



Conditional Cautions: Key findings from a victim satisfaction survey, December 2007

1. Introduction

This paper presents the key findings from a small-scale survey of victim satisfaction with the conditional caution scheme in one area. The survey was undertaken by a local voluntary organisation on behalf of the Office for Criminal Justice Reform.

Summary

- Successful interviews were conducted with 158 victims.
- Most victims (80%) said they were aware the offender had received a conditional caution – of these, 71% reported having the aims of the scheme explained to them.
- Over 80% of victims who had the aims of the scheme explained to them (irrespective of whether they knew the case was given a conditional caution or not) were satisfied to some degree with the information they received.
- Approximately two thirds of victims said that they had not been consulted about whether the offender should receive a conditional caution. Where victims had been consulted, the majority – 80% - said they felt that their opinion had been taken into account.
- Just under two thirds of victims reported knowing what conditions the offender received, although 29% stated that they did not (7% were unsure).
- Victims reported to being aware of up to three conditions administered, with the vast majority (125 of 157 conditions reported) being compensation. Other conditions cited were to write a letter of apology (16 reports), to attend an alcohol intervention session (five reports) and not to re-offend (five reports).
- Victim ratings of the fairness of the first condition administered to offenders showed that there was a fairly even split between the proportions reporting these as fair in some way as opposed to unfair (45% and 47%, respectively).
- Almost a fifth of the reasons for victims' ratings of fairness were concerned with the compensation being regarded as insufficient. However, 13% of the reasons were also associated with the compensation being sufficient. A further 19% of reasons were because the conditions were regarded as inappropriate.
- 71% of victims reported that there were benefits to the scheme. These included the speed/cost of the disposal, a decrease in court down-time and addressing offending behaviour. However, 29% of responses given by victims was that there were no benefits.
- The largest set of drawbacks reported (26%) concerned the fact that victims regarded the conditional caution scheme as not harsh enough or inappropriate. A further 17% were associated with the length of time taken to receive compensation or non-receipt of the payment. However, 15% of responses were that there were no drawbacks to the scheme.
- An equal number of respondents reported being satisfied or dissatisfied to some degree with the conditional caution scheme.
- Satisfaction levels with the scheme were statistically significantly related to:
 - ◆ Whether or not the aims of the scheme had been explained to victims
 - ◆ Whether victims were consulted about whether the offender should get a conditional caution
 - ◆ Perceived fairness of conditions administered
 - ◆ Case status

2. Methodology

Potential respondents to the survey were selected from records held by the area on conditional cautions administered between 1 January 2005 and 31 January 2007. Not all cases involved an identifiable victim and therefore the final dataset for the survey covered 435 cases and 574 victims. Whilst most of the cases involved only one victim, 101 cases involved two victims and 14 cases three or more victims.

Consent letters were sent to 574 victims. Where there were valid contact details and the victim did not opt-out of the survey, in general, four attempts were made to contact them to request their participation in a telephone interview – successful interviews were then conducted with 158 victims¹.

The interviews covered a range of issues, including:

- Status of the conditional caution – e.g. current, completed, breached;
- Victim details – age, gender, ethnicity;
- Understanding of the scheme and consultation with victims;
- Knowledge of conditions administered;
- Knowledge of compensation payments – amount, payment dates and mode of payment;
- Opinions of fairness of conditions administered and reasons for this opinion;
- Opinions of the key benefits and drawbacks of the scheme;
- Overall satisfaction with the conditional caution scheme.

A copy of the questionnaire employed in this survey is provided in Annex 1. Data were coded and analysed using the statistical software package, SPSS.

3. Limitations of the data

Whilst the following outlines the key information derived through analysis of this victim survey, there are a number of factors that should be taken into consideration when considering the findings:

- It is not known how representative of victims experiencing conditional cautions within the area these data are. Only 28% of victims approached for an interview took part in one and it is not known whether they differed in any way from the 72% remaining. This means that the following findings cannot be generalised to other groups of victims.
- The information provided has been reported by the victims themselves; it will therefore be subject to various biases including differences in interpretation of questions, and differences in recall of information, especially for those victims recalling their experiences from further back in time.
- Analysis of the questionnaires suggested there may have been variations in interviewing practice between interviewers, which may have led to some inconsistency in the ways in which victims responded and how these responses were recorded.

