



A snapshot from Wales

The voluntary sector working in criminal justice

March 2014

Clinks

In partnership with

The University of South Wales & Welsh Centre
for Crime and Social Justice

Authors:

Katy Holloway & Neil Tomkins
The University of South Wales



The document is available in Welsh on request.
Mae'r ddogfen ar gael yn Gymraeg ar gais.

Contents

■ Executive summary	4
■ Introduction	6
■ 1. Methods	8
Research methods	8
Ethical issues.....	9
■ 2. A profile of voluntary sector organisations in Wales	10
Characteristics of respondents	10
Characteristics of voluntary sector organisations.....	10
Client group(s)	12
Support services provided.....	13
Working in partnership with the voluntary sector and private sector	15
Working in partnership with the statutory sector.....	18
Commissioning	20
Summary	22
■ 3. The needs of voluntary sector organisations in Wales	23
Knowledge and perception of Clinks	23
Summary	26
■ 4. Conclusions	28
■ References	29
■ Appendix	30
Appendix - Reason for priority need	30

Executive Summary

In 2013, Clinks commissioned researchers from the University of South Wales to conduct a needs assessment of voluntary sector organisations operating in Wales. The aim of this research was to gather information that would help inform the development and delivery of Clinks' services in Wales. This report presents the results of the needs assessment, collated through an on-line survey.

Those who took part represented a wide range of voluntary sector organisations including those working with: sex offenders, prisoners, young offenders, families, substance misusers, the homeless, victims of crime and people with mental health problems. The respondents were all in high level positions within their organisations and had all been working for their organisation for at least one year.

The majority of respondents indicated that the organisation

they worked for was not a specialist criminal justice organisation but nevertheless provided support to people within the Criminal Justice System (CJS). Nearly three-quarters of all the organisations had been providing support to people within the CJS for five or more years. Most of the organisations were operating in South Wales while less than half were operating in North, West or Mid Wales.

The organisations were reported to be delivering support to a wide range of client groups. The most frequently targeted were current or former prisoners (and their families), young people, sex offenders and substance misusers. Most respondents indicated that their organisation's primary aim was to motivate and empower people. Helping them into education, training and employment or helping them with family-related issues were also key areas of support provided.

Just under half of organisations worked in partnership with other voluntary sector organisations with just over a third working in partnership with the private sector. In most cases the quality of the relationship with partner organisations was rated positively, although the responses indicated that private sector partners were felt to be most effective in terms of planning and developing services, while voluntary sector organisations were most effective in terms of the practical delivery of support to service users. When asked to describe what could be improved in the relationship with voluntary sector and private partners, the main response seemed to be in relation to finances. Respondents were keen to improve access to funding, make funding streams easier to apply for and improve payment systems to ensure more timely deposits from some of the larger partner organisations.

Working with the statutory sector was rated as being more difficult than working with private and other voluntary sector partners. However, respondents indicated that they enjoyed the best practical working relationships with the Prison Service and Local Authorities and the worst with the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) and National Offender Management Service (NOMS) Cymru. In terms of planning and development of services, respondents rated the Welsh Government and Local Authorities most positively and CPS and Courts most negatively. When asked what they felt could be improved when working with statutory sector organisations, funding, communication and better understanding of the voluntary sector organisation's needs were frequently mentioned. Respondents were keen to rebalance power inequalities, engage in more joined up working, improve level and

access to funding and ensure a fairer distribution of funds.

Most of the respondents had heard of Clinks prior to completing the survey (more than half were already Clinks members) and perceptions of Clinks were overwhelmingly positive. The most frequently used and most highly rated Clinks service was the Light Lunch ebulletin. Access to funding (or funding support) and general advice and guidance were identified as the main areas where support would be welcomed.

A range of other needs were also identified by fairly large proportions of respondents (e.g. bridging relationships, signposting to other support and help with developing partnerships). Nearly three-quarters were happy to receive support from Clinks by email while just over one-third said that they would be happy to attend conferences or other events.

Introduction

Clinks supports, represents and campaigns for the voluntary sector working with offenders. Clinks aims to ensure the sector and all those with whom they work, are informed and engaged in order to transform the lives of offenders. To date, most of the work undertaken by Clinks has been with the voluntary sector in England. However, Clinks is now seeking to provide more targeted support to voluntary sector organisations that work with offenders and their families in Wales.

Clinks' strategic objectives are to:

- Promote the work of the voluntary sector in the Criminal Justice System (CJS),
- Provide specialist support to organisations working with offenders,
- Represent the voluntary sector within the CJS,
- Identify priority areas which the voluntary sector face within the CJS and work with them to find solutions.

The voluntary sector is "diverse in size, scope, staffing and funding" and includes local community and voluntary groups, registered charities, foundations, trusts as well as social enterprises and co-operatives (Department of Health 2011). Although voluntary sector organisations may differ in terms of the services that they deliver and the client groups that they support, they are similar in that they are usually independent from government.

They also share common characteristics in the social, environmental or cultural objectives that they pursue (Department of Health 2011). Voluntary sector organisations working in the field of criminal justice are particularly diverse in terms of the client group that they target. They provide support not only to offenders and their families, but also to victims, witnesses and to people at risk of offending.

In 2013, Clinks commissioned, through the auspices of the Welsh Centre for Crime and Social Justice, researchers from the Centre for Criminology at the University of South Wales to undertake a needs assessment of voluntary sector organisations operating in Wales. The main aim of this research was to gather information that would help inform the development and delivery of Clinks' services in Wales. This report presents the results of the needs assessment.

The report is divided into four chapters. Chapter 1 focuses on the methods used to conduct the research and gives an overview of the design, strategy, sampling, methods of data collection and analysis. Chapter 2 focuses on the characteristics of the voluntary sector organisations included in the survey and examines their client group and partnership working. Chapter 3 moves on to consider what voluntary sector organisations

.....

in Wales know about Clinks and investigates the ways in which Clinks may help these organisations deliver their services in Wales. Chapter 4 draws some conclusions and highlights the main areas where Clinks might target their support to the voluntary sector in Wales.



