

Restorative Justice Pilot Evaluation Report

Submitted To: The State Court Administrator's Office

July, 2016



Restorative Justice Pilot Evaluation Report

For more information, please contact:

Chandra Winder, MPA

cwinder@omni.org

303.839.9422

Ana Nunes, PhD

anunes@omni.org

303.839.9422

Jean Denious, PhD

jdenious@omni.org

303.839.9422

For General Inquiries/Questions

p. 303-839-9422

f. 303-839-9420

OMNI Institute

899 Logan Street, Suite 600

Denver, CO 80203

www.omni.org

Table of Contents

Background	2
Methods.....	3
Development of Evaluation Plan and Measurement Tools.....	3
Measures.....	3
Sample.....	4
Results.....	5
Demographics of Offender Youth	5
Process Data.....	6
Victim Participation Data.....	9
Youth Offender Accountability	10
Satisfaction Data.....	12
Offender Satisfaction	13
Victim Satisfaction.....	15
Community Member Satisfaction	16
Satisfaction Analysis	18
Recidivism	19
Discussion.....	21
Limitations	22
Evaluation Recommendations	22
Appendix A	i

Figures

- Figure 1: Race/Ethnicity6
- Figure 2: Referral Source for RJ participants7
- Figure 3: Most Serious Type of Charge at Arrest.....8
- Figure 3: Type of RJ process.....9
- Figure 4: Victim Participation 10
- Figure 5: Sense of Accountability at Pre and Post 11
- Figure 6: Satisfaction Questions Asked of All Participants 13
- Figure 7: Offender Specific Satisfaction Questions 14
- Figure 8: Victim Specific Satisfaction Questions..... 15
- Figure 9: Community Member Roles 16
- Figure 10: Community Member Specific Satisfaction Questions 17

Background

In 2013, House Bill 13-1254 was approved by the Colorado State Legislature and signed by the Governor to create funding for the development of restorative justice in Colorado. The statute created four restorative justice pilot programs for youth being diverted from the juvenile justice system in the 10th, 12th, 19th, and 20th judicial districts. The State Court Administrator's Office (SCAO), along with the Colorado Restorative Justice Council, has overseen the pilot from its initial approval in the legislature to the development and implementation of the restorative justice programs in each judicial district.

In 2014, OMNI Institute (OMNI) was awarded a grant from SCAO to conduct an evaluation of the pilot in order to document its implementation and impacts, and satisfy legislative requirements for monitoring and reporting. More specifically, the evaluation has sought to address the following questions:

- What are the numbers, demographics, and program completion rates of youth participating in the pilot program (across the four sites)?
- What restorative justice practices are implemented across cases and programs?
- Do youth show increased levels of accountability and express satisfaction following participation in the restorative justice process?
- Are victims and participating community members satisfied with their experiences in the restorative justice process?
- What is the recidivism rate of youth who successfully completed the program?

Answers to these questions help document whether the pilot sites, and overall program, have been effective in referring and serving eligible youth, repairing harm to victims and the community, and reducing youth recidivism through programming that promotes the principles of restorative justice: relationship building, responsibility, reintegration, respect, and repairing harm.¹

In 2015, House Bill 15-1094 expanded the restorative justice pilot to allow petty and municipal charges to be eligible for diversion. This change went into effect in August, 2015, allowing a greater number of youth to be served by the pilot programs.

This report reflects analysis of data collected through June 2016.

¹ SCAO and the Restorative Justice Council also sought to understand the cost effectiveness of the program, but this question was not addressed as part of the evaluation conducted by OMNI.

METHODS

Development of Evaluation Plan and Measurement Tools

In order to collect data for addressing the evaluation questions, OMNI Institute worked with SCAO and the Colorado Restorative Justice Council (RJ Council) to:

- Develop and refine survey tools for youth, victims, and offenders (for assessing pre- and post-program accountability among youth; and satisfaction for all parties following participation in the restorative justice process).
- Identify specific pieces of information for documenting individuals and cases processed by each pilot site, including information such as youth demographics, the offense type/level, victim participation, restorative justice practices used (i.e., circle, community group conferencing), and whether an agreement was reached.
- Develop an online case management software system for pilot programs to enter individual- and case-level data, and to support them in monitoring and improving adherence to data collection protocols through provision of evaluation technical assistance.

Once these tools and systems were finalized, OMNI provided training to program staff, and initiated ongoing evaluation work including survey data entry, regular auditing of the data, and provision of evaluation technical assistance to support timely data collection, data submission and resolution of data related issues.