¹ Whilst a small number of questionnaires were sent out to victim through the post, these have been excluded from this analysis for methodological reasons.

- For some aspects of the analysis, the sample sizes on which the findings are based are very small (not all questions were relevant to all victims and not all victims responded to all questions), so findings will need to be interpreted with caution.

When interpreting the findings, the above limitations need to be taken into account.

4. Key findings

The following presents the key findings from the interviews, as reported by the victims who were interviewed.

Case status

Where victims knew the status of the conditional caution case they had been involved in (143 cases), they reported that:

- 48% had been completed, ended or adhered to;
- 26% had been breached, prosecuted, dealt with at court or the CPS had decided NFA over non completion; and,
- 25% were still current.

Profile of victims

The gender of the victims participating in the survey was known in 153 cases. For these, it was found that 56% were male and 44% female. Eighty six per cent of the 157 victims who reported their ethnicity classified this as 'White British'. Victims' age ranged from 15 years to 82 years (156 victims responded to this question).

Knowledge and consultation over conditional cautions

Victims were asked whether they were aware that the offender had received a conditional caution and all 158 victims responded to this; 80% of victims responding said that they were aware (126 victims), with only 17% stating they were not aware (27 victims). Five victims – three per cent - were unsure whether they knew this or not. Of the 158 victims, 58% (92 victims) reported having the aims of the scheme explained to them, whilst 29% (46 victims) said they had not. Thirteen per cent (20 victims) were unsure about this.

For those who had had the aims of the scheme explained to them (irrespective of whether they knew the case was given a conditional caution or not), it was found that the majority – over 80% – were satisfied to some degree with the information they received. Only 16% of these victims expressed dissatisfaction at the quality of the information:

Table 1: Satisfaction with the quality of information given for those victims who had the scheme explained to them

Satisfaction rating	Number of victims (n)	Percentage (%)
Very satisfied	20	22%
Satisfied	56	61%
Not very satisfied	11	12%
Not at all satisfied	4	4%
Don't know	1	1%
Total	92	100%

Victims were then asked if they were consulted about whether the offender should receive a conditional caution. Of the 156 people responding to this question, approximately two thirds (65%; 102 victims) said that they had not been consulted and just under a third (31%; 49 victims) that they had. A further 3% were unsure.

Of the 49 victims who said they had been consulted, 46 went on to state who had consulted with them. In all cases, this had been a police officer. The majority of the 49 victims consulted – 80% - said they felt that their opinion had been taken into account and only 6% that it had not (14% were unsure either way).

Conditions administered

Just under two thirds of victims (98 of the 154 victims responding to this question) reported knowing what conditions the offender received, although 29% stated that they did not (7% were unsure). The following table indicates the conditions that were reported as having been administered to offenders.

It should be noted that some victims reported up to three conditions and therefore numbers will be in excess of the number of victims reporting having known the conditions. In addition, it was clear from the questionnaire that whilst some victims reported not knowing the conditions, they then went on to discuss them with the interviewer. It is therefore not known whether the following figures are a true reflection of knowledge of the conditions, or whether some victims were responding to prompts given by the interviewers during the course of the interview.

Table 2: Reported conditions administered to offenders

Condition	Number of times reported as a condition
Compensation	125
Attend alcohol intervention session	5
Pay alcohol intervention session fee	3
Write letter of apology	16
Not to re-offend	5
Other	3
Total	157

Most offenders received only one condition (116 of 157 conditions reported were not administered alongside other conditions), and the vast majority received compensation as this condition. Where known, only 10 victims reported conditions that did not involve compensation.