1. Methods

The main aims of the needs assessment were to (a) find out more about the characteristics of the voluntary sector operating in the field of criminal justice in Wales and (b) to identify what specialist support the voluntary sector in Wales would like to receive from Clinks and other partners, such as Wales Council for Voluntary Action¹, or other generalist infrastructure organisations². In this chapter we briefly describe the methods that were used to help achieve this aim.

Research methods

Research design and strategy

The observational study took a data snapshot, to gather the views of people working in voluntary sector organisations across Wales. Such surveys are widely used in social research largely because they are the simplest and least costly alternative (Kraska and Neuman 2008). The on-line survey had 35 respondents. This small number of participants means that caution

must be taken when drawing conclusions and generalising the findings. It may be that this sample of respondents and organisations does not reflect the views of the wider population of voluntary sector organisations currently operating in Wales.

The survey was conducted using a mixed strategy approach through which both quantitative and qualitative data were collected. Both types of research have their own unique strengths and weaknesses and together they can complement one another (Bryman 2012).

Data collection method

The data was collected through an on-line survey that comprised more than 50 questions, the majority of which were closed in nature and involved respondents ticking appropriate boxes. A small number of open questions were included in the survey to generate qualitative data that would add detail to the

quantitative data generated by the closed questions.

¹ Wales Council for Voluntary Action (WCVA): www.wcva.org.uk (last accessed 17.02.2014)

² For a list of voluntary sector infrastructure organisations: www.clinks.org/other-infrastructure (last accessed 17.02.2014)

Sample source

Clinks' contacts database of voluntary sector organisations in Wales was used as the principal source of respondents for the survey³. Clinks provided a link to the on-line survey to representatives of the voluntary sector organisations and to partner organisations to distribute to their networks (e.g. WCVA and Community Justice Cymru). A link to the survey was also placed on the Clinks website and in the weekly Light Lunch ebulletin. Incentives (including free membership to the Clinks network and entry to Clinks training events) were offered by Clinks to encourage participation.

Sample size

It was acknowledged at the outset of the project that generating a high response rate to an on-line survey would be difficult (it is notoriously difficult in social research). The use of incentives and frequent reminders

were therefore employed to try and address this problem. At the end of the eight-week study period, a total of 35 respondents had completed the survey. This response rate (18%, 35 of 200 targeted organisations) was somewhat lower than anticipated (we had hoped for at least 50 responses).

Data analysis

SPSS version 21 analysis software was used to analyse the data generated by the survey. The quantitative data was analysed using traditional univariate and bivariate methods. The qualitative data was analysed using descriptive tools and thematic analysis.

Ethical issues

The needs assessment was office based and involved indirect contact with representatives of the voluntary sector in Wales. There were, therefore, no ethical concerns. However, one important issue to note was that at the end

of the survey respondents were asked to provide their name and contact details if they were willing to contribute further to the research. Respondents were therefore assured that all data provided would be stored securely using password protected databases and that responses would be anonymised in any publications.

³ At the time of writing, more than 200 organisations were included on the Clinks database. These organisations are 'self-identified' as working in Wales and while they may all formally cover Wales it is possible that some have not (yet) physically delivered a service there.

2. A profile of voluntary sector organisations in Wales

In this chapter we focus on the sample of respondents who took part in the needs assessment and examine the main features of the voluntary sector organisations that they represent. In the next chapter we turn our attention to the reported ‘needs’ of these organisations.

Characteristics of respondents

The survey was launched on 26th August 2013 and ran for an eight week period, closing on 18th October 2013. During that period, questionnaires were completed by representatives from 35 different voluntary sector organisations operating in Wales. The respondents represented a wide range of voluntary sector organisations including those working with: sex offenders, prisoners, young offenders, families, substance misusers, the homeless, victims of crime and people with mental health problems.

The respondents were all in high level positions within their organisations and included managers, directors, CEOs, founders, leaders or heads of divisions, and they had all been working for their organisation for at least one year. In fact, nearly two-thirds of respondents had been working in their organisation for at least three years. This would tend to suggest that the respondents had sufficient knowledge about the organisation to provide valid responses to the survey.

Characteristics of voluntary sector organisations

The majority of respondents (63%) indicated that the organisation that they worked for was not a specialist criminal justice organisation but nevertheless provided support to people within the Criminal Justice System (CJS). The remaining 37 per cent defined themselves as specialist criminal justice organisations. Nearly

three-quarters (74%) of all the organisations had been providing support to people in the Criminal Justice System for five or more years (see Table 1).

Length of time supporting people in the CJS

	Frequency	Per cent
Less than 1 year	2	6%
1-3 years	6	18%
3-5 years	1	3%
5+ years	25	74%
Total	34	100%

Table 1
Notes: 1 organisation did not respond.

Region in which organisation currently operates and plans to operate next year

	Currently operating		Planning to operate	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
North	16	46%	18	51%
South	28	80%	27	77%
Mid	13	37%	14	40%
West	16	46%	18	51%

Table 2

Notes: Multiple responses possible.

Two-thirds of the organisations were described as having their Head Office in Wales, while the remainder were in England⁴. When asked about the coverage of services provided by their organisation, equal proportions described this as being local, regional or the whole of the UK (27%). The remaining respondents described the coverage as national (this was not specified as being Wales or England). The vast majority of respondents indicated that their organisation operated in both urban and rural areas (85%). However, four organisations were focused solely on urban areas while one organisation provided support solely in a rural area.

Most organisations (80%) were reported to be currently operating and delivering support in South Wales while only just over one-third were operating in Mid Wales (see Table 2). This is perhaps unsurprising given that the population is most dense in the

South of Wales and least dense in Mid Wales (ONS, 2012). It is interesting to note that several organisations were planning to diversify and start operating in North, Mid and West Wales in the next year. Conversely, while 28 of the organisations were currently operating in South Wales, only 27 were planning to operate there next year.

Cardiff and Swansea were the two Local Authority Areas with the most voluntary sector organisations operating within them (54% and 51% respectively) while Powys had the least (n=8, 23%). Cardiff and Swansea were also the areas in which the organisations were described as being most active, with Bridgend a close third. No respondents indicated that Ceredigion, Powys or Torfaen were in their top three most active areas. Evidently, and perhaps understandably, the more densely populated areas of Wales have

attracted most of the voluntary sector organisations covered by this survey.