These efforts have created a basic infrastructure to support standardized data collection, allowing for systematic processes and analysis of restorative justice efforts across multiple programs.

Measures

In addition to youth demographics, the evaluation included collection of individual- and case-level process measures such as the referral source, offense level and type, participation of the victim(s), and the restorative justice practices implemented. The demographic and process data were captured by program staff and entered into a central case management software system, Efforts to Outcomes (ETO), managed by OMNI.

Second, a measure of accountability (i.e., feelings of responsibility for one's offense and recognition of the harm it caused to others) was collected from offenders at two time points (pre-restorative justice program participation and post-restorative justice process) to assess positive change on this targeted outcome.

Third, satisfaction data were captured from offenders, victims, and community members. Questions focused on each individual's role, their participation in the restorative justice process, experience interacting with others in the restorative justice process, and their overall satisfaction

with the experience. Specific questions are displayed in the example surveys in Appendix A as well as in the Results section of this report.

The measure of youth's accountability and satisfaction data for all parties were gathered through the surveys². Offenders completed the pre-survey at the beginning of their involvement in the restorative justice program, and all participants in the restorative justice process (offenders, victims, and community members) completed surveys immediately following participation in the restorative justice process in order to capture satisfaction data.

Finally, recidivism data were requested from DCJ in order to understand the longer term impact of restorative justice on youths' likelihood to re-offend. The Restorative Justice Legislation specified the importance of examining, for any youth who participated in the restorative justice pilot programs, any subsequent arrests *or* filings within one year³.

Sample

As specified in the legislation, youth served by the restorative justice pilot were participating in pre-filing diversion. Data included in this report include only those who began and completed their restorative justice process and juvenile diversion contract between July 1, 2014 and June 30th, 2016. During this timeframe, 574 youths were suitable and began participating in a restorative justice program. Of those, 474 youths participated in a restorative justice process and reached an agreement, and 433 youths had successfully completed their restorative justice contracts. These 574 youths reflected 423 cases referred to the restorative justice pilot programs, with the number of juvenile offenders associated with each case ranging from one to four.

Youth included in the analyses were marked as 'suitable' for restorative justice and were within the juvenile age range (10-18⁴) at the time of offense. Any youth outside of these parameters was not included. Additionally, the number of youths (n) included for each item sometimes varied as a result of missing data or data that did not fit diversion criteria⁵.

Of the 433 youth who completed their restorative justice contracts, 75.9% of youths (n=329) completed both the pre- and post-survey. Paired samples t-tests were run on the individual

² Surveys can be found in Appendix A

³ This definition of recidivism to include subsequent arrests or filings is more stringent than definitions of recidivism found in juvenile probation or juvenile diversion which both look at only *filings* that occur in the one year after participation in the program.

⁴ Though programs are charged with serving 10 – 17 year olds, two 18-year olds were served by the programs and their data were included in this report.

⁵ For example, if a level of charge was outside of what was expected to be included in the restorative justice pilot (i.e. Class 1 Felony), these data were recoded as missing given the likely data entry error.

questions as well as the overall accountability scale and findings are presented in the Results section of this report.

Data included in the satisfaction results include responses from youth offenders, victims, and community members. Of the 496 cases represented in this dataset, 348 offenders⁶, 140 victims, and 835 community members provided satisfaction data.

In order to assess recidivism as a long-term outcome, OMNI and SCAO worked with the Division of Criminal Justice (DCJ) to obtain information on statewide district level offenses and filings for all youth who had exited restorative justice programming. Analysis and observations reflect only filings (and do not include arrests) that occurred in the year following restorative justice program participation. Filing data were extracted from the Judicial Department's Integrated Colorado Online Network (ICON) information management system via the Colorado Justice Analytics Support System (CJASS) by DCJ's Office of Research and Statistics and analyzed by OMNI. These data informed whether individuals met the criteria for recidivism for diversion: a filing or filings for a new offense (criminal, misdemeanor, or juvenile delinquency) up to one year after they exited the program.

Results

The vast majority of the youth were served by three of the four judicial district pilot programs. **The largest proportions of youth were served by the 19th judicial district, 37% (n=201), followed by the 20th judicial district, 31% (n=165), and the 12th judicial district 29% (n=155).** The 10th served only 3% (n=16).


DEMOGRAPHICS OF OFFENDER YOUTH

Demographic data were gathered to understand the population being served by the restorative justice pilot programs.