Where compensation was reported as a condition, victims also reported being informed of the following:

Table 3: Knowledge of compensation payments

	Yes (%)	No (%)	Unsure (%)
The total amount of compensation (n=121)	69%	26%	5%
The date by which the offender should make payment (n=122)	46%	43%	11%
How they would receive the compensation payment (n=122)	48%	41%	11%

Victims were then asked if they were informed of the outcome of the conditional caution. There was a fairly even split between those saying they were informed and those saying they were not (44% and 41% respectively). A further 13% said they did not know the outcome of case because the conditional caution was still ongoing.

Satisfaction with conditions administered

For all of the conditions cited by victims, they were asked whether or not they felt the condition was fair compared to the harm caused to them. Again, it is clear that respondents answered this question in different ways (e.g. they may have commented irrespective of whether or not they reported knowing the conditions or they may not have commented for all conditions). Numbers will therefore not match the numbers associated with knowledge of conditions.

One hundred and fifty three victims commented on the fairness of the first condition reported. The following table indicates views of these conditions and shows that there was a fairly even split between the proportions of victims reporting these as fair in some way as opposed to unfair (45% and 47%, respectively):

Table 4: Ratings of fairness of Condition 1

Rating	Percentage (%)
Very Fair	9%
Fair	36%
Not very fair	29%
Not at all fair	18%
Don't know/No opinion	8%
Total	100%

A variety of reasons were given for these responses, as shown in Table 5, below. Victims could give up to three reasons, all of which have been amalgamated into this table.

Table 5: Reason for rating of fairness of condition 1

Reason	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Compensation insufficient	29	19%
Conditions inappropriate as do not take into account relevant factors	29	19%
Views on appropriateness of condition for this case	27	17%
Compensation paid/sufficient	20	13%
Issues associated with breach and non compliance/continuing problems	19	12%
Positive feedback on conditions administered	9	6%
Issues associated with administration of conditional caution ²	8	5%
Negative feedback on conditions administered	1	1%
Other ³	13	8%
Total reasons	155	100%

As can be seen, almost a fifth of the reasons were concerned with the compensation being regarded as insufficient – this was mainly concerned with the level of compensation not covering the costs incurred for the victim. However 13% of the reasons were also associated with compensation being sufficient – that it was paid or that it covered the cost of damage.

² This includes the information provided to victims as well as police handling.

³ 'Other' includes comments that the victim lost out more than the offender, that the victim wasn't expecting the compensation, the victim feels let down and disappointed and that the compensation was to be paid to a third party.

A further 19% of reasons were associated with the fact that it was felt that the conditions were inappropriate as they did not take account of various factors which victims felt were relevant to the case/situation⁴ and 12% related to issues concerned with breach and non-compliance or continuing problems with the offender.

Other categories contained both positive and negative responses – for example, reasons associated with the administration of cases covered the fact that no information was received and poor police handling, as well as the fact that the case was dealt with quickly.

The following table goes on to compare the perceived fairness of Condition 1, with reasons given for this (based on the first reason given only). This indicates that, despite some seemingly negative reasons given by some victims (e.g. that the compensation was insufficient), they sometimes still cited the condition as fair in relation to the harm caused to them.

It also indicates that issues concerning compensation seemed to be particularly important for victims in terms of how fair they regarded the conditions. After this, issues around the appropriateness of conditions were prominent.

Table 6: Fairness rating for condition 1 compared to first reason given for this rating

	Fair (n)	Not fair (n)	Don't know/no opinion (n)
Compensation insufficient	2	25	0
Compensation paid/sufficient	18	0	0
Condition inappropriate as do not take into account relevant factors	1	18	0
Issues associated with breach, non compliance and continuing problems	5	5	2
Views on appropriateness of conditions for this case	7	15	1
Issues associated with administration of conditional cautions	1	2	1
Positive feedback on conditions	9	0	0
Negative feedback on conditions	0	1	0
Other	4	2	1

⁴ Relevant factors in this context included stress, injury, damage incurred, time delay to receive compensation and inconvenience caused.

