</td>
<td>Assessment, Case management and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPO</td>
<td>Custody Probation Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCS</td>
<td>Determinate Custodial Sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOJ</td>
<td>Department of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECS</td>
<td>Extended Custodial Sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRCS</td>
<td>Human Resource Consultancy Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIACRO</td>
<td>Northern Ireland Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIPS</td>
<td>Northern Ireland Prison Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NISRA</td>
<td>Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBNI</td>
<td>Probation Board for Northern Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMS</td>
<td>Probation Information Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO</td>
<td>Probation Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSNI</td>
<td>Police Service of Northern Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROP</td>
<td>Reducing Offending in Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSH</td>
<td>Risk of Serious Harm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 Context

A significant proportion of individuals are recalled to custody within the first few weeks of release, as a consequence of either failing to comply with supervisory requirements or because of reoffending. The transition from prison to community resettlement therefore is a critical point in an offender’s life, with wider societal implications in terms of crime rates, the impact on victims, confidence in the Criminal Justice System, and the attendant costs to society.

The Probation Board for Northern Ireland (PBNI) introduced the Intensive Resettlement and Rehabilitation Project (subsequently branded ‘Reset’), a desistance based paid Mentoring scheme, funded for one year (2015/2016) by the NI Executive Change Fund. Its aims were to positively impact on reoffending to ensure that, when possible and appropriate, recall could be prevented, and to enhance good citizenship outcomes for offenders and the wider community.

The programme operated throughout Northern Ireland in recognition of the presence of PBNI offices in all six counties. It worked with prisoners released from the three Northern Ireland establishments - Maghaberry, Magilligan and Hydebank Wood – from July 2015. Service delivery was commissioned through a PBNI/NIACRO partnership with support from Housing Rights.

The target group for inclusion were male and female offenders, aged 18 years and over, with a medium or high ACE (Assessment, Case management and Evaluation) score and who were subject to statutory post-custody supervision by a Probation Officer (PO). The Mentors’ role was to complement that of the PO through the provision of practical support.

Mentoring commenced up to four weeks pre-release and continued for a maximum of 12 weeks post-custody. Mentors supported Mentees during their first day of release. Contact thereafter was daily for the first week, and then as required for the remaining weeks. A critical component of the project was the central coordinating and assessment role of the supervising PO.

Regular progress updates were made to the Reset Project Board which included representatives from PBNI, NIACRO, NIPS, NISRA and PSNI, and was chaired by a PBNI senior manager.

The primary objectives of Reset were to:

- Reduce the number of recalls to prison in the first 12 weeks following the release from custody of prisoners who PBNI assessed as a medium or high likelihood of reoffending through the ACE score;
- Reduce the ACE scores of participants;
- Improve offender outcomes in relation to accommodation, employment, training/work experience, self-esteem/confidence and social/family integration.

This report summarises the findings from an evaluation which aimed to assess the effectiveness of the programme in terms of the impact on Mentees and to gather evidence to establish the extent to which programme objectives were met.
1.2. Approach

After commissioning, recruitment and set-up, Reset was operational from 1st July 2015 to 31st March 2016. During that time 294 eligible individuals were offered a place on the programme with 196 agreeing to engage initially, with Mentors. By the 31st March 122 had successfully completed, 41 were still actively engaged, 23 had been recalled, and 10 had not taken up the programme for a variety of reasons.

An interim evaluation was carried out in Autumn 2015 to assess initial progress. The current evaluation provides a full overview of progress towards objectives and is based on an analysis of quantitative administrative data and qualitative information gathered through surveys to Mentees (baseline, n=173; exit, n=62), Mentors (n=89), POs (n=14) and project partners (n=9), interviews with Mentees (n=11), Probation managers (n=4) and stakeholders (n=4) and focus groups with Mentees (n=9), Mentors (n=7) and POs (n=5).

1.3 Outcomes

Recall Rate

Reducing the number of returns to prison during the first 12 weeks post release was one of the key objectives of the Reset programme and both quantitative and qualitative evidence suggests that this is being achieved. Interviewees and focus group participants reported that Reset was impacting on this area. Whilst not directly comparable the recall rates for both DCS and ECS offenders were lower than the respective rates for recall prior to the introduction of the Reset programme (DCS, 11% with Reset and 28% prior to Reset introduction; ECS, 28% with Reset and 72% prior to Reset introduction).

Of the 186 Mentees that Reset worked with 150 were DCSs and 18 ECSs. Using a recall rate of 28% for DCSs, we may have expected to see 42 of the 150 recalled. However with Reset we saw 17 recalled – potentially 60% lower than expected. Using a recall rate of 72% for ECSs, we may have expected to see 13 of the 18 recalled. However, with Reset we saw 5 recalled – potentially 62% lower than expected. While it is not possible to say that this change occurred because of Reset alone, achievement towards this objective should not be underestimated given that over 70% of Reset participants were assessed as high likelihood of reoffending (high ACE score), and nearly 20% a significant risk of serious harm (ROSH).

Further, regarding participants who were subsequently recalled, examples were given during the evaluation interviews of individuals remaining out of prison for longer than expected (an average of 39 days in the community).

Mentees attitudes towards reoffending were also collected pre and post Reset, using Crime Pics II, an instrument previously found to be statistically correlated with reconviction. The reduction across the five measures employed, four of which were statistically significant, suggests that Reset had an effect in reducing pro-criminal attitudes.

---

1 Reasons for exclusion included: not released from prison, deported, or moved out of Northern Ireland before engaging on the programme.
2 Recall rates of 28% for DCS and 72% for ECS are from 2008 to 31 January 2014.
3 Reset recall rates of 11% for DCS and 28% for ECS are in respect of the Reset mentoring period of 12 weeks.
Likelihood of reoffending assessments (Ace Scores)

At an overall level there was a statistically significant decrease between pre and post Reset ACE scores among those who successfully completed the programme; changes were most notable for high ACE Mentees. This is notable given that the general feeling across the qualitative activities was that the 12 week time frame was too short to see a measurable change in ACE score.

Self-Esteem and Confidence

An increase in self-esteem and confidence has been shown to have an impact on a reduction in the likelihood of reoffending. Increasing self-esteem and confidence was the objective on which Reset was seen as having made the most impact and there was unanimous agreement during the qualitative activities that this objective had been successfully achieved.

Over two thirds of Mentees said that taking part in Reset had increased their confidence. They were also asked to reflect on their feelings pre and post Reset and to score themselves on a ten-item Likert scale to measure self-esteem. Average post-Reset scores were higher than pre-Reset scores.

Accommodation

Finding and maintaining accommodation was reported to be challenging, taking up a large amount of Mentors' time. It was suggested that referrals needed to be made more than four weeks prior to release. That said, the general consensus was that Reset was positively impacting on this area and, by the end of the mentoring process, over half of Mentees had secured permanent accommodation.

Employment/Education/Training

Getting basics such as accommodation and health care in place was seen as the main priority for Mentees and it was felt that the majority were not ready to consider employment or training during the first 12 weeks following release. Examples of vocational training/work experience were provided however and over a fifth of Mentees were in some form of full or part time employment by the end of the mentoring process; a further 10% were in education or training.

Increased Social and Family Reintegration

Not everybody required support with family or social integration but the general feeling was that Reset had helped when needed and was seen as invaluable for long-term offenders and those who were isolated (e.g. those convicted of sexual offences).

The majority of Mentees said Reset helped them integrate back with their family (60%) and into their community (71%).
The evaluation has demonstrated that Reset has had a positive impact on the lives of newly released offenders, both through achievement of programme objectives and the provision of practical and emotional support during the critical transition from custody to release. The commitment of the involved staff has been impressive, and the progress made within a short timeframe should not be underestimated. The costs incurred by NIPS and the wider Criminal Justice system could potentially be reduced if the level of progress achieved continues. For example, Reset costs £2,544 per Mentee (12 weeks), compared to prison costs (12 weeks) of £15,291 per recall. It is recommended that funding is found to enable extension of this innovative programme, which has the potential to generate savings across the Criminal Justice sector.
1.5 General Themes

**Practical and emotional support**
Accessing critical services was immensely challenging and frustrating for Mentees due mainly to bureaucracy and long waiting times. The fact, therefore, that Reset provided Mentees with ongoing practical support in this area was seen as a particular strength of the programme, as was having somebody there for them particularly for those who were isolated. Participants questioned why some of these services couldn’t be put in place pre-release.

**Intensive, adaptable and flexible**
The intensive support provided by Reset including collection at the gate on the day of release was seen as highly effective; as was the adaptive and flexible nature of the programme including the ability to respond to demands very quickly. Greater flexibility with programme duration however was suggested going forward. Having a single point of contact to co-ordinate the complex aspects of Mentees’ lives and the availability of support outside office hours were also valued. That said, Mentee independence was very much encouraged.

**Mentors complement the PO role**
There was high praise for Mentors from participants across all evaluation activities. Their role was seen as complementing that of the PO, ensuring Reset was not just a befriending service but related to risk management including supporting licence compliance, something of which Mentors had a good understanding.

**Co-operation and communication**
Given the number of organisations interfacing with Reset it was recognised that communication was going to be a challenge but the general consensus across evaluation participants was that both communication and co-operation had worked well.

**Targeting the right group**
While the general feeling was that the right clients were being targeted a couple of suggestions were made regarding targeting in the future. For example there was a perception that some clients didn’t actually need the support and were participating because they felt that it looked good. Evidence regarding those most likely to reoffend, was now available and could be used going forward to target those most likely to benefit from Reset.
1.6 Going Forward

There is evidence that the Reset programme worked very effectively. A number of recommendations, however, are detailed below for consideration going forward (funding permitted):

- PBNI may wish to take into consideration further targeting of Mentees in relation to need for support and likelihood of reoffending.
- PBNI and NIPS should identify significant needs and definitively confirm post-custody accommodation status prior to release. Investigate whether it is possible, at this stage, to put basics such as ID provision, accommodation and post-release health care in place. Review current referral processes to relevant parties.
- The lead partner on any future Reset programme may wish to review flexibility of programme duration, level of Mentee contact and making best use of Mentor time to support Mentees should additional funding be made available for Reset to continue. In addition, differing needs of female offenders should be considered as recent research has shown that women may have their most challenging time at 6 months post release.
- Review input from and communication to POs. PBNI should examine and further outline the critical role of POs in any future evaluation of Reset/post custody supervision.
- Having a service to refer Mentees to following Reset would be very beneficial. The lead partner on any future Reset programme should identify whether this is possible.
Recall Rates of 28% for DCS and 72% for ECS are from 2008 to 31 January 2014.

70% of Mentees were in a hostel at the point of recall.

Reset Recall Rates

DCS 11%

ECS 28%

Reset Recall rates are approx 60% lower than previous rates.¹

Number of Mentees on Reset: 186
Average age of Mentee: 33
Mentees with a high ACE Profile: 70%
Average time in days on Reset: 81

78% Of Mentees agreed their mentor helped them avoid/reduce reoffending
90% Of Mentees were satisfied with the support received from Reset
71% Of Mentees agreed their mentor helped them integrate back into their community
95% Of Mentees would recommend Reset to others

¹Recall Rates of 28% for DCS and 72% for ECS are from 2008 to 31 January 2014.
2. Context

This report sets out the findings of the evaluation of the Intensive Resettlement and Rehabilitation Project (Reset), a desistance based paid mentoring scheme commissioned by PBNi from the community and voluntary sector and funded for one year (2015/2016) by the NI Executive Change Fund.

2.1 Mentoring

Offender re-integration needs are complex and multi-faceted and research has shown that individuals are contending with a range of issues. This was evident in the findings of the 2013 SPS Prisoner Survey which showed that 27% of prisoners had accessed mental health services in custody and one fifth had used drugs while in prison. In addition over half had lost their home while in custody and over one third did not know where they would stay on release.

Research has shown that mentoring has a positive impact on offenders following release from prison, helping them to make progress with some of these aspects such as housing, employment, and substance abuse, as well as providing them with a social connection in the community and the motivation to change their behaviour. Evidence also suggests that mentoring which is maintained over a period of time and which begins in prison and lasts beyond release is most effective. A recent report on the effects of mentoring on reoffending in US prisons, described mentoring as “the glue that binds all the support services and interventions together; the glue that enables a Mentee to access everything they need to succeed”.

2.2 Desistance

Desistance theory is broadly concerned with how and why a person decides to stop offending. It is an individualised approach that recognizes the complex issues surrounding reoffending and the need for support. Rather than focusing on ‘correction’ it focuses on the importance of rebuilding relationships, fostering self-efficacy, and supporting individuals with practical and emotional needs in order to reduce the likelihood of reoffending.

