

Detention Action
Alternative to Detention
Community Support Project
April 2014 – June 2017

IARS' Evaluation of the Detention Action
Community Support Project
(covering June 2014 – May 2015)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	3
Detention Action Community Support Project.....	3
The IARS International Institute.....	4
IARS Project Team.....	5
Methodology	5
Fieldwork conducted by IARS	6
Research findings.....	6
References.....	11
Appendix A: Biographies of key staff.....	12
Appendix B: Information sheet for participants	12
Appendix C: Questionnaire for participants	12
Appendix D: Research ethics form	12

Introduction

In May 2014, The IARS International Institute successfully applied and was commissioned to carry out formative and summative evaluation of the 3 year Detention Action Community Support Project, launched in 2014 and finishing in June 2017. IARS was considered to be the right organisation to deliver this work given its history as a youth-led, community born charity with extensive experience in the field of offender rehabilitation, migration and user involvement. The formative evaluation will influence the development of a monitoring framework and baseline assessments of participants as well as capture learning on the strengths and weaknesses of the delivery model from the first two years of the programme. A final summative report will be produced at the end of the project in June 2017.

This interim formative evaluation is the first report covering the first year of the project, which was a pilot phase of the programme. Young migrant ex-offenders facing deportation are inevitably a hard-to-reach group. Consequently, there were also limitations involved in carrying out fieldwork for this evaluation (e.g. small sample and necessity to interview users on the phone). This was mitigated by the researcher's longstanding interest and expertise in immigration detention. In year 2, the situation will change dramatically as DA will be recruiting participants pre-release, and using transition plans to try to help participants to get released on bail onto the project. The demand for the project is therefore likely to become very high.

Based on the evidence that we have collected, **it is our expert and independent view that the programme is meeting its intended objectives.** It is a very unique project that responds to very complex needs of young migrant ex-offenders who experienced often very long term immigration detention in the UK. Our recommendations for year 2 and 3 are mainly about capacity building, and refer to a need for more signposting and a more robust referral system for clients. The last recommendation, namely that participants would like to be involved in more sessions, preferably delivered in person is actually an indicator of a success of the project. We acknowledge that the geographical scope of the programme (South East, i.e. London and the surrounding areas, and North East, including Newcastle, Sunderland, Middlesbrough) poses a challenge; local capacity building in the form of volunteer peer mentoring could be a solution to this problem in the future.

Detention Action Community Support Project

In 2014, Detention Action launched an alternative to detention project for young migrant ex-offenders at risk of indefinite immigration detention. The Community Support Project is the first alternative to detention specifically to address the needs of migrant ex-offenders, who frequently experience the longest periods of immigration detention. It is also the first alternative to detention to focus on migrants' active community participation. The project addresses the risks of absconding and reoffending relied on by the Home Office to justify extreme long-term detention. It aims to demonstrate that, with reintegration support, ex-offender migrants rarely abscond or reoffend, and therefore that the long-term detention of ex-offenders with barriers to removal is unnecessary.

Detention Action intends to provide intensive case management support to 30 young (between the age of 18 and 30) migrants per year, over a period of 3 years. This year participants were recruited from Detention Action's clients and through the Sapphire Ex-Detainees Project. They receive both one-to-one support and training in life skills, and may also join the 'Freed Voices' self-advocacy group to speak out about their experiences as part of Detention Action's campaign against indefinite detention.

Later on this year, Detention Action will be working with migrants in detention to seek their release onto the project. Migrants applying for release will be able to present their reintegration plan to the Home Office or the courts, setting out the community support in place and the absconding and reoffending rates of the project to date. It is hoped that the evidence and learning from the project will influence the development of wider alternatives to detention by both government and civil society, as well as enabling a shift in policy away from indefinite detention.

The objectives of the project are as follows:

- To support young ex-offenders leaving long-term detention
- To enable them to speak out about their experiences
- To generate evidence that indefinite detention is unnecessary since risks can be managed in the community

Detention Action's aim is to develop an evidence base showing that young migrant ex-offenders, considered to be at high risk of re-offending by the Home Office, do not abscond or reoffend if engaged in reintegration support and activities. This will be evidenced by an evaluation report showing that 70% of participants have complied with the conditions of their release.

The IARS International Institute

[The IARS International Institute](#) is user-led and user-focused charity with a mission **to give everyone a chance to forge a safer, fairer and more inclusive society**. Over the last 10 years, the Institute has been providing world-class and cutting-edge educational, research, policy and networking services of local, national and international significance. We are focused on empowering the most marginalised communities through direct service delivery, while enabling organisations to achieve, measure and improve their social impact.

We deliver our charitable mission:

- **By** carrying out action research that is independent, credible, focused and current.
- **By** acting as a network that brings people and ideas together, communicates best practice and encourages debates on current social policy matters.
- **By** supporting the individual (with an emphasis on young people) to carry out their own initiatives to shape decision-making.
- **By** being an authoritative, independent and evidence-based voice on current social policy matters.
- **By** thorough, high quality user-led (youth-led) evaluations, increasing the effectiveness of how organisations' work and deliver.