Reported benefits of the conditional caution scheme

Victims were asked to specify what, in their opinion, were the key benefits of the conditional caution scheme. Multiple responses could be made, which have been amalgamated into the table below:

Table 7: Reported benefits of the conditional caution scheme⁵

Benefit	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
None	42	29%
Speed/cost of disposal	28	19%
Cuts court time down/do not have to go to court	23	16%
Helps to address offending behaviour	21	15%
Conditional caution is appropriate	20	14%
Reparation/restitution/recompenses	4	3%
Other	6	4%
Total	144	100%

A total of 71% of responses cited specific benefits to the scheme. Of these, 19% stated that a benefit was the speed and cost of the disposal – that the matter is dealt with quickly and saves money. A further 16% specified a reduction in court time/not having to go to court, and 15% that the conditional caution helps to address offending behaviour⁶. Twenty nine percent of the responses given were that there were no benefits to the conditional caution scheme.

Reported drawbacks of the conditional caution scheme

Victims were also asked to specify what, in their opinion, were the key drawbacks of the conditional caution scheme. They could specify up to five reasons, amalgamated into the table below:

Table 8: Reported drawbacks of the conditional caution scheme⁷

Reason	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Scheme not harsh enough/too lax/inappropriate	49	26%
Issues associated with compensation – length of time to receipt, non receipt, appropriateness	32	17%
None	29	15%
Issues associated with offenders' behaviour/future offending	22	12%
Issues associated with knowledge of scheme and information provided	23	12%
Issues associated with breach/non-compliance	7	4%
Other	7	4%
Issues associated with victims' feelings/treatment	6	3%
General dissatisfaction	6	3%
Drawbacks relevant to the circumstances of the case	6	3%
Depends if the offender learns from this	2	1%

⁵ 118 victims responded to this question.

⁶ It should, however, be noted that in some cases it appeared that interviewees were prompted for responses to this question. This may have influenced the benefits cited by them during the interview.

⁷ 135 victims responded to this question.

Reason	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
and changes for the future		
Issues associated with administration/ processing of conditional caution/ information to victim	2	1%
Total	191	100%

The largest set of drawbacks reported concerned the fact that victims regarded the conditional caution scheme as not harsh enough or inappropriate – this included it being a soft option, being open to abuse by offenders, that it didn't take into account the seriousness of offences and that it didn't send offenders the right message. A further 17% of reasons were associated with the length of time taken to receive compensation or non receipt of the payment. However, 15% of responses were that there were no drawbacks to the scheme.

Overall satisfaction with the conditional caution scheme

Victims went on to rate their overall satisfaction with the conditional caution scheme. One hundred and fifty four victims responded to this.

Table 9: Overall satisfaction with the conditional caution scheme

Satisfaction rating	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Very satisfied	16	10%
Satisfied	54	35%
Not very satisfied	38	25%
Not at all satisfied	31	20%
Don't know	8	5%
No opinion	7	5%
Total	154	100%

Table 9 shows that an equal number of respondents reported being satisfied or dissatisfied to some degree with the scheme. The highest proportion of victims reported being 'satisfied' with the scheme (35%), followed by 25% who said that they were 'not very satisfied'.

Further analysis was undertaken to compare these overall satisfaction levels against knowledge of the scheme and case status⁸. In doing this, it was found that victims' satisfaction ratings of the scheme were related to whether or not the aims of the scheme had been explained to them. This was statistically significant⁹:

Table 10: Relationship between whether the aims of the conditional caution scheme were explained to victims and their overall satisfaction with the scheme

	Scheme explained (n)	Scheme not explained (n)	Total (n)
Satisfied	47	10	57
Not satisfied	38	26	64
Total	85	36	121

Likewise, satisfaction was significantly related to whether victims were consulted about whether the offender should get a conditional caution¹⁰:

⁸ For these analyses, 'satisfied' is a combination of victim responses that they were 'very satisfied' and 'satisfied', and 'not satisfied' a combination of 'not very satisfied' and 'not at all satisfied'.