- **51% of youth served were male.**
- **Half of participants were identified as Hispanic/Latino (54%)** and just under half were identified as White, non-Hispanic (41%). Colorado's Hispanic/Latino population as of 2015 was 21.3%, and the White (non-Hispanic) population was 68.7%. The pilots operate in four distinct areas of the state which vary in specific demographics, however this state-level snap shot suggests that Hispanics may be overrepresented and White, non-Hispanic youth may be underrepresented in youth who are referred to RJ.

⁶ This number may be greater than the number of matched pre- and post-surveys because all post-surveys completed were included in the satisfaction results, even if a corresponding pre-survey was not obtained.

Figure 1: Race/Ethnicity




- The age of the youth participating in restorative justice ranged between 10 and 18, and the **average age of the offender youth was 14.6 years.**

PROCESS DATA

Youth referred to the restorative justice programs came from a variety of referral sources, but the vast majority were referred from the DA's Office (74%). Figure 2, below, displays the referral sources.

Figure 2: Referral Source for RJ participants




Nearly all youth were referred to restorative justice pre-file: alternative to filing petition (90%). Some youths were referred pre-file: alternative to summons/arrest (10%). A small portion of youth were, upon further review, dismissed without prejudice.

Petty offenses (48%) and misdemeanors (45%) made up nearly all of the charges referred to restorative justice. The remaining charges were felonies, class three, four, five, or six.

The most serious type of charge at arrest was also reported for each youth. The largest proportion of charges were theft (37%), followed by person charges (28%). Figure 3 below, displays the proportion of each type of charge.

Figure 3: Most Serious Type of Charge at Arrest




Descriptions of the charges included the following:

- Trespassing,
- Assault,
- Burglary/Theft,
- Arson,
- Underage possession of marijuana or marijuana paraphernalia,
- Criminal mischief,
- Disorderly conduct (fight/weapon), and
- Disturbing the peace

Youth participated in a number of restorative justice processes, as displayed below in Figure 3. Youth frequently participated in more than one process; thus, percentages in the table below do not equal 100%.

Figure 3: Type of RJ process



In 94% of cases that were included in this set of analyses, the participants were able to reach an agreement during the restorative justice process. The vast majority of youth (93.7%) were able to successfully repair harm, complete their agreement and their contract. In the cases where youth did not successfully complete their contracts (0.3%), often youth were unsuccessful due to an arrest on a new charge or failure to comply with the terms of their contract.

Calculations were also made to determine the length of time between referral to the program and date of completion of the contract. The average time spent in restorative justice (from referral to contract completion) was just over three months (97 days). Additionally, youth, on average, took two months (61 days) to complete their restorative justice contract after participating in the restorative justice process.

Victim Participation Data


Data were available for 140 victims in the ETO case management software. In some cases, youth were counted as both offenders and victims due to the mutual responsibility for harm to each other. Given the challenge in asking youth to separate their experiences as an offender and then as a victim, the standard protocol was to administer only the offender survey to youth representing both an offender and victim. This process was established since the offender survey contained similar measures as the victim survey while also ensuring pre- and post-data would be collected regarding their feelings of accountability. The data reflected in this section include only individuals who were identified solely as a victim.

As displayed in Figure 4 below, just over half of the cases noted that victims were contacted for participation in the restorative justice process (62%). Of those that were contacted, 64% of victims participated (124 total) in a restorative justice process. For those that did not participate, programs were asked to report the reason for their lack of participation.

Reasons why a victim might not participate included being unavailable (20%), not interested (11%), and 'other' (69%). Those that had entries under 'other' were often cases involved in RESTORE where a retailer representative is used as a surrogate victim. In 49% of the victim records, a surrogate victim was noted as having participated.

Few victims submitted an impact statement with only four percent of victims having been recorded as having done so. Only seven percent of cases were considered a Victim Rights Act crime.

Figure 4: Victim Participation




YOUTH OFFENDER ACCOUNTABILITY

Youth were asked to complete a pre-survey prior to their involvement in the restorative justice program and a post-survey following their participation in the restorative justice process which included questions about their sense of accountability for the offense that caused the harm. Response options ranged from 1 to 4, with 1 indicating 'strongly disagree' and 4 indicating

‘strongly agree.’ The figure below displays both the pre- and post-survey mean scores, an asterisk notes whether the change from pre-survey to post-survey was statistically significant⁷.