IARS has significant evaluation and research expertise in evaluating programmes on offender rehabilitation, social action and user involvement. Our approach is grounded in the Theory of Change whereby the impartment of meaningful knowledge and understanding informs attitude change, which can then lead on to personal development and empowerment as well as further insights. Our evaluation tools fall within the category of qualitative research methods, and include ethnographic observations, focus groups and questionnaires which are designed to provide qualitative information, particularly any gains in knowledge and skills, and any shift in attitude. The evaluation will help the organisation to develop and improve capacity to provide effective reintegration support to young migrants leaving detention.

IARS Project Team

The evaluation is overseen by Professor Theo Gavrielides, IARS Director. The research has been conducted by Dr Natalia Paszkiewicz, IARS Projects Coordinator (Equalities). IARS standing [Academic and Editorial Board](#) is also engaged. Please see Appendix A for key staff biographies.

Any research centre should conform to international rules and research ethics when conducting fieldwork with vulnerable individuals. Furthermore, if the work is to be published, then it is highly recommended that the international code of conduct for publishers is followed. IARS Publications conform to the International Code of Conduct for Editors as issued by COPE. In addition, any research that is conducted with vulnerable individuals should receive prior approval from a credible research ethics body such as one established by a university, a research centre, government or a publisher. IARS has a standing, international and independent Academic and Editorial Board. To read the membership and its TOR click [here](#). Any fieldwork with offenders is classified as research with vulnerable individuals and must receive advance Research Ethics approval. To this end, the IARS Standard Research Ethics Application Form must be completed and submitted to the IARS Director prior to fieldwork. Please see Appendix D for the form used in the process.

Methodology

Our expertise is based on sound knowledge and experience of research and evaluation using qualitative methodology. When evaluating the activities of the project, we draw on the following qualitative research methods:

- Self-assessment questionnaire for participants
- One to one interviews (in person and on the phone)
- Group interviews/ focus groups
- Ethnographic observations of group sessions
- Ethnographic observations of meetings and other events related to the project and work of the organisation

Modern criminological research is characterised by a sociological approach looking at factors beyond the individual pathology of offenders. Sociologists have an interest in the social and structural factors that surround us all (let those be social inequality, blocked opportunities, the growth of cities etc.). Sociologists structure their research in a way that allows them to study the *lives*, *attitudes* and *behaviour* of offenders (see the “Chicago School”). IARS uses the sociological approach to researching ex-offenders while acknowledging the risks associated with labels (Labelling theory). We are mindful that “offenders” do not constitute a natural category, but is a construct (a label) of our current social and legal structures and processes.

Fieldwork conducted by IARS (July 2014 – April 2015)

The inception meetings between the two organisations took place on 5 June 2014 and 3 July 2014. However, due to delay in the recruitment of participants for the project, the first semi-structured interview was carried out in February 2015. All users filled in self-assessment questionnaires and one person has completed the full programme after one year of engagement (as of April 2015).

Research method	Date/Location	Project Year
One to one interview	1. 17.02.2015, Newcastle	1
Phone interview	2. 17.02.2015	1
Phone interview	3. 10.03.2015	1
Phone interview	4. 10.03.2015	1
Ethnographic observation of a campaigning groups session (2 users)	5. 23.03.2015, London	1
Group interview (2 users)	6. 23.03.2015, London	1
Phone interview	7. 13.04.2015	1
Ethnographic observation, Reference Group meeting	8. 10.07.14, London	1
Ethnographic observation, 1 st Detention Inquiry hearing	9. 17.07.14, London	1
Ethnographic observation, DA public meeting	10. 07.10.14, London	1
Ethnographic observation, DA public meeting	11. 23.10.14, London	1
Ethnographic observation, Reference Group meeting	12. 14.01.15, London	1
Ethnographic observation, Detention Forum Strategy Day	13. 20.02.15, London	1
Desk research at DA office	14. 10.04.15, London	1

Research findings

IARS' evaluation focuses on assessing the following:

- The reintegration outcomes of participants, considered against Home Office risk assessments (e.g. imminence of removal; risk of absconding; risk of harm to the public)
- The impacts of case management and training on skills, confidence and participation levels of 90 young migrants;
- The strengths and weaknesses of the programme delivery method

Accordingly, our evaluation examined the following areas:

- Changes in behaviour
- Better interpersonal skills and relationships
- Participants' experiences of the programme

The sample interviewed for the evaluation included 7 people, out of 15 participants involved in the project but the researcher also had access to files of all the participants. One person completed the programme after one year of engagement (May 2014 – May 2015), and the researcher spoke to him near the completion of the project.

The participants have very complex needs. They come from various national and ethnic backgrounds, and have different immigration status, including asylum applicants, refused asylum seekers and stateless persons. All users that were interviewed had varied level of vulnerability, ranging from mental health issues such as anxiety depression, past suicide attempts and experience of homelessness (including being homeless as a child). Consequently, some were taking medication to deal with their mental health problems. Some participants mentioned that it was homelessness, destitution and peer pressure at a young age that led them to crime. There were people who were charged only for immigration offences and were detained on numerous occasions; and in some cases they absconded in the past. They all had been detained from a period of 3 months to over 4 years and all had served custodial sentences in prison, the majority of at least 12 months for crimes connected with immigration offences or drugs.