⁹ $\chi^2 = 7.685$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.01$

¹⁰ $\chi^2 = 13.859$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.01$

Table 11: Relationship between whether victims were consulted and their overall satisfaction with the conditional caution scheme

	Victim consulted (n)	Victim not consulted (n)	Total (n)
Satisfied	32	33	65
Not satisfied	13	56	69
Total	45	89	134

The relationship between satisfaction with the conditions administered and overall satisfaction with the scheme was examined. It was found that victims' ratings of the fairness of Condition 1 in relation to the harm caused to them was significantly related to their overall satisfaction of the scheme¹¹. As can be seen from the table below, victims were more likely to rate the scheme as satisfactory if they felt Condition 1 was fair and less likely to rate the scheme as satisfactory if they regarded the condition as unfair¹².

Table 12: Relationship between ratings of fairness of Condition 1 and overall satisfaction with the scheme

	Condition 1 fair (n)	Condition 1 not fair (n)	Total (n)
Satisfied	47	16	63
Not satisfied	15	48	63
Total	62	64	126

Finally, the relationship between case status and overall satisfaction with the scheme was analysed. For this analysis, only those cases reported as having been completed/adhered to, or having been breached and prosecuted or not completed because the CPS decided NFA were selected; those cases that were still current were excluded due to the outcome being unknown at the time of interview.

It was found that there was a statistically significant relationship between case status and satisfaction, with victims being more likely to be satisfied with the scheme in cases that had been completed and adhered to¹³.

Table 13: Relationship between case status and overall satisfaction with the conditional caution scheme

	Case completed/ adhered to (n)	Case breached/ prosecuted/NFA (n)	Total (n)
Satisfied	43	8	51
Not satisfied	20	25	45
Total	63	33	96

¹¹ It should be noted that for analysis purposes, these findings are based on the fairness ratings for condition 1 only.

¹² $X^2 = 32.516$, $df=1$, $p<0.01$

¹³ $X^2 = 16.845$, $df=1$, $p <0.05$

5. Recommendations

On the basis of the findings from this small victim survey, the following recommendations have been made in relation to taking forward the conditional caution scheme in local areas:

- *Improve the amount of communication to victims:* this would include ensuring that victims are aware that the offender received a conditional caution, providing victims with a full explanation of the aims of the scheme and informing them of the outcome. This is likely to be particularly important in cases that are breached or result in No Further Action, given that victims were less satisfied overall in these cases.
- *Improve quality of communication to victims:* this might include providing more detailed information to victims on the aims and objectives of the scheme and what they can expect to receive through the scheme (e.g. the amount and timing of compensation). Given the benefits highlighted by victims that have already been involved in the process, it would be worth including these in information given to victims.
- *Consider increasing victim input into conditional caution decision-making:* two thirds of the victims in this survey reported not being consulted about whether an offender should receive a conditional caution and being consulted was significantly related to satisfaction with the scheme. Improving consultation may help victims feel that factors such as the costs incurred to them or stress involved were taken into account in deciding on the penalty.

Victim Satisfaction Survey

Introduction

“Good morning/afternoon. I am x..... from x..... We are carrying out a survey on conditional cautioning on behalf of the Office for Criminal Justice Reform. I understand that you were a victim of a crime where the offender admitted committing the offence and was given a Conditional Caution. You should have received a letter asking you to let us know if you did not wish to be involved in this survey. We are now calling people who did not turn down the opportunity to take part but – can I just check that you are still happy to take part by completing an interview over the phone? The interview should only take around 15-20 minutes.”

Confidentiality Statement

“The responses you provide will be treated confidentially and your name will not appear anywhere on any materials produced from the interview. We will not be asking you for details of the case in which you were involved”.