Accepting responsibility for the offense is a qualifying factor for participation in restorative justice. Youth participating in the restorative justice pilot are required to accept responsibility for the offense, and as such, may already feel a high level of accountability. Scores on the pre-survey indicated that youth already felt a high level of accountability for their offense at the time they completed the pre-survey. However, a statistically significant increase was still observed from pre- to post-survey. When questions were examined individually, scores showed a statistically significant change on four of the five questions, highlighting that participation in the restorative justice pilot programs was positively associated with increases in youths’ sense of accountability.

Figure 5: Sense of Accountability at Pre and Post



⁷A p-value of less than 0.5.

SATISFACTION DATA


All participants in the restorative justice process (offenders, victims, and community members) were asked to complete a satisfaction survey in order to understand their experience and to assess whether their goals for the process were met. Responses to the satisfaction questions were measured on a four-point scale, with 1 indicating 'strongly disagree' and 4 indicating 'strongly agree.' Questions asked of all participants are displayed below in Figure 6. Participants also responded to a few questions that were unique to specific participant type surveys⁸. These questions are displayed separately in subsequent figures, broken out by individual completing the survey. Parents of offenders are included in the community member group.

As shown in Figure 6, the mean scores indicate a high level of satisfaction across the common satisfaction questions with all responses falling between a 3 (Agree with the statement) and 4 (Strongly Agree with the statement).

HIGH LEVELS OF SATISFACTION WERE REPORTED ACROSS ALL QUESTIONS. OPEN ENDED RESPONSES OVERWHELMINGLY INDICATED THAT EXPECTATIONS WERE MET AND PARTICIPANTS APPRECIATED THE RESTORATIVE JUSTICE PROCESS.

⁸ For example, an offender responded to questions about the victim and community members treating him/her with respect, whereas a victim responded to questions about the *offender* and community members treating him/her with respect.

Figure 6: Satisfaction Questions Asked of All Participants




Participants overwhelmingly indicated their satisfaction when responding to the overarching question regarding satisfaction, 'I am satisfied with my restorative justice experience'. Specifically, results demonstrated the following:

- 95% of offenders reported that they agreed (29%) or strongly agreed (66%) with this statement.
- 97% of victims reported that they agreed (29%) or strongly agreed (68%) with this statement.
- 98% of community members reported that they agreed (22%) or strongly agreed (76%) with this statement.

Offender Satisfaction

Overall, mean responses of offender participants indicated positive levels of satisfaction both in the common satisfaction questions (those found in Figure 6, above) and questions that were unique to the offender, as displayed in Figure 7, below.

Figure 7: Offender Specific Satisfaction Questions



Offenders were also given the opportunity to respond to open ended questions regarding their initial goals when they entered the program, whether those goals were met, and any additional comments they wished to share about their overall experience. A few quotes from each question are included below.

“My goal was to change my opinion about fighting. It did help me achieve my goal; not only that, but it made [me] more responsible”

“I hope as a result of being in the restorative justice process to take a minute to think about actions, and to be more respectful of other people’s property.”

“To gain more trust from everybody, be a better role model and try to figure out what my plans are for the future”.

“Everybody involved was very respectful and civil, it all went extremely smoothly without any major inconveniences to anyone.”

“I am very thankful that I was able to go through the restorative justice process because it made me a better person. I will never attempt to steal again. “

Finally, offenders also were able to reflect on whether they felt they repaired the harm done to the victim and to the community. The vast majority felt that they were able to repair the harm they caused to the victim (89%), and that they caused to the community (93%).

Victim Satisfaction

Victims responded to the satisfaction questions following their participation in a restorative justice process. Victim participants indicated a consistently high level of satisfaction, with all responses falling between a 3 and a 4, and nearly all 3.5 or above. In addition to the victim satisfaction data displayed in Figure 6, above, Figure 8, below, displays the questions that were only asked of victims.

Figure 8: Victim Specific Satisfaction Questions



Victims also had the opportunity to respond to open ended questions about their goals and experience in the restorative justice program. A few quotes are included below.

“My goals were to resolve any questions left unanswered, speak with all affected persons, and the offender in person, and come up with a resolution/plan that the offender could follow. I hoped the result would be: questions answered, the offender told he’s forgiven and to begin healing/moving on, and agreement/plan created.”

“To see how the process might encourage better choices from the offending individuals and promote understanding of the importance of good decision making in the future.”


“I really like how all this was calmly discussed and how we all had a say in what we were discussing. And that I got to see everything from multiple points of view.”

“Appreciated getting to tell him how I felt and knowing he heard me. Getting to see him move from hardened to a young boy who actually was allowed to feel sorry for what he did.”