I. Reintegration/ desistance

The Home Office's default position is to identify factors that justify detention rather than consider each case in accordance with its policy which presumes release, and in line with assessments published by the National Offender Management Service. Offender rehabilitation has traditionally focused on all that is wrong with the offender (psychologically, socially, biologically etc.) by trying to minimise risk through treatment programmes. This is also called the Risk Need Responsivity (RNR) model of rehabilitation. Its focus is on reducing and managing risk as well as on studying the process of relapse. Pathology-focused research and intervention have consequently been developed as tools for RNR based approaches to rehabilitation. Concentrating on criminogenic needs to reduce risk factors may be necessary, but not a sufficient condition for effective correctional intervention.

In 2008, Andrews expanded RNR to include a total of 18 principles. These are grouped into overarching principles (respect of the person, theory, human service and crime prevention), RNR principles (risk, need, responsivity: general and specific), structured assessment principles (assess RNR, strengths, breath, professional discretion), programme delivery principles (dosage), staff practices principles (relationship skills, structuring skills) and organisational principles (community-based, continuity of service, agency management and community linkages).

The Good Lives Model (GLM) was recently developed as an alternative approach focusing on nurturing the offender's personal strengths and goals. Detention Action's Community Support Project falls within this category, as it is focused on engagement and holistic support of ex-offenders. Our evaluation looks, among others, at the positive factors used to make reintegration possible. To this end, it is important that the life stories of our sample are put in context so that their journey is understood without making assumptions about their intentions and circumstances they find themselves in as young people with complex migration history affected by the trauma caused by experience of detention. The Good Lives Model (GLM), (now referred to as Good Lives – Comprehensive) assumes that we are goal-influenced and all seek certain 'goods' in our lives, not 'material', but qualitative, all likely to increase or improve our psychological well-being. The model sees us as driven in search of at least ten primary human goods: healthy living and functioning, the experience of mastery, autonomy and self-directedness, freedom from emotional turmoil and stress, friendship, happiness and creativity (Ward, Mann and Gannon 2007: 90). The majority of these areas have a base of research within the discipline of positive psychology.

All project participants had very strong links with UK (lived in Britain for at least 10 years), grew up in the UK, studied and worked at some point, and had children here. Their goals were also similar, the main one being regularising their immigration status, and seeing their children regularly. This implied that much of the support offered by DA at this stage of the programme was about helping people with their legal problems (including cases regarding unlawful detention) and housing as Section 4 accommodation is offered on no choice basis, and given tagging restrictions and lack of money, this meant that participants who have children in different parts of the UK could not keep in touch with them. Being separated from their children was seen as particularly unjust by participants.

Participants involved in the project do not have a right to work, and can't afford to study, so realistically it is only volunteering and campaigning that serve as reintegration factors. When developing transition plans for users, very little is actually achievable:

'I have all these qualifications and I'm not able to use it. I have so many skills, trying to rebuild my life. It's a shame, I speak 6 languages. Since 2003, I've just been asking for permission to work. It's tricky.'

It is therefore hard to minimise the risk of offending. Nevertheless, the project does encourage participants to identify personal goals and to work on action plans, however limited they may be. Offending behaviour is seen as an inappropriate or unskilled means of achieving primary 'human goods', particularly where it lacks internal or external conditions to work towards a positive or good life plan (Scottish Prison Service 2011: 37). The GLM operates in both a holistic and constructive manner in considering how offenders might identify and work towards a way of living that is likely to involve the goods we seek in life, as well as a positive way of living that does not involve or need crime (ibid: 36). In this process the argument is that the model works towards a positive, growth-oriented change in life where an offender works on the development of the values, skills and resources towards life based on human goods that is a necessary counter-balance of managing risk alone (Ward, Mann and Gannon 2007: 92), i.e. risk is managed as well as seeking to develop positive life alternatives. To illustrate the importance of this balance, Emmons (1999 and 2003) has made an articulate and moving case for why positive personal goals and the skill to attain them are central to psychological well-being and conversely how avoidance-based extrinsic goals may lead to lower levels of functioning. McAdams (1994; 2006) argues that integration and relatedness are crucial in encouraging desistance. His research suggests that self-narratives and the recognition of offenders' personal strivings have the most potential for change over the course of a life. This is very much in line with the campaigning element of the project, Freed Voices.

We are confident that the programme is meeting its intended objectives. **100% of the group have to date complied with the terms of their release, over the target level of 70%.** None have absconded or failed to maintain contact with the Home Office.

II. Skills, confidence and participation

We corroborated data from our evaluation with the Detention Action's own internal evaluation tools, namely baseline interviews to identify strengths and needs on entering project. All participants are asked to describe their typical day, and what they are good at, at beginning and end of project, in order to measure the change in their level of participation. Detention Action has also introduced a system of evaluation of achievement through a simple system of agreeing or disagreeing with statements. The vast majority of participants 'strongly agreed' with the statements: 'I am more confident at speaking in public now' and 'I am more likely to talk about my feelings now'.

Peer support aspect of the project was also very important, with participants finding it therapeutic to share their experience with people who went through similar ordeal. This has contributed to

increase in emotional awareness, self-reflection and active listening. Even though the attendance was patchy because of chaotic lifestyle of the users, nevertheless they appreciated the regular sessions because they gave a structure to their day thereby helping not to relapse, and in some cases, the meetings were a reason to leave their room and interact with others:

‘It was difficult to adjust to life when I first got out, all the time I was at home, I slipped into depression again. Until Detention Action called. I was lonely, isolated, didn’t want to know anyone – I felt like a stranger. I began to talk to Detention Action in July – things started to move a bit. It helped my confidence, gave me the confidence to help others. Confidence and self-esteem improving, I’m thinking more clearly.’