Some of the key factors that support desistance have been identified in the literature and include:

7 Andy Laidlaw. 2015. The Impact of Effective Mentoring on Community Safety and Reducing Reoffending (pdf)
9 ibid.
• Being believed in
• Not having a criminal identity
• Having a place in a social group
• Having something to give others
• Hope and motivation
• Families and relationships
• Sobriety
• Employment
• Getting older and maturing

Key practical issues have also been identified which, if left unresolved, have the potential to impact the ability to desist from offending. These include:

• Accommodation
• Substance Misuse – Drugs and Alcohol
• Health Issues – Mental and Physical
• Attitudes and Behaviour
• Employment, Education and Training
• Finance
• Social Relationships – Children, Families, and Communities

Desistance theory is important to the criminal justice system because it both recognises that individuals have the capacity to change and identifies some key factors that help support this change.

Consequently it has been a focus in several strategies/reviews:

• The Northern Ireland Executive Programme for Government 2011-2015\(^{11}\) recognized the importance of a desistance strategy in reducing reoffending as a key to its commitment to reducing the level of serious crime in Northern Ireland. The Executive committed to “Develop and action a desistance strategy for offenders to cover custodial and non-custodial settings”.

• The Department of Justice’s (DOJ) Strategic Framework for Reducing Offending\(^ {12}\), published in 2013, sets out the Department’s overall vision for a long-term reduction in offending behaviour and one of the Core Principles was a “Focus on a desistance-based approach through effective rehabilitation and resettlement”.

---
\(^{11}\) Northern Ireland Executive Programme for Government 2011 — 2015.
\(^{12}\) Strategic Framework for Reducing Offending, Department of Justice Northern Ireland. 2013.
• It was emphasised in a Review of Prisons in Northern Ireland\footnote{Owers, D. A., Leighton, P., McGrory, C., McNeill, F., Wheatley, P. October 2011. Review of the Northern Ireland Prison Service.} that while desistance is highly individual, it also requires a level of commitment and support from families, the community, and institutions of social support in order for changes to take hold. It recommended that “the desistance strategy developed in the Northern Ireland Prison Service (NIPS) must involve partnership with and support for families and community organisations to build social capital and prevent social exclusion, drawing upon and extending initiatives and experience.”

• In response to the Executive’s Programme for Government, DOJ’s own framework, and the Prison Review Team’s recommendation, DOJ published Supporting Change: A Strategic Approach to Desistance\footnote{Supporting Change: A Strategic Approach to Desistance. Department of Justice, Northern Ireland: 09/2015.} in 2015. It outlined DOJ’s plan for reducing reoffending using key ideas from Desistance Theory, proposing 12 interventions, including a pilot mentoring scheme, with the objective of delivering an evidence-based desistance approach. The Reset project as one of the 12 interventions outlined in this document is part of the department’s strategic approach to desistance.

2.3 The Reset Programme

The Reset programme operated throughout the whole of NI, working with prisoners released from the three Northern Ireland establishments - Maghaberry, Magilligan and Hydebank Wood – from July 2015. Service delivery was provided through a partnership between PBNI and NIACRO and involved a Reset Coordinator, full-time paid Mentors, a benefits advice service, and assistance from Housing Rights. Overall management of the Reset programme was the responsibility of a project manager from PBNI (see Appendix A for Roles and Procedures).

The target group for inclusion were male and female offenders, aged 18 years and over, with a medium or high ACE (Assessment, Case Management and Evaluation) score and who were subject to post-custody supervision - Determinate Custodial Sentences (DCS), Extended Custodial Sentences (ECS), Article 26 licences, Custody Probation Orders (CPO) and Life Licences.

Mentoring commenced up to four weeks pre-release (see Appendix B for Reset referral/registration form) and continued for a maximum of 12 weeks post-custody, providing intensive resettlement support to offenders during the transition from custody to community, a critical period in their lives with over half (54.5\%)\footnote{Adult and Youth Reoffending in Northern Ireland (2012/13 Cohort). Duncan, L. Department of Justice Analytical Services Group. Research and Statistical Bulletin 17/2015. August 2015.} of adult offenders\footnote{Released on custodial supervision} who reoffend doing so within the first three months of release.
Mentors met Mentees, usually at the prison gate, on the day of release and supported them during their first day out. They then had daily contact for the first week, and, if required, for longer, to provide practical support related to the personal and social factors identified by PBNi in their ACE assessment and attendant release plan. The Probation Officer (PO) ensured that information was shared (i.e. licence conditions, risk issues and the Mentees workplan) and realistic objectives set during an initial tripartite meeting with the Mentor and Mentee.

The primary objectives of the programme were to:

- Reduce the number of recalls to prison in the first 12 weeks following the release from custody of prisoners who PBNi assessed as a medium or high risk of reoffending through the ACE score;
- Reduce the ACE scores of participants;
- Improve offender outcomes in relation to accommodation, employment, training/work experience, self-esteem/confidence and social/family integration.

The objectives and how each has been measured can be found in Chapter 4.

2.4 Evaluation Aims and Objectives

PBNi commissioned the Human Resource Consultancy Services (HRCS) branch of the Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency (NISRA) to undertake an evaluation of Reset. The review endeavoured to assess the effectiveness of the programme in terms of the impact on the Mentees who participated and to gather evidence to establish indicators of the extent to which its objectives were being achieved. This report outlines the methodology, findings, conclusions and recommendations.
3. Approach

3.1 Data Collection

A range of qualitative and quantitative data was gathered using the following techniques:

**Interviews and Focus Groups**
- Semi-structured interviews were undertaken with Mentees\(^{17}\) (11), Probation Managers (4) and stakeholders from PBNi (2) and NIACRO\(^{18}\);
- Focus groups were conducted with Mentees (9), Mentors (7), and POs (5)\(^{19}\).

Participation in interviews and focus groups was voluntary. Those with Mentees were conducted in private (i.e. the Mentor or PO was not present). NISRA researchers randomly selected the Mentees who took part in the interviews. Recruitment of all other participants was arranged by PBNi. Question schedules for the interviews and focus groups can be found in Appendices C to G.

**Administrative Data Sources**

The evaluation used administrative data from:
- the Probation Board Management Information database (PIMS);
- data held by the Offender Recall Unit, DOJ;
- data held by the Analytical Services Unit, DOJ.

A data sharing agreement was in place to facilitate the exchange of information between the organisations involved.

**Mentor Logs**

Mentors used an Excel based data collection system developed by the NISRA researchers. Entries were recorded each time the Mentor made contact with the Mentee and included the type, duration, location and reason for contact as well as the activities involved and the outcome. Logs were submitted on a weekly basis for collation by the PBNi Reset administration team. Collated logs were then forwarded to the researchers for quality assurance and analysis.

\(^{17}\) See Appendix C
\(^{18}\) See Appendix D
\(^{19}\) See Appendices E, F, & G
Questionnaires

- Baseline\textsuperscript{20} (n=173) and Exit\textsuperscript{21} Questionnaires (n=62)

Mentees completed a baseline questionnaire with their Mentor at the start of the programme and an exit questionnaire with their PO when it finished. Both questionnaires gathered data regarding Mentee background, self-esteem\textsuperscript{22} and attitudes towards offending\textsuperscript{23}. Expectations about Reset were gathered in the baseline questionnaire while experiences of Reset were gathered in the exit questionnaire.

- Mentor case closure questionnaires\textsuperscript{24} (n=89)

Online questionnaires were completed by a Mentor each time a Mentee finished the programme. The survey collected information about Mentee achievements, progress made towards objectives, and time spent on specific activities. Responses for recalled Mentees have not been included in the analyses due to the limited time spent in the community; analyses were therefore based on responses from those who successfully completed Reset.

- PO case closure forms (n=17)

Introduced following the interim evaluation and completed by POs each time a Mentee finished the programme. Gathered views on Mentee progress and on PO satisfaction with Reset.

- Project partner feedback forms (n=9)

Online questionnaire completed by project partners (PSNI, Housing Rights, NIPS, Reset project board representatives). Gathered views on Mentee benefits, what did/did not work well and suggested improvements.

- Reset refusal feedback forms (n=75)

Completed by offenders who declined to take part, to determine reasons for non-participation.

\textsuperscript{20} See Appendix H
\textsuperscript{21} See Appendix I
\textsuperscript{22} Rosenberg Self-Esteem Measure - see Appendix K
\textsuperscript{23} \url{http://www.crime-pics.co.uk}
\textsuperscript{24} See Appendix J
### Project Objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Quantitative Methods</th>
<th>Qualitative Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To reduce the number of returns to prison of this cohort in the first 12 weeks following release.</td>
<td>✓* ✓* ✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in ACE scores in cohort.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To facilitate access to positive employment outcomes.</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To afford opportunities for vocational training and work experience.</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To find and maintain settled accommodation.</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase self-esteem and confidence.</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase social and family reintegration.</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The CRIME-PICS II questionnaire forms part of the baseline and follow up questionnaires. This instrument has been found in previous studies to be related to reconviction (Raynor, 1998) and is hence useful as an early ‘proxy’ measure for reconviction rates.
3.2 Sample

From 1 July 2015 to 31 March 2016, 294 (79%) of the 370 offenders identified as eligible for Reset were approached to take part. While PBNI recorded that 196 initially engaged with mentors, 10 were excluded from analyses leaving a total of 186 (63.3% of those approached) participants.

Mentee Profile

Table 1 shows the profile of those who participated on Reset. While only five out of the 186 Mentees were women, only 9 eligible females were released from prison during the evaluation period.

Table 1
Reset Participant Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age on Release</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 29</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>97.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk of Serious Harm (ROSH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>81.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing Offending in Partnership (ROP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>90.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydebank Wood</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maghaberry</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magilligan</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE Risk of Reoffending on Release</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Post Custody Licence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCS</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECS</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB License</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inescapable Voluntary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life License</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offender License</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By March 31, 2016

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Still active on Reset</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Reset</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recalled to custody</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25 Reasons for exclusion included: not released from prison, deported, or moved out of Northern Ireland before engaging on the programme.
26 PBNI received funding in March 2016 to enable Reset to run for an additional three months. An additional 12 offenders participated in the programme. They have not included in this analysis.
27 Brings together PBNI, PSNI, NIPS and the Youth Justice Agency to tackle people who regularly commit crime and who impact most upon the community. Yes means they are ROP status and no means they are not. Figures for ROP may not be complete.
28 Includes the following: Determinate Custodial Sentence (DCS), Extended Custodial Sentence (ECS), CPO, Inescapable Voluntary — (someone who voluntarily accepts PO supervision), and Life Licenses.
A statistically\(^{29}\) higher proportion of offenders who joined Reset had high ACE scores (69.9%) compared to the proportion of all offenders released who had high ACE scores (54.3%) suggesting that the programme appealed to those with more complex needs.

**Time in Custody**

Under two thirds of Mentees had been in prison for less than two years (Table 2); four participants had been given a life sentence and on release would be subject to PO supervision. The average time spent in custody (excluding those on life license) was 25 months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time in custody</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year or less</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 1 and 2 years</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2+ years</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>97.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life sentence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Most Recent Offence Type**

Table 3 shows that the most common offence committed by Mentees of all ages was ‘Violence against the person’. This was followed by ‘Robbery’ and ‘Burglary’ for those aged under 30 and crimes defined as ‘Sexual’ for those aged over 30.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence by Age Group</th>
<th>18 to 29</th>
<th>30+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violence against the person</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Damage</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession of Weapons</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Order</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motoring</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{29}\) A chi-square test of independence was performed and the relationship between ACE score and Reset participation was significant, \(X^2(1, N=359), p<0.001\).
3.3 Programme Delivery

Over two thirds of Mentees reported finding out about the programme directly from NIACRO staff (Mentors). The Reset model was that PBNI provided NIACRO with the names of all those eligible for the project and Mentors approached these people in prison up to four weeks prior to release. Consent and referral forms, as well as the baseline questionnaire were completed at this stage. Participation was on a voluntary basis. Given desistance theory this was regarded as critical.

Reasons for participation
Mentees reported multiple reasons for taking part in Reset (Table 4) suggesting that the programme was able to help them access a number of services thereby broadening its appeal. Getting ‘Support with Employment/Training’, followed by ‘Support with Housing’ and ‘Help with Practical Issues’ were the most popular reasons for participation. Almost one third of Mentees stated they had taken part for ‘Other’ reasons which included getting help with benefits and issues with disclosure.

Frequency of contact
The logs showed that Mentors kept in frequent contact with Mentees both in person and by phone/text, recording an average of 3.1 contacts per week per Mentee. Contacts lasted an average of 27 minutes and 98% lasted an hour or less. Contact on day of release however would have been prolonged, lasting for a number of hours. The majority of Mentees (93.5%) agreed they could get in touch with their Mentor whenever they needed (Source: Exit Questionnaire, n=62).

