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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Master’s project, “Evaluation from the Ground Up: The (Co) Creation of a Restorative Justice Evaluation Tool” is a community-based and community-initiated evaluation project. The final product, a set of surveys, was created with and for the local Restorative Justice community. A need for evaluative tools has been expressed by many Vancouver Island programs, but the primary organization involved with the piloting of the product and the multiple revisions of the tool, was the Victoria Restorative Justice Society (VRJS).

In order to identify the goals of the evaluation tool, primary data was collected using focus groups and stakeholder interviews. As a volunteer and Board Member with VRJS, I identified key local stakeholders in certain fields (e.g., academia, police, advocacy and volunteers) to participate in the focus groups. A “snowball” method was used to recruit additional participants. Three focus groups were conducted with a total of fifteen participants. Additionally, three semi-structured interviews/conversations were conducted. All of the primary qualitative data was gathered in the spring and summer of 2008.

The focus groups pointed to four central goals. The evaluation tool would assist with: knowledge acquisition; securing funding/resources; ensuring adherence to standards/process; and, community engagement/education. This information directed the survey development and established that the goal of this evaluation was for tracking program outcomes and process effectiveness.
In addition to the data collected from the primary research conducted in this project, literature and other evaluative tools also influenced the development of the surveys. In particular, Kirsten Ho Chan’s Master’s Project, “Searching for Best Practices in Evaluation of Restorative Justice: A Systematic Review” provided a collation of various international community justice evaluative tools, which provided a foundation of best practices in community justice evaluations.

This project resulted in the creation of a series of surveys. The first two surveys were developed specifically for the victim and offender (Appendix E and F), and resulted in two surveys. The two phased administration of this survey was created for the victim and offender, in order to measure change. The second set of surveys included a post-intervention survey to be completed immediately after the restorative intervention (Appendix E), and a post-agreement survey to be completed at the completion of the file (Appendix F). There was a third set of surveys developed (Appendix G, H, I and J), which are case overview surveys for the involved police officer, case facilitator, mentor and VRJS staff. In total, there are six surveys.

The surveys were trialed for six months, at which point further revisions were made in consultation with the VRJS staff. The surveys are now integrated into the VRJS process and will be used to measure program outcomes and participant satisfaction. The data collected will also be an integral component of data collection and reporting for funding presentations and internal quality tracking.
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Background

This project is the result of a community-based initiative. The impetus for this research emerged from the ground level, specifically from community volunteers in Southern Vancouver Island restorative justice programs. Victoria Restorative Justice Society (VRJS) requested assistance in creating a sustainable evaluation tool for their community restorative justice program.

Victoria Restorative Justice Society is a non-profit community-based organization which provides restorative processes for youth and adults who are residents of the City of Victoria or Esquimalt in the aftermath of crime and other harmful behaviour. The organization is victim-centred, offender-focused and community-driven. VRJS addresses the community’s need for participation, accountability, results, healing and closure. Those who facilitate restorative processes are volunteers, most of whom are professionals in fields such as psychology, social work, counselling and mediation. The organizational goals are to develop and operate a restorative justice program for the benefit of the community; and to educate the general public and raise community awareness about restorative justice.

VRJS operates under the guidance of a Board of Directors. VRJS employs a part-time Program Coordinator and a part-time Program Assistant/Volunteer Coordinator and have 70 active volunteers.
This project builds on the work produced by Kirsten Ho Chan’s in her 2007 Master’s Project, “Searching for Best Practices in Evaluation of Restorative Justice: A Systematic Review.” Chan collected and summarized available evaluation and assessment tools in the Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) field and made recommendations for the implementation of a tool which would meet the needs of Restorative Justice Oak Bay (RJOB). Although many of the tools evaluated in Chan’s project have similar elements and themes, it is still important to note that individual communities may have unique needs for an evaluation tool.

In order to ensure that the voice of the local Restorative Justice (RJ) community was heard and involved in the creation of the evaluation tool, I chose to expand the study and include primary research (focus groups and interviews) with stakeholders. The focus groups were used to extract themes and needs that may be unique to the Greater Victoria area. This project culminates in the creation of an evaluation tool for the Victoria Restorative Justice Society (VRJS) with additional recommendations for successful implementation strategies and future evaluation suggestions. This tool is the result of integrating accepted best practices in community justice evaluation and melding this with the specific needs of local RJ stakeholders.