Community Member Satisfaction

The Community Member survey included additional information about their specific role in the restorative justice process. As seen in the data displayed below, the largest proportion of respondents were parents (42.6%) with the second largest proportion identifying themselves simply as community members (33.3%)

Figure 9: Community Member Roles



Similar to offenders and victims, community members also indicated a high level of satisfaction. Data displayed in Figure 10, below, show questions that were unique to the community member satisfaction survey.

Figure 10: Community Member Specific Satisfaction Questions



Finally, community members also had the opportunity to respond to open-ended questions about their experience, their goals and other thoughts on the process.

"[My goals were] A change in the problem behavior, a way in which to pay for mistakes and learn. Turn a negative situation into a positive experience."

"[My goals were to] Assist youth in understanding the larger impact their actions have on family and community. I hope they will think more about their decisions and make wiser choices in the future."

"I enjoyed the trust in the circle, openness between everyone."

"I am impressed and my expectations were exceeded. I believe this program will benefit our children who make mistakes and the community we share."

Satisfaction Analysis

In order to further understand the overall satisfaction of participants in restorative justice, additional analyses were conducted on the overall satisfaction question (“I am satisfied with my restorative justice experience”) related to several other variables. As noted previously, overall satisfaction is very high across all three types of participants. These additional comparative analyses seek to provide additional information about whether satisfaction differs when taking into account other information about the case which differs slightly, and is outlined in the following sections, for each type of participant.

OFFENDERS

For offenders, differences in satisfaction were examined related to the type of referring agency⁹, level of charge at arrest, and type of restorative justice process¹⁰ in which they participated.

- Youths whose cases were referred to restorative justice by the DA or Judge reported greater overall satisfaction in the restorative justice process than cases referred by the police/sheriff’s department or school.
- There was very little difference in the overall satisfaction in the restorative justice process between youths whose highest level of charge was a misdemeanor or petty¹¹.
- Very few differences in overall satisfaction in the restorative justice process were observed when comparing the types of restorative justice processes in which youths participated.

VICTIMS

Overall satisfaction in the restorative justice process for victims was examined for type of referring agency and type of restorative justice process in which they participated.

- Victims reported a higher overall satisfaction in the restorative justice process in cases referred to restorative justice from the DA.
- Very few differences were observed in victims’ overall satisfaction in the restorative justice process for differing types of restorative justice processes.

⁹ Judge, District Attorney, Police/Sheriff’s Department, or School

¹⁰ These included Circle, Conference, Dialogue and RESTORE. Pre-Conference was excluded from these analyses as was Rethinking Drinking.

¹¹ While some youth referred to restorative justice had a felony charge, the number of felony charges was much smaller than misdemeanor and petty charges and thus were not included in this comparison.

COMMUNITY MEMBERS

Overall satisfaction in the restorative justice process for community members was examined for type of referring agency, youths' point of entry, and type of restorative justice process in which they participated.

- Community members reported the highest level of overall satisfaction in the restorative justice process for cases referred by the DA.
- Community members reported a higher level of satisfaction in the restorative justice process in cases where the youth's point of entry was pre-file: alternative to filing petition.

RECIDIVISM

The Restorative Justice Legislation specified the importance of examining, for any youth who participated in the restorative justice program, any subsequent arrests *or* filings within one year of completing the restorative justice process. Data were only comprehensively available for youth who had received a district level filing sometime in the year after their participation in the restorative justice program. Thus, the following analysis and observations consider only filings that occurred in the year following restorative justice program participation. Additionally, these numbers include all youths for whom data were available from the start of the pilot data collection in January 2014; thus these numbers vary slightly from numbers included in the previous sections of the report as surveys were not collected during the initial phase of the pilot.

In July 2016, OMNI worked with DCJ and SCAO to obtain statewide recidivism data for any youth who had exited the restorative justice program since the start of data collection on the restorative justice pilot program. At the time recidivism data were requested, 283 youths had completed their participation in a restorative justice pilot program; 17.7% (50) had been out of the restorative justice program for a full year, 45.9% (130) had been out of restorative justice at least six months, but less than a full year, and 36.4% (103) had been out of restorative justice for less than six months.

Looking at youth for whom a full year of recidivism data were available (n=50) **overall, 8.0% of youth recidivated in the year following the completion of their restorative justice contract.**

PRELIMINARY ANALYSES FOUND THAT 8% OF YOUTH (EXITED FOR ONE YEAR) RECIDIVATED IN THE YEAR AFTER THE COMPLETION OF THEIR RESTORATIVE JUSTICE CONTRACT.