Programme duration
Over 70% of Mentees who successfully completed Reset spent between two and three months on the programme. The average length of time, calculated from the day of release to the day of completion as

Table 4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why did you decide to take part in the Mentoring Programme?</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support with Housing</td>
<td>65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support with Employment/Training</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help with Keeping Appointments</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone to Talk to</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help with Practical Issues</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support with Alcohol/Drugs</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Baseline Questionnaire (n=170)

Table 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time spent on Reset after release from custody (Source: Mentor logs n=122)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 60 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 90 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 90 Days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30 Median
indicated by the Mentor, was 81 days. This was higher than the retention rates reported in a recent review of two informal mentoring schemes in England\textsuperscript{31} where an average of 62% of mentoring relationships lasted less than a month.

**Activities**

Mentees generally found the activities they undertook with their Mentor to be worthwhile, and logs and case closure questionnaires showed that undertaken activities matched Mentees’ reasons for taking part.

The logs showed that the most frequently stated reason for contact between Mentors and Mentees was described as “Just checking in” although, Mentors often identified more than one reasons for contact. The most frequently stated included:

1. Probation/Police/Courts/Justice
2. Arranging a meeting
3. Accommodation
4. Advice/Benefits
5. Health

Chart 1 shows the amount of time that Mentors spent assisting Mentees with various activities, many of which provided practical support.

**Chart 1**

Amount of time Mentors reported spending on activities - % of Mentees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>No time/Not relevant</th>
<th>Very little time</th>
<th>Some time</th>
<th>A large proportion of time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completing paperwork</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying for benefits</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelling to appointments</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping with stress/anxiety</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding things to occupy mentee’s time</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding work</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding accommodation</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organising appointments</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting GP/obtaining scrips</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying for training/education</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Limitations

The following limitations should be kept in mind when reading this report:

- Participation on Reset was on a voluntary self-selection basis. There is the potential therefore that the cohort consists of a more motivated group of individuals with a greater desire to stop reoffending.

- While 186 participants took part in Reset, exit questionnaires (n=62), Mentor case closure questionnaires (n=89) and PO case closure questionnaires (n=17) were returned for subsets of these individuals.

- Efforts were made to obtain control data but time constraints mean that it has not been possible to include in this report. Progress regarding outcomes has therefore been identified using pre and post Reset data along with qualitative information. It cannot be categorically said however that if a change occurs with these measures that it is because of Reset alone as other factors may also influence outcomes.
4. Outcomes

4.1 Recall Rates

Reducing the number of returns to prison during the first 12 weeks following release was one of the key objectives of Reset and both quantitative and qualitative evidence suggests that it is being achieved. Table 6 shows the recall rates for both DCS and ECS offenders were approximately 60% lower than the respective rates for recall prior to the introduction of the Reset programme (DCS, 11% with Reset and 28% prior to Reset introduction; ECS, 28% with Reset and 72% prior to Reset introduction1,2. As previously stated efforts were made to obtain control data but given time constraints this information is not available for this report. There was a general consensus during the focus groups and interviews however that Reset was impacting on recall and Mentees felt that their Mentors had helped them a lot with this challenging aspect.

Table 6
Profile of Recalled Mentees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Recalled (n=23)</th>
<th>Non-recalled (n=163)</th>
<th>Total (n=186)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at Release</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE Risk of Reoffending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCS</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB License</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sentence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offender License</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Recall rates of 28% for DCS and 72% for ECS are from 2008 to 31 January 2014.
2Reset recall rates of 11% for DCS and 28% for ECS are in respect of the Reset mentoring period of 12 weeks.
Time in the Community

For the 23 Mentees who were recalled, 39.1% were recalled within the first 30 days and 47.8% were recalled between 30 and 60 days. The average time this group spent in the community was 39 days. Many felt that Reset had enabled individuals to remain out of prison for longer than had been expected.

“We’ve had several clients who were involved in Reset. Two who we thought would be recalled sooner they lasted a bit longer.” PBNI Manager

Those clients who I had expected to be recalled very quickly were able to stay out longer and one in particular has been able to find his own accommodation and is working. Given his history this has been quite an achievement and a credit to Reset.” NIPS

It was also reported that Mentor input had been valued even though the Mentee had been recalled.

“It’s focused more on the person’s needs, and less on licence compliance. All the prisoners I spoke to on recall were very positive about the service, even when negative about Probation.” NIPS

Attitudes towards offending

Mentee attitudes towards offending were also collected using Crime Pics II, a 35 item structured questionnaire which measures changes across five scales. This instrument has been found in previous studies to be statistically correlated with reconviction32,33. Within the context of Reset, the questionnaire was used as an evaluative measure, assessing Mentees’ pro-criminal attitudes at the pre-release stage (before mentoring) and again following completion of Reset. The difference between the two measures was used to indicate the impact of Reset on Mentee attitudes to offending. A reduction in score suggests a reduction in pro-criminal attitudes.

There was a reduction of the average score across all scales (Table 8) indicating Reset had an effect in reducing pro-criminal attitudes for Mentees. What’s more, the change in four of the scales (G, A, V and E) was statistically significant34, meaning the probability that the change in score was due to chance was small (less than 5 in 100 (5%)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time in the Community on Reset for recalled offenders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 60 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 – 90 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33 http://www.crime-pics.co.uk/publications.html
34 A paired sample t-test was used to look at whether there was any statistically significant difference between the pre and post mean score on each scale.
**Change was statistically significant, p<.05. (Source: Baseline and Exit Questionnaires)**

**Number of Previous Convictions**

The number of previous convictions for recalled Mentees ranged from 9 to 265 with an average of 63.5. The number of previous times in custody ranged from 2 to 39 with an average of 10.2. Comparative information was unavailable for non-recalled Reset participants.

**Baseline Offence**

Table 9 shows that, for recalled participants, the most common type of baseline offence was Burglary (26.1%; comparative figure for non-recalled participants, 6.5%). This is in line with research on reoffending in adults and youths released from prison in Northern Ireland in 2012/13 which found the highest reoffending rates occurred for those whose baseline offence was Burglary. The most common cause for recall was further offending or breach of licence conditions.

---

**Table 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Pics II</th>
<th>Pre-Release</th>
<th>Post-Reset</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G: General attitude to offending</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>31.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Anticipation of reoffending</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>9.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V: Victim hurt denial</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: Evaluation of crime as worthwhile</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>8.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P: Perception of current life Problems</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Change was statistically significant, p<.05. (Source: Baseline and Exit Questionnaires)

---

35 A low score indicates that the individual believes that an offending lifestyle is not desirable.

36 A low score indicates that the individual does not anticipate reoffending.

37 A low score indicates that the individual recognises their actions impact on victims, either directly or indirectly.

38 A low score indicates that the individual perceives the cost of crime as being greater than its rewards.

39 The higher the score, the greater the number and gravity of identified problems.

40 Baseline Offence refers to the most recent offence. Where more than one offence occurs, the most significant offence is selected. This will generally be the disposal considered to attract the highest penalty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline Offence</th>
<th>Recalled Count</th>
<th>Recalled %</th>
<th>Non-recalled Count</th>
<th>Non-recalled %</th>
<th>Total Count</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violence against the person</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Damage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession of Weapons</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Order</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motoring</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Accommodation Status**

The majority of recalled Mentees (70%) were living in a hostel at the time of recall. While not directly comparable, approximately 46% of those who successfully completed Reset reported they were currently living in temporary accommodation (Source: Exit questionnaire, n=61). This is interesting given that recent research\(^{42}\) found that temporary accommodation on release was one of the significant, predictive indicators of recall in young males.

It was suggested that Mentees released to their own homes tended to do better.

\(^{42}\) Maguire, C. September 2015. *Resettlement Outcomes for 18-21 Year Old Males in Northern Ireland*. Faculty of Social Sciences, Ulster University.
**4.2 ACE Scores**

A reduction in ACE scores was one of the objectives of the Reset programme. At an overall level there was a statistically significant decrease between pre and post (approximately 12 weeks following release) Reset ACE scores among those who successfully completed the programme (n=81, p<0.05). Differences were most notable in high ACE Mentees who saw their post-Reset ACE score decrease by an average of 2.1 points (or 5%), a small but statistically significant decrease (n=57, p<.05). Mentees who had a medium ACE score on release saw no significant change.

**Chart 2**

*Pre and post ACE scores for Reset participants and control group*

![Chart showing pre and post ACE scores](image)

*Statistically significant decrease [p<0.05]*

The general feeling across all groups providing input to the evaluation was that the 12 week period was too short to see a measurable change, given the high risk levels, previous convictions and previous periods spent in custody of the Mentees.

“But the hope of the Probation Officers, because clients are high risk, is to maintain, rather than decrease ACE scores in the initial weeks post release given all the challenges the clients face. No change in ACE scores is seen as a positive outcome at that early stage. Review at 26 weeks is more realistic.” PBNI Stakeholder

There was some discussion by POs regarding whether Reset could impact ACE, and while some thought it could, others disagreed.

“The ACE score is completely separate. It’s outside anything Reset can have an effect on – Reset deals with transport, GP, benefits – helpful but not reflected in ACE.” PO

“I disagree – all the things Reset does reduces frustrations – this is reflected in ACE – it’s a holistic assessment.” PO
A reduction in ACE score for high risk offenders, though modest, perhaps does reflect one of the most valuable aspects of the Reset programme – that of providing a strong hand of support when frustrations are at their highest.

### 4.3 Self-Esteem and Confidence

Increasing confidence and self-esteem were further Reset objectives due to their impact on the likelihood of reoffending. Mentees were asked, in both the baseline and exit questionnaires, to reflect on their current feelings about their self-esteem by scoring themselves on a ten-item Likert type scale. Scores were totalled and the higher the score, the higher an individual’s self-esteem.

**Table 10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rosenberg Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Pre-Reset</th>
<th>Post-Reset</th>
<th>% increase</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>18.7*</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Exit Questionnaire (n=58)

*Statistically significant increase (p<0.05)

The average score increased from 16.8 pre-Reset to 18.7 post-Reset; an increase of 11.3% (Table 10). This, along with the fact that 68.8% agreed that taking part in Reset had helped increase their confidence (Source: Exit Questionnaire, n=61), suggests the mentoring process helped improve Mentee confidence and self-esteem.

In addition, Mentors reported that 85.7% of their non-recalled Mentees had made at least ‘Some’ progress towards gaining self-confidence and self-esteem since release from prison (Chart 3).

**Chart 3**

**Progress made towards gaining self-esteem and self-confidence - % of mentees**

Source: Mentor Case Closure Questionnaire (n=70)

Moreover, there was unanimous agreement across the focus groups and interviews that this objective had been achieved.

---

“When a client first comes out they are a bit nervous, they see a massive cliff in front of them and a few months down the line you can see they can do things they would never have been able to do when first released.” Mentor

“The Mentor, through raising self-esteem, has enabled people to become motivated and remain in the community longer. Makes them feel more in control and able to see how they will survive this time.” PBNI Manager

“Increased self-esteem. A lot of them coming out were concerned that they had no connection to anyone anymore — they didn’t feel judged and got both practical and emotional support with the Mentor. Having somebody walking beside them in those first few weeks buoyed them.” PBNI Manager

“All Mentees moved some way to increasing their self-esteem and confidence. For example, one of our Mentees was interviewed on stage at a cross-border event in November. He displayed great confidence.” NIACRO

“I have seen benefits to Mentees in terms of their personal confidence and resilience in dealing with challenges which might otherwise have seen them back in custody.” PO

4.4 Accommodation

It was reported that the objective of finding and maintaining accommodation was a challenging area, taking up a large amount of the Mentors’ time. Over half of Mentees (50.8%) however had secured permanent accommodation by the end of the mentoring process (Source: Exit Questionnaire, n=61).

Reported difficulties included arrangements made pre-release (e.g. staying with a relative) didn’t always materialise, and release at times was too last minute to enable arrangements to be put in place. The general consensus, however, was that Reset was positively impacting on this area with Mentors helping to secure accommodation as well as providing support with practicalities such as moving, decorating, purchasing household items, accessing grants, and with maintaining their homes.

“I had one client who was having relationship issues and was going to move out of the house he shared with his girlfriend — he called his Mentor and said he needed accommodation sorted. The Mentor was able to talk to him, calm the situation down and resolve the situation over the weekend.” PO

Housing needs were often complex and it was suggested referrals needed to be made more than four weeks prior to release. Similarly, while the partnership with Housing Rights was reported as having been very successful, it was suggested that, going forward, contact be made with them at an earlier stage, e.g. eight to ten weeks pre-release. Release without accommodation in place was seen as a barrier for Mentees to move on and one stakeholder suggested that “accommodation arrangements being in place” should be a condition of release.
Facilitating access to positive employment outcomes and affording opportunities for vocational training and work experience were two further Reset objectives. While the general consensus was that getting the basics in place (e.g. arranging benefits and accommodation, addressing mental health issues etc.) was the priority for Mentees and the majority just weren’t ready to consider employment or training during the first 12 weeks following release, some progress was reported and examples of vocational training/work experience were provided.