Rationale / Research Questions

The practice of restorative programs is supported in theory by authoritative bodies\(^1\), yet the implementation of restorative programs is often the responsibility of

---

\(^1\) The United Nations Economic and Social Council introduced guiding principles for the use of restorative justice in criminal matters (2002) and the Canadian Government introduced extrajudicial measures in the Youth Criminal Justice Act (2003), which includes restorative justice programs.
non-governmental and non-profit volunteers. This creates significant variation in the way restorative programs are offered\(^2\) and potentially the outcomes of the program. The lack of standardization is an important reason to ensure an evaluative process is integrated into any restorative justice program.

Victoria Restorative Justice Society has sought out the development and implementation of an evaluation tool for multiple reasons. Most notably, the development of this tool was to provide feedback about the program and support provincial reporting requirements and potential funders. Evaluation literature supports the importance of non-profit evaluation stating, "The days of programs being funded based on good ideas and intentions are forever gone; the days of programs needing data and proof to support their existence are here to stay" (Harper, Pennell, & Weil, 2002, p. 2).

In order to support the VRJS organization in measuring program outcomes, they wanted a tool to measure their program goals. The purpose of this project is to develop an evaluative tool which is consistent with international restorative evaluation, but which also integrates the identified needs of the local Restorative Justice community.

**Definition of Restorative Justice**

There are various opinions on how to define restorative justice. It may be best understood when compared to criminal justice. The chart below is Howard Zehr’s

---

\(^2\) Restorative programs can include: family group conferencing, victim-offender mediation, peacemaking circles, sentencing circles, community accountability panels etc.)
interpretation of how restorative justice differs from criminal justice (Zehr, The Little Book of Restorative Justice, 2002).

Figure 1: Two Different Views of Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criminal Justice</th>
<th>Restorative Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crime is a violation of the law and state.</td>
<td>Crime is a violation of people and relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violations create guilt.</td>
<td>Violations create obligations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice requires the state to determine blame (guilt)</td>
<td>Justice involves victims, offenders, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and impose pain (punishment).</td>
<td>community members in an effort to put things right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Focus: Offenders getting what they deserve.</td>
<td>Central Focus: Victim needs and offender responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for repairing harm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Essentially Zehr’s table highlights the focus of reparation and responsibility involving a criminal act. Zehr further expands by stating that when viewed through a restorative lens “crime is a violation of people and relationships. It creates obligations to make things right. Justice involves the victim, the offender, and the community in a search for solutions which promote repair, reconciliation, and reassurance” (Zehr, 1990, p. 118).

Essentially, restorative justice refers to programs, processes, paradigms and practices which seek to repair the harm caused by crime.

Restorative processes are frequently considered an alternative to the traditional justice system, and are predominantly operated by non-governmental organizations.

---

3 The Ministry of Attorney General has a policy (policy code ALT 1) which outlines guidelines for the consideration of alternative measures. In the Youth Criminal Justice Act (YCJA) restorative programs is categorized under “extrajudicial measures.”
Many restorative programs are operated by volunteers in a grassroots community setting. There is no fundamental reason (although many suppositions) why the traditional justice system and restorative programs predominantly operate in a vacuum, yet this is typically the way. The Law Commission of Canada authored a discussion paper on restorative justice which provided an insightful opinion on the relationship between the traditional justice system and the restorative alternatives.

At the moment, restorative justice assumes a critical stance in relation to the criminal justice system. It is frequently cast as an alternative to the existing process and is dependent upon it. The relationship between these two responses to conflict will always be in tension (Law Commission of Canada, 1998, p. 35).

The “critical stance” referred to may come from some of the originating foundations of the traditional tenets of law. In 1977, criminologist Nils Christie suggested the legal system was “stealing conflict.” Christie argued that legal proceedings convert personal conflict into state conflict, essentially robbing the public of their right to conflict (Christie, 1977). The legal system takes ownership of the process and outcome of the proceedings, further removing the victim and offender from the process, as the lawyer becomes the voice for both parties.

Although there is no one definitive list of restorative values, these are common words used to describe restorative values: respect, empathy, honesty, accountability, inclusiveness, participation, responsibility and holism (Pranis, 2007, p. 61). Wonshe (2004) states that values of restorative justice “begin with respect, seek reconciliation and are based on love” (p. 255). When comparing restorative values to the values
associated with the justice system, (e.g, objective or “blind”, logical, equal, democratic) it is apparent that these are very different approaches (White, 2008, p. 6).

This is not to say that state justice and community justice are mutually exclusive, nor that they are philosophically irreconciable. The quintessence of restorative justice can manifest in any program or practice. Restorative justice is not a concrete “thing”, but rather a paradigm of how one views justice. Essentially, “restorative justice is not a map, but the principles of restorative justice can be seen as compass pointing a direction” (Zehr, 2002, p. 10).