⁴Two respondents did not answer this question.

Client group(s)

Respondents were asked to describe briefly, in a free-text box, the main client groups that their organisations supported. The responses were varied and ranged from very specific types of client to extremely broad groups. For example one organisation reported providing support to 'those at risk of committing a sexual offence, or who have already committed one'. Another organisation was described as helping 'anyone in any form of

need'. The varied responses and the broad range of groups covered, makes summary and categorisation of responses difficult. However, generally speaking, it is evident that current or former prisoners (and their families), young people, sex offenders and substance misusers were the kinds of client most frequently targeted by the voluntary sector organisations in this survey. Respondents were then asked to provide information about specific client groups (as opposed to the

main group) that their organisation provided support to. The results can be seen in Table 3 below.

Most organisations (i.e. more than 90%) were reported to provide support to people of any gender over the age of 16. However, less than half (37%) of the organisations provided support to children under 16.

Clients supported by voluntary sector organisations in Wales

	Frequency	Per cent		Frequency	Per cent
<i>Any support</i>			Learning disabled	10	29%
Male	33	94%	Physically disabled	8	23%
Female	32	91%	Other [1]	8	23%
Young adults (16-25)	33	94%	Victims	7	20%
Adults (25+)	32	91%	Refugees/asylum seekers	4	11%
Older people (60+)	27	77%	Lesbian	4	11%
Young people (16-18)	21	60%	Gay	4	11%
Children (under 16)	13	37%	Bi-sexual	4	11%
			Ethnic minority	3	9%
<i>Specialised/targeted support</i>			Sexual orientation minority	3	9%
Transgender	24	69%	(ex) Military	2	6%
(ex) Offenders	17	49%	Witnesses	2	6%
Families	16	46%			

Table 3

Notes: Multiple responses possible. [1] Other includes: 'specialised programmes', '... anyone and all', 'all in the CJS', 'prisoners regardless of the above', 'older people Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET) and young people', 'Trustees and senior staff'

Location of support to offenders

	Frequency	Per cent
In prison	17	49%
In the community	31	89%
Work 'through the gate'	13	37%
Other	6	17%

Table 4

Notes: Multiple responses possible.

Type of offenders

	Frequency	Per cent
Short-term prison sentences (<12 months)	21	60%
Long-term prison sentences (>12 months)	19	54%
Community orders	19	54%
Life sentences	15	43%
Remand in custody	14	40%
Other	7	20%

Table 5

Notes: Multiple responses possible. Other includes: n/a, all of the above, no specific target, young people referred by YOT, 'those not convicted'.

Respondents were also asked about a range of client groups that their organisation provided specialised or targeted support to. Just under half of organisations specifically targeted offenders (or ex-offenders). Less than one-third provided specialist support to people with physical or learning disabilities. Only a handful of organisations specialised in delivering support to minority ethnic or minority sexual orientation groups, the military or to witnesses.

About half of the organisations in the survey provided specialised support to offenders (or ex-offenders) the rest did not specifically target them.

To investigate how, in practice, organisations worked with offenders, respondents were asked about the location in which they delivered the support. The majority (89%) provided support in the community. Just under half (49%) provided support to offenders in the prison

environment while just over one-third worked 'through the gate' (see Table 4). Six respondents described 'other' types of working, which included 'back through the gate (recall)', 'in prison news-letter based' and 'in young people's secure units'.

Respondents were also asked if they specifically targeted particular types of offenders. Most organisations (60%) were described as targeting offenders on short-term sentences, but more than half (54%) targeted offenders on long-term sentences or on community orders (see Table 5).

Support services provided

All respondents were asked to provide information about the nature of the support provided by their organisation. Respondents were given a list of services and were asked to indicate whether each one was a primary service provided by their organisation, a secondary 'other' service provided by them, or

a service that they usually referred clients on to other organisations for help with. An 'n/a' option was also provided for those services that the organisation had no role in.

More than three-quarters (76%) of respondents indicated that motivating and empowering clients was a primary service provided by their organisation. Helping clients into education, training and employment was a primary service for 53 per cent of organisations and helping with children and family-related issues was a primary service for 50 per cent of organisations. Providing support with health, substance misuse, domestic violence or sex working issues were primary services for comparatively few organisations.

As might be expected, when a 'field' was not a primary or secondary focus for an organisation, it was often something that clients would be referred on to other agencies

for support with. It is interesting to note that the 'n/a' box was ticked on relatively few occasions, which tends to suggest that it was rare for an organisation to provide no assistance at all with a particular issue.

A small number of respondents ticked the 'other' box to indicate that another 'field' or issue was the primary or secondary focus of their organisation. These included: 'all problems of false allegations of sexual abuse', 'counselling

and psychotherapy', 'Information Advice and Guidance (IAG)', 'mountaineering related recovery activity', 'personal development workshops', 'training and support for staff and trustees', and 'employment, housing and welfare support to prisoner families'.

Respondents were also asked to provide information about the range of fields or issues that their organisation provided support with. Respondents were asked to tick only

those services that the organisation itself provided rather than referred on to other organisations. The results are presented in Table 6 below and clearly show that a wide range of services are available in Wales. The most popular field of work provided was that of personal development, which was offered by two-thirds of voluntary sector organisations. This was followed closely by volunteering, which was offered by 63 per cent of organisations. Approximately half

Fields of work that the organisation provides itself

	Frequency	Per cent		Frequency	Per cent
Personal development	23	66%	Domestic Violence	8	23%
Volunteering	22	63%	Restorative justice	8	23%
Advice and advocacy	17	49%	Environment and regeneration	7	20%
Education	17	49%	Generic services	7	20%
Family support	17	49%	Physical health	6	17%
Mentoring and befriending	16	49%	Arts	5	14%
Employment	15	46%	Research and academia	5	14%
Peer mentoring support/ advice	15	43%	Sports	4	11%
Training	15	43%	Faith	3	9%
Service user involvement	14	43%	Legal advice	3	9%
Alcohol	12	40%	Lobbying and campaigning	3	9%
Drugs	12	34%	Transport provision	3	9%
Counselling	12	34%	Media	2	6%
Mental Health	12	34%	Mediation	2	6%
Finance, benefits and debt	11	34%	Racial equality	2	6%
Resettlement	11	31%	Gambling	1	3%
Housing and homelessness	10	31%	HIV/AIDS	1	3%
Disability	9	26%	Infrastructure	1	3%
Parenting skills	9	26%	Visitors centre	1	3%

Table 6

Notes: Multiple responses possible.