The Role of the Office for Criminal Justice Reform

The Office for Criminal Justice Reform (OCJR) is the cross-departmental team that supports all criminal justice agencies who work together to provide an improved service to the public. As a cross-departmental organisation, OCJR reports to Ministers in the Home Office, Department for Constitutional Affairs and the Office of the Attorney General.

Responsibilities

OCJR is responsible for delivery of the cross-CJS Public Service Agreements to bring more offences to justice and to raise confidence in the criminal justice system. In addition, its detailed responsibilities include:

- Support and co-ordination of performance management for Local Criminal Justice Boards.
- Support for the National Criminal Justice Board.
- Management of the CJS Reserve and CJS Spending Reviews.
- The CJS Information Technology programme.
- Support for victims and witnesses.
- A programme of work to improve cross-agency work on enforcement of court orders.
- Co-ordinating implementation of the Criminal Justice Act.
- Leading on cross-CJS work on race.
- Compensation for miscarriages of justice and sponsorship of the Criminal Cases Review Commission.

Case Status & Respondent's profile

Reference:	
-------------------	--

Case status (completed, prosecuted, current)	
--	--

Age	
------------	--

Gender	Male	
	Female	

Tick appropriate box	
Ethnicity	✓
W1 - White British	
W2 - White Irish	
W9 - White any other	
M1 - White & Black Caribbean	
M2 White & Black African	
M3 White & Asian	
M9 Mixed Any Other	
A1 Indian	
A2 Pakistani	
A3 Bangladeshi	
A9 Any Other Asian	
B1 African Black/Black British	
B2 Caribbean Black/Black British	
B9 Any Other Black/Black British	
O1 Chinese	
O9 Any Other Ethnicity	
NS Not Stated	

Questions

Consultation over conditional cautions

I am now going to ask you a few questions that will help us assess whether you felt consulted and that you received appropriate information about the conditional caution.

Q1. We understand that the offender in your case was given a conditional caution. Were you aware of this?

Yes	No	Unsure

Brief explanation of the scheme

A Conditional Caution is a new way of dealing with certain criminal offences. The scheme is not available to serious, violent or persistent offenders. A Conditional Caution is where an offender, on admitting the offence, accepts a caution with condition(s). The offender agrees to complete the Condition(s) instead of being charged and prosecuted. The offender doesn't have to accept the Conditional Caution but can instead opt to be prosecuted in court. Conditions are decided by the CPS and are aimed at addressing the offender's behaviour. A decision to give a Conditional Caution is made when there is a reasonable expectation that it will prevent further re-offending and will help to rehabilitate the offender and/or ensure that they make reparation for the effects of the offence on the victim or the wider community. If the offender fails to comply with the conditions attached to the caution they can be prosecuted for the original offence. The Police will investigate allegations of non-compliance and the Crown Prosecution Service will then consider the case for prosecution. (Fuller details provided in Conditional Cautioning Leaflet.)

Q2. Were the aims of the conditional cautioning scheme explained to you?

Yes	No	Unsure

Q3. Thinking about the quality of information that you were given, would you say you were?

Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not very satisfied	Not at all satisfied	Don't know	Can't remember

Q4. Were you consulted about whether the offender should get a conditional caution?

Yes	No	Unsure

Q4a If yes to Q2, who consulted with you?

Q4b If yes to Q2, did you feel your opinion was taken into account?

Yes	No	Unsure

Conditions

The next few questions focus on the condition(s) attached to the caution and how well informed you felt.

Q5. Do you know what conditions the offender received?

Yes	No	Unsure

Q5a. If yes to Q5, what were these conditions?

Compensation	
Attend Alcohol Intervention Session	
Pay Alcohol Intervention Session Fee	
Meet with a Drug Worker	
Write a Letter of Apology	
Not to re-offend	
Restricted from entering premises or area	
Repair Damage	
Return stolen item(s)	
Other, Please state	

Q5b If compensation was involved, were you informed of?

i The total amount of compensation?

Yes	No	Unsure

ii The date by which the offender must make the due payment?

Yes	No	Unsure

iii How you would receive the compensation payment?

