



This is a presentation of the following unpublished document, ©2025 Jonathan Hobson, All Rights Reserved and is licensed under All Rights Reserved license:

Hobson, Jonathan ORCID logoORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8081-6699> (2025) Evaluating restorative practices with those on IPP sentences. In: Being Restorative in Prisons Summit 2025, 08/10/2025, The National Council for Voluntary Organisations, London. (Unpublished)

Official URL: <https://restorativejustice.org.uk/civicism/event/info%3Fid%3D815%26reset%3D1>

EPrint URI: <https://eprints.glos.ac.uk/id/eprint/15417>

Disclaimer

The University of Gloucestershire has obtained warranties from all depositors as to their title in the material deposited and as to their right to deposit such material.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation or warranties of commercial utility, title, or fitness for a particular purpose or any other warranty, express or implied in respect of any material deposited.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation that the use of the materials will not infringe any patent, copyright, trademark or other property or proprietary rights.

The University of Gloucestershire accepts no liability for any infringement of intellectual property rights in any material deposited but will remove such material from public view pending investigation in the event of an allegation of any such infringement.

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR TEXT.



This is a presentation of the following unpublished document:

Hobson, Jonathan ORCID logoORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8081-6699> (2025) Evaluating restorative practices with those on IPP sentences. In: Being Restorative in Prisons Summit 2025, 08/10/2025, The National Council for Voluntary Organisations, London. (Unpublished)

EPrint URI: <https://eprints.glos.ac.uk/id/eprint/15417>

Disclaimer

The University of Gloucestershire has obtained warranties from all depositors as to their title in the material deposited and as to their right to deposit such material.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation or warranties of commercial utility, title, or fitness for a particular purpose or any other warranty, express or implied in respect of any material deposited.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation that the use of the materials will not infringe any patent, copyright, trademark or other property or proprietary rights.

The University of Gloucestershire accepts no liability for any infringement of intellectual property rights in any material deposited but will remove such material from public view pending investigation in the event of an allegation of any such infringement.

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR TEXT.

Cultivating Change: Doing and Being Restorative in Prisons Summit



*Evaluating restorative practices with those
on IPP sentences*

Dr Jon Hobson – jhobson@glos.ac.uk



UNIVERSITY OF
GLOUCESTERSHIRE

Dr Jon Hobson
Dr Rebecca Banwell-Moore



Swansea
University
Prifysgol
Abertawe

Dr Sara Correia-Hopkins
Kate Smyth



Cardiff
Metropolitan
University

Prifysgol
Metropolitan
Caerdydd

Dr Zoe Cross



UNIVERSITY OF
GLOUCESTERSHIRE



- Indeterminate Public Protection (IPP) orders:
(2005 > 2012)
- As of 31/03/2025 there are still 2,544 people in prison on an IPP sentence
- Labelled as a '**violation of human rights**' by the United Nations.



Sentences of imprisonment for public protection: HM Prison and Probation Service annual report

Published Friday, 06 December, 2024

The report by the House of Commons Justice Committee published in 2022 described IPP sentences as “irredeemably flawed”.^[20] It argued that “whilst there have been some efforts made in the last 10 years to reduce the IPP prison population [...] not enough has been done”.^[21] It said, “the problem is becoming more significant and pressing due to the increasing number of released IPP sentenced individuals being recalled back to prison”. It identified several problems, including:^[22]

- psychological harm to prisoners caused by the indefinite nature of the sentence, leading to high levels of self-harm and some suicides within the IPP population and barriers to progressing to release
- limited availability of appropriate courses for IPP prisoners
- lack of transparency around the evaluation of programmes that the prison and probation service and the Parole Board rely on to help determine risk
- resource issues within the probation service and Parole Board, resulting in an “ineffective” parole process that poses “a significant barrier” to progression for IPP offenders
- a “growing concern” about the population of recalled IPP prisoners, such as questions about what the threshold for recall should be and whether IPP prisoners receive enough support on release to help them reintegrate into the community

(See: HMPPS 2024)

Project Aims

1. Improve wellbeing and safety for POIPP community and families, particularly those affected by trauma.
2. Work with secondary and vicarious trauma affecting staff and others in the POIPP support network.

Funding & Timeline

- UK Ministry of Justice, HMPPS Innovation Grant 2023-25
 - Grant Programme: Enabling the voluntary sector to contribute to better outcomes for offenders in Prisons, under Probation Service supervision, and in Youth Custody. Theme 3: Improving Safety.
- 2-year project, Nov 2023-2025, but due to initial delays, it has recently been extended to end of March 2026.

The intervention

Activity	Delivery
Group and 1:1 'restoring myself' sessions includes activities centred around; life events, protective factors, habits and hobbies, self-care toolkit, strengths, emotions, impact of shame, self talk, affirmations, coping with stress, coping with change, shield of resilience, wellbeing toolkit and the final session is a letter of kindness.	More 1:1 than originally thought due to cognitive ability, un-willingness to work in groups, and non-stop red regimes since start of august
Agored qualification	3/3 coming back as having passed so far
Training course with accredited mentoring units	
Family days	Only 2 members of IPP community having clearance to attend
2 day RA training	Originally 4 day training but shortened to 2 days due to concerns over safety
Staff training and supervision	

Restorative Practice/Approaches

Broad, informal, every day practices used to build relationships, foster empathy and prevent harm.