Working in partnership with the voluntary sector and private sector

	Yes	No	Don't know	Total
Does your organisation work in partnership with the voluntary sector	46% (15)	39% (13)	15% (5)	100% (33)
Does your organisation work in partnership with the private sector	38% (12)	59% (19)	3% (1)	100% (32)

Table 7

Notes: some organisations did not respond.

of all organisations offered 'advice and advocacy', 'education' or 'family support'. By contrast, only one organisation provided support with gambling problems, HIV/AIDS, infrastructure or a visitors' centre.

Working in partnership with the voluntary sector and private sector

To investigate service delivery in more depth, respondents were asked about any partnership working that their organisations were involved in. Nearly half (46%) of respondents indicated that their organisation worked in partnership with other voluntary sector organisations and just over one-third reported that their organisation worked in partnership with the private sector (see Table 7)⁵. In a small number of cases the respondents did not know and were therefore unable to comment about working with voluntary sector or private partners.

When asked about the nature of their partnerships, respondents described a range of both informal and formal⁶ partnerships with other voluntary sector organisations. Partnerships with the private sector usually included either or both of the two key private sector organisations that work in the field of criminal justice in Wales (i.e. G4S and Serco). For example, one respondent simply wrote 'G4S' while another explained 'We work with G4S and have worked greatly with Serco - we have delivered in their prisons a great deal of provision, from sports clubs, mentoring and resettlement projects - this was according to their needs'.

⁵ Questions were also asked about working in partnership with the public sector. The results of these slightly different questions are presented and discussed later in the report.

⁶ Formal partnerships tended to cover instances where organisations worked and submitted bids for funding together. They also included some sub-contracting arrangements.

Rating partnership working with the voluntary sector and private sector

	Very good /good	Average	Poor/ very poor	n/a	Total
Relationship with voluntary sector					
Practical delivery	69% (9)	15% (2)	-	15% (2)	100% (13)
Planning and development	54% (7)	15% (2)	15% (2)	15% (2)	100% (13)
Relationship with private sector					
Practical delivery	64% (7)	27% (3)	-	9% (1)	100% (11)
Planning and development	73% (8)	27% (3)	-	-	100% (11)

Table 8

Notes: some organisations did not respond.

In most cases, the quality of the relationship with partner organisations was rated positively, particularly in terms of practical service delivery (69% for voluntary sector partners and 64% for private partners) (see Table 8). Interestingly, the relationship in terms of the planning and development of services was rated less positively with voluntary sector partners (54% rated this as good or very good) but more positively with private partners (73% rated this as good or very good).

The numbers are too small to draw any firm conclusions about partnership working, but there appears to be a belief that private partners are most effective in terms of planning and developing services (as perhaps might be expected from a profit-making business), while voluntary sector organisations are most effective in terms of the practical day-to-day delivery of support to clients (as perhaps might

be expected from a third sector organisation).

When asked to describe what tends to work well when working with other voluntary sector organisations, respondents described a range of positive features including: 'each partner contributing their particular area of expertise', 'good open communication, mutual trust and respect, etc', 'having the backup of a larger organisation was very good', and 'like minded intentions that are allowing the client the choice of their future'.

Similar comments were made about what works well when working with private sector partners. The complementary roles and mutual support were highlighted although it was suggested that private sector organisations are businesses and sometimes put clients second. Comments included: 'good planning and understanding of the contract, good close working relationship',

'mutual collaboration and support', 'relationship management', 'the autonomy and independence of our organisation enhances our work', and 'we know where we stand - they are a business - we are passionate about the client first and business second'.

When asked to describe what could be improved in the relationship with voluntary sector partners, respondents described a variety of things that could be done. These included 'a more co-ordinated approach to a client's action plan', 'access to funding', 'actual planning and tangible completion of activities in a timely fashion', 'communication and information sharing', 'funding streams made easier to apply for', 'increase in understanding of what makes a good partnership, how the partnership can be formed, etc', and 'more participation on the management and delivery level'.

Rating the relationship with private sector partners

	Strongly agree/ agree	Neither	Disagree/ Strongly disagree	n/a	Total
Private sector partners understand the ethos and values of the voluntary sector	46% (5)	55% (6)	-	-	100% (11)
Private sector partners understand your organisation's needs and support you to develop your services	73% (8)	27% (3)	-	-	100% (11)
My organisation finds it easy to engage with private sector organisations	82% (11)	18% (2)	-	-	100% (11)

Table 9

Notes: some organisations did not respond.

Areas of improvement in the relationship with private sector partners included: 'a less reactive provision would improve working and the outcomes for all involved', 'level and types of support to be developed and actual number of private sector partners', 'payment systems - they are such big organisations, the payment can take a great deal of time to land in our accounts', and 'sharing of more work to right qualified companies'.

Three additional questions were asked about the relationship with private sector organisations (see Table 9). The first asked them if they agreed that 'private sector partners understand the ethos and values of the voluntary sector'. Of the 11 respondents, more than half (55%) were neutral in their response while 46 per cent either agreed or strongly agreed that this was the case.

The second statement asked them if they agreed that 'private

sector partners understand your organisation's needs and support you to develop your services'. Nearly three-quarters (73%) of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, while the remainder expressed neutral views. The third statement asked respondents if they agreed that 'my organisation finds it easy to engage with private sector organisations'. Again, the majority of respondents (82%) either agreed or strongly agreed with this statement while two remained neutral.

Evidently, private sector partnerships were viewed most positively in terms of planning, support and engagement but less positively in terms of their understanding of voluntary sector organisations' ethos and values. For these respondents, the 'business' and profit-making focus of the private sector seems to be in conflict with the charitable 'client-centred' focus of the voluntary sector.