**Restorative Justice in British Columbia (BC)**

During my literature review, I found a vestige of evidence of BC’s initial advocacy for community justice programs. In 1977, the Second Annual Symposium of Justice Councils was hosted in Victoria. The theme of the symposium was: “Bringing Justice Back Into the Community.” Although the eighty-one page document summarizing the symposium speakers did not once use the terminology “restorative justice”, it was evident that the participants recognized the growing need for community engagement in the justice system. In the opening speech, the Chairman of the Captial Region Justice Council states:

Too much professionalism and specialization has caused too little community involvement, with apathy, unawareness, often cynicism and above all – insensitivity as a consequence. I don't know which of these came first, but any one of the symptoms has the others as inevitable consequence. (Capital Regional District of Victoria, 1977, p. 2)

This symposium affirms that BC was innovative in recognizing that a healthy justice system includes the community which it serves.
Two recent constitutional events have impacted the BC government response to community justice programs: an amendment to the *Criminal Code*, and the introduction of the *Youth Criminal Justice Act*. In 1996 the *Criminal Code* was amended to reduce the use of prison as a sanction and to expand community-based alternatives. The *R. v. Gladue* case highlighted the systemic discrimination of Aboriginal Peoples in the Canadian justice system, and provided the first interpretation of section 718.2 (e) of the *Criminal Code of Canada*, which states: “all available sanctions other than imprisonment that are reasonable under the circumstances should be considered for all offenders, with particular attention to the circumstance of Aboriginal offenders.” (R. v. Gladue, 1999)

In 1998, the BC Ministry of the Attorney General published a paper, “A Restorative Justice Framework: British Columbia Justice Reform.” The purpose of the framework was to “provide a context within which ministry line branches and justice partners can develop operational policies to meet the needs of the communities they serve.” (British Columbia Ministry of Attorney General, 1998, p. 4) The paper recognizes the weakness of both the civil and criminal justice system, stating:

> [The current system] doesn’t always allow people input into decisions that affect them. And it frequently fails to take into account the interests of the victims, families and members of the community who may not be immediately involved in the justice process but who have a legitimate interest in the outcomes. In addition, in relying too much on the justice system, communities have become less able to resolve their problems, and the social bonds that support healthy human relationships and communities have been weakened. (British Columbia Ministry of Attorney General, 1998, p. 1)

This sentiment was reinforced with the implementation of the Youth Criminal Justice Act (YCJA) in April 2003. The YCJA opened the door to alternative measures for coping with young offenders. One such measure is conferencing, a restorative justice mechanism that

---

4 The YCJA replaced the Young Offenders Act (YOA) that was in effect from 1984 to March 2003.
allows the individual that committed the harm to meet with the person harmed by the offence and discuss a mutually agreeable option for repairing the harm (Reeve, 2003, p. 1). Conferencing provides a mechanism to understand the multiple factors that lead youth to commit the offences in the first place.

In 2004, the Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General, Community Programs Division, published an information package designed to assist people with implementing restorative justice programs in their communities. The publication refers to these restorative programs as “Community Accountability Programs (CAP)”, and states that the Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General remains committed to supporting the development of Community Accountability Programs across BC (British Columbia Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General, 2004, p. 4). The Ministry of Public Safety provides up to 2,500 dollars to programs approved under CAP, and the programs are required to adhere to the guidelines indicated by the Ministry.

Most community restorative justice programs rely heavily on volunteer labour and charitable grants and donations to sustain their programs. The challenge to community programs, including VRJS, is that these sources of funding are not predictable, not guaranteed and often do not support core funding. In addition, the process involved to obtain these grants can be labour intensive, which draws the limited volunteer resources away from other projects.
CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGY

Community-Based Research

In order to lend legitimacy to my project in the community, as well as respect the values inherent in the process I am evaluating, it was essential that the research was grounded in the community. Hills & Mullet (2000) define community-based research as:

a collaboration among community groups, decision-makers and researchers for the purpose of creating new knowledge or understanding about a practical community issue in order to bring about change. The issue is generated by the community and community members participate in all aspects of the research process. Community-based research/evaluation therefore is collaborative, participatory, empowering, systematic and transformative (p. 24).

The primary tenet of community-based research is that the research is conducted with the communities, not “on” them or “about” them.

Reitsma-Street asserts that participatory research approaches “have been developed to promote the knowledge and participation of people most affected by the concern” (Reitsma-Street, 2002, p. 69). This principle is in direct keeping with the restorative justice goals of engaging community in the justice process.