It was clear that support element of the project was in general of more interest to the interviewees than campaigning, except three particularly articulate participants. The barriers to community participation may include the following (Blake et al. 2008: 31-32):

1. Personal barriers – lack of confidence, feelings of discomfort in formal meetings, difficulties in the use of English
2. Socio-economic barriers
3. Motivational barriers
4. Barriers relating to legitimacy, recognition and acceptance

All four are applicable to this particular group, and the Community Support Project is working on all of them, with a focus on personal barriers and motivation. Some people were also afraid of the ramifications from the Home Office; those fears are largely unfounded, but this does not mean that they are not real as experienced subjectively by people with high levels of anxiety and strong mistrust of the authorities.

On the other hand, playing the role of experts by experience (the users disliked the term ‘ex-detainee’ or ‘former detainee’) did have an empowering effect on participants through granting them political agency that they are usually denied as migrants. In this respect we can identify four factors which have an impact on community participation (Purdue et al. 2000: 4-5):

1. The external policy environment
2. The institutional arrangements and culture
3. The personal characteristics of a migrant (charisma, commitment, persuasion, ambition)
4. The local community

The most charismatic Anglophone participants were unsurprisingly taking the lead on Freed Voices campaigning element of the project, but there also users who were initially shy but over the course of the project gained confidence to talk to the media. Working on listening skills and peer mentoring could be an alternative for those who don’t feel comfortable when speaking in the public.

III. Programme delivery method

With regards to the project delivery, those who took part in the interviews were all very enthusiastic about Detention Action’s work, and emphasized the following strengths of programme:

- Equipping people with transferrable skills
- Good learning methods, including interactive character of the training
- Facilitating self-reflection
- User-centred approach (‘Other organisations don’t listen properly to your needs, but Detention Action does’; ‘Someone listens to you and is there to guide you’)

- Staff commitment ('They are helping from their heart')

The project is unique as it is filling the gap in services for young people released from detention who present complex immigration history, strong links with the UK and criminal record. That is because organisations that work with migrants have low awareness of the needs of ex-offenders as well as long term UK residents. In the long term, Detention Action could provide training to both migrant organisations and those who work with ex-offenders, on how to meet complex needs of people with those intersectional identities. On the other hand, the uniqueness of the programme has at times led to unrealistic expectations as to what extent Detention Action can help the users. Managing expectations will inevitably become an even bigger issue when the project progresses into the pre-release work phase with detainees. We also believe that there are some areas of improvement. The recommendations for year 2 and 3 include the following:

- More signposting is needed, especially with regards to housing as some participants had strong social networks far away from where they have been housed. This is clearly going to be very difficult in the context of Section 4 accommodation.
- More liaison with other agencies, e.g. social services for clients who have children
- Sessions could be organised more often, and preferably face to face because work over the phone impedes disclosure of sensitive information. Local capacity building in the form of volunteer peer mentoring could be a solution in the future.

The character of the project will change significantly in year 2 when Detention Action will begin working with participants pre-release, as mentioned earlier. This will reduce many of the current problems with recruitment of participants, but will introduce new challenges. The formative evaluation report that will be produced next year will therefore be very different to this one.

The evidence described in this short formative evaluation demonstrates the value of Detention Action's model in providing reintegration support to young ex-offenders who experienced long-term immigration detention. Despite considerable challenges, participants are succeeding in reintegrating and participating in the community. A key focus has been accessing mental health support services and liaison with Home Office case owners to address urgent issues related to immigration status of participants. **The holistic approach employed in the programme is its greatest strength**, with provision of intensive support to overcome the barriers to integration in the community, and with participation in campaigning, by developing skills and confidence and helping with accessing local activities and services.

References

Andrews, D. (2008) 'Extensions of the Risk Need Responsivity model of assessment and correctional treatment', in G. Bourgon et al (Eds), *Proceedings of the North American Correctional and Criminal Justice Psychology conference*, Ottawa, Ontario: Correctional Services Canada, 7-11.

Emmons, R.A. (1999) *The Psychology of Ultimate Concerns*. London, The Guildford Press.

Emmons, R.A. (2003) Personal Goals, Life Meaning, and Virtue: Wellsprings of a Positive Life. In: Keyes, C.L.M. and Haidt, J. (Eds) (2003) *Flourishing: Positive Psychology and the Well-Lived Life*. Washington: American Psychological Association.

Gavrielides, T. and P. Worth (2013) Another push for restorative justice: Positive psychology and offender rehabilitation, in *Crime: International Perspectives, Socioeconomic Factors and Psychological Implications*, Nova Science Publishers.

McAdams, D. P. (2006) *The redemptive self: Stories Americans live by*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Scottish Prison Service (2011) *The Good Lives (SO) Programme Theory Manual Version 1*. Sourced from the internet / Google.