Working in partnership with the statutory sector

Respondents were also asked to rate the quality of their working relationship with a range of agencies within the statutory sector. First, they were asked about the quality of the relationship in terms of the practical delivery of services and then they were asked to rate the quality of the relationship in terms of planning and development. The results are presented in Table 10 below. The figures show that voluntary

sector organisations enjoyed the best practical working relationships (i.e. rated as good or very good), with Prison Service (87%), Local Authorities (84%), Police (72%) and Welsh Government (63%). By contrast, the relationship with the CPS and NOMS Cymru rated most poorly (50% and 33% respectively).

A similar pattern of results was found in the quality of relationship in terms of the planning and development of services (see

Table 11). Once again, Welsh Government and Local Authorities were rated most positively (73% and 65% respectively) while CPS and Courts were rated most poorly.

Relationship with statutory partners in terms of the practical delivery of services

	Very good /good	Average	Poor/ very poor	Total
Police	72% (13)	11% (2)	17% (3)	100% (18)
Crown Prosecution Service	-	50% (4)	50% (4)	100% (8)
Magistrates	25% (2)	50% (4)	25% (2)	100% (8)
Courts	18% (2)	64% (7)	18% (2)	100% (11)
Prison Service	87% (14)	6% (1)	6% (1)	100% (16)
Wales Probation Trust	47% (8)	36% (6)	18% (3)	100% (17)
Youth Justice Board Cymru	50% (6)	33% (4)	7% (2)	100% (12)
Local Authorities	84% (16)	5% (1)	11% (2)	100% (19)
Area Planning Boards	44% (4)	44% (4)	11% (2)	100% (9)
Community Safety Partnerships	61% (11)	22% (4)	17% (3)	100% (18)
Local Health Boards	55% (6)	27% (3)	18% (2)	100% (11)
Ministry of Justice/ National Offender Management Service	40% (6)	33% (3)	27% (4)	100% (15)
National Offender Management Service Cymru	47% (7)	20% (3)	33% (5)	100% (15)
Welsh Government	63% (12)	32% (6)	5% (1)	100% (19)
Police and Crime Commissioners	50% (6)	33% (4)	17% (2)	100% (12)

Table 10

Notes: some organisations did not respond.

Relationship in terms of planning and development of services

	Very good /good	Average	Poor/ very poor	Total
Police	50% (7)	7% (1)	43% (6)	100% (14)
Crown Prosecution Service	-	25% (2)	75% (6)	100% (8)
Courts	-	44% (4)	55% (5)	100% (9)
Prison Service	40% (6)	40% (6)	20% (3)	100% (15)
Wales Probation Trust	38% (5)	15% (2)	46% (6)	100% (13)
Youth Justice Board Cymru	33% (4)	25% (3)	42% (5)	100% (12)
Local Authorities	65% (11)	12% (2)	24% (4)	100% (17)
Area Planning Boards	20% (2)	40% (4)	40% (4)	100% (10)
Community Safety Partnerships	50% (7)	14% (2)	36% (5)	100% (14)
Local Health Boards	56% (7)	22% (2)	22% (2)	100% (9)
Ministry of Justice/ National Offender Management Service	42% (5)	8% (1)	50% (6)	100% (12)
National Offender Management Service Cymru	46% (6)	8% (1)	46% (6)	100% (13)
Welsh Government	73% (11)	7% (1)	20% (3)	100% (15)
Police and Crime Commissioners	36% (4)	18% (2)	45% (5)	100% (11)

Table 11

Notes: some organisations did not respond.

Rating the relationship with statutory sector partners

	Strongly agree/ agree	Neither	Disagree/ Strongly disagree	n/a	Total
Your organisation understands and meets the needs of statutory partners	67% (19)	14% (4)	11% (3)	7% (2)	100% (28)
My organisation finds it easy to engage with statutory sector organisations	50% (14)	29% (8)	18% (5)	4% (1)	100% (28)
The needs of your organisation are understood and met by statutory partners	38% (11)	28% (8)	31% (9)	3% (1)	100% (29)

Table 12

Notes: some organisations did not respond.

Respondents were asked to elaborate on what they felt tended to work well when working with statutory partners. A range of positive factors were identified including: 'collaboration and allow autonomy', 'communication and history of working together', 'good working connections and regular meetings', 'having personal contacts', 'multi agency meetings and open discussions', 'regular communication and engagement', and 'working as team to make the best of any event'.

Some respondents were more specific in their answers and provided quite detailed answers. For example, one respondent explained that 'peer led recovery projects can be outside of a lot of core strategic and operational structures - this can be a desirable situation as it means we are not subject to other people's agendas and can develop radical service provision away from the

restrictions of the formal statutory preoccupations'.

When asked what they felt could be improved when working with statutory sector organisations, funding, communication and better understanding of the voluntary sector organisation's needs were frequently mentioned. Comments included: 'A basis for mutual respect and a re-balancing of the power inequalities', 'Communication, it can be very difficult to make contact with the person you need', 'Level and access to funding', 'Long term sustainability planning', 'more joined up', 'Sometimes they are unwilling to co-operate and make assumptions about prison working', 'Fairer distribution of funds', and '... more training and awareness is needed to encourage and support statutory services to improve ...'.

Respondents were also asked to state if they agreed with three statements relating to working

with the statutory sector (see Table 12). The first question asked them if they felt their organisation understands and meets the needs of statutory partners and more than two-thirds either agreed or strongly agreed that this was the case. By contrast, only just over one-third felt that statutory organisations understood and met the needs of voluntary sector organisations. Nevertheless, half of respondents indicated that it was easy to engage with the statutory sector. This was considerably lower than the proportion of respondents who indicated that it was easy to engage with private partners (82%).

Commissioning

An important part of working in the voluntary sector is working with people and organisations who commission (or purchase) their services (i.e. commissioners and procurement teams). To investigate the nature of the relationship between voluntary sector

Rating the relationship with commissioners

	Strongly agree/ agree	Neither	Disagree/ Strongly disagree	n/a	Total
Your organisation operates independently from service commissioners	50% (14)	18% (5)	21% (6)	11% (3)	100% (28)
The needs of your organisation are listened to and valued by service commissioners	36% (10)	29% (8)	29% (8)	7% (2)	100% (28)
Commissioners are client focused and look for the best possible services for them	39% (11)	21% (6)	32% (9)	7% (2)	100% (28)

Table 13

Notes: some organisations did not respond.

organisations and commissioners, respondents were asked to rate how strongly they agreed with three statements (see Table 13). The first statement asked them if their organisation operates independently from service commissioners. While half of respondents indicated that their organisation did operate independently, just over one-fifth (21%) indicated that it did not. Nearly one-fifth of respondents neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement.

