

## Benefits of Restorative Justice to Victims, Offender, Communities

### Victims

- Reasons for victims participation: desire for restitution, to hold offender accountable, to learn more about crime, share pain with offender, avoid court process, help offender change, see offender is punished<sup>1</sup>
- Consistently high satisfaction rates for victims who participate in VOM/FGC; one multi-site study in 6 counties in Oregon found 89% satisfaction rate. Another in England found 84% satisfaction rate. Victims thought process was fairer than criminal prosecution (80% vs. 34% in control group going through traditional process)<sup>2</sup>
- They were more likely to experience healing and emerging studies show less Post Traumatic Stress Symptoms<sup>3</sup>
- More likely to get restitution once personal connection with offender was established through the process and offender was involved in constructing agreement that provided for restitution; 80% or more compliance rate vs. 50% in traditional system<sup>4</sup>

### Offenders

Studies consistently show that offenders who have participated in VOD have lower re-offense rates and, when they do engage in criminal activity, a less serious offense is involved.<sup>5</sup> While the majority of restorative justice research has been done in the juvenile arena, promising outcomes also exist for adult offenders:

- Wisconsin has three prosecutor based restorative justice initiatives in addition to a number of community-based restorative justice programs. Evaluation of cases in Milwaukee County's Community Conferencing program from August 2002 through July 2003 showed that 4.3 % of 47 offenders who participated were charged with another crime compared to 13.5 % of the 52 nonparticipating offenders. For 2002, 8.8 % of participating offenders with no prior convictions were rearrested for or charged with another criminal offense within one year of participation, compared to 27.6 % of non participating offenders in the control group;<sup>6</sup>
- A 2005 study of Bethlehem, Pennsylvania's Restorative Justice Policing Experiment showed that 10% of violent offenders who participated in a restorative conferences re-offended, compared to 36% of violent offenders who did not participate;<sup>7</sup>
- A 2002 study of restorative justice conferencing in Australia produced a reduction of 15 to 20% in re-offending across different offense type and regardless of gender, criminal history, age and ethnicity of offenders;<sup>8</sup>
- A 2001 study from West Yorkshire, England found 44% of those participating in VOD were reconvicted within two years compared with 56% of the control group. These statistics were based on VOD involving the most serious offenders with the greatest amount of victim involvement;<sup>9</sup>
- In a 2001 study in Austria, first time offender participating in restorative justice process re-offended less than half the amount of the control group. Those who were repeat offenders re-offended at a rate of two-thirds of the control group's re-offense rate;<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Marc Umbreit, Betty Voss, Robert Coates, and Elizabeth Lightfoot, 89 *Marquette Law Review* 251 (Winter 2005).

<sup>2</sup> Marc Umbreit, Robert Coates, Betty Voss, *Impact of Restorative Justice Conferencing: A Review of 63 Empirical Studies in 5 Countries*, Center for Restorative Justice and Peacemaking, pg. 3 (2002).

<sup>3</sup> Lawrence W. Sherman and Heather Strang, *Restorative Justice: The Evidence*, Jerry Lee Institute Randomized Trials in Restorative Justice, pg. 64 The Smith Institute (2007)

<sup>4</sup> *Supra* note 2 at 9.

<sup>5</sup> *Supra* note 2, at 12.

<sup>6</sup> An Evaluation: Restorative Justice Programs Milwaukee and Outagamie Counties, Legislative Audit Bureau, State of Wisconsin, June 2004.

<sup>7</sup> Restorative Justice Consortium, The Positive Effect of Restorative Processes on Re-offending, London, March 2006 at 3(citing Hayes, "Assessing Re-offending in Restorative Justice Conferences,"2005).

<sup>8</sup> Restorative Justice Consortium, *supra* note 11, at 5 (citing Luke & Lind, "Reducing Juvenile Crime: Conferencing vs. Court," 2002).

<sup>9</sup> Restorative Justice Consortium, *supra* note 11, at 7 (citing Miers, et al, "An Exploratory Evaluation of Restorative Justice Schemes," 2001).

<sup>10</sup> Restorative Justice Consortium, *supra* note 11, at 7 (citing Miers, "An International Review of Restorative Justice," 2001).

- In a 2001 study in Germany, research showed that with successful mediation cases, the average rate of re-offending was two thirds that of the control group;<sup>11</sup>
- A study of sentencing circles in Canada showed an 80% decrease in recidivism for those adult and juvenile offenders who participated in the circles.<sup>12</sup>

## Community

### Cost savings

- A Missouri study found that it costs between \$232 and \$338 to provide VOD to a juvenile;<sup>13</sup>
- Genesee County in New York has been running a restorative justice program since 1981. Based on data compiled at the end of December 2004, the County estimates it saved over four million dollars by diverting offenders to “community service sentencing” versus placing them in jail;<sup>14</sup>
- In Henderson County, S.C., trials were reduced with the adoption of VOD by two-thirds, resulting in great cost savings;<sup>15</sup>
- In Cobb County, GA, the processing time for VOD cases was one-third of that required for trials;<sup>16</sup>
- In an Indiana-Ohio study, by comparing consequences for 73 youths and adults going through VOD programs with those of matched samples of those processed in the traditional manner, VOD offenders spent less time incarcerated and when they were incarcerated, they served county jail time instead of state prison time, resulting in substantial cost savings;<sup>17</sup>
- In a cost-benefit study of an adult felony drug court, researchers found that though the cost of probation for drug court participants was about \$1,400 more than for those who were not, there was a net savings and other financial benefits to the community that far outweighed the costs.<sup>18</sup>

### Community Building and Regard for Criminal Justice System

- The community benefits due to an increased sense of involvement in the methods by which crime is addressed in that there is greater collaboration among community members<sup>19</sup>
- The Community has greater satisfaction for and increased confidence with the criminal justice system.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> *Id.*

<sup>12</sup> Restorative Justice Consortium, *supra* note 11, at 10 (citing Mathews & Larkin, Guide to Community-Based Alternative for Juvenile Offenders, 1999)

<sup>13</sup> Joanne Katz, A DECADE OF RESTORATIVE JUSTICE IN MISSOURI’S JUVENILE COURTS: ACCOUNTABILITY, RESTITUTION AND TRANSFORMATION 46 (Missouri Department of Public Safety, 2006).

<sup>14</sup> Genesee Justice Project Report, <http://www.co.genesee.ny.us/frameset.html?/dpt/communityservices/progress.html&1> (last visited October 1, 2006).

<sup>15</sup> Umbreit, Coates, and Voss, *supra* note 2, at 16.

<sup>16</sup> *Id.*

<sup>17</sup> Roberts Coates & J. Gehm, Victim Meets Offender: An Evaluation of Victim Offender Reconciliation Programs, Valparaiso, IN: PACT Institute of Justice, (1985).

<sup>18</sup> A Cost-Benefit Analysis of the St. Louis City Adult Felony Drug Court, Institute of Applied Research. 2004. Link to study can be found at [www.mo.gov.osca](http://www.mo.gov.osca)

<sup>19</sup> Donald Schmid, Restorative Justice in New Zealand: A Model for U.S. Criminal Justice at 41, Wellington, New Zealand (August 2001) citing Barry Stuart, “Guiding Principles for Peacemaking Circles”, 235, Restorative Community Justice, Eds. Bazemore and Schiff (2001),

<sup>20</sup> Zvi D. Gabbay, Justifying Restorative Justice: A Theoretical Justification for Use of Restorative Justice Practices, Journal of Dispute Resolution, (Vol. 2) 349,271-372 (2005),