

PFCC Decision Report

Please ensure all sections below are completed

Report reference number: 110/20

Classification Not protectively marked

Title of report: UK Mediation accredited training

Area of County/Stakeholders affected: Countywide

Report by: Nikki Essex

Date of report: 18 September 2020

Enquiries to: Nikki.essex@essex.police.uk

1. Purpose of report

1.1. To seek approval for the commissioning of UK Mediation to deliver accredited mediation training to one of our RJ co-ordinators.

2. Recommendations

2.1. Approve the allocation of £1,795 to UK Mediation for the delivery of mediation training

3. Benefits of Proposal

- 3.1. This accredited training will equip one of our coordinators within the Essex Restorative and Mediation Service (ERMS) with the skills required to take on mediation cases including family and neighbourhood disputes, complaints and consumer business conflicts. This course is delivered by real mediators and is an internationally recognised training, providing reassurance to volunteers and service users.
- 3.2. The course covers the principles of mediation, step by step process, confidentiality and impartiality and how to manage the conflict resolution processes, whilst ensuring the process is safe and effective.
- 3.3. This training will mean the co-ordinator will also be able to take on mediation cases and train new facilitators dealing with mediation cases.

4. Background and proposal

- 4.1. ERMS is a Ministry of Justice-funded service that offers both mediation and RJ to victims of crime or conflict. Our service utilises a volunteer facilitator-led model which relies on individual volunteers putting themselves forward for cases.
- 4.2. Due to vetting limitations there has been added stress on existing volunteers to take on cases. This means that we have to ensure our RJ staff are qualified to be able to take on cases and assist should there be a need.
- 4.3. Trained individual(s) can forward some of the knowledge acquired to ERMS volunteers and our standard training offer can be amended to achieve some of the same learning outcomes.
- 4.4. Furthermore, we have made the decision due to changes in the format and an increase in the costs, not to renew our RSQM quality mark which demonstrated that our organisation is committed to delivering high quality restorative practice to nationally agreed standards. On this basis we are seeking alternative accreditations which reassures service users that our staff are qualified and competent in the role. The accredited aspect isn't only accredited by UK Mediation, but is also externally accredited by awarding body AIM Qualifications.
- 4.5. This training can either be delivered over 5 days of face to face training or by 3 days of online training, followed by 3 days of direct learning

5. Alternative options considered and rejected

5.1. The PFCC may decide to decline the funding of this training but the ERMS would have less resilience and expertise in terms of mediation.

6. Police and Crime Plan

6.1. The Police and Crime Plan makes specific reference to expand referrals to provide RJ and mediation across the service. This training would facilitate this additional expertise and capacity.

7. Police Operational Implications

7.1. This training would enable our co-ordinator to mediate cases and provide efficient guidance for other facilitators, increasing service user satisfaction and supporting increased confidence in Essex Police.

8. Financial Implications

8.1. The PFCC will allocate a one-off grant of £1,795 from the 2020-21 Victims' Fund to UK mediation.

9. Legal Implications

9.1. The grant is subject to the PFCC's standard funding agreement

10. Staffing and other resource implications

10.1. This would provide accredited training to one of our RJ coordinators – something that is recognised as a current gap in their skill set and the skills within the office.

11. Equality and Diversity implications

		NO	X			NO	$\frac{1}{x}$
1. Of	Decision Sheet	YES		2. Of /	Appendix	YES	
If the report is for publication, is redaction required:							
Reda	<u>ction</u>						
	report is not for public informed of the dec		ne Chief	Executive	will decide if	and how	v the public
If 'NO', please give reasons for non-publication (state 'None' if applicable)							
				NO			
	report for publicat	ion?		YES	\checkmark		
Public	<u>cation</u>			·			
			Date:	21 Septer	mber 2020		
			Print:	Elizabeth			
Chief	Finance Officer / Tre	easurer	Sign:	EL	ساو		
			Date:	18 Septer	mber 2020		
			Pri	nt: Darren	Horsman		
Deput	y Monitoring Officer		Sign:		Man		
	eport will be signed on and sign off by the			Chief Exe	cutive and Tr	easurer	, prior to
Repo	rt Approval						
13. 13.1.	Governance Board This decision has n		subject t	o discussic	on at any gov	ernance	boards.
12. 12.1.	Risks No risks associated with this funding.						
	which can impact a	•			se in deliverii	ig media	dion cases
11.1.	will improve the cap		•	•	•		

If 'YES', please provide details of required redaction:						
Date redaction of	carried out:					
Treasurer / Ch	ief Executive Sign Off – for Redactions only					
	uired, Treasurer or Chief Executive are to sign off that redaction has					
been completed.	Sign:					
	Print:					
Chief Executive/Treasurer						
Date signed:						
Decision and Final Sign Off						
I agree the recommendations to this report;						
	At Eg aromer					
	Sign:					
	Jane Gardner Print:					
	Deputy PFCC					
	Date signed: 23 September 2020					
I do not agree the	e recommendations to this report because;					
	Sign:					
	Print:					
PFCC/Deputy PFCC						
	Date signed:					