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What is Restorative Justice?
What is RJ?
Basic RJ Principles

1. Focus on harms and needs rather than law or policy
2. Non-adversarial and multipartial and relational
3. A variety of practices such as circles and conferences
4. Empowered, collaborative decision-making process
Expanding RJ Movement

- Schools
- Workplaces
- Families

- Juvenile Justice
- Criminal Justice

- Genocide
- Human Rights Violations
- Historical Harms
Core RJ
Practices and Origins

- Youth Justice
- New Zealand Maori Justice and 1989 Act
- Australia Community Policing 1992

- Indigenous Rights
- First Nations/ Native American Justice
- Native Law Center 1975
- Yukon Sentencing Circles 1991

- Criminal Justice
- Alternative Dispute Resolution
- Mennonite VORP 1978, Indiana

- Human Rights
- Peacebuilding
- South Africa TRC 1995
- Uganda 1974

Conference
Circle

Victim Offender Dialogue
Truth Commission
Emergence of Transformative Justice

- RJ within systems; TJ outside systems
- Integration of structural/historical harms
- Concerns about cultural appropriation
- Concerns about power/privilege
Restorative justice is a way to prevent or respond to harm in a community with an emphasis on healing, social support, and active accountability. RJ includes a variety of practices with many rooted in indigenous and religious traditions. Some practices help prevent harm by helping people build relationships and strengthen communities. Other practices respond to harm by helping to clearly identify harms, needs, and solutions through an inclusive and collaborative decision-making process.
Whole Campus Approach

 Tier III
Support Reentry

 Tier II
Respond to
Conflict and Harm

 Tier I
Build and Strengthen Relationships

Circles of Support and Accountability
Restorative Conferences
Community-Concern Circles
Community-Building Circles
## RJ Questions by Tier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier I: Community Building</th>
<th>Tier II: Responding to Harm</th>
<th>Tier III: Reintegration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Who are we?</td>
<td>• What happened?</td>
<td>• How do we support this individual?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What are our stories?</td>
<td>• Who has been impacted? In what way?</td>
<td>• How do we support harmed parties?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What are our core values?</td>
<td>• What are the harms to be addressed?</td>
<td>• Has the individual taken responsibility?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What is important to us?</td>
<td>• What needs do we have?</td>
<td>• How do we prevent recurrence?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What kind of community do we want?</td>
<td>• What will make things right?</td>
<td>• How will we welcome this person back?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How do we want to treat each other?</td>
<td>• How do we rebuild relationships?</td>
<td>• What resources do we need for successful reintegration?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How will we all contribute?</td>
<td>• How do we address this in a restorative way?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tier 1: Community Building
Centerpieces and Talking Pieces

“Centerpieces change the space
Talking pieces change the pace”
Gina Gutierrez Karp
The Why of Circles

- To build community and strengthen relationships
- To create a brave container for difficult dialogue
- To voice harms and concerns in community
- To collaborate on next steps for response
Tier 2: Responding to Harm
RJ is an Exploration of Harms, Needs, and Solutions

- Material/Physical
- Communal/Relational
- Emotional/Spiritual
- Inflamed Structural/Historical

Harm
RJ Conference – The Basics
Basic RJ Process

Pre-Conference
- Referral
- Outreach
- Assessment
- Preparation

Conference
- What happened?
- What was the harm?
- How can we repair harm and rebuild trust?

Post-Conference
- Mentoring
- Agreement monitoring
- Assessment

Voluntary meeting
Trained facilitators
Evidence of Effectiveness
RJ Evidence is Growing

In the past two decades, restorative justice has been the subject of more rigorous criminological research than perhaps any other strategy for crime prevention and victim support. Strang and Sherman (2015)
University of Vermont Residential Life

Rodriguez and Whitworth 2016

Survey of all residents (2014-15 & 2015-16)

Impact of circles since 2009 implementation:

- Decrease in high-risk drinking
- Decrease in unassigned damage
- Stronger and more genuine relationships among staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>All PH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I know fellow residents on my floor</td>
<td>79.8%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other residents respect my community</td>
<td>86.5%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a sense of connection on my floor</td>
<td>65.8%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I regularly attend Community Circles</td>
<td>64.2%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues impacting my community are addressed</td>
<td>86.0%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My RA actively builds a sense of community</td>
<td>75.1%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a voice in addressing issues that arise</td>
<td>84.0%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community members are held accountable for their behaviors</td>
<td>73.9%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My RA facilitates Community Circles to address ongoing issues or concerns in the community</td>
<td>82.0%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My community is able to discuss concerns openly and freely</td>
<td>82.7%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My RA facilitates Community Circles as a way to share important updates and information</td>
<td>83.9%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My RA knows me</td>
<td>81.5%*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CURJ ANNUAL REPORT 2017/18

Restorative Justice Program
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO BOULDER

CONFERENCES
- Fall: 126
- Spring: 82
- Summer: 16
Total: 224

STUDENT OFFENDERS
- Fall: 272
- Spring: 230
- Summer: 17
Total: 519

VOLUNTEERS
- 120 total volunteers
- 50% overall growth in volunteer base in 2017/18
- 11 new facilitators completed the 20 hour training

Crime Isolates, CURJ Connects

- 98% of students felt they better understood the community impact of decisions
- 97% of students felt CURJ was a good way to handle offenses like theirs
- 88% of students felt more connected to the CU-Boulder community
- 99% of students felt process was fair
- 99% of students felt respected through the process

Center for Restorative Justice
sandiego.edu/rj
STARR Project

STudent Accountability and Restorative Research Project
❖ Offender Survey
❖ Harmed Party Survey
❖ Conduct Administrator Surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Process</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Discipline Administrative/Board Hearing</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restorative Justice Circle/Conference/Board</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are Harmed Parties Satisfied with RJ?

- Fair to all parties?
- Discussed values and responsibilities?
- Meaningfully contribute your ideas?
- Student was held accountable?
- Comfortable seeing student on campus?
- Satisfied with the process?
- Would you recommend this process?

Not at all  Just a little  Fair amount  Great amount
Student Development

- Just Community/Self-Authorship
  - "I had a voice"

- Active Accountability
  - "I took responsibility"

- Interpersonal Competence
  - "I talked it out"

- Social Ties to Institution
  - "I belong here"

- Procedural Fairness
  - "That was fair"

- Closure
  - "I'm ready to move on"

Comparison:
- Restorative Justice Practice
- Developmental Discipline Hearing
Further Reading
Q&A