“Most clients feel overwhelmed when they are released and need time to settle. They are not ready to think about employment.” Mentor

“At the start it’s all about settling and stabilising the client’s life. There’s accountability and the risks need to be addressed before considering employment.” PO

“Helped me to continue my creative writing through the IT department in NIACRO.” Mentee

“Funding for training would be helpful. One of my clients couldn’t get access to a course because of funding and by the time he heard that he could have funding the course was full up.” Mentor

Over a fifth of Mentees (21.0%) were in some form of employment (either full-time or part-time) by the end of the mentoring process and 10% were in some form of education or training (either full time or part time). (Source: Exit Questionnaire, n=60)

Mentors also reported that just over a third of their non-recalled Mentees had made at least ‘Some’ progress towards finding work and starting training or education, and that five Mentees had started a volunteer position. (Chart 4)

Chart 4
Progress made towards finding work and starting education/training - % of mentees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding work</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>A little bit</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>A lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Starting training/education</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>A little bit</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>A lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Mentor Case Closure Questionnaire (n=70)

To help further with this objective NIACRO held an initiative which brought employees and Mentees together.
4.6 Social and Family Integration

Not everybody required support with family or social integration but the general consensus was that, when it was needed, Reset had helped. Just over 60% of Mentees said Reset helped them integrate back with their family (Source: Exit Questionnaire, n=58) and Mentors reported that over 75% of their non-recalled Mentees had made at least some progress towards building family relationships (Chart 5). Mentees spoke of the practical aspects such as lifts to visit family members while Mentors discussed a mediatory role helping families see the positive changes Mentees had made since release. Reset also helped with issues relating to access to children (or if the Mentee had siblings under 18) through referrals to Barnardos.

Overall, 70.5% of Mentees agreed Reset helped them integrate back into their community. (Source: Exit Questionnaire, n=61), something seen as particularly helpful to those who had been in prison for a long time.

“If you're in prison for some time it's like you are Tarzan in the city. You can't even cross the road. The confidence they give you. Times have changed.” Mentee

Chart 5 shows that Mentors reported that at least 75% of their non-recalled Mentees had made at least ‘Some’ progress towards integrating into a community. They also said they could see social integration happening over time, particularly for those with placements or voluntary work, who started to feel they were ‘fitting in’.

**Chart 5**
Progress made towards building family and community relationships - % of mentees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>A little bit</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>A lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building family relationships</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating into a community</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Case Closure Questionnaire (n=70)

Stakeholders also felt that this objective was being achieved.

“Mentees say ‘People don’t accept me, but the Mentor accepted me’. This has really helped with integration.” PBNI Stakeholder

“Support services which have assisted the Mentees in their integration back into the community.” PSNI
4.7 Estimated Financial Savings

This aspect of the evaluation provides an estimate of the financial savings due to the reduction in recall rate. It is meant only as a guide. There will be other factors involved that have not been taken in to consideration and so it should be used accordingly. The following steps were taken:

Step 1 – Estimate the financial costs per recall per offender

PSNI, Parole Commissioner and Prison costs have been included. Costs to the offender and the offender’s family (lost earnings), costs to the victims and the community and PBNI and staff costs have not been included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Cost</th>
<th>Cost per Recall</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSNI costs</td>
<td>£217.50</td>
<td>Hourly cost of a PSNI Constable is £43.50 and it is estimated that a typical recall including arrest, transfer to Prison and booking in/admin takes 5 hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole Commissioner NI costs</td>
<td>£1,597</td>
<td>Recalled offenders are referred to the Parole Commissioner where the process depends on licence status -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>For DCS:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A Parole Commissioner will be appointed to consider the case and will either -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Direct release;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Not direct release;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Refer matter to a panel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>For Life, ICS and ECS:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A Parole Commissioner will be appointed to consider the case and will either -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provisionally direct release. A panel of three Commissioners will then consider case and make a decision on whether the prisoner should be released or not. If the decision is not to release, the panel will normally recommend a review period. If the decision is for release, the panel will recommend licence conditions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provisionally direct not to release. The prisoner can then decide whether they want their case to be considered by a panel of three Commissioners who will make a decision set out above. These prisoners have a right to an oral hearing;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provisionally direct that the case should be considered by a panel of three Commissioners who will make a decision as set out above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The costs are:
- £180 for a summary recall;
- £718 for consideration by a single Commissioner;
- £1,045 for consideration of a DCS re-referral (panel of two);
- £1,404 for consideration by a panel of three (ECS/ICS).

Depending on the circumstances the costs therefore range from £898 up to £2,302 per case.

We have calculated an average cost based on the offenders who were recalled during Reset, 17 of whom were DCS and 5 were ECS. If we assume half of the DCS went to panel (£180+£718+£1,045=£1,943)
and the other half didn't ((£180+£718=£898) and that all the ECS were considered by three panel members at a cost of (£180+£718+£1,404=£2,302) then the average is (£1,943*8)+(£898*9)+(£2302*5)/22 = £1,597.

| Weekly Prison costs | £1,123 per week | £58,387 per prisoner place per year. The weekly cost has been calculated by dividing by 52. |

**Step 2 – Reset cost versus recall cost**

Reset had a total budget of £472,000 (including project development and evaluation costs) and 186 offenders fully engaged. The cost per offender has been calculated to be £2,538 (£472,000/186). Note this figure will be slightly higher than the actual cost as it includes development and evaluation costs. If we assume that all participants take part for 12 weeks then the cost per Mentee per week was £212. The table below compares the Reset cost per Mentee for 1, 2, 4, 8, 12 and 18 weeks with the cost per recalled offender for the same time periods:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of weeks</th>
<th>Reset cost per Mentee</th>
<th>Cost per recalled offender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>£212</td>
<td>£2,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>£424</td>
<td>£4,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>£848</td>
<td>£6,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>£1,696</td>
<td>£10,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>£2,544</td>
<td>£15,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>£3,816</td>
<td>£22,029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 4.8 Extent of Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in recall rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in ACE Scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate access to positive employment outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording opportunities for vocational training and work experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding and maintaining settled accommodation/sustained tenancies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased self-esteem and confidence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evidence of Progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Evidence of Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative¹</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Red circle: Indicates no evidence
- Orange circle: Indicates some evidence
- Green circle: Indicates a lot of evidence

¹ Note: Quantitative evidence is qualitative in nature.
4.9 Overall

The general consensus among all evaluation participants was that Reset is a highly worthwhile and effective programme which they very much hope continues. Mentees themselves were enthusiastic about the programme; 90.3% were satisfied with the support they received from taking part and 95.2% would recommend Reset to someone else. (Source: Exit Questionnaire, n=62).

Mentees were asked to give three words to describe Reset, and the sentiment expressed about their experience was positive. The word cloud gives greater prominence to words that appeared more frequently; 81.7% of the words had a positive sentiment, 6.7% were neutral while 11.7% were negative.

How would you describe Reset?

Source: Exit Questionnaire, n=62.
5 Overall

This chapter provides an overview of the benefits of Reset to Mentees, aspects of the programme that worked well, challenges faced and suggestions going forward.

5.1 Mentee Benefits

A number of benefits outside those identified in Chapter 4 were highlighted during the evaluation and are detailed below:

**Practical support**

Accessing critical services on release was reported to be immensely challenging and frustrating for Mentees due to bureaucracy, disorganisation, waiting times (particularly for mental health provision) and a perceived lack of sympathy by some. Participants across a number of the evaluation activities questioned why it was not currently possible to have these basics in place prior to release given the difference that this would make. This is in line with the findings of a recent research paper which recommended that all women leaving custody should be registered with a GP and if required have mental health support services in place. It also recommended a need for a DOJ and DSD partnership to consider accommodation needs for women leaving custody. The fact, therefore, that Reset provided Mentees with ongoing practical support and assistance with a range of services (e.g. securing housing, accessing benefits and health care, obtaining ID, help with keeping appointments, familiarity when relocated to new areas) was seen as a particular strength of the programme.

“They help you sort the paperwork because it would melt your head. If you’re skint, what are you going to do. If the paperwork is messed you about, what would you do?”

“We need to be armed with support for drug/alcohol addiction services before the Mentees are released into hostels. We need something we can signpost the Mentee to quickly. Sometimes they can’t even get access to a GP or their own prescriptions, never mind support services, when released.”

“Just knowing that you are there makes an enormous difference to the mentee. It helps them relax. Whether it’s an appointment with the Housing Executive or for a Job Interview, it reassures them. It gives them increased confidence.”

“I help the client make a list of the things they want to say to the GP. The doctor’s in a hurry and it’s too easy to get brushed off. When I went with the Mentee and to their appointment I helped the doctor to listen to what the Mentee was actually saying.”

44 O’Neill J. 2015 Time After Time — A Study of Women’s Transition from Custody.
The integration of Housing Rights and the Barnardo’s Parenting Programme within Reset was valued and it was suggested that further services, especially those related to mental health, should also be included.

“Access to services like Housing Rights has been a real time saver. One of my clients was in a really confusing situation, they would have never been able to sort out on their own and I couldn’t understand at all. Housing Rights were able to sort it all out for them and work out what the client actually owed.”

Mentor

“It offered an opportunity for me to work with clients beyond their release date for the first time. It was reassuring to know that the aspects of a client’s post release needs, which I wasn’t already addressing, were being dealt with, without the need for me to make multiple support referrals. It was helpful to have a Mentor on call to link in with a client, as they already had developed a level of trust with the person.”

Housing Rights

“The extra support and element of hope offered helps clients get over the challenging issues they are presented with. For example, the pilot with Barnado’s has given parents (or expectant parents/step-parents) extra support. Barnardo’s have said that a lot of the people they worked with from the programme did not have access to their children.”

PBNI Stakeholder

Emotional support

Having somebody ‘there’, to talk to and build relationships with was seen as a benefit to all Mentees but particularly those who were isolated or had no family support.

“For those convicted of sexual offences, they feel isolated coming out of custody. Having someone not like a PO – to provide additional support, accompany them to appointments, to the GP, to provide practical support was invaluable.”

PBNI Manager

“The relationship between worker & client appears to have been very motivating. Clients with poor family support, mental health problems and addictions appear to have particularly valued and appreciated the support.”

NIPS

Meeting at the gate

The benefits of meeting Mentees at the prison gate on the day of release were highlighted across the evaluation although one of the stakeholders questioned whether collection was necessary for everyone.

“Picking people up at the gate, taking them to appointments, its practical help. Some people won’t need and that’s nice but not everyone has the support of family and friends when they get out. Offering a lift from the gate to their accommodation, saves someone getting off at the train station and heading straight for the pub.”

PO

“From the PO point of view, for chaotic releases, the fact someone was able to meet them and take them to their first appointment – they didn’t have to worry about that first appointment or getting to their accommodation. It helped the stress of the POs dealing with those releases and trying to help with those issues too.”

PBNI Manager

“Consider should we always be collecting people at the prison gate? Is this a useful way to use resources? Perhaps in some cases but not all. Sometimes the two hour car journey helps form a relationship. In some cases the mentor could just collect them off the train”.

PBNI Stakeholder
Intensive nature of the programme

The intensive support provided by the programme following release was seen as highly effective. It offered stability which was important early post-release when Mentees could become overwhelmed by appointments and getting the basics put in place.

“The main benefits I have witnessed are in the transition from custody to the community - the Mentors provide a safety net in this high risk period in terms of recall.” PBNI

Encouraging Mentees to do things for themselves to ensure they coped when the intensive support finished was seen as important. It was reported that most Mentees coped well as Mentors planned and prepared them for independence.

“I see Reset as a pair of stabilisers on a bike – it’s there to help you get the hang of things and they come off to let you learn independence. Clients shouldn’t be spoon-fed – they’ll need intensive support in the first week but this isn’t sustainable in the long-term.” PO

“It’s always an ongoing challenge to promote independence as opposed to the opposite. NIACRO responded to this to make sure that it was done properly.” PBNI Stakeholder

A number of Mentees, however, said they would have benefitted from more end of programme preparation and further support once Reset finished.

Adaptive and flexible

Reset was described as adaptive and flexible to individual need, and the ability to respond to demands very quickly or without much notice, especially for those who were released at the last minute, worked well.

“Those who are released without notice – no warning. Reset was there for me on release. I hadn’t time to even think about it.” Mentee

“The mentors meet the prisoner and the first thing they do is get a coffee and talk about what they need. It’s a sort of crisis intervention and the steps they agree are all goal orientated.” PO

“The workers are very flexible and all requests from Probation were responded to, meaning clients left Prison with a very clear plan for the first few days/weeks.” NIPS

Having a single point of contact to co-ordinate the complex aspects of Mentees’ lives and the availability of support outside office hours were also valued. It was interesting to note, that, while Mentors were very flexible in the days and times they were available including evenings and weekends, they recorded in their logs that 95.4% of all contacts (face to face, telephone, text, email) occurred between Monday and Friday, and 89.7% between 9am and 5pm suggesting that just knowing a Mentor was available was enough for Mentees.