The second statement asked if they agreed that the needs of their organisation were listened to and valued by commissioners. Just over one-third of respondents agreed that this was the case but nearly 30 per cent disagreed or strongly disagreed that this was true. Finally, respondents were asked if commissioners were client focused and looked for the best possible services for clients. Nearly two-fifths (39%) felt that they were while one-

fifth were neutral and roughly one-third felt that they were not.

While the small numbers taking part in this survey make it difficult to draw firm conclusions, the general pattern of results indicate that voluntary sector organisations enjoy fairly positive relationships with their commissioners and most manage to maintain independence from them.

A free text-box was provided for respondents to write in any further comments that they had about commissioning. The comments were varied and included short and long statements. For example, '[voluntary sector] are often undervalued', 'commissioners respond to and implement government based policies and not service user led need - the exception can be those who show some imagination', 'I have approached various social services and probation officers, and police, but have met with pretty much

complete disinterest, so I have continued on my own on a private basis, self funded', 'On the whole commissioning appears to be driven by cost considerations and not quality or needs of the users', '... some commissioners are very receptive to the needs of [clients]', and 'the procurement methods and mechanics are often not effective and vary from opportunity to opportunity - with challenging communication methods'.

The main points being made here seem to be that the quality of commissioning can vary and that there is sometimes a conflict between the needs and values of the voluntary sector and the needs and values of commissioners.



Summary

In this chapter we described the characteristics of the 35 organisations represented in this survey. The majority of organisations were not specialist criminal justice organisations but nevertheless provided support to people within the CJS. Most of the organisations had been providing support to people within the Criminal Justice System for five or more years and most were operating in South Wales while less than half were operating in North, West or Mid Wales.

The organisations were reported to be delivering support to a wide range of client groups. The most frequently targeted were reported to be current or former prisoners (and their families), young people, sex offenders and substance misusers. In terms of the nature of support provided to clients, most respondents indicated that their organisation's primary aim was to motivate and empower clients.

Helping clients into education, training and employment or helping them with family-related issues were also key areas of support provided.

In terms of partnership working, just under half of organisations worked in partnership with other voluntary sector organisations and about a third worked in partnership with the private sector. In most cases the quality of the relationship with partner organisations was rated positively although the responses indicated that private partners were felt to be most effective in terms of planning and developing services while voluntary sector organisations were most effective in terms of the practical delivery of support to clients. The main area where partnerships were felt to need most improvement was in relation to financial issues.

In terms of partnerships within the statutory sector, respondents indicated that they enjoyed the

best practical working relationships with the Prison Service and Local Authorities and the best planning and development relationships with Welsh Government and Local Authorities. Areas for improvement included financial issues, communication and more joined-up working.

An important part of working in the voluntary sector is working with people and organisations who commission their services. While the small numbers taking part in this survey make it difficult to draw firm conclusions, the general pattern of results indicate that voluntary sector organisations enjoy fairly positive relationships with their commissioners and most manage to maintain independence from them.

3. The needs of voluntary sector organisations in Wales

In Chapter 2 we profiled the characteristics, structure and operations of a sample of voluntary sector organisations operating within the CJS in Wales. In this chapter we move on to examine the specific needs of these organisations as reported by representatives of them. The chapter begins by examining the respondents’ knowledge of Clinks and the services that Clinks provides. It then moves on to consider the particular needs of the individual organisations and how Clinks might help them deliver their services more effectively.

Knowledge and perception of Clinks

When asked if they had heard of Clinks prior to completing the survey, the majority (93%) of respondents who answered the question indicated that they had (see Table 14) and just over half were already members of Clinks. Nearly all respondents who had heard of Clinks (92%) had positive or very

Knowledge and perception of Clinks

	Frequency	Per cent
Knowledge of Clinks		
Yes, had heard of Clinks before	27	93%
No, had not heard of Clinks before	2	7%
Total	29	100%

Membership of Clinks		
Yes, a member of Clinks	15	56%
No, not a member of Clinks	8	30%
Don't know	4	15%
Total	27	100%

Perception of Clinks		
Very positive	11	42%
Positive	13	50%
Neutral	2	8%
Negative	-	-
Very negative	-	-
Total	26	100%

Table 14
Notes: Some organisations did not respond.

What Clinks services has your organisation used

	Yes	No	Don't know	Missing	Total
Light Lunch ebulletin	43% (15)	-	-	57% (20)	100% (35)
Conferences and events	29% (10)	11% (4)	-	60% (21)	100% (35)
Website	31% (11)	6% (2)	-	63% (22)	100% (35)
Reports and guidance	23% (8)	14% (5)	-	63% (22)	100% (35)
Policy briefings	23% (8)	11% (4)	3% (1)	63% (22)	100% (35)
GRANTnet	14% (5)	17% (6)	6% (2)	63% (22)	100% (35)
Training	17% (6)	17% (6)	3% (1)	63% (22)	100% (35)
Regional support	9% (3)	23% (8)	3% (1)	66% (23)	100% (35)
Consultations	14% (5)	20% (7)	3% (1)	63% (22)	100% (35)
Arts Alliance	6% (2)	26% (9)	3% (1)	66% (23)	100% (35)
Safer Future Communities	6% (2)	26% (9)	3% (1)	66% (23)	100% (35)
Social media, e.g. Twitter	6% (2)	26% (9)	3% (1)	66% (23)	100% (35)

Table 15

Notes: Some organisations did not respond.

positive general perceptions of the organisation. Only two respondents were neutral in their perception but none were negative or very negative.

Respondents were given a list of Clinks services and asked to indicate if they had used any of them. Table 15 shows that the Light Lunch ebulletin was the service that had been used by most organisations (43%). This was followed by the Clinks website (31%) and by conferences and events (29%). The least commonly used services were social media, the Arts Alliance and Safer Future Communities (6% each).