Appendix A: Biographies of key staff

IARS Director, [Theo Gavrielides](#) PhD, LLM, LLB (Hons)

Dr. Theo Gavrielides is the **Founder and Director** of [The IARS International Institute](#) and the **Founder and co-Director** of the [Restorative Justice for All Institute \(RJ4All\)](#). He is also an **Adjunct Professor** at the [School of Criminology \(Centre for Restorative Justice\) of Simon Fraser University](#) as well as a **Visiting Professor** at [Buckinghamshire New University](#). Professor Gavrielides is the Editor-in-Chief of the peer-reviewed [International Journal of Human Rights in Healthcare](#), as well as of the [Youth Voice Journal](#) and the [Internet Journal of Restorative Justice](#). Professor Gavrielides is a **Trustee** of the [Anne Frank Trust](#), an **Advisory Board Member** of the Institute for Diversity Research, Inclusivity, Communities and Society (IDRICS) and a **Member** of the [Scrutiny and Involvement Panel of the Crown Prosecution Service](#) (London). Previously, Professor Gavrielides was the **Chief Executive** of [Race on the Agenda](#), a social policy think-tank focusing on race equality. He also worked at the Ministry of Justice as the **Human Rights Advisor** of the Strategy Directorate. There, he led on the [Human Rights Insight Project](#), which aimed to identify strategies that will further implement the principles underlying the Human Rights Act 1998 and improve public services. He also advised on the Ministry's Education, Information and Advice strategy. Dr. Gavrielides served as a **Visiting Professorial Research Fellow** at [Panteion University](#) of Social & Political Science (Greece) and a **Visiting Senior Research Fellow** at the International Centre for Comparative Criminological Research (ICCCR) at [Open University](#) (UK). During 2002-2004, he worked as a **Researcher** at the [Centre for the Study of Human Rights](#) of the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE) alongside Professorial Research Fellow [Francesca Klug](#) OBE. He is also a legal counsel specialising in criminal law, human rights and EU law. He taught criminal law and common law reasoning and institutions at the University of London, and has acted as a human rights and criminal justice advisor for various Chambers and policy bodies including the [Independent Advisory Group of the London Criminal Justice Partnership](#)

IARS Projects Coordinator (Equalities), [Natalia Paszkiewicz](#) PhD

Dr. Natalia Paszkiewicz is Projects Coordinator (Equalities) at The IARS International Institute and is responsible for the development, coordination and delivery of IARS' research and policy projects related to equality issues, including race and gender equality. Natalia completed her PhD in Social Policy at the University of Brighton. She graduated from the Adam Mickiewicz University in Poland with BA and MA degrees in Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology; and from the University of East London with MA degree in Refugee Studies. Natalia has a first-hand, ten year experience of working with young migrants, asylum seekers and refugees, including in the context of immigration detention. Her recent roles include SPARKLET (Supporting Open and Closed Reception Systems in Malta by Profiling, Action Research and Knowledge Transfer) Project Officer at the University of Malta, Senior Liaison Assistant at UNHCR Liaison Office to the European Asylum Support Office (EASO) in Malta and Researcher at the Arbour, a youth centre in East London.

Appendix B: Information sheet for participants

Evaluation of Detention Action Community Support Project

You are being invited to take part in this research project because you are a service user of Detention Action Community Support Project. I welcome you to ask questions about the study before you decide whether to participate. If you agree to do so, you may withdraw from the study at any time by advising me of this decision. Thank you for your time.

My name is Natalia Paszkiewicz and I am Projects Coordinator (Equalities) at the [Independent Academic Research Studies \(IARS\)](#). I am carrying out evaluation of Detention Action Community Support Project. As part of the research, you would be requested to fill in a questionnaire. I would also like to interview you.

The focus of the research is on your experience of being involved in the project. Benefit of your participation in the study may be that it will enable you to suggest your own ideas on how the project could be improved in order to meet specific needs of those involved.

The interviews will last for about one hour. I would like to record them to make it easier to transcribe but you may ask for me to take notes instead. I will make these sessions as comfortable as possible and you are under no obligation to answer any of my questions and can stop the session at any time.

If you have any questions or queries please either call me at 0207 064 4380 or email me at N.Pasziewicz@iars.org.uk. You can also contact Dr Theo Gavrielides, IARS Director, who is overseeing the project at T.Gavrielides@iars.org.uk

Sincerely,

Dr Natalia Paszkiewicz
Projects Coordinator (Equalities)
Independent Academic Research Studies (IARS)
14 Dock Offices, Surrey Quays Road
London SE16 2XU
Office line: 0207 064 4380
Office Mobile: 07833224442

Appendix C: Questionnaire

Name

Address

Date of birth

Country of birth

Accommodation NFA Staying with friends Private Other

Family in the UK Yes No

Your goals for the future (please specify three)

Are you interested in public speaking/campaigning: Yes No

Below are some statements about feelings and thoughts. Please tick the box that best describes your experience of each.

STATEMENTS	NONE OF THE TIME	RARELY	SOME OF THE TIME	OFTEN	ALL THE TIME
I've been feeling optimistic about the future					
I've been feeling useful					
I've been feeling relaxed					
I've been feeling interested in other people					
I've had energy to spare					
I've been dealing with problems well					
I've been thinking clearly					
I've been feeling good about myself					
I've been feeling close to other people					
I've been feeling confident					
I've been able to make up my own mind about things					
I've been feeling loved					
I've been interested in new things					
I've been feeling cheerful					

End of Programme Self Evaluation Form

Q1. Which words would you use to describe your experience of the programme?