It is also important to recognize that the community can bring unique qualities to a project that “professionals” or “institutions” may not have. Kay Pranis summarizes this sentiment:

The community has tools which the system does not have. The community has resources which the system does not have. The community has power which the system does not have. Criminal justice system activity needs to be built around a core of community activity – not the reverse (Pranis, 2007, p. 24).
Evaluation literature also reinforces the need to involve stakeholders/community in evaluation projects. Primarily, community involvement will help shape and inform the study so that it is reflective of community goals; secondarily, people are more likely to have “buy-in” for the finished product (e.g., survey), if they are consulted and involved in the process (Robson, 2000, p. 18).

Community-based research principles are at the foundation of this project. As this project was community initiated, and required VRJS community involvement at various stages throughout the development and implementation of the evaluation – this is truly a collaborative project.

Method

The purpose of this first part of the research was to collect information from the local restorative justice groups about any specific needs or wants they desired from an evaluative tool. This would allow for an existing tool to be developed to accommodate specific requests from the stakeholders, or a new tool to be created if an existing tool was not sufficient.

Focus groups were used to collect this data. The primary goal of focus groups is to have a groups of individuals explore a specific set of issues. The objective of this project was to explore the purpose and needs of an evaluation for Victoria Restorative Justice Society. The focus groups had the benefit of providing dynamic and collaborative material for the research, but in addition and in the spirit of community-based action research, the focus groups also allowed for participants to share information and strategize about implementation and next steps. This is one reason why focus groups
were the main method for data collection (as opposed to interviews), as of focus groups ensure that participants are engaged in discussion with each other, rather than solely with the facilitator (Catterall & Maclaran, 1997, p. 3).

Waterton and Wynne (1999) have conducted research on whether focus groups can access community views, in particular, as compared to opinion polls. They found that focus groups offer a “more critical or reflexive framework for research on the very nature of attitudes, on the construction of the issue at hand, as well as on the constructive role of the social scientist as interpreter or part-constructor of such views” (Waterton, 1999, p. 129). The focus group offers an interactive discourse that may reflect subtle relationships that cannot be obtained from a survey. Additionally, focus groups allowed for information to be collected in a more timely method than an interview would allow.

Although the three focus groups were the primary method of data collection, there was one semi-structured in-person interview conducted. This individual was unable to attend the focus groups, but was identified as an important stakeholder, so the interview was arranged. Also, two informal telephone conversations were conducted with a researcher in the field of RJ evaluation, and with the provincial RJ Coordinator. There were 18 participants involved in total (15 in the focus groups, 1 interview, 2 informal phone conversations). Figure 2 on the follow page denotes the research process.
In total, three focus groups occurred over the course of one month. Twenty-one individuals were invited to participate in the focus groups. The initial invite list included individuals from: local RJ groups, Victoria Police Department and Oak Bay Police Department, City Council, Academia, Victoria John Howard Society and Nanaimo Regional VRJS Implementation.
John Howard Society. Fifteen people participated in the focus groups and three people participated in interviews/informal conversations, for a total of 18 research participants.

The initial fifteen participants were selected by purposive sampling. It was essential to have participants who were stakeholders in the RJ process and had an intimate knowledge of local RJ processes. A few key individuals in the RJ community were identified, and from this initial group, the “snowball” method was used to gather further participants. Participants were primarily volunteers with local RJ organizations.

Participants were initially contacted by email, which included a brief description of the study and an explanation of how I received their name as a contact for the study. Participants who were interested in participating were asked to contact me by email or phone. Those who confirmed their interest were then sent further information on the focus groups, and they were provided with three potential dates for the focus group, and asked to provide their first and second choice. All but one participant received their first selection of dates for the focus group. The focus groups ranged from four to seven people, and the average time for the focus group was two hours. The first focus group was held at the Graduate Student Centre at University of Victoria, and the remaining two focus groups were held at the University of Victoria McPherson Library. The University was chosen due to the central location, neutrality of the space and the absence of a rental charge for the room space.

Iterative Process

There were multiple revisions of the surveys based on continuous community feedback. This was not only in keeping with the community-based research
methodology, but was essential to ensuring the survey was reliable and functioning as intended. This process took substantially longer, as there multiple points of feedback, resulting in revisions each time I consulted with the stakeholders. As staff members and volunteers were engaged throughout the survey development, this also made implementation less cumbersome, as many had already been exposed to the tool.

After coding the focus group data, and reviewing the best practice literature produced in Kirsten Chan’s MA project, I presented a number of survey drafts. The drafts were based on the best practice research in evaluation, and directly linked to the themes which emerged from the primary research. From this point, the survey was presented multiple times to different audiences, all whom provided meaningful feedback, which helped shape the survey design and content. Feedback on this iteration of the questionnaire was elicited from: VRJS staff (after 4 consultations), VRJS Board of Directors, a consultant in statistics and multiple VRJS volunteers provided feedback before the pilot and during the survey pilot. They were asked to comment on survey readability, clarity, length and any potential concerns with the proposed questions.