Several factors were considered; first, data were examined to ensure that the arrest *and* filing occurred after participation in the restorative justice program in order to be considered true *post*-program recidivism.

Second, data were examined to identify whether youth recidivated within the first 6 months of completing the program. **For those youth who had been out of the program for a full year and were found to have recidivated, all filings occurred in the second half of the year following completion of their contract.**

Of those that recidivated, only 1.9% of youth did not successfully complete their restorative justice contract; thus, it was not possible to compare recidivism rates of successful versus unsuccessful program participants.

Because the sample of youth for whom a full year of recidivism data were available was relatively small, additional analyses were conducted on a larger sample of youth who had completed their restorative justice contract at least 6 months, but less than 1 year, prior to the time recidivism data were available, (n=130). This *unofficial* examination of the data indicated that 8.5% of these youth had recidivated after completion of their restorative justice contract. While more time must elapse to calculate official recidivism rates for a larger sample, this analysis suggests there may be relatively low recidivism for youth that participated in the restorative justice pilot.

Recidivism data was further examined to understand if there were any differences by the level of charge youth received when initially being referred to restorative justice. Table 1, below, displays the numbers of youth who recidivated.

Table 1: Recidivism by Type of Charge at Referral to Restorative Justice

Time Since Exiting Restorative Justice Program	Level of Charge at Arrest	Total # of Youth	# of Youth who Recidivated
6 months to 1 year	Petty	45	5
	Misdemeanor	75	6
	Felony	9	0
1 year or more	Petty	8	1
	Misdemeanor	34	1
	Felony	8	2

Once the sample size of youth for whom a full year of recidivism data are available is larger, further exploratory analyses will be conducted on the current dataset to understand further details about youth who recidivated.

Discussion

These findings paint a promising picture of the restorative justice pilot program in Colorado. The four sites have collectively served and supported hundreds of youth offenders in repairing the harm of their offenses to victims and community members.

Youth were referred to restorative justice for a variety of offenses and often participated in more than one restorative justice process. Offender youth indicated an overall increased sense of accountability following the completion of the restorative justice process, and nearly all youth were able to successfully repair the harm caused by their offense.

The experiences reflected in the responses to the satisfaction survey indicate that participants are leaving the restorative justice process with a positive perspective of restorative justice and an improved perspective of the justice system in general. Importantly, victims have overwhelmingly provided positive feedback, with open-ended responses indicating that participants appreciated and benefited from their participation in restorative justice.

When further examined, some differences were observed in participants' overall satisfaction in the restorative justice process. For many cases, there was not much variability in responses making it difficult to draw conclusions from these findings. Specifically, three quarters of youth were referred to restorative justice by the DA and nearly all youth participated in multiple restorative justice processes making it difficult to truly observe any differences in satisfaction related to specific types of processes. Higher levels of satisfaction were observed in cases referred to restorative justice by the DA suggesting that there may be some differences in the way these cases are handled by restorative justice programs. Despite the difference noted in the case of referring agencies, few differences in satisfaction were observed elsewhere indicating that participants' satisfaction in the restorative justice process does not differ when looking at the level of charge referred to diversion or type of restorative justice process.

Finally, recidivism data were examined to understand the long term outcome of the restorative justice programs. Of those youths that had completed their restorative justice contract 1 year (or more) prior to the time recidivism data were available (July 2016), 8% of youth recidivated. Further, preliminary examination of recidivism data for youths who had not yet been out of the program for a full year, showed that 8.5% of these youth had recidivated. These findings suggest that youth participating in the restorative justice programs are completing their contracts, and the restorative justice programs, at a low risk for recidivism.

LIMITATIONS

As with all evaluations, the ability to address questions of interest hinges on the completeness and quality of the data collected. Missing data was an issue in particular for information regarding victims and victim participation. While the importance of collecting information about victim participation was communicated both in the previous report and subsequent targeted technical assistance, these data continue to be the most challenging for programs to obtain and enter. Data regarding victim participation were missing for a large portion of cases. In order to fully understand the participation of victims, programs must be consistent in collecting and entering full and complete data throughout the process.

Demographic and background data are entered by program staff into the ETO database (rather than provided directly by youth via a survey). While many program staff may determine this information based on youths' self-identification, the inability to monitor internal data collection and coding practices results in the possibility of misrepresentation of youths' demographic information.

