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Contrasting Adversarial and Restorative

“What happened?”  “What happened?”
“Who’s to blame?” “What harm has resulted?”
“What punishment is needed?” “What needs to be done to make things right?”

‘For punishment and sanctions to be effective (in changing behaviours), they need to be delivered in a context that provides both meaning and relevance.’

“Why would restorative approaches be better than adversarial ones in this regard?”
EXISTING COMPLAINTS, DISCIPLINE, and GRIEVANCE SYSTEMS

- Behaviour seen as a breach of the discipline code/rules
- Wider workforce and community largely ignored
- Accountability and responsibility viewed in terms of punishment and sanctions
- Adversarial approach pre-occupied with blame and punishment

RESTORATIVE APPROACH

- Behaviour seen as harmful to individual/s, organisation and service provision
- Wider workforce and community involvement
- Accountability and responsibility related to repairing harm and professional relationships
- Promotes the opportunity for challenge, reflection and learning
What are the needs of the following in workplace complaint, grievance and discipline systems?

1. The organisation
2. The person making the grievance
3. The person subject of the grievance

Gather group idea’s / thoughts, discuss and nominate one person to feed back your group's views on your allocated question.
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For Restorative Practice to be explicit, organisations need to actively:

1. Work WITH people
2. Offer them Fair Process
3. Use Restorative Language
4. Encourage Free Expression of Emotions
Acknowledged Harm - CONFERENCE FRAMEWORK
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Unacknowledged Harm - CONFERENCE FRAMEWORK
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PARTICIPANTS ASKED TO IDENTIFY: WHAT HAS HAPPENED / WHO HAS BEEN AFFECTED / WHAT HARM CAUSED

ASK ALL PARTICIPANTS (AND SPECIFIC PARTICIPANTS WHO HAVE TAKEN RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE HARM THEY HAVE CAUSED) “ANYTHING TO SAY? / HARM CAUSED? / NEED TO REPAIR THAT HARM?”
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Participants asked to identify: What has happened / who has been affected / what harm caused.

Ask all participants (and specific participants who have taken responsibility for the harm they have caused) “Anything to say? / Harm caused? / Need to repair that harm?”

Agreement phase

Ask what all participants want to come out of the meeting?
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Who are IIRP UK working with?

- Police Services
- Royal Mail
- School staff teams
- Council Offices
IIRP UK Case Studies

- Staff Problems
- Management dispute
- Team re-building
Case Studies

1. Who was affected and how?
2. What were their needs?
3. What might help meet those needs?
4. What are the implications for the organisation/team?

Gather group idea’s / thoughts, discuss and nominate one person to feed back your groups feedback on your allocated case study.
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