Feedback was solicited in both informal meetings and formal presentations. I presented at the annual VRJS volunteer meeting and a VRJS board meeting. I also requested that the Program Coordinator invite feedback from volunteers, as they piloted the survey. I asked volunteer feedback on user readability, length to complete and any questions which participants may be struggling with answering. Some glitches were identified during the pilot process, which sparked another round of revisions. The series of surveys had a significant metamorphosis from the existing VRJS survey (see Appendix
D). The multiple feedback points created a significant amount of work in revisions, but resulted in a functional product, that was truly participatory in nature.

Surveys

The series of surveys (6 in total) were developed for various stakeholders in the RJ process, including: the victim and offender, VRJS staff, police officer, case facilitator and the case mentor. The victim and offender are administered the first survey (Appendix E) after the Restorative Justice intervention (e.g., family group conference). A second survey is administered to both the victim and offender at the completion of the agreement (Appendix F). This allows for the measurement of change which may have occurred during the RJ process. At the completion of the case, Case Overview surveys are also administered to: VRJS staff, the Police Representative, VRJS mentor, VRJS Case Facilitator (Appendix G, H, I and J). Collecting data from multiple sources regarding program outcomes is mechanism to support reliability of the evaluation (i.e., triangulation of data). Figure 3 demonstrates the process for the survey delivery.
The questions that are posed in the survey are a direct result of the combination of feedback from the focus groups, on-going feedback from stakeholders and best practices gleaned from other community justice evaluation programs. Although a pre-intervention survey was not developed in this evaluation, there is an opportunity to add this survey at a later date. It was decided to only have two points of change measurement at this point for simplicity. It was also discussed that it may be stressful to administer a survey to the victim and offender just before beginning a restorative process.

Findings

The surveys were transcribed and grounded theory was used to identify emerging themes. When the data was transcribed, I went through line by line, coding the data into like categories. Two primary research themes occurred; responses that could be grouped into “process findings”, and those that could be grouped into a “content
findings.” There were other interesting themes that emerged when participants were asked the question about the purpose and intent for an evaluation, which also helped determine that this evaluation would be an “outcome” evaluation. These findings are referenced in Appendix C.

The process responses provided information about the structure and delivery of the tool. Specifically, who should deliver the survey, how long should it be, when should the survey be filled out (e.g., pre or post intervention), where and how should the survey be delivered, what format is preferred, what type of data (qualitative or quantitative), who is the target audience for the results, who will fill out the survey (e.g., all those involved in the intervention or just the youth harmed and the youth whom committed harm) how many surveys do we need to have (e.g., pre and post intervention).

The content responses reflect the specific needs of the group regarding the type of information they hope the surveys will collect. The responses ranged from very diffuse contemplations about what questions should be asked, to very concrete, specific examples of questions they wished to have answers to.

Process

The slight majority of participants were supportive of a short and simple tool, which could rely on existing knowledge of RJ evaluations. Some participants were specific about their recommendations, giving suggestions such as, “Here’s five true/false questions...Now I’m not saying this will give you great, rich material, I’m saying it’s cheap, fast and painless” and “I would suggest you also use things like multiple choice or true/false. They are fast.”
The term “don’t reinvent the wheel” emerged twice during the focus groups. Other participants also supported this sentiment with comments such as, “You have to develop an instrument, and they are already out there” and “There is a lot we can do without developing a grandiose tool, that will still indicated where we are and whether or not we are making a difference in some way.”

Of note, although the slight majority did support a brief and simple tool, there were others that indicated different expectations. In fact, some participants relayed opposing requests within the same sentence: “Don’t reinvent the wheel, but make it work for our community in some way –with the resources we have.” Other participants relayed their desire for a more complex tool, “Evaluation has to be multi-faceted, it can’t just be one variable it’s measuring. That’s essential to me that it is not just linear – measuring one thing.”

Also there was significant input which blended both content and process, “We also need to do some type of post-agreement survey, because that’s often where, you know, the change happens.” This person was requesting that the delivery of the tool be in two phases (i.e., process request) and that the tool be used to measure change (i.e., content request). As demonstrated previously in the question posed to the participants with regards to the purpose for evaluation, there was no overwhelming singular unified response.