“I barely contact the Mentor because I try to do it myself – it’s good to have the option”. Mentee
5.2 What Worked Well

A number of positive aspects relating to the programme were highlighted during the evaluation. These included:

The Mentors

The vast majority of Mentees (96.8%) were happy with the Mentor to whom they were matched (Source: Exit Questionnaire, n=62) and there was high praise from participants across all of the evaluation activities. They were described as going above and beyond the requirements of their role. From the PO perspective, 94.1% were satisfied with the support Mentors offered Mentees (Source: PO case closure questionnaire, n=17). Mentors developed strong relationships with both Mentees and Probation staff and the fact that a number had previous experience in this area was also highly valued.

“One of the reasons it worked so well was because we had strong Mentors in place and they took to the programme very quickly. They were able to build strong relationships with both the Mentee and the Probation Officer. They were willing to go that extra mile and often above and beyond what was expected of them.” NIACRO

“My Mentor is great. He’s not judgmental in any way. He’s really easy going and easy to talk to. He’s always there to help. When I had an appointment with my drug addiction counsellor I wasn’t sure I’d be able to afford the taxi but my Mentor told me to give him a ring – he’s willing to help with anything if it keeps me out of prison.” Mentee

“The Mentors themselves are great and the feedback I’ve received from them has been very good. I really appreciate that communication.” PO

Mentors complemented the PO role

The Mentor role was seen as complementing that of the PO, ensuring Reset was not just a befriending service but related to risk management including supporting licence compliance.

“A lot of clients have huge demands because of their licensing conditions. The Mentor helps them manage demands as opposed to the Mentor being an extra demand on the client.” PBNI Stakeholder

“Supports resettlement but also helps to support licence compliance and an understanding of what service users need to do to comply with their licence.” PBNI Stakeholder

Mentors were reported to have a good understanding of risk management raising concerns with POs when necessary. The tripartite between the PO, Mentor and Mentee was viewed by some as critical. It was also reported that Mentors had contributed to a circle of support and accountability type model with POs ensuring work was linked to protecting and preventing victims.
“One Mentor rang me up and told me she thought a client was taking drugs – his speech was slurred and he wasn’t coherent. I asked to go and get him drug-tested and she did.” PO

“For one Mentor it was down to his experience of working with offenders and us in the past. He knew the importance of sharing information and passing info along and sharing concerns.” PBNI Manager

The benefit of the provision of ongoing practical support by Mentors was highlighted by a number of PBNI participants who said that this was an aspect that PBNI no longer had the time or resources to assist with; 88.2% of POs felt that Reset was at least ‘a little bit effective’ in supporting their work (Source: PO case closure questionnaire, n=17).

“By having a project like this there’s an acknowledgement that these cases are challenging for POs. Licences are hard in terms of resources. It’s difficult helping someone who has multiple issues and you may only see them once a week. It’s something well overdue that POs have a bit of support with these cases.” PBNI Manager

In addition, the flexibility that Reset offered, including weekend and evening availability, was seen as particularly helpful for POs. For example, clients released on Saturday would in recent years have had no support until Monday.

“They were responsive at the weekend. At the most chaotic and risky times – the weekend – there was someone there who was a positive role model and contact and who could get them through the weekend.” PBNI Manager

Both Mentors and POs highlighted the benefits of the more open nature of the Mentor/Mentee relationship and over three quarters of Mentees (77.6%) believed their PO and Mentor worked well together.

“We can then help explain the role of the Probation Officer and help them see straight – ‘It wasn’t the Probation Officer that put you back in, it was because you did this’. Then you can see the understanding and change in the client towards Probation.” Mentor

“There was one case of a guy who had gotten out of his approved accommodation and he had contacted his Mentor in the first instance and was able to discuss his licence without jeopardising himself. It’s having someone separate but who has that relationship. Things that the PO can’t do but that clients needs support with.” PBNI Manager

Co-operation and communication

At a management level there was excellent partnership working between PBNI and NIACRO, and indeed other partners at the monthly project board meeting, chaired by a PBNI senior manager. Outside of this forum there was frequent cooperation and collaboration between the PBNI project manager and NIACRO mentor coordinator, and any arising issues were dealt with swiftly and efficiently.
Operationally, co-operation between all parties was reported to be good, and several participants commented that the previous partnership working with NIACRO had given Reset a ‘head start’ as Mentors already had experience of working with POs. It was reported that while there had been some initial resistance from NIPS, this had disappeared when the benefits of the programme became evident. The benefits/success of Reset were also reported to have spread through word of mouth among prison in-mates encouraging participation.

“I believe the integration between PBNI, NIACRO and PSNI has worked really well. There was clear evidence of excellent partnership working from referrals by PSNI (ROU) to NIACRO and support offered to Prisoners prior to and upon release, ensuring they got the necessary support to desist from crime. Also the internal and external communication of the programme has been to a very high standard.”  PSNI

Given the number of organisations interfacing with Reset it was recognised that communication was going to be a challenge but the general consensus across evaluation participants was that it had worked well.

“The communication between PBNI and partners in particular NIACRO has worked well and this is the case right down to the Probation Officer-Mentor-Mentee communication and relationship.”  PBNI Stakeholder

Views from Probation staff regarding communication and Mentor feedback were mainly positive although some POs felt that it could be improved on occasion from some Mentors.

**Targeting the right group**

The fact that the programme ran across NI, offered through three prisons, so that every prisoner at risk could be offered the service was seen as working well and the general consensus across the evaluation was that the right clients were being targeted.

It was suggested during the PO focus group that some clients were potentially signing up to Reset because they felt that it looked good or would impact on their licence conditions if they didn’t rather than because they needed support. However it is likely these Mentees stayed engaged with the project as they were benefitting from it.

It was reported that evidence was now available regarding those most likely to reoffend, information that wasn’t available when Reset started. This included those entering temporary accommodation on release, high ACE, ROSH offenders, and those who had a previous burglary or robbery offence, and this information could be used going forward to target those most likely to benefit from Reset.
In the Reset refusal survey offered to offenders who declined to take part in Reset\textsuperscript{45}, just over half indicated they felt they “did not need Reset” but didn’t elaborate why. Others indicated they had a plan on release (17.3%), enough family support (15.4%), or didn’t want another organisation involved with them (13.5%).

**Mentee commitment**

Mentees were asked to rate their commitment to Reset. The majority (74.6%) said that it had been ‘Excellent’ or ‘Pretty good most of the time’. Those who said ‘Could have tried a lot harder’ or ‘OK but could have done better’ were asked to describe what was preventing them. The main reasons given related to problems with addiction and mental health.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentee Commitment</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent, gave my best effort</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretty good, most of the time</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK, but could have tried harder</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could have tried a lot harder</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Exit Questionnaire (n=59)

\textsuperscript{45} Source: Reset Refusal Feedback Form (n=75). 23 responses were excluded because the respondent was ineligible for Reset leaving a total of 52 valid responses.
5.3 Challenges

A number of challenges were highlighted during the evaluation some of which have been mentioned previously - bureaucracy and a lack of service provision (see page 33) and location of Magilligan. Additional challenges are detailed below:

- **Short lead-in time to establish Reset** - while challenging, delivery against this demanding timescale worked very well.

- **Short-term funding** - identifying the true impact of the programme in one year was seen as a challenge. Concerns were also raised regarding funding going forward and the impact on offenders if Reset was no longer available.
  
  “The limited timeframe of the programme and problems with future funding has not helped. Future planning is therefore a problem.” PSNI

- **Last minute nature of some releases** - made planning difficult although they had been facilitated as far as possible.

- **Raising unrealistic Mentee expectations** - Mentors said they’d had to deal with the after-effects of promises made to Mentees by POs at release which then did not materialise.
  
  “They say ‘we will put you up in a hostel in Belfast for four weeks, then you will be moved to Derry’. But it never happens and the Belfast hostel is maybe not even aware of the move to Derry. We have to deal with the promises that don’t materialise. The client gets angry. They have built all their hopes on the promise, they lose motivation and we have to stop them from throwing the head up. The inconsistent approach and misleading information leads to client motivation going down and they want to blame someone. They have built their goals on the misinformation.” Mentor

- **Potential risk to Mentors** – a number of stakeholders raised concerns regarding the potential risk to Mentors’ safety. These risks however were mitigated through online diaries and the lone worker personal security service Guardian 24.

- **Co-ordination** - reported to be difficult within the prisons.
  
  “It has been difficult to keep all the custodial and community supports in the loop, Reset, Community PO, Adept, NIACRO Employment and occasionally Housing First. Overlap in roles also to a small extent with Reset and Housing First.” NIPS

- **The process for Housing Rights referrals**
  
  “The referral process never really worked due to security restrictions, this caused at best long delays in referrals being received and at worst referrals not being received at all. The time scale was not long enough to effect positive change in a housing context. That being said I am continuing to work with most of my referrals after they ceased to be Reset clients and am starting to see outcomes now.” Housing Rights

- **Mentee licence conditions**
  
  “If Mentees’ risk increased, PBNI have to consider recall. This is a challenge as there are no steps between breaching a licence condition and being recalled. There’s no ‘step up’. It’s not allowed for legislatively. Licence conditions can sometimes be set up in a way that leads to failure e.g. an alcoholic has a ‘no alcohol’ condition on licence.” PBNI Stakeholder
5.4 Suggestions Going Forward

Evaluation participants were asked for ideas regarding how Reset would look going forward. An overview grouped into themes has been provided below. Some of the suggestions outlined may represent individual views only, so need to be considered in perspective.

Pre-release period

- Consider making Reset participation compulsory (although it is recognised that desistance theory emphasises the importance of voluntary participation);
- Ensure targeted clients actually need Reset support and use DOJ re-offending information to target those most at risk of reoffending;
- Ensure provision of pre-release contact with the Mentor occurs and consider extending from 4 to 6-8 weeks;
- Prior to release, NIPS to identify significant needs and put in place basics such as ID provision, securing permanent tenancies and registration with a GP;
- Test the validity of accommodation statements where appropriate. For example, if the Mentee says they are staying with their mother confirm with her by telephone;
- Review which Mentees require collection at the prison gate.

Level of Mentor contact

- Allow Mentors and POs to judge how often to see Mentees during the first week (currently daily);
- Match the level of contact with Mentees to the level of risk.

Programme Duration

- Base programme duration on need as some Mentees will require less than 12 weeks while others will require more;
- Base programme duration on the length of time Mentees have been in prison e.g. the longer the sentence the longer the programme;
- Offer the programme for six months (potentially with support from volunteers) although not necessarily at the same intensity as the first 12 weeks.

Increased PO input

- Ensure a three-way conversation takes place between the Mentee, PO and Mentor 6 weeks into the programme;
- Have a formally built-in review with POs at 6 to 8 weeks to look at the exit plan;
- Provide input into the activities undertaken by ROSH Mentees with their Mentors to determine suitability.
Communication and co-ordination

- More co-ordination between initiatives such as Reset and Access to Employment, as referring clients to more than one at a time is potentially overwhelming;
- Provide a linkage between the Benefits Office and Probation;
- Provide prison based Probation staff with information regarding when the initial approach has been made, the outcome, when the support in the community ends and how the prisoner has responded to the support. In addition more information regarding why people did not want to engage with Reset would be helpful.

For Mentees

- Provide a discretionary fund for Mentees for training etc;
- Consider a certificate for programme completion;
- Introduce a drop-in centre style peer support group for Mentees or some type of social scheme to enable them get out and about;
- Include volunteer support at the end of Reset;
- Involve Mentees in the design of any amended programme.

The Mentor Role

Mentors made several suggestions relating to their role including:

- Use of smart phones instead of lap tops to enable easy access to information required by Mentees when out and about;
- Monthly team meetings to enable more knowledge sharing;
- All prison work carried out by a central co-ordination team.

Housing Rights Suggestions

Representatives from Housing Rights made several suggestions including:

- Better referral procedure and more information provided at the time of referral;
- Earlier identification of intention to engage with the project and longer time frame of engagement;
- Closer liaison with other third sector agencies to achieve common goals and agree parameters as well as ensuring full awareness of what already exists to avoid duplication.
**APPENDIX A**

**Roles and Procedures**

PBN I will provide NIACRO with potential Mentee list each **Tuesday**.

Reset Co-ordinator will **allocate new potential work/referrals to Mentors within 2 working days** of being received.

**Criterion for Reset**
High/Medium ACE, on Post Custody Supervision and due for release from 1st July 2015 – end of February 2016.