Most youth are recorded as having participated in multiple restorative justice processes. However, surveys completed by youths, victims, and community members do not indicate the type of restorative justice process upon which they are reflecting. This limits the ability of the data to reflect any differences in satisfaction related to type of restorative justice process.

Finally, with the numbers of youth served varying greatly across pilot programs, it is important to note that programs were not represented equally in these data sets; thus individual pilot program findings may differ.

EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS

Data from the pilot restorative justice programs highlighted juvenile offenders' increased sense of accountability following participation, and the success of the restorative justice process in helping offenders and victims meet their goals, repair harm to victims and the community, and yield high satisfaction from all participants. To ensure evaluation of the larger program effort continues to yield valid and actionable findings, and is responsive to the information needs of multiple stakeholders, we offer the following recommendations:

- ❖ **Continue to review and refine evaluation activities**
 - *Identify opportunities to collect new information* for cases where victims may not be participating in the process. These additional pieces of data could provide important information about the youths' experience as well as help account for data that currently appear to be missing for the victims.
 - *Identify opportunities to capture additional short-term outcome data.* In addition to the sense of accountability scale, incorporating additional short-term outcome measures into the youth pre- and post-survey may help provide a greater depth of understanding of the potential impact of restorative justice on youth offenders.

Outcomes of interest might include connection to community or family and measures of youths' beliefs or attitudes that are targeted through restorative justice practices and are predictive of reduced delinquency. With any changes or updates to the short-term outcomes, it may also be beneficial to reconsider the timing of the post-survey to be conducted following completion of the full restorative justice contract. This would ensure post outcome measurements are taken only after full participation in restorative justice. Satisfaction questions could continue to be completed immediately following the restorative justice process.

- *Identify additional ways to refine satisfaction data collection* in order to allow analyses to further understand whether any observed differences in satisfaction data are related to specific characteristics of the case, offense, or process.
 - *Identify opportunities to meet all evaluation goals.* One of the more challenging aspects of the evaluation has been to assess whether the principles of restorative justice (relationship building, responsibility, reintegration, respect, and repairing harm) are being promoted through the restorative justice pilot. While it can be assumed that these principles are a core focus of the restorative justice programs being implemented, no data were obtained to validate this assumption. Given the importance of these principles, and that they were originally identified as a goal of the evaluation, future efforts should explore means to operationalize and collect data related to these principles.
- ❖ **Continue to support restorative justice practitioners through evaluation technical assistance.** Data collection is an often complex process which can result in incomplete data. To ensure the complete and quality data are available for the evaluation, it will be important for programs to continue to receive ongoing support with regular data auditing and technical assistance. Additional data tools such as reports pulled from ETO and the data dashboard will support documentation and communication of any data related issues identified by the technical assistance team.
 - ❖ **Ensure consistent and clear definitions and messaging** regarding data collection, data entry, and reporting. The pilot phase of the restorative justice programs has been instrumental in shaping and defining the evaluation participants, the timing of data collection and the data entry requirements. Through the process of the pilot phase, several tools were developed to help support consistent definitions and expectations. It will remain critical to build upon and refine these tools with feedback from pilot programs to ensure consistency and standardization across all programs.

Appendix A

Case ID: _____	Agency Name: _____
Survey Date: __/__/____	Offender



Pre Satisfaction Questionnaire

As part of doing restorative justice, we would like you to answer some questions about your thoughts, feelings, and behaviors. There are no right or wrong answers so choose the answer that is closest to what you really think or feel. This survey will help make the restorative justice program useful for other people so please answer each question as thoughtfully and honestly as possible. **Please DO NOT put your name anywhere on this survey.** All of your answers will be kept private and will only be seen by the program staff and researchers.

Completing this survey is completely voluntary. Please read every question carefully and choose only one answer for each question. If you don't find an answer that fits exactly, use the one that comes closest.

Thank you for sharing your perspective.

What are your goals for the restorative justice process? What do you hope will be achieved as a result?

Please mark the box that best matches how much you agree with each item.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I think restorative justice will help me deal with my offense.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My offense harmed the victim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My offense harmed the community.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My offense harmed my family.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My offense harmed me.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I am sorry for my offense.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I think I will be able to repair the harm I caused to the <u>victim</u> .	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I think I will be able to repair the harm I caused to the <u>community</u> .	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTS:

Is there anything else you would like to say about the restorative justice process or about how this case is being handled?