Many respondents also noted a preference for having both qualitative and quantitative data collected in the surveys. This same participant stated, “The real essential thing about RJ is qualitative. It’s the experience” and later said, “How many
(volunteer/staff) hours were spent (on the conference), what was the rate of pay...how much cost to the organization?” Both ideas were important, both would require different ways to measure the two ideas.

Almost all indicated the need for “hard data” and “statistics” but many others did not want to only preserve this data at the cost of losing “the story.” It became evident that it was important to the participants to have an opportunity for free text in the survey.

Content

The most common theme among the focus group participants was the importance of measuring change or transformation among the participants. One participant specifically noted the need to measure transformation in the victim, “What are the changes that actually happen for the victim, that’s very important. We can really use evaluation to flush out what the human component is when a person has been harmed.” Another participant also noted the need to measure change, but focusing on the offender. “How is (the victim) feeling at the end of the circle... And has the offender transformed in some way because of the circle?”

In order to measure change, it is then necessary to have two surveys delivered at different points along the process. There were no consistent requests as to what the time interval should be, but some participants did indicate a desire to see one survey delivered immediately after the intervention and then a second survey provided at the completion (or conclusion) of the agreement.
The other strong theme that emerged for content of the survey was measuring participant satisfaction. This is a very common measure, and was not surprising.

“There is one simple question that is often used because you can’t go through all the variables: Is this a process you would recommend to someone else?” Another participant stated, “Is everyone satisfied? Is everyone in a better headspace than when they started?”

Other participants wanted the surveys to produce data that would allow for the production of statistics which could elicit comparison to the traditional justice system. Essentially this meant participants wanted data that would help VRJS produce information that could be used to sway community stakeholders/funders, into understanding RJ is a good value. One police officer noted, “from a pragmatic standpoint (we evaluate for) the resources, not just money, but the resources. And in my case officers, to get them to buy into the program and from the referral standpoint, there just has to be a clearly articulated reason that it works.” Another participant shared, “And I want to emphasize the importance of evaluation for funding. I think that evaluation research increases or puts interventions, movements, on the radar screen in a society that is very focused on numbers and funding and being able to quantify things before they can say ‘yes, we support this‘.” The need to quantify information was important for “selling” RJ to the community and funders. Another participant directly stated that, “evaluation is important to demonstrate to people who hold provincial purse strings that this is an important and superior way of running criminal justice.”

Finally it was important that the evaluation monitored program consistency and quality. “Within programs themselves, we need to be going back to best practice and
basic principles and following those basic principles, because RJ is so broad. . . .I think individual programs need to say this is our mission statement so we can evaluate and constantly go back to whether we have strayed from this. If we are not clear on what we do, it’s very hard to convey the message to community and government." Along this theme, another person shared, “I’m all for keeping things open for people to be innovative and creative, but still work within the values and beliefs of RJ...we have some standards of practice that we are obligated to abide by, it protects the public and the users of the system.” The word “values” was used frequently in all of the focus groups (a total of 31 times in all the focus groups). It was very important to participants that there was a way to ensure the program is reflecting the core RJ values and producing a quality community program.

The collation of the subthemes in both the content and process groupings was in keeping with the literature review produced by Kirsten Chan's MA project. Specifically, Chan noted that the primary types of evaluation for restorative programs are: needs assessments, process evaluations, participant satisfaction and outcome evaluations (2007, p. 29). Chan also noted that the primary purpose of evaluation is “to ensure services are being delivered effectively and efficiently, according to the preferences and needs of users” (2007, p.29).

This made the development of the surveys much easier, as I was working from a consistent and clear platform, which was supported by the international research.
Limitations

Bias

It is essential to disclose my personal involvement in the RJ community, specifically as a volunteer and board member of Restorative Justice Victoria, as this undoubtedly frames my approach and reactivity to this research. When considering reflexivity in research, and the debate of the “outside” versus “inside” research, I align with perspective of sociologist Howard Becker.

To have values or not to have values: the question is always with us. When sociologists undertake to study problems that have relevance to the world we live in, they find themselves caught in a cross fire. Some urge them not to take sides...I propose to argue that it is not possible and, therefore, that the question is not whether we should take sides, since we inevitably will, but rather whose side we are on. (Becker, 1967, p. 239).

I do not claim to be objective in this research, and I do clearly have a “side” in this research, as I was recruited by the organization I am a member of. My involvement in restorative justice programs (e.g. VRJS and William Head Restorative Justice Coalition\textsuperscript{5}) has inveterated my belief in a need for a different type of justice.

It should be noted that “insider” research is very common in small scale evaluation projects (Robson, 2000, p. 31). This may be due to several factors, but essentially in small scale community projects it may be more cost effective for an “insider” evaluator. In addition the organization does not need to spend time developing trust and explaining their business to an external researcher.