Restorative Justice

Formal, structured, reactive tools used following a harm, often involving the harmed and the harmer.

PREVENTATIVE; relationship focused

REACTIVE: responding to conflict

Every day culture, relationship focused

Restorative chats and wing meetings

Circles and restorative reasoning programmes

Victim-offender mediation; family conferences

Culture Change

Restorative
Adjudications

Recognition of
POIPP needs

Restore 'My Community'

121 coaching and
peer mentoring
training (POIPP)

RA Training (staff)

Family Work

Restore 'Me'

121 Coaching and Wellbeing
Circles (POIPP)

Therapeutic Reflexive Practice and
Clinical Supervision (staff)

Adapted 'QUALIPREV' mixed methods Process and outcome evaluation (Rummens et al, 2026; Hobson et al, 2018; Rees and Hobson, 2021)

Phase 1 (Collected)	Phase 2 (Dec 2025)
Interviews and focus groups (n=14) • Intervention delivery team (n=6) • Intervention Org CEO • Prison staff (n=6) programme manager, head of offender management, head of rehabilitation, delivery staff, lead psychologist IPP Circle • 1x circle with n=6 men Secondary data • Delivery feedback and reflection forms • Participation data	Interviews and focus groups (n=16 est) • Interviews with original cohort • Clinical supervision lead for delivery team • Family member interviews (or survey) IPP Circle • Second circle with participants Secondary data • prison data (incidents etc) • programme feedback

What's challenging

- I. Initial deployment, access to keys, systems and space.
- II. Complex, dynamic, high-risk prison environment
- III. Multi-part intervention covering multiple groups (inc. IPP, their families, prison staff, delivery staff)



What's working

- I. Well received with high participation from the men (including some first-time intervention engagement)
- II. Men report impacts on 'self' and behaviour
- III. Some move towards prison 'culture change' for IPP and prison more broadly

The evaluation

Trusted relationships aren't common in [the prison]. And the fact that we have them and have maintained them, I think is very powerful... quite a few men whose POMs said that they've never worked with anyone, they wouldn't engage with anything...and now we've got those same people who are at the doorway to sell the course every week...They're coming back week after week.”

Delivery Focus Group

“You give us a voice because you really listen. Other staff are either too clinical or don't give a shit. You are the only ones who lay in the middle and actually seem to care”.

“You cheer me up and give me hope”.

The evaluation

“the interventions team have all of the rooms blocked out all morning every morning. So from the very beginning 50% of the availability was gone. So that has been a struggle because if we had more opportunity to use rooms, we could have done more circles and more courses.”

“It took six weeks to even get like an interview [for security clearance] (...) We still don't have a laptop. We technically don't have a room... We now have an office, but we've been told many times that it's not ours and we're about to be kicked out and we have to leave. So at the moment we are just in it until someone physically removes us.”

Delivery Focus Group

“They say that they can't cope, we double check on the system, you know, because we want to encourage group work because the additional benefits or they getting bullied or they're learning needs, their cognitive delays are extreme. They just couldn't [and] we couldn't accommodate that. So we're doing more one to ones than we thought we would.”

Charity CEO Interview

Fair, H. and Jacobson, J., 2018. Process evaluation of the Restorative Prisons project.

Hobson, J., Lynch, K., Payne, B., & Ellis, L. (2018). Are Police-Led Social Crime Prevention Initiatives Effective? A Process and Outcome Evaluation of a UK Youth Intervention. *International Criminal Justice Review*, 31(3), 325-346.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1057567718814891>

Rees, Ella and Hobson, Jonathan (2021) [Restorative Practice in the Criminal Justice System: Examining a Restorative Reasoning Programme in a Women's Prison](#). *Laws*, 10 (4). Art 95. doi:[10.3390/laws10040095](https://doi.org/10.3390/laws10040095)

Rummens, Anneleen, Wim Hardyns, Ffeya Vander Laenen, and Lieven Pauwels. (2016) *Criteria for the Evaluation of Crime Prevention Practices; Research Report*. Institute for International Research on Criminal Policy, Ghent University for the European Crime Prevention Network. Available [online](#)

HMPPS (2024) Sentences of imprisonment for public protection: HM Prison and Probation Service annual report. Available:
<https://lordslibrary.parliament.uk/sentences-of-imprisonment-for-public-protection-hm-prison-and-probation-service-annual-report/>





UNIVERSITY OF
GLOUCESTERSHIRE



Swansea
University
Prifysgol
Abertawe



Cardiff
Metropolitan
University

Prifysgol
Metropolitan
Caerdydd

Dr Jon Hobson

(jhobson@glos.ac.uk)

Dr Sara Correia-Hopkins

(S.Correia@Swansea.ac.uk)

Kate Smyth

Dr Rebecca Banwell-Moore

Dr Zoe Cross



UNIVERSITY OF
GLOUCESTERSHIRE



Discussion activity:

What are the outcomes you are hoping for from using RJ/RP in prison?

In what ways might those outcomes be measured?

What information/data will you need to measure those outcomes (and how easy/complex might it be to get the data?)