Mentor to check with Prison Admin that they are receiving the correct **PIMS REFERRAL NUMBER and Date of Birth that relates to current order and CED**

Referrals to Reset can also be made/suggested by Mentees, Prison/Community Probation Officers and all Prison based staff.

The **Prison Probation Officer** will inform Community Probation Officer and record in PRISM/PIMs if Mentee has engaged or declined Reset.

The **Reset Mentors** who has a direct prison role will complete the **referral form, baseline questionnaire and Mentee consent form** (pre release) and forward to PBNI within 2 days. Cases will be considered as engagements from date of completion. They will also inform Prison PO, for PRISM/PIMs entry, when any Mentee has declined or engaged with Reset.

The **Prison Probation Officer** will inform Community Probation Officer and record in PRI SM/PIMs if Mentee has engaged or declined Reset.

**Mentors** will approach potential Mentees/referrals **within 2 working days** - a minimum of 4 weeks in advance of release.

Mentors will approach potential Mentees/referrals **within 2 working days** - a minimum of 4 weeks in advance of release.

The **Reset Mentors** who has a direct prison role will complete the **referral form, baseline questionnaire and Mentee consent form** (pre release) and forward to PBNI within 2 days. Cases will be considered as engagements from date of completion. They will also inform Prison PO, for PRISM/PIMs entry, when any Mentee has declined or engaged with Reset.

Referrals to Reset can also be made/suggested by Mentees, Prison/Community Probation Officers and all Prison based staff.

**Mentors** will approach potential Mentees/referrals **within 2 working days** - a minimum of 4 weeks in advance of release.

The **Reset Mentors** who has a direct prison role will complete the **referral form, baseline questionnaire and Mentee consent form** (pre release) and forward to PBNI within 2 days. Cases will be considered as engagements from date of completion. They will also inform Prison PO, for PRISM/PIMs entry, when any Mentee has declined or engaged with Reset.

**Mentors** will check with Prison Admin that they are receiving the correct **PIMS REFERRAL NUMBER and Date of Birth that relates to current order and CED**

Referrals to Reset can also be made/suggested by Mentees, Prison/Community Probation Officers and all Prison based staff.

The **Prison Probation Officer** will inform Community Probation Officer and record in PRISM/PIMs if Mentee has engaged or declined Reset.

The **Reset Mentors** who has a direct prison role will complete the **referral form, baseline questionnaire and Mentee consent form** (pre release) and forward to PBNI within 2 days. Cases will be considered as engagements from date of completion. They will also inform Prison PO, for PRISM/PIMs entry, when any Mentee has declined or engaged with Reset.

The **Prison Probation Officer** will inform Community Probation Officer and record in PRISM/PIMs if Mentee has engaged or declined Reset.

The **Reset Mentors** who has a direct prison role will complete the **referral form, baseline questionnaire and Mentee consent form** (pre release) and forward to PBNI within 2 days. Cases will be considered as engagements from date of completion. They will also inform Prison PO, for PRISM/PIMs entry, when any Mentee has declined or engaged with Reset.

Volunteers will be allocated to some Reset cases.

Mentors will forward Mentor logs to PBNI on a **weekly basis** and ensure recording is accurate/up to date.

The **Reset Co-ordinator** will provide weekly reports to PBNI (Tuesday) outlining new/total approaches/new starts and current caseload.

The community PO will inform Reset Manager should any Recall occur.

The **PO will complete the Reset exit questionnaire with the Mentee immediately after they have completed Reset and review ACE** (to inform formal project evaluation).

PBN I Community PO will arrange a **tripartite including Mentor either pre release (during home leaves etc) or asap after release** to clarify roles/information sharing/communication etc. This may also include other providers ie hostels/start 360.

Mentors will email PO brief summary within 2 days of each Mentee contact. Any urgent /risk issues will be communicated to PO immediately.
# APPENDIX B

## Referral Form

### Reset

**Intensive Rehabilitation and Resettlement Project**

*Official Sensitive when completed*

### Mentee Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>PBNI PIMS Referral Number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>DOB/Age:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Telephone Number(s)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sentence Details/Additional Licence Requirements:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order Type:</th>
<th>ACE Score:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High/Medium:</th>
<th>ROD:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROP:</th>
<th>PPN:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Release Date:</th>
<th>Has this case been recalled?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expected PCNI Decision date:**

**Referring PO:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PO/Referrer Email</th>
<th>Referrer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Telephone No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Type of activity to be undertaken with Mentor?**

- [ ] Employment/Education/Training
- [ ] Assistance with Accommodation
- [ ] Debt/money management/ Benefits
- [ ] Assistance with Literacy
- [ ] Befriending/Social Isolation
- [ ] Support with relationships/Children
- [ ] Support with substance abuse issues
- [ ] Assistance with forms and appointments
- [ ] Sporting Activities
- [ ] Health issues

**Other:**

*N.B.:* Reset is available to all those Medium/High ACE clients released on post custody supervision

When complete, please email this referral form to gareth.eametta@NIACRO.xjrm.net, NIACRO Mentor Coordinator

Please ensure that a secure email is used.
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### Reset

**Referral/Registration Form**

**Intensive Rehabilitation and Resettlement Project**

**Official Sensitive when completed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please provide any relevant information including current offence/other relevant: i.e. SOPO Conditions; PPAR level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there any particular safety concerns or limitations that the Co-ordinator/Mentor should be aware of? Including <em>under threat</em> issues.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is this person currently involved with any specific services in Prison (or release) i.e. Housing Rights; Start 360, Adept, Barnardo’s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is this person a parent, expectant parent, step-parent, or living with sibling under 18. Would they be interested in working with Barnardo’s - Please contact Charmaine 07834150066</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Issues: please provide any appropriate information (e.g. Section 75)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there any physical, medical or mental health issues that the mentor should be aware of in relation to their role with this offender? Including relevant medication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_I have spoken to this client and they have confirmed they wish to engage with Reset._

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referrer Signature:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When complete, please email this referral form to gareth.eanettt@niacro.cism.net, NIACRO Mentor Co-ordinator.

Please ensure that a secure email is used.

---
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APPENDIX C

Mentee Interview Schedule

Welcome
Interviewer and note taker introductions.

Why are we here?
You have been taking part in the Reset custody Mentoring programme. We have been asked to find out how the programme is working and how well it is helping people.

We are very keen to hear your views and opinions about the programme so today we will be asking you some questions to find out how useful you found it, what you think could be improved and the difference (if any) the programme has made to you.

It will take about half an hour. Will this be all right for you?

We will talk fairly informally and it is up to you how much you want to say about things. **We do need to let you know before we start that if you say anything during the session which indicates you, or anyone else's safety is at risk, we will have to pass the information on. Are you ok with that?**

What will we do with the data?
[____] will be taking notes and we will write a report on the Reset programme at the end of November which will include the views and opinions of many of the people who have been involved.

This report may include some of the things you say today however it will be anonymous. We will remove all names and other identifying details so those reading the report will not be able to tell it is you.

Have you any questions?

Are you ok to begin?

**Awareness:**
- How did you find out about Reset? Who told you about it?

**Purpose:**
- Why do you think the Reset programme exists? What is it for?

**What they wanted from it:**
- What did you think the programme was going to be like? [Prompt: Why did you sign up to do it? What did you think that you would get out of it?] Did the programme provide this?
- Have you ever done anything like this before? [Prompt: How does it compare?]
- Was there anything that worried you about taking part in the programme?

**Mentors:**
- What was your Mentor like?
• Do you think you were well matched with them? Why?
• Did you change Mentor at any point? Why?
• Was there anything you particularly liked about the way your Mentor did things? Disliked?
• Can you try and think about what is the most important thing your Mentor has done for you?
• How do you think the role of your Probation Officer differs from that of your Mentor?

Sessions:
• How often were you in contact with your Mentor? How (in person, email, phone, texts etc)?
• How often did you meet face to face? Where did you meet? And how long (on average) did the meetings last? Did you feel face to face meetings were held often enough? And were long enough?
• What kinds of things did you do? Talk about?
• Did you ever miss any appointments/meetings? Why?
• How do you feel about the overall amount of contact you had with your Mentor? [Prompt: too much, about right, too little]
• How long did you take part in the programme (max 12 weeks post custody)? How do you feel about the length of time you were in the programme? [Prompt: too much, about right, too little]

Other Sources of Help:
• Have you received help from services not linked to the Reset programme? What services? Tell me a bit about the ways in which they helped you.

Overall Best/ Worst Aspects:
• What was the best thing about Reset? What was the worst?

Challenges:
• What have been the main challenges you have faced since being released from custody? Did Reset support you in dealing with these challenges? If so, how?
• What were the challenges associated with your licence conditions?
• What would you have done about your problems if you hadn’t joined Reset?
• Have you been thinking towards the end of the programme? Do you see any challenges when you leave the programme? If so what?

Achievements:
• Have you made any changes to your life as a result of the programme?
• What has the programme helped you achieve? [Prompt: accommodation, employment, training, education, self-esteem/confidence, family/community integration]

Suggestions:
• What would you change about the programme? How would you improve it? [Prompt: length of programme, Mentor, etc]

Recommend it:
• Would you tell others to take part in the programme?

Close the interview and thank individual for their time.
APPENDIX D

Stakeholder Interview Schedule

STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS

Introduction
Thank you for agreeing to meet with us today.

The purpose of today’s interview is to gather your views on Reset so that we can feed them in to the evaluation.

Today’s interview will last a maximum of 45 minutes. ________ will be taking notes and these will be summarised in the report of our findings. Due to the small number of individuals being interviewed the comments you make may be attributable to you in your organisational role.

Are there any questions before we begin?

INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. Overall, how do you think the programme has worked? What has worked well? What hasn’t worked as well?

2. I know that the lead in time was a challenge were there any other particular challenges in developing/delivering this project that you want to highlight (e.g. external factors such as the impact of reduced resources)?

3. What do you see as the main benefits to the mentees of taking part in the programme?

4. I’ve listed the seven key programme objectives - what area(s) do you think Reset made the biggest impact on? (Probe each of the areas in turn for interviewee’s opinion on each objective)
   a. To reduce the number of returns to prison of this cohort in the first 12 weeks following release.
   b. To reduce in ACE scores in cohort.
   c. To facilitate access to positive employment outcomes.
   d. To afford opportunities for vocational training and work experience.
   e. To find and maintain settled accommodation.
   f. To increase self-esteem and confidence.
   g. To increase social and family reintegration.

Do you think there are certain people who take more from the programme/less?

Do you feel that RESET is targeting the right clients for inclusion in the programme? If ‘No’ what type of people do you think it should target?

5. What impact has the programme had on preventing recall? Thinking of cases where individuals have been recalled is there anything that the programme could do differently? Of those who were recalled did any remain in the community for longer than you would have expected?

6. How do you think the mentors’ role has helped PBNI in their responsibilities for the case? (With risk management, with licence conditions?) How does the role of the mentor differ from that of the Probation Officer?

7. What barriers (if any) made it difficult to have a programme as effective as you would like?
8. How would you rate the communication between the parties involved in Reset? (PBNi, Niacro, Mentors, Probation Officers, NiPS)

9. With hindsight if you had to do it again what would you do differently (if anything)?

10. Going forward what do you think Reset should look like? (Get participants to think of the following - When would it start? Who would it target? What sort of things would it help people with? How would it do this? Type of contact, how often and where? How long would the programme last? What would happen at the end of the programme?)

Any other comments

Conclusion

Draw discussion to a close - thank interviewees for their time and input.
Appendix E

Mentee Focus Group Schedule

Facilitator Introduction

Thank you for taking part in the session today. I’m XXXX and this is XXXX.

We have been asked to find out how the Reset mentoring programme is working and how well it is helping people. One of the best ways to do that is to talk to you – the people taking part in the programme.

We are very keen to hear your views so today we will be asking you some questions to find out how useful you found Reset, the difference (if any) the programme has made to you and what you think could be improved.

We want your honest opinions on any of the topics raised today. There are no wrong or right answers. You may all have different views and that’s fine with us – we value everybody’s opinion and want to hear from you all.

The session will last about an hour. Everything that is discussed will be totally anonymous. **We do however need to let you know before we start that if you say anything during the session which indicates you, or anyone else’s safety is at risk, we will have to pass the information on. Are you ok with that?**

[ ] will be taking notes which will be summarised in a report which will include the views and opinions of many people involved with Reset.

This report may include some of the things you say today however no-one will be identified. We will remove all names and other identifying details so those reading the report will not be able to tell it is you.

Are there any questions before we start?

---

FOCUS GROUP FORMAT/ AGENDA

**Culture Card Exercise Part 1**

On arrival ask participants to select an image that reflects their feelings about the Reset programme.

**Culture Card Exercise Part 2**

Ask participants to introduce themselves, say why they decided to take part in Reset and briefly discuss why they selected their chosen image.