\textsuperscript{5} William Head Restorative Justice Coalition is a mixture of William Head Institution (WHI) inmates and community volunteers whom meet on a weekly basis to discuss issues relevant to restorative practices. In addition the group plans a semi-annual restorative justice conference which is held on the grounds of WHI.
Additionally, the focus groups were predominantly composed of RJ volunteers, the population who will be using the tool. As a result, the feedback and suggestions were offered from the perspective of the RJ community. This is not necessarily a limitation, but rather an observation that the evaluation product will address the questions and concerns of the involved stakeholders. It is possible that should this tool be expanded beyond the Greater Victoria region, there may be different needs expressed by other communities which are not represented in this tool.

**Sample Size**

Twenty-three people were invited to participate in the study, with 15 attending the focus groups, one providing an interview, and two providing informal telephone interviews. The limited sample can be attributed to the limited pool of people to draw from (there is a finite number of stakeholders in the RJ community). In addition, if the funds were available, compensating the participants may have increased the acceptance rate. In addition, an email invitation may have been too impersonal for some individuals.

**Focus Groups**

Although focus groups can be an efficient and economical way of gathering information, there are limitations. Individuals who are introverted in personality may not feel as comfortable participating in a large group conversation. In every focus group there were certain individuals whom spoke more frequently than others. This may have been a combination of their passion about the topic and their comfort speaking in a group setting. This may mean I missed some important feedback from individuals who weren’t comfortable in this forum.
**Age**

All of the research participants were over the age of 18. This was due both to the fact that there are very few RJ volunteers under the age of 18, and due to confidentiality and ethical considerations (both from UVIC and the RJ) former participants of the RJ process were not approached to participate. This is a knowledge gap, and in future it would be useful from a research perspective, to approach former RJ participants for their feedback in any further focus groups. Of course, the desire for their input would need to be balanced with any potential infringement of privacy upon approaching participants. The privacy concern may be mitigated by asking a question at the end of the survey about whether they would be willing to be approached in future for further feedback regarding their RJ experience.
CHAPTER 3: RECOMMENDATIONS

Training

Any organizational change requires education and training for the volunteers and/or staff. As this process was community-driven, the education process will be easier, as stakeholder “buy-in” has been established. It is essential that all volunteers understand the purpose of the survey and are comfortable administering the survey and answering questions.

In the development phase of the survey I presented at a volunteer meeting for VRJS. The purpose was to introduce the survey to the volunteers, field any questions about the evaluation process and to encourage feedback. It was essential that the volunteers understood why they were being asked to deliver/monitor the survey. If the volunteers were provided with appropriate information on the survey, they should then be able to field basic questions should they arise, and if they cannot answer the questions, they would know who to refer the participant to. Additionally, the volunteers needed to know the survey was voluntary, for all participants, including themselves. It is imperative that participants in no way feel coerced to complete the survey. Participants need to be clearly informed that their responses are confidential and will in no way influence the process or outcome of their case with VRJS.

It is suggested that the evaluation process is introduced to all new volunteers, and is included in the agenda for all on-going volunteer information sessions. This is to both encourage on-going feedback of the survey, and to continue to educate staff about the basic tenets of survey delivery.
VRJS recently completed a volunteer manual, which incorporates general information about the volunteer roles, VRJS forms, process information and other relevant information to assist the VRJS volunteers. There is information provided on the evaluation process, which I provided, in addition to examples of the surveys. This manual is a great asset to the volunteers and the incorporation and updating of any changes to the evaluation tool will be a helpful visual reference.

Data Standards

Any evaluation is only as good as the information that is collected. In order to establish credible and reliable data, I would recommend the establishment of data standards. Key issues that should be addressed are data management and survey management.

Data management should include guidelines for how data is input into the electronic database. This task involves access to confidential information, and should remain limited to an appropriately trained staff or volunteer. There should also be guidelines established for how VRJS will protect the confidentiality of the data stored by the organization. For example, will VRJS only report on aggregate data in order to ensure anonymity of information. Also, how will the qualitative information in the surveys be stripped of identifying information for reports. It is also important to note that electronic information stored by an American company is subject to the Patriot Act, which means the United States government does have the right to access any information stored in the database. Although it would be unlikely for this to happen, it would be worthwhile to transfer the data collection to a Canadian company.
I would also recommend that upon 12 months of data collection, a base line of information is collated and reported on. This would mean that all the data in the previous 12 months is collected and reported, allowing for these statistics to provide a starting point for data contrast and comparison in future.