Respondents who had used Clinks services were asked to rate on a scale from 1 to 5 (with 1 being not helpful and 5 being very helpful) how helpful they had found the service (see Table 16). The results indicate that, more often than not, the service was found to be

helpful. The service rated as being most helpful of all was the Light Lunch ebulletin (79% rated this as being very helpful) followed by conferences and events (55%) and regional support (50%). By contrast, the Arts Alliance⁷ and social media were rated less positively with 60 per cent of respondents opting for the middle of the rating scale. Interestingly, few respondents rated any of the services at the lower end of the scale (i.e. as being unhelpful).

A key aim of the survey was to identify the on-going needs of voluntary sector organisations operating in the CJS in Wales. Respondents were therefore asked to rate on a scale of 1 to 5 how important specific kinds of additional support would be to their organisation. The results are presented in Table 17 below. Support with accessing funding was rated as being 'very important' to the majority of respondents (80%) as too was the provision of advice and

guidance (70%). More than two-thirds of respondents (64%) rated 'information dissemination' as 'very important' to their organisation and just under two-thirds (61%) indicated that support in bridging relationships with the private and statutory sector was 'very important' to their organisation. Interestingly, few issues were rated as being of no importance to organisations. This tends to suggest that voluntary sector organisations would value support across the board but with particular focus on access to funding.

⁷It should be noted that more respondents rated the helpfulness of certain services than had reported using those services. This could mean that respondents had either missed or misunderstood the first question or they were reporting on the potential helpfulness of that service.

How helpful were the services provided by Clinks (1=not helpful, 5=very helpful)

	5 - Very helpful	4	3	2	1 - Not helpful	Total
Light Lunch e-bulletin	79% (11)	7% (1)	7% (1)	7% (1)	-	100% (14)
Conferences and events	55% (6)	27% (3)	9% (1)		9% (1)	100% (11)
Website	36% (4)	46% (5)	18% (2)	-	-	100% (11)
Reports and guidance	44% (4)	33% (3)	22% (2)	-	-	100% (9)
Policy briefings	33% (3)	44% (4)	22% (2)	-	-	100% (9)
GRANTnet	14% (1)	57% (4)	14% (1)		14% (1)	100% (7)
Training	43% (3)	43% (3)	14% (1)	-	-	100% (7)
Regional support	50% (3)	-	50% (3)	-	-	100% (6)
Consultations	25% (1)	50% (2)	25% (1)	-	-	100% (4)
Arts Alliance	20% (1)	20% (1)	60% (3)	-	-	100% (5)
Safer Future Communities	-	50% (2)	50% (2)	-	-	100% (4)
Social media, e.g. Twitter	40% (2)	-	60% (3)	-	-	100% (5)

Table 16

Notes: Some organisations did not respond.

On-going needs of your organisation in terms of how important additional support would be on a scale of 1 to 5 (1=not important, 5=very important)

	5 - Very important	4	3	2	1 - Not important	Total
Information dissemination	64% (14)	23% (5)	14% (3)	-	-	100% (22)
Advice and guidance	70% (16)	26% (6)	4% (1)	-	-	100% (23)
Consultation/listening events	46% (10)	23% (5)	32% (7)	-	-	100% (22)
Developing partnerships & collaborating	63% (15)	25% (6)	8% (2)	-	4% (1)	100% (24)
Network development	56% (14)	24% (6)	16% (4)	-	4% (1)	100% (25)
Providing a voice/lobbying	46% (10)	23% (5)	23% (5)	-	9% (2)	100% (22)
Providing local one-to-one support	46% (10)	23% (5)	23% (5)	-	9% (2)	100% (22)
Promoting good practice	59% (13)	23% (5)	14% (3)	-	5% (1)	100% (22)
Providing training	43% (9)	33% (7)	24% (5)	-	-	100% (21)
Bridging voluntary and statutory sectors	61% (14)	17% (4)	22% (5)	-	-	100% (23)
Bridging voluntary and private sectors	61% (14)	22% (5)	17% (4)	-	-	100% (23)
Supporting innovation	58% (14)	25% (6)	13% (3)	-	4% (1)	100% (24)
Signposting to other support	58% (14)	29% (7)	4% (1)	8% (2)	-	100% (24)
Access to funding/funding support	80% (20)	12% (3)	8% (2)	-	-	100% (25)

Table 17

Notes: Some organisations did not respond.

Method of receiving support from Clinks

	Frequency	Per cent
Conference/events	13	37%
Email	26	74%
Telephone	5	14%
Post	4	11%
Other (webpage accessed on demand)	1	3%

Table 18

Notes: Some organisations did not respond. Multiple responses possible.

When respondents were asked to state which one area of work they felt they needed most support, perhaps unsurprisingly, the top priority area was funding. This was followed by networking and partnership working, lobbying and gaining a voice, advice and guidance, and information dissemination. One respondent felt that it was too difficult to identify any one issue stating that ‘It’s difficult to say as all the areas above are important in their own way’. Unfortunately, eleven respondents did not identify their priority need.

Respondents who did provide information about their priority need were asked to explain why this was the case. The responses to this question are listed in full in Appendix 1. In summary, the responses were quite varied in nature but some common issues emerged. In terms of funding, there were concerns about the ability to continue to deliver existing services

in the current financial climate particularly in light of the new payment by results agenda.

Some respondents described working with a hidden population that needed a ‘voice’ while others were concerned that they were too busy delivering the service and were unable to broadcast their successes. Other respondents described a need for help with bridging their services with other partners or networking with other organisations to deliver a more efficient service. In addition, some respondents described how their organisations were hoping to extend their services in various ways while others were less specific and wanted general help and guidance across a range of fields of work.

In summary, it is evident that help is needed across the board with a particular focus on help with accessing further funding. When asked how they would like

to receive support from Clinks, the majority (74%) indicated that email was their preference. Just over one-third indicated that they would like to receive support through conferences/events while 14 per cent wanted telephone communication, 11 per cent wanted letterbox information and one person was happy with web access on a needs basis (see Table 18). Last of all, respondents were asked if there was anything else that Clinks might be able to help with. Only a small number of additional comments were provided and all four referred to the need for help with accessing funding.