Interesting	
Easy	
Tiring	
Inspirational	
Difficult	
Enlightening	
Fun	
Boring	
Good	
Stressful	
Different	
Frustrating	
Waste of time	
Social	
Powerful	
Educational	
Uncomfortable	
Motivational	
Helpful	
OTHER? (below):	
Amazing	
Overwhelming	

Q2. How would you score your support worker during the programme, from 1 to 5?

1 = poor, 2 = ok, 3 = good, 4 = very good, 5 = excellent

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

Q3. How would you score your own participation during the programme from 1 to 5?

Scoring is the same as previous question.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

Q4. Do you feel you have received enough support during the project? Please explain why/ why not.

Q5. If you have any other feedback, please tell us below.

Appendix D: Research ethics form

Section 1: Researcher details

1.1 Contact details of researcher					
Title	Dr	Forename	Natalia	Surname	Pasziewicz
Supervisor: Dr Theo Gavrielides			E-mail: N.Pasziewicz@iars.org.uk		
			Tel. No: 0207 0644380		
Status:	Employee	Intern	Research Associate	Other	
	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

1.2 Co-applicants (please include everyone who will be involved in the research project, including research assistants) N/A		
Name	Post held	Organisation

Section 2: Project details

2.1 Project title and timescale	
Title	Evaluation of Detention Action's Community Support Project
Proposed start date:	September 2014
Proposed end date: (of data collection)	April 2017

2.2 Costs and funding
<i>Please indicate the total costs and source of funding (if applicable):</i> Detention Action, £14,000 over the period of 3 years

2.3 Brief project description
<i>Please summarise your proposal in non-scientific language, using words and terms that can be easily understood. Your summary must include a clear statement of the purpose of your research, how it</i>

2.3 Brief project description

will build on existing evidence where available, and its intended benefits. You must also describe how the research will be conducted and how people will be involved. Lay people may review this form.

IARS is going to carry out formative and summative evaluation of Detention Action's Community Support Project over the period of three years. The Community Support Project is the first alternative to detention specifically to address the needs of young migrant ex-offenders, who frequently experience the longest periods of immigration detention. It is also the first alternative to detention to focus on migrants' active community participation. The project addresses the risks of absconding and reoffending relied on by the Home Office to justify extreme long-term detention. Detention Action will provide intensive case management support to 30 young (aged under 30) migrants per year, over the period of 3 years. Participants will receive both one-to-one support and training in life skills, and will also join the 'Freed Voices' self-advocacy group to speak out about their experiences as part of Detention Action's campaign against indefinite detention.

IARS evaluation will assess the impact that the Community Support Project has on each of the areas hypothesized by the Theory of Change (i.e. attitude/knowledge/personal development). In order to deliver both formative and summative evaluations, our research methods are applicable to varying stages of the project (i.e. assessing attitudes/ knowledge/personal qualities before/during/immediately after programme end/in the longer term).

IARS evaluation focuses on assessing the following:

- Reintegration outcomes of participants, considered against Home Office risk assessments (e.g. imminence of removal; risk of absconding; risk of harm to the public);
- Impacts of case management and training on skills, confidence and participation levels of 90 young migrants;
- Strengths and weaknesses of the programme delivery method.

Conceptual framework

The Home Office's default position is to identify factors that justify detention rather than consider each case in accordance with its policy which presumes release, and in line with assessments published by the National Offender Management Service. Offender rehabilitation has traditionally focused on all that is wrong with the offender (psychologically, socially, biologically etc.) by trying to minimise risk through treatment programmes. This is also called the Risk Need Responsivity (RNR) model of rehabilitation. As a result, policies, laws and practices have traditionally focused on setting up and managing a criminal justice system that aims to deal with these negative traits. Gavrielides (2012; 2013) has argued that these policies are based on "disadvantage thinking" i.e. seeing young offenders as problems. Concentrating on criminogenic needs to reduce risk factors may be necessary, but not a sufficient condition for effective correctional intervention. The Good Lives Model (GLM) was recently developed as an alternative approach focusing on nurturing the offender's personal strengths and goals. It includes dimensions such as gratitude, forgiveness, humility and apology which have not been explored in relation to desistance for young offenders. The Good Lives Model (GLM) posits that offending is a means of satisfying needs in anti-social ways due in part to a lack of skills and external factors; desistance from crime can be achieved through programmes that help offenders to behave in pro-social ways; rehabilitation is easier when the development of offenders' motivation to change is based on meeting their needs.

2.3 Brief project description

Research methodology

In order to ensure the robustness and academic rigour, the research methodology will be a combination of qualitative and quantitative research tools. While our quantitative design, namely a questionnaire, will look at desistance and the other variables forming part of the Risk Need Responsivity Model, our qualitative design will look at the positive factors used to make reintegration possible. It is important that the life stories of our sample are put in context so that their journey is understood without assumptions. The key advantage of qualitative research is that it allows participants to define the situation in their own terms, hence focusing on the meanings people give to the social world. The qualitative research methodology includes half-day non-participant observations, focus groups and in-depth interviews which are designed to provide qualitative information, particularly any gains in knowledge. Qualitative research will focus on the impact of the programme on soft skills acquisition of the migrants.