Case ID: _____

Agency Name: Center for Restorative Programs

Survey Date: __/__/____

Offender



Post Satisfaction Questionnaire

As part of doing restorative justice, we would like you to answer some questions about your thoughts, feelings, and behaviors. There are no right or wrong answers so choose the answer that is closest to what you really think or feel. This survey will help make the restorative justice program useful for other people so please answer each question as thoughtfully and honestly as possible. **Please DO NOT put your name anywhere on this survey.** All of your answers will be kept private and will only be seen by the program staff and researchers.

Completing this survey is completely voluntary. Please read every question carefully and choose only one answer for each question. If you don't find an answer that fits exactly, use the one that comes closest.

Thank you for sharing your perspective.

What were your goals for the restorative justice process? What did you hope would be achieved as a result?

Please mark the box that best matches how much you agree with each item.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The restorative justice process helped me deal with my offense.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My crime harmed the victim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My crime harmed the community.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My crime harmed my family.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My crime harmed me.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I am sorry for my crime.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I think I was able to repair the harm I caused to the <u>victim</u> .	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I think I was able to repair the harm I caused to the <u>community</u> .	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The restorative justice <u>facilitator(s)</u> treated me with respect.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The <u>victim</u> treated me with respect.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The <u>community members</u> treated me with respect.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I felt safe during the restorative justice process.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I am satisfied with my restorative justice experience.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I am satisfied with my restorative justice contract.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I would recommend restorative justice to others.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The restorative justice process improved my experience with the criminal justice system.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTS:

Is there anything else you would like to say about the restorative justice process or about how this case was handled?

Case ID: _____

Agency Name: Center for Restorative Programs

Survey Date: ___/___/_____

Victim



Post Satisfaction Questionnaire

As part of doing restorative justice, we would like you to answer some questions about your thoughts, feelings, and behaviors. There are no right or wrong answers so choose the answer that is closest to what you really think or feel. This survey will help make the restorative justice program useful for other people so please answer each question as thoughtfully and honestly as possible. **Please DO NOT put your name anywhere on this survey.** All of your answers will be kept private and will only be seen by the program staff and researchers.

Completing this survey is completely voluntary. Please read every question carefully and choose only one answer for each question. If you don't find an answer that fits exactly, use the one that comes closest.

Thank you for sharing your perspective.

What were your goals for the restorative justice process? What did you hope would be achieved as a result?

Please mark the box that best matches how much you agree with each item.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The restorative justice process met my needs in response to this case.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I had a voice in how my crime was dealt with.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The restorative justice facilitator(s) was responsive to my needs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The restorative justice <u>facilitator</u> treated me with respect.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The <u>offender</u> treated me with respect.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The <u>community members</u> treated me with respect.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I felt safe during the restorative justice process.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I am satisfied with my restorative justice experience.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I would recommend the restorative justice process to others	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The restorative justice process improved my experience with the criminal justice system.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTS:

Is there anything else you would like to say about the restorative justice process or about how this case was handled?

Case ID: _____

Agency Name: Center for Restorative Programs

Survey Date: __/__/____

Community Member



Post Satisfaction Questionnaire

As part of doing restorative justice, we would like you to answer some questions about your thoughts, feelings, and behaviors. There are no right or wrong answers so choose the answer that is closest to what you really think or feel. This survey will help make the restorative justice program useful for other people so please answer each question as thoughtfully and honestly as possible. **Please DO NOT put your name anywhere on this survey.** All of your answers will be kept private and will only be seen by the program staff and researchers.

Completing this survey is completely voluntary. Please read every question carefully and choose only one answer for each question. If you don't find an answer that fits exactly, use the one that comes closest.

Thank you for sharing your perspective.

My role in this restorative justice process is:

- Parent/Guardian
- Other Family member
- Witness
- Police/Law Enforcement
- Community Member
- Offender Support
- Victim Support
- Other _____

What were your goals for the restorative justice process? What did you hope would be achieved as a result?

Please mark the box that best matches how much you agree with each item.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The restorative justice process met my needs in response to this case.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The restorative justice facilitator(s) was responsive to my needs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The restorative justice <u>facilitator</u> treated me with respect.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The <u>offender</u> treated me with respect.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The <u>victim</u> treated me with respect.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The other <u>community members</u> treated me with respect.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I felt safe during the restorative justice process.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I am satisfied with my restorative justice contract for the offender.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I am satisfied with my restorative justice experience.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

I would recommend restorative justice to others.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The restorative justice process improved my experience with the criminal justice system.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTS:

Is there anything else you would like to say about the restorative justice process or about how this case was handled?