Summary

In this chapter we examined respondents’ knowledge and general perceptions of Clinks. We then focused on the needs of the organisations and the way in which Clinks could help address these needs. Most of the respondents had heard of Clinks prior to completing

the survey (more than half were already members) and perceptions of Clinks were overwhelmingly positive. The most frequently used and most highly rated Clinks service was the Light Lunch bulletin.

In terms of the on-going needs of the organisations, access to funding/ funding support and general advice and guidance were identified as the main areas where support would be welcomed although a range of other needs were also identified by fairly large proportions of respondents (e.g. bridging relationships, signposting to other support and help with developing partnerships). Nearly three-quarters were happy to receive support from Clinks by email while just over one-third would be happy to attend conferences or other events.



4. Conclusions

This report has presented the results of a survey of representatives of voluntary sector organisations currently operating in Wales. The aim was to profile the characteristics of voluntary sector organisations working in criminal justice in Wales and to identify the ways in which Clinks might help them deliver their services in the future.

The survey was conducted on-line and in spite of efforts to boost the response rate only 35 respondents took part. It is therefore difficult to draw any firm conclusions from the data as it is unclear whether this sample accurately represents the wider population of voluntary sector organisations operating in Wales. Nevertheless, the responses are useful in providing a good general indication of the characteristics and needs of voluntary sector organisations working in the field of criminal justice in Wales.

The main conclusion to draw from the research is that while the voluntary sector organisations are diverse in terms of their client groups and locations, they nevertheless have common goals (i.e. motivating and empowering clients) and common experiences of working with different partners. Generally speaking, working with the voluntary sector and private sector was reported to be easier than working with statutory partners, although areas for improvement (particularly in terms of funding arrangements and lines of communication) were noted across all working relationships.

While Clinks are already recognised as a positive source of support, respondents indicated that their organisations would benefit from further support across a range of areas. Most importantly, however, was the need for help in obtaining funding to enable them to continue to deliver their core services.

Most respondents indicated that they would be happy to receive support from Clinks by email while a smaller proportion indicated that conferences and events would be welcomed. Given that the Light Lunch ebuletin was so positively rated by respondents, this may be the most useful and economical way of delivering generic funding support to voluntary sector organisations in Wales. More specific and specialised support might then be provided through personal email contact with Clinks on a needs basis. An annual event at which organisations might share best practice or learn key skills (e.g. how to write successful bids) as well as network with potential collaborators, may also be a way of helping address the needs of voluntary sector that were highlighted in this survey.

References

Bryman, A. (2012) Social Research Methods. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Department of Health (2011) The Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise Sector, access November 2013 via: http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+/www.dh.gov.uk/en/Aboutus/OrganisationsthatworkwithDH/Workingwithstakeholders/DH_128070.

Kraska, P.B. and Neuman, W.L. (2008) Criminal Justice and Criminology Research Methods. Columbus, Ohio: Allyn and Bacon.

ONS (2012) Country Profiles: Key Statistics - Wales, accessed November 2013 via http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/dcp171780_275347.pdf



Appendix

Reason for priority need

Reason for priority need	Summary reason
Because at the moment I am funding my project myself, and with contributions from users	Funding
Because it would save us time and be tailored to our needs	Efficiency
Because the really small, independent, service user led, peer led organisations need to work outside of some frameworks but could do better to have a collective voice - this not about traditional Voluntary Service Council activity (this tends to serve a different voluntary sector population) - this is about forum activity	Voice
Because we are a new organisation and up to now are 100% funded by the volunteers who set it up	Funding
Challenging financial climate	Funding
Develop innovative ideas for 16+ age group aim towards transitional work between YOS and Probation	Ideas Bridging work
For reasons previously listed, children and families of prisoners/affected by criminal justice are a relatively "hidden" population and the non-devolved aspect of criminal justice can act as a barrier to raising awareness of the issues in wales - Clinks could provide lobbying/campaigning support on a national level in particular with Welsh Government	Lobbying
Generic advice and guidance would cover areas such as: briefings, one-to-one support, network development, developing partnerships and collaborations, bridge between voluntary sector and statutory and private sectors, supporting innovation, signposting and funding information - All would be useful to our organisation over the next 6 months at least	General advice and guidance
Our growth is being curtailed due to lack of funding, need more funding stream for the work we do	Funding
So that we can provide more support to people in need through our drop in and training facilities	To extend services
The whole environment of funding/commissioning/contracting is changing for the Sector and the capacity, skills and experience for each organisation needs to be developed to keep pace with the opportunities that are presenting themselves	Funding Commissioning

Reason for priority need	Summary reason
To advise us what everyone is doing and to network with all organisations in order to ensure the falsely accused are eventually recognised and to help create less falsely accused prisoners - to help them and their families when they come into the community	Advice Networking Lobbying
To market our services	
We are a very small organisation. Criminal justice is not our soul focus. We have been doing innovative, pioneering work in prisons for 7 years and are now in real danger of not surviving these changes. It really feels like the Big Boys are in town and you need manpower, infrastructure, capacity in order to play the game. A good example is applying for the Social Action fund - some organisations will have teams working on this	Support Networking
We are creating a new charity to provide our service users with employment opportunities, plus welfare support for prisoner families	Extend services
We do some great work - we work very hard and as such don't have the time to shout about what we doing - we are too busy doing it - Clinks helps us all have a collective voice that allows us to continue to do what we do, and be heard at the same time!	Voice Lobbying
We have only 6mths funding left and concerned about the implications of the Rehabilitation Project will create for funders and payment by results	
We have only 6mths funding left and concerned about the implications of the Rehabilitation Project will create for funders and payment by results	Funding
We rely on funding, everything falls apart if we do not have it	Funding
We want to extend our criminal justice services	Extend services
We will need to get better at working in partnership as organisations get squeezed on resources. MoJ Transforming Rehabilitation also means partnership working will be more important	Networking Partnership Funding
We work locally across England and Wales with [a large] local membership. We employ staff who deliver services locally to the needy. Networking access would help us to work more effectively	Networking



Clinks
59 Carter Lane
London
EC4V 5AQ

0207 248 3538
info@clinks.org

Registered Charity Number:
1074546. Company limited by
guarantee, registered in England
Number: 3562176