**Liked about Reset/Changes to Reset**

Ask participants to work in pairs to come up with a list of

(i) 3 things that they liked about Reset and
(ii) 3 things that they would change about Reset.

Give each pair post-it notes and a pen (to write one factor on each post-it). At the end of the exercise, put post-it notes on board in groupings.

- How do you think the role of your Probation Officer differs from that of your mentor?
**Achievements & Challenges**

Ask participants to place stickers to represent their views on wall charts from 1 to 5. Each chart represents a different statement embracing the following areas:

**To what extent has Reset helped you with.........**
1. Finding work?
2. Finding training courses?
3. Finding accommodation?
4. Increasing your confidence?
5. Support with family issues?
6. Support with going back to your community?
7. Stopping reoffending?

- Have you made any other changes to your life as a result of Reset?
- What have been the main challenges you have faced since being released from custody? Did Reset support you in dealing with these challenges? If so, how?
- What would you have done about these challenges if you hadn’t joined Reset?
- What impact has Reset had on stopping you from going back to prison?
- Have you been thinking towards the end of Reset? Do you see any challenges when you leave the programme? If so what?
- Would you tell others to take part in Reset?

**Programme Design Suggestions**

If you were in charge of designing a mentoring programme to help people coming out of prison – what would it look like?

(Get participants to think of the following - When would it start? What sort of things would it help people with? How would it do this? Type of contact (face to face, telephone, email etc), how often and where? How long would the programme last? What would happen when it finished?)

**Any Other Comments?**

Any other comments?

**Conclusion**

Draw discussion to a close - thank group participants for their time and input.
APPENDIX F

Mentor Focus Group Schedule

Facilitator Introduction

Thanks for agreeing to come along today. My name is [  ] and this is [  ]. We work for the Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency.

As you will be aware, we have been commissioned by the Probation Board for Northern Ireland to undertake the evaluation of the Reset programme. This evaluation will involve two stages – the interim evaluation process that is being undertaken at the minute and then the final stage evaluation towards the end of the project.

The main aims of this staff workshop are:
• to discuss your views on various aspects of the Reset programme;
• to identify any areas for improvement, new ideas and good practice experiences.

The session today will last a maximum of 1½ hours. Everything that is discussed will be totally anonymous.

We want your honest opinions on any of the topics raised today and we value everyone’s opinion. There are no wrong or right answers. You may all have different views on the issues raised and that’s fine with us. If there are any other factors which you think are important and which we haven’t mentioned, please let us know.

[     ] will be taking notes but these will be summarised and no-one will be able to be identified. The resulting report, which will cover all the evaluation activities, will be ready towards the end of November 2015.

Are there any questions before we begin?

Culture Card Exercise Part 1
On arrival ask participants to select an image that reflects their feelings about how the Reset programme is going to date.

Culture Card Exercise Part 2
Ask participants to introduce themselves and briefly discuss why they selected their chosen image.

Background and Involvement
What do you understand the purpose of the Reset programme to be?
Why did you get involved as a Mentor?
Did you Mentor on any programmes in the past?

Working Well/ Not Working Well
Ask participants to work in pairs to come up with a list of 3 things that are working well and 3 things that aren't working well with the Reset Programme. Give each pair post-it notes and a pen (to write one factor on each post-it). At the end of the exercise, put post-it notes on board in groupings.
Your Role
Who is the “typical” Mentee you work with and what are Mentees expecting from Mentoring?
What do you do specifically for/ with the Mentee?
How appropriate do you think your role and the tasks undertaken have been to date?
How would you rate your workload? (Too light/ Just Right/ Too Heavy)
How many people do you think it’s possible to work within the community at any one time?

Reset Programme Structure
Do you think that daily contact for the first week is appropriate? If not, why not? What frequency of contact would be appropriate?
What do you think of the length of the programme (i.e. up to 4 wks pre release and max 12 wks)?
What has been the optimal schedule for your work with Mentees, both in terms of overall length and the scheduling of the Mentorship activities? Why?
How are your relationships with key stakeholders/ other agencies providing post release services for Mentees (e.g. drug and alcohol agencies and housing schemes)?
How have you worked out your role alongside others (e.g. hostel staff, drug and alcohol agencies)?
How is your relationship with the Probation officers? What are the differences between your role and theirs?
How did you plan or create independence and an exit plan for the Mentee?

The Mentoring Relationship
How did you get the Mentee to engage with the programme initially?
How did you create trust between yourself and your Mentee? How did you get the Mentee to open up? How long did this take?
Is there anything that would have made it easier to create relationships with the Mentees?
Which case or which aspects of your cases were the most challenging and for what reason?
Was there something Reset could have done differently to help with the challenge?

Training & Support
How were you supported through Reset?
What was the training like (including induction)?
What aspects of the training were most important for you as a Mentor?
What support systems have you relied on to get help and resources for yourself? [prompt] other Mentors, managers/supervisors, etc
Do you feel that you have the skills required for the role?
Is there anything else that would have been useful in terms of training and/or support?

Views on Achievement of Reset Programme Objectives
Ask participants to place stickers to represent their views on wall charts from plus 5 to minus 5. Each chart represents a different statement embracing the following areas:

How would you rate the impact of the Mentoring programme on ......
8. Facilitating access to positive employment outcomes?
9. Affording opportunities for vocational training and work experience?
10. Finding and maintaining settled accommodation?
11. Increasing self-esteem/self confidence?
12. Increasing integration back into their family?
13. Increasing social integration into their community?
14. Reducing reoffending rates?
15. Facilitating access to support for mental health issues?

16. How would you rate the overall effectiveness of the Reset programme?
17. How would you rate the work load involved in record keeping? [Prompt: Did they feel it was a sustainable system?]

**Impact/ Changes**
Thinking of cases that worked well - what are some of the key changes you saw in your Mentees taking part in the programme?
What areas are you most successfully able to impact through Mentorship?
Are there any individual cases which were particularly striking? [Note cases and arrange with Mentor at end of the session to get further detail].
Do you think there are certain people who take more from the programme/less?
What has surprised you as a Mentor? [prompt] What makes you think “wow” I didn’t realize this would be so important to the success of Mentoring”?
What impact has the programme had on preventing recall? Thinking of cases where individuals have been recalled is there anything that the programme could do differently?

**Barriers to Success/ Progress**
What barriers make it difficult for you or the Mentee to have a program as effective as you would like? [prompt] - What makes you think; “If not for.xyz, my Mentoring could work better”?

**New Ideas and Suggestions**
The purpose of the interim evaluation is to use the lessons learned to date to help inform the way forward for the programme. With these two aspects in mind have you any suggestions for future improvements or new ideas for the programme?

**Changes**
Overall are there any changes you would make to the programme?

**Any Other Comments?**
Given our goal of finding out what really works in the “real world” of Mentoring - what am I not asking that you think is important for us to know?

**Conclusion**
Draw discussion to a close - thank group participants for their time and input, and reiterate assurance of anonymity.
Appendix G

Probation Officer Focus Group Schedule

Facilitator Introduction

Thank you for taking part in the session today. I’m [ _______ ] and this is [ _______].

We both work for the Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency (known as NISRA) and we have been commissioned by PBNI to evaluate RESET.

The purpose of today’s session is to gather your feedback regarding the impact of Reset on mentees and to identify any suggestions for the future.

The session will last a maximum of 1 1/2 hours. Everything that is discussed will be totally anonymous.

We want your honest opinions on any of the topics raised today. There are no right or wrong answers. You may all have different views on the issues raised and that’s fine with us - we value everyone’s opinion. If there are any other aspects which you think are important and which we haven’t mentioned, please let us know.

[ _______ ] will be taking notes but these will be summarised and no-one will be able to be identified. The resulting report, which will cover all the evaluation activities, will be ready towards the end of May/start of June.

Are there any questions before we begin?

Focus Group exercises:

Culture Card Exercise Part 1
On arrival ask participants to select an image that reflects their experience of the Reset programme.

Culture Card Exercise Part 2
Ask participants to introduce themselves, extent of their experience of Reset and briefly discuss why they selected their chosen image.

Working Well/Not Working Well
Ask participants to work in pairs to come up with a list of:

• 3 things about Reset that have worked well for mentees and
• 3 things about Reset that haven’t worked so well for mentees.

Give each pair post-it notes and a pen (to write one factor on each post-it). At the end of the exercise, put post-it notes on board in groupings.

• What has been the impact (if any) of the RESET programme on your role/ work?
• How has your relationship been with mentors?
• What has the level of communication with the mentor been like? How satisfied are you?
• How satisfied are you with the communication received from the mentor about Reset?

Views on Achievement of Reset Programme Objectives
Ask participants to place stickers to represent their views on wall charts from plus 5 to minus 5. Each chart represents a different statement embracing the following areas:
How would you rate the impact of the mentoring programme on …...

18. Facilitating access to positive employment outcomes?
19. Affording opportunities for vocational training and work experience?
20. Finding and maintaining settled accommodation?
21. Increasing self-esteem/self confidence?
22. Increasing integration back into their family?
23. Increasing social integration into their community?
24. Reducing reoffending rates?
25. Reducing ACE scores?
26. Facilitating access to support for mental health issues?
27. How would you rate the overall effectiveness of the Reset programme?

- What do you see as the main benefits to the mentees of taking part in the programme?
- What area(s) does mentoring make the biggest impact on?
- Thinking of clients for whom Reset worked well - what changes did you see in them?
- Do you think there are certain people who take more from the programme/less?
- Do you feel that RESET is targeting the right clients for inclusion in the programme?
- What barriers make it difficult for you or the mentee to have a programme as effective as you would like?
- What impact has the programme had on preventing recall? Thinking of cases where individuals have been recalled is there anything that the programme could do differently? Of those who were recalled did any remain in the community for longer than you would have expected?
- How do you think the mentors’ role has helped PBNi in their responsibilities for the case? (With risk management, with licence conditions?)
- How satisfied are you with the overall quality of the service provided by RESET?

Programme Design
If you were in charge of designing Reset what would it look like?
(Get participants to think of the following - When would it start? What sort of things would it help people with? How would it do this? Type of contact, how often and where? How long would the programme last? What would happen at the end of the programme?)

Potential Probes
- In your experience how have clients coped once Reset has ended?

Any Other Comments?
Any other suggestions or comments? Anything that we haven’t covered?

Conclusion
Draw discussion to a close - thank group participants for their time and input.
APPENDIX H
Baseline Questionnaire

To be completed pre-release with Reset mentor

Client Name: 

PIMS Ref No: 

Date (dd/mm/yy): / / 

You are being asked to complete this questionnaire because you are taking part in a post custody mentoring programme. We’d like to hear what you think on a number of areas before you start the programme.

Your responses will help us find out how the programme is working and how we can make it better.

All the information we collect will be analysed by staff from the Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency (NISRA). For your privacy, we will remove any details that may identify you.

This questionnaire is the first of two that we are asking you to complete. We want to know what you think before you leave custody and meet with your mentor. There are no right or wrong answers.

You will receive another questionnaire just before you exit the programme.
This questionnaire includes four sections that ask about:

1. Your expectations of the mentoring programme
2. You and your background
3. Your view on how things are at the minute regarding your attitudes to offending and some current life issues
4. How you’re generally feeling about yourself and your well-being

The questionnaire will take about 15-20 minutes to complete.

Thank you
1 Expectations

a. How did you first hear about the mentoring programme? Please tick one box

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prison Staff</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leaflet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reset Nacro Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of mouth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please state)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. How do you feel about your introduction to the programme – were you given enough information about what to expect? Please tick one box

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very happy – information was very helpful</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OK, but would have liked to be told a bit more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still don’t really know what to expect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Why did you decide to take part in the mentoring programme? You can tick more than one box if needed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support with Alcohol / Drugs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support with Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support with Employment / Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help with practical issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone to talk to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help with keeping appointments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lift home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please state)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. What are your expectations of being mentored? Please write your answer


e. What do you hope to achieve by taking part in the mentoring programme? Please write your answer


2 Background

a. Thinking about the **four weeks before you came into custody**, which of these best describes your **housing** situation? *Please tick one box*

| Permanent | Temporary* | Homeless |

*If you have been accepted to the homelessness waiting list by the Housing Executive and are housed temporarily while you wait for an offer of permanent accommodation, please mark your housing situation as temporary.*

**Permanent**: includes accommodation secured by the Housing Executive or Housing Association. It also includes accommodation secured in the private rented sector or in family/friends home for over 6 months.

**Temporary**: includes staying in a hostel, with family/friends or in supported accommodation (for example Simon/Flax, Springwell or Triangle).