Yes	No	Unsure

The next question needs to be repeated if the respondent stated that more than one condition was question 5a - this will help to ascertain whether it was a particular type of condition that victims felt was fair, and thus whether it is particular conditions that affect overall satisfaction more.

Condition 1

Q5b. Do you think that the condition **X** (insert condition answer **Q5a**) was fair compared to the harm caused to you?

Not at all fair	Not very fair	Fair	Very Fair	Don't know	No opinion

Q5c Why do you say that?

Condition 2

Q5b. Do you think that the condition **X** (insert condition answer **Q5a**) was fair compared to the harm caused to you?

Not at all fair	Not very fair	Fair	Very Fair	Don't know	No opinion

Q5c Why do you say that?

Condition 3

Q5b. Do you think that the condition **X** (insert condition answer **Q5a**) was fair compared to the harm caused to you?

Not at all fair	Not very fair	Fair	Very Fair	Don't know	No opinion

Q5c Why do you say that?

Condition 4

Q5b. Do you think that the condition **X** (insert condition answer **Q5a**) was fair compared to the harm caused to you?

Not at all fair	Not very fair	Fair	Very Fair	Don't know	No opinion

Q5c Why do you say that?

Outcomes

We are nearly at the end now of the survey and I just need to ask you some questions that will help us assess whether you felt informed about the conditional caution outcome.

Q6. Were you informed of the outcome of the conditional caution (i.e. whether the offender had completed their conditions, breached their conditions or prosecuted for the original offence)

Yes	No	No, I declined to be informed of the outcome	No, because the conditional caution is still ongoing

Q7. What do you feel are the benefits of the conditional caution scheme?
Respondent may need prompting [the offence was quickly dealt with/I did not have to go to court, it addressed the offenders' behaviour, there were none]

Q8. Do you feel there are any drawbacks to the conditional caution scheme?

Q9. Please rate your overall satisfaction with the conditional caution scheme

Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not very satisfied	Not at all satisfied	Don't know	No Opinion

Q10 Have your feelings about the criminal justice system changed as a result of your experiences in this case?

Yes	No

Q10a If yes are they better?

Yes	No	Unsure

Or

Are they worse?

Yes	No	Unsure

Q10b Can you explain why you have said this?

Response to the recommendations of *Conditional Cautions: Key findings from a victim satisfaction survey December 2007*

This paper sets out the actions being taken to address the recommendations in the paper. The paper was considered by the Conditional Cautioning Programme Board at its meeting in July 2007. The Board accepted the report (acknowledging the limitations of the data) and asked for steps to be identified and taken to address the findings.

The first step was to strengthen the Director of Public Prosecutions' Guidance on Conditional Cautioning. The 5th edition of the guidance (which was introduced on 1st October 2007) now makes it clear that the effect on the victim should be considered by the prosecutor when deciding whether a conditional caution is a suitable response to offending behaviour.

The second step was to share findings of the report with practitioners. The report has been circulated to police and CPS practitioners involved in the implementation of conditional cautioning in their areas. The report was also discussed in detail with practitioners at a series of four conditional cautioning events held in September 2007. Delegates at the events were asked to consider what they might do locally to implement the recommendations and to put forwarded suggestions for consideration at a national level. The outcomes of these discussions have been circulated to areas. They included:

Locally	Nationally
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of technology including emails to victims. • Ensure letters of apology are used as part of the conditional caution scheme in all Basic Command Units. • Use Police Community Support Officers to engage with the victim. • Base conditional cautioning champions in custody suites. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider whether changes can be made to appropriate MG forms to indicate that the victim has been consulted. • Revisit nationally produced victim leaflet and standard letters. • Produce good practice for victims guide

Next steps will be to:

- consider and take forward as appropriate the recommendations for national changes made by practitioners;
- continue to work with practitioners to identify and take forward further steps to improve victim satisfaction; and
- consider the need for and take forward as appropriate further evaluation of victim satisfaction.