Section 3: Research Design

3.1: Methodology

Please check boxes for all methods that you plan to use:

A	Written questionnaires	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B	Semi-structured interviews	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
C	Unstructured interviews	<input type="checkbox"/>
D	Focus groups	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E	Observation (non-participant)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
F	Analysis of pre-existing data from human participants (where this data is sensitive or could be identifiable)	<input type="checkbox"/>
G	Audio/video recording or photography in a public place	<input type="checkbox"/>
H	Audio/video recording or photography in a private place	<input type="checkbox"/>
I	Quantitative experiment	<input type="checkbox"/>
J	Other method: please give details	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.2 Research design

Describe and justify the methods you intend to use. Include details of and reasons for your sample size to enable robust outcomes.

To achieve maximum results and accuracy, a combination of quantitative and qualitative research methods will be employed.

Questionnaire-based quantitative research will look at different variables such as immigration status, family ties in the UK, and the weight of offence. These will be measured against the Home Office risk assessments (e.g. imminence of removal; risk of absconding; risk of harm to the public). The quantitative research will cover 90 people, i.e. 100% of the cohort over the period of 3 years, and the questionnaires will be completed by Detention Action staff. The quantitative data will be thematically analysed and organised through SPSS software.

Qualitative research will focus on the impact of the programme on soft skills acquisition of the migrants. Our approach is grounded in the Theory of Change (ToC) whereby the impartment of meaningful knowledge and understanding informs attitude change, which can then lead on to personal development and empowerment as well as further insights. Our evaluation tools fall primarily within the category of qualitative research methods, and include half-day non-participant observations, focus groups and in-depth interviews which are designed to provide qualitative information, particularly any gains in knowledge and skills. 15 semi-structured interviews will be carried during each year of the project, that is 50% of those who take part in the programme every year.

Our detailed action plan includes:

June 14: “Project Initiation”

→ **September 2014 – March 2015: “Research Phase 1”**, to include:

- **Qualitative Evaluation**, including the following:
 - observation
 - semi-structured interviews
 - focus groups
- **Quantitative Evaluation**
 - assessment of rates of absconding and reoffending

→ **May 2015 – March 2016: “Research Phase 2”**, to include:

- **Qualitative Evaluation**, including the following:
 - observation
 - semi-structured interviews
 - focus groups

- **Quantitative Evaluation**
 - assessment of rates of absconding and reoffending

→ **May 2016 – March 2017: “Research Phase 3”**, to include:

- **Qualitative Evaluation**, including the following:
 - observation
 - semi-structured interviews
 - focus groups
- **Quantitative Evaluation**
 - assessment of rates of absconding and reoffending

→ **June 2017:** Final report produced. Support the dissemination and promotion of good practice and projects’ outcomes and successes through IARS existing networks.

The evaluation will help Detention Action understand and learn from the project, but also allow for the development of strategies for further improvement, with a focus on good practice in case management as alternative to detention, and in probation and reintegration work with ex-offenders.

3.3 Dissemination

Please state how you intend to disseminate research findings. Include details of any Intellectual Property or security issues and whether dissemination is local or national.

- IARS will assist DA at relevant presentations at conferences and other events with local and national decision and policy makers. Detention Action will lead on the dissemination, and we will support them with relevant publications.

Section 4: Participants and Recruitment

Section 4.1: Participants

Describe who you are looking to recruit into the project and why, including any criteria for inclusion / exclusion.

Given that our research evaluates Detention Action Community Support Project, and that the number of their users is very small, they will select the participants from their pool.

We will interview 15 participants per year, i.e. 45 people over the course of the project.

The questionnaire will be filled in by Detention Action staff, and will cover all the project's users, i.e. 90 young male ex-detainees.

Section 4.2: Recruitment method

Provide a brief outline of how potential participants will be approached and recruited into the project (any recruitment materials should be included with the application).

Detention Action will organise, hold and deliver the meetings where non-participant observation will be carried out. In order to arrange one to one interviews, the researcher will be given access and contact the participants directly. The format of one to one interviews with the project's beneficiaries, where confidentiality and anonymity are ensured, will provide environment for an open and honest feedback and unbiased responses.

Section 4.3: Vulnerability

If vulnerable people are allowed to take part in this study, give details and please indicate any necessary checks required by the researchers (eg Disclosure and Barring Service checks).

The ex-offenders who will take part in the research are vulnerable individuals. However, they are service users of Detention Action, and they have responsibility for their welfare.

Researchers have a responsibility to ensure that the physical, social and psychological wellbeing of an individual participating in the research is not adversely affected by participation in the research. According to the principle of avoiding undue intrusion, the advancement of knowledge and the pursuit of information are not in themselves sufficient justifications for overriding the values and ignoring the interests of those studied.

Research participants have a right to remain anonymous and to have their rights to privacy and confidentiality respected. This will be made explicit in the consent forms that all participants will be asked to sign prior to any data being collected. We will take appropriate measures relating to the storage and security of records during and after fieldwork, and will remove any possible identifiers of the participants. All data will be stored on a computer using the appropriate password facility. Hard copies of data will be kept in a lockable drawer. And destroyed after the period of time in line with Data Protection law.

The principle of informed consent expresses the belief in the need for truthful and respectful exchanges between researchers and research participants. Participants must fully understand what it means to participate in the research, what the risks and benefits of doing so are, as well as what rights they have, i.e. right not to participate and right to withdraw at any time. Voluntary informed consent will be negotiated with research participants by talking them through the research process. All participants will be required to sign a consent form and given an information sheet about the study.