Survey management should explore questions of maintenance of the surveys. Specifically, VRJS should consider who will make revisions to the surveys and who will incorporate any organizational needs which should be reflected in the evaluation tool. Also, who needs to sign off on these changes. I would recommend any content changes to the evaluation tool is approved by the Board of Directors.

The core responsibility of maintaining the data should be the responsibility of a staff member, with the decisions regarding guidelines and standards being supported by one of the VRJS Committees. The data input function would ideally be done in “real time” via a web survey, administered at the time of the RJ intervention. This would have two main benefits. Firstly, the VRJS program is more likely to receive candid information, as there is a stronger perception of anonymity submitting the information electronically. Currently the survey is filled out in paper format and put in an envelope, where a third party then inputs the data – potentially compromising the individual’s privacy of their response. Additionally, there would be significant time, environmental and cost savings by switching to an electronic input system. The current survey is housed in “Survey Monkey”, which allows for online survey input, and email links to the survey. This means a VRJS staff member does not have to spend a significant amount of time manually inputting the data into the data program. The average case results in
approximately six surveys which require 40 minutes to input. This time and money could be avoided by electronic input. Electronic input and tracking also avoids the use of paper, which is important for environmental sustainability.

**Informed Consent**

Although the issue of consent was mentioned in the above paragraph, I would recommend that the surveys are introduced into the existing consent form used by VRJS. The consent form should include information about the intent of the surveys, how information in the surveys is distributed and used by the organization, who they can contact about questions, and that the survey is strictly voluntary. This information should also be provided verbally at the pre-conference meeting with the participants, or prior to commencing the community justice conference.

**Funding Support**

One of the primary reasons indicated by the stakeholders to have an evaluation process was to support the organization in obtaining funding. There are specific questions in the survey which may elicit information which would assist when writing grant proposal and making funding requests. Specifically, I would recommend using that data collected from survey one and survey two, questions 7, 8, 9, 11 and 12. Questions 7 and 8 indicate any emotional and cognitive transformation which may have resulted for the victim or offender as a result of this process. Questions 9, 11 and 12 directly report on participant satisfaction, which is also a key indicator for measuring the program outcomes.
CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSION

This project has resulted in the successful implementation of a standardized evaluation process for the Victoria Restorative Justice Society. At the time of writing, the evaluation has been in effect for approximately eight months. Although still early in the implementation phase, the pilot phase of the survey and the multiple points of feedback have proved successful in producing a reliable and comprehensive evaluation tool. The tool is being supported by program staff, and information on the surveys has been incorporated into the VRJ Volunteer Handbook.

This project may have been possible, but not nearly as successful, had it not been for the restorative justice volunteers and staff members who worked relentlessly to help achieve this end goal. As the researcher during this process, I relied heavily on the support of the restorative justice community. The open sharing of their experiences, opinions and suggestions, and much personal encouragement along the way, ensured I was able to complete this project.

There has been significant personal learning for me throughout this process, but most significantly has been my understanding of the strength in community. During the process of conducting the primary research, I was forever amazed at the exuberance and sincerity of restorative justice stakeholders. The community-based nature of this research required more time and consultation than would be required for a typical research project. Not a regret though, as Kay Pranis says it best when she states that the community has tools, resources and power, which neither the system [nor an independent researcher] could hope to have (Pranis, 2007).
References


R. v. Gladue, 26300 (The Supreme Court of Canada 1999).


Appendix A
Invitation to Participate in Focus Groups

INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE

Integrating Theory and Practice: Establishing Best Practices in the Evaluation of Community-Based Restorative Justice Programs

Dear (Name):

Your name and email address were forwarded to me by (name of person referring) from Restorative Justice Oak Bay (RJOB)/ Restorative Justice Victoria (RJV) as you are already involved in a Restorative Justice Organization and have expressed an interest in the topic of Restorative Justice Evaluation.

You are invited to participate in a focus group discussion regarding the evaluation needs of local community-based Restorative Justice Programs. I am a graduate student of the University of Victoria Master of Dispute Resolution program and a volunteer member of Restorative Justice Victoria. My Project Supervisor and my Project Committee Members are also volunteers with local Restorative Justice Organizations. As the Restorative Justice Community has expressed the need to implement a sustainable evaluation tool, I will be developing an evaluation tool for my Master’s Project. In order to ensure that this project meets the needs of the RJ community, it is important to me to have RJ community members fully engaged in informing the development of this tool. The focus groups and other secondary research will be the foundation for the development of the evaluation tool.

Should you be willing to participate, the time commitment will be approximately 90 minutes.

If you would like to participate in this project, please contact me by email: crystalw@uvic.