**Homeless**: You have no where to stay

b. Do you expect to go back to the same housing situation when you are released? *Please tick one box*

| Yes | No | Maybe / not sure |

c. If you answered either **no** or **maybe / not sure**, *why? Please write your answer*


d. Thinking about the **four weeks before you came into custody**, which of these best describes your **employment** situation? *Please tick one box*

| In full time employment | Full time employment: Work for more than 35 hours in a week |
| In part time employment | Part time employment: Work for less than 35 hours in a week |
| Unemployed | Unemployed: Not employed but looking for work |
| Inactive | Inactive: Unable to work because of retirement, sickness or disability |

e. Do you expect to go back to the same employment situation when you are released? *Please tick one box*

| Yes | No | Maybe / not sure |

f. If you answered either **no** or **maybe / not sure**, *why? Please write your answer*
2 Background

\(g.\) Thinking about the **four weeks before you came into custody**, which of these best describes your education / training situation? **Please tick one box**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In full time education / training</th>
<th>In part time education / training</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

\(h.\) Do you expect to go back to the same education / training situation when you are released? **Please tick one box**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe / not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

\(i.\) If you answered either **no** or **maybe / not sure**, why? **Please write your answer**

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
3 **Attitudes**

Below is a list of statements we’d like you to think about.

If you **strongly agree** with the statement, circle **SA**. If you **agree**, circle **A**.
If you **neither agree or disagree** with the statement, circle **N**.
If you **disagree** with the statement, circle **D**. If you **strongly disagree**, circle **SD**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In the end, crime does pay</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I have never hurt anyone by what I’ve done</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I will always get into trouble</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Crime has now become a way of life for me</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Crime can be a useful way of getting what you want</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I believe in living for now, the future will take care of itself</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Most people would commit offences if they knew they could get away with it</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I definitely won’t get into trouble with the police in the next 6 months</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I don’t see myself as a real ‘criminal’</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Committing crime is quite exciting</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I find it hard to resist an opportunity to commit a crime</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Many so-called crimes are not really wrong</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. My crimes have never harmed anyone</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. If things go wrong for me, I might offend again</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I am not really a criminal</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I always seem to give into temptation</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. When people have no money, they can’t be blamed for stealing</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. There was no victim of my offence</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I wouldn’t commit the offence again</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Once a criminal, always a criminal</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Atitudes

Below is a list of problems people may face in their life.

We'd like you to read each problem and decide whether it is a 'Big Problem', 'Problem', 'Small Problem' or 'No problem at all' for you.

If it's a **Big Problem**, circle **BP**.
If it's a **Problem**, circle **P**.
If it's a **Small Problem**, circle **SP**.
If it's **No problem at all**, circle **NP**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Big problem</th>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Small Problem</th>
<th>No problem at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Problems with money</td>
<td><strong>BP</strong></td>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
<td><strong>SP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Problems with relationships</td>
<td><strong>BP</strong></td>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
<td><strong>SP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Problems with employment / prospects</td>
<td><strong>BP</strong></td>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
<td><strong>SP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Controlling temper</td>
<td><strong>BP</strong></td>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
<td><strong>SP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Need for extra excitement in life</td>
<td><strong>BP</strong></td>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
<td><strong>SP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Family problems</td>
<td><strong>BP</strong></td>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
<td><strong>SP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Problems of health and fitness</td>
<td><strong>BP</strong></td>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
<td><strong>SP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Tendency to get bored</td>
<td><strong>BP</strong></td>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
<td><strong>SP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Problems with housing</td>
<td><strong>BP</strong></td>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
<td><strong>SP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Problems with drink / drugs</td>
<td><strong>BP</strong></td>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
<td><strong>SP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Problems with gambling</td>
<td><strong>BP</strong></td>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
<td><strong>SP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Depressed</td>
<td><strong>BP</strong></td>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
<td><strong>SP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Problems with feeling good about self</td>
<td><strong>BP</strong></td>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
<td><strong>SP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Problems with lack of confidence</td>
<td><strong>BP</strong></td>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
<td><strong>SP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Lots of worries</td>
<td><strong>BP</strong></td>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
<td><strong>SP</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below is a list of statements about how you feel about yourself.

If you strongly agree with the statement, circle SA. If you agree, circle A. If you disagree with the statement, circle D. If you strongly disagree, circle SD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>On the whole, I am satisfied with myself</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>At times, I think I am no good at all</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I feel that I have a number of good qualities</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I am able to do things as well as most other people</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I feel I do not have much to be proud of</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I certainly feel useless at times</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I feel that I’m a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I wish I could have more respect for myself</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I take a positive attitude toward myself</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I

Exit Questionnaire

Reset

Intensive Rehabilitation and Resettlement Project

To be completed at the end of the Reset mentoring programme with Probation Officer.

Client name

PIMS Ref No.

Mentor Name

Date completed: d m y

You are being asked to complete this questionnaire because you have taken part in a post custody mentoring programme. We'd like to hear about your experience of the programme.

Your responses will help us find out how the programme has worked and how we can make it better.

All the information we collect will be analysed by staff from the Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency (NISRA). For your privacy, we will remove any details that may identify you.

This questionnaire is the second of two that we have asked you to complete. There are no right or wrong answers.

This questionnaire includes four sections that ask about:

1. Your experience of the mentoring programme.
2. You and your background.
3. Your view on how things are at the minute regarding your attitudes to offending and some current life issues.
4. How you're generally feeling about yourself and your well-being.

The questionnaire will take about 15-20 minutes to complete.

Thank you

Please send the completed questionnaire and/or any queries to: christine.hunter@pbnl.gsi.gov.uk or reset@pbnl.gsi.gov.uk.
1 Experience

By taking part in the Reset programme, you were mentored during the last four weeks of custody and up to 12 weeks after being released.

a. What do you think about the length of the mentoring programme? Please type 'X' in one box

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Too long</th>
<th>About right</th>
<th>Too short</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

b. If you answered either Too long or Too short, why do you think this? Please type your answer.

c. Below is a list of statements about your experience of being mentored on the Reset programme.

Please type 'X' under the column that corresponds to your answer. For example, if you 'Agree' to Statement 1, please type 'X' in the box under 'Agree' for Statement 1. Please only select one box per statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>My mentor helped me to plan realistic and useful goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The activities we did were useful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reset helped me to integrate back with my family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reset helped me to integrate back into my community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I could get in touch with my mentor whenever I needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>My mentor's support helped me to avoid/reduce re-offending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I was happy with the mentor I was matched to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Taking part in Reset has increased my confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>My experience of taking part in the Reset programme met my expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I would recommend Reset to someone else</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Overall, I am satisfied with the support I received from taking part in the Reset programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 2
1 Experience

d Think about your own involvement in the Reset mentoring programme. How would you rate your commitment?
Please type 'X' in one box

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Could have tried a lot harder</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ok, but could have done better</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretty good, most of the time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent, gave my best effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e If you answered either ‘Could have tried a lot harder!’ or ‘Ok, but could have done better!’ describe what was preventing you? Please type your answer

f What did you want to achieve by taking part in the mentoring programme? Please type your answer

g Do you feel like you achieved this? Please type X beside Yes or No.

| Yes | No |

h Did your Probation Officer and Reset Mentor work together in a way which helped you?

| Yes | No |

i If you answered No, why do you feel like this? Please type your answer

j What 3 words would you use to describe your experience of Reset? Please type your answer

1
2
3

k If there was one thing you could change about the mentoring programme, what would it be? Please type your answer
2 Background

a Which of these best describes your current housing situation? Please type ‘X’ in one box

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permanent</th>
<th>Temporary*</th>
<th>Homeless</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

* If you have been accepted to the homelessness waiting list by the Housing Executive and are housed temporarily while you wait for an offer of permanent accommodation, please mark your situation as temporary.

Permanent: Includes accommodation secured by the Housing Executive or Housing Association. It also includes accommodation secured in the private rented sector or in family/friends home for over 6 months.

Temporary: Includes staying in a hostel, with family/friends or in supported accommodation (for example Simon / Flix? Springwell or Triangle).

Homeless: You have no where to stay

b Which of these best describes your current employment situation? Please type ‘X’ in one box

| In full time employment | In part time employment | Unemployed | Inactive |

Full time employment: Work for more than 35 hours in a week.

Temporary: Work for less than 35 hours in a week.

Unemployed: Not employed but looking for work.

Inactive: Unable to work because of retirement, sickness or disability.

c Which of these best describes your current education / training? Please type ‘X’ in one box

| In full time education / training | In part time education / training | None |

3 **Attitudes**

Below is a list of statements we'd like you think about.

Please type 'X' in the box in the column that corresponds to your selection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>In the end, crime does pay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I have never hurt anyone by what I've done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I will always get into trouble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Crime has now become a way of life for me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Crime can be a useful way of getting what you want</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I believe in living for now; the future will take care of itself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Most people would commit offences if they knew that they could get away with it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I definitely won't get into trouble with the police in the next 6 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I don't see myself as a real 'criminal'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Committing crime is quite exciting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I find it hard to resist an opportunity to commit a crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Many so-called crimes are not really wrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>My crimes have never harmed anyone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>If things go wrong for me, I might offend again</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I am not really a criminal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I always seem to give in to temptation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>When people have no money, they can't be blamed for stealing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>There was no victim of my offence(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I wouldn't commit the offence again</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Once a criminal, always a criminal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 **Attitudes**

Below is a list of problems people may face in their life.

We'd like you to read each problem and decide whether it is a 'Big Problem', 'Problem', 'Small Problem' or 'No problem at all' for you.

Please type 'X' in the box in the column that corresponds to your selection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Big problem</th>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Small Problem</th>
<th>No problem at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Problems with money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Problems with relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Problems with employment / prospects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Controlling temper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Need for extra excitement in life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Family problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Problems of health and fitness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tendency to get bored</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Problems with housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Problems with drink / drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Problems with gambling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Depressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Problems with feeling good about self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Problems with lack of confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Lots of worries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Well-being

Below is a list of statements about how you feel about yourself. Please type an "X" in the box in the column that corresponds to your selection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>On the whole, I am satisfied with myself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>At times, I think I am no good at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I feel that I have a number of good qualities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I am able to do things as well as most other people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I feel I do not have much to be proud of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I certainly feel useless at times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I wish I could have more respect for myself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I take a positive attitude toward myself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE

Please send the completed questionnaire to: reset@pbnl.gsi.gov.uk
Any queries: christine.hunter@pbnl.gsi.gov.uk
APPENDIX J

Mentor Case Closure Questionnaire

RESET Mentor Survey

Please spend a few moments filling in this short survey.
Please click the SUBMIT button at the end of the survey when you are finished.

PIMS Ref No. ____________________
Client DOB ____________________
(DD/MM/YY)

1. Was your client recalled for an offence that occurred during RESET?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No

2. Please tick all that applied to your client by the end of their participation in RESET:
   ☐ Got full-time work
   ☐ Got part-time work (less than 30 hrs per week)
   ☐ Attended a job interview
   ☐ Started work experience/vocational training
   ☐ Started volunteer position
   ☐ Started education or a course
   ☐ Living in stable accommodation (not homeless/hostel)
   ☐ Started receiving benefits
   ☐ Received a crisis loan
   ☐ Received prescription drugs for mental health issues
   ☐ Received prescription drugs for physical health issues
   ☐ Received help for drug/alcohol addiction
   ☐ Attended counselling
   ☐ Opened/restarted a bank account
   ☐ Obtained ID
### RESET Mentor Survey

3. Over the course of RESET, how much progress do you feel your client made in the following areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>A little bit</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrating into a community</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building relationships with family</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining self-confidence</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building self-esteem</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding work</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting training/education</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding settled accommodation</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desisting from offending</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Your client may have had a variety of needs after being released from prison and may have required different amounts of support for these needs.

Please rate the following needs in terms of how much time was spent on each for this client from 0 (no time/issue not relevant) to 3 (a high proportion of time was spent assisting in this/these areas).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
<th>0 (no time/not relevant)</th>
<th>1 (very little time)</th>
<th>2 (some time)</th>
<th>3 (a high proportion of time)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finding work</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying for benefits</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening a bank account</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding accommodation</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying for training/education</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting GP-obtaining prescriptions</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping with stress and anxiety</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organising appointments</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelling to appointments</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completing paperwork on behalf of or with client</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridging relationships between client and family</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediating relationships between client and community</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding things to occupy client's time</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix K

Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale

Below is a list of statements about how you may feel about yourself. Please select Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, or Strongly Disagree for each statement.

1. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself
2. At times, I think I am no good at all*
3. I feel that I have a number of good qualities
4. I am able to do things as well as most other people
5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of*
6. I certainly feel useless at times*
7. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others
8. I wish I could have more respect for myself*
9. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure*
10. I take a positive attitude toward myself

Scoring: Strongly Agree=3, Agree=2, Disagree=1, Strongly Disagree=0. Items with an asterisk are reverse scored. Sum the scores for the 10 items. The higher the score, the higher the self-esteem.

http://www.yorku.ca/rokada/psycetest/rosenbg.pdf
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