Given the non-participant nature of the observations, the researcher will not interfere with the nature of the meetings. Both observations and interviews will be terminated and the researchers will withdraw immediately, if risk for the participants and/or the process is identified.

The researcher has been DBS checked.

Section 4.4: Incentives

If your project will involve offering incentives of any kind, state what the incentives (financial or otherwise) will be and provide a brief justification as to why you feel this is necessary for the project.

N/A

Section 4.5: Gatekeepers

Please indicate any gatekeepers whose permission is required to contact participants or access data (eg Headmaster, NHS R&D committee, Company manager, Head of School, HR). Include any documents for seeking permission or where permission has been granted.

N/A

Section 5: Consent procedure

This section will demonstrate how you will obtain informed consent from the participants. *Please include all supporting documents (eg Information Sheets, Consent forms and questionnaires).* Please answer YES, NO or NOT APPLICABLE (N/A) to **each** of the following:

		Yes	No	N/A
5.1	All respondents will be given an Information Sheet and enough time to read it before being asked to agree to participate.	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.2	All participants taking part in an interview, focus group, observation (or other activity which is not questionnaire-based) will be asked to sign a consent form.	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.3	All participants completing a questionnaire will be informed on the Information Sheet that returning the completed questionnaire implies consent to participate.	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.4	All participants being asked to provide sensitive personal data will have	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	the following statement on the consent form or on the bottom of their questionnaire “I consent to the processing of my personal information for the purposes of this research study. I understand that such information will be treated as strictly confidential and handled in accordance with the UK Data Protection Act 1998”. A tick box should be included to allow participants to give explicit consent for the collection and use of such data.			
5.5	All respondents will be told that they can withdraw at any time, ask for their interview tape to be destroyed and/or their data removed from the project until it is no longer practical to do so (e.g. when the report has been written up).	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.6	Where full information cannot be given prior to participation (because it could influence outcomes) participants will be fully de-briefed after participation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	x
5.7	If you answered NO to any of the above (or think more information could be useful to the reviewer) please state why here:			

Section 6: Confidentiality, Anonymity & Data and Records Management				
This section will show how participants can expect confidentiality and/or anonymity and will show how any research data collected will be managed during and after the study. <i>Confidential data is not disclosed to other people; Anonymous data cannot be linked to the participant’s personal details.</i> Please answer YES, NO or NOT APPLICABLE (N/A) to each of the following:				
		Yes	No	N/A
6.1	Questionnaires will be returned anonymously and indirectly. Please note that questionnaire data cannot then be followed up/clarified.	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6.2	Questionnaires and/or interview transcripts will only be identifiable by a unique identifier (e.g. code/pseudonym)	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6.3	Lists of identity number or pseudonyms linked to names and/or addresses will be stored securely and separately from research data	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6.4	All place names and institutions which could lead to the identification of individuals or organisations will be changed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	x
6.5	I confirm that all processing of personal information related to the study will be in full compliance with the UK Data Protection Act 1998 (DPA) <i>(including the Data Protection Principles)</i>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6.6	I confirm that processing of all security sensitive information will be in full compliance with the “Oversight of security - sensitive research material in UK universities: guidance (October 2012)” (Universities UK,	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	recommended by the Association of Chief Police Officers)			
6.7	If you answered NO to any of the above (or think more information could be useful to the reviewer) please state why here:			

Section 7: Authorisation	
For employees:	
Please ask your line manager to sign that they have read the application form and that they accept responsibility for the applicant who is undertaking the work in their School.	
Signed:	
Date	
For interns/ associates/ other:	
Please ask your supervisor to sign that they have read the application form and that they accept responsibility for the applicant who is undertaking the work.	
Signed	
Supervisor	
Date	

Section 8: Checklist for Applicants	
X The Ethics application form	
X The Participant Information Sheet	
X The Consent Form	
<input type="checkbox"/> Letter to gatekeepers	
<input type="checkbox"/> Materials for recruitment of participants	
X 2 Questionnaires	
<input type="checkbox"/> Authorisation received	

Independent Academic Research Studies (IARS) Publications

Unit 14, Dock Offices Surrey Quays Road, London SE16 2XU, UK

+44(0) 20 7064 43805, contact@iars.org.uk www.iars.org.uk

IARS is a leading, international think-tank with a charitable **mission to give everyone a chance to forge a safer, fairer and more inclusive society**. IARS achieves its mission by producing **evidence-based** solutions to **current** social problems, sharing best practice and by supporting **young people** to shape decision making. IARS is an international expert in restorative justice, human rights and inclusion, citizenship and user-led research.

IARS' vision is a society where everyone is given a choice to actively participate in social problem solving. The organisation is known for its robust, independent evidence-based approach to solving current social problems, and is considered to be a pioneer in user-involvement and the application of user-led research methods

Published in the UK by IARS Publications

© 2015 IARS

The moral rights of the author have been asserted

Database right IARS Publications (maker)

First published 2015

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the prior permission in writing of IARS Publications, or as expressly permitted by law, or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics rights organisation. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside of the scope of the above should be sent to IARS at the address above.

You must not circulate this book in any other binding or cover and you must impose the same condition on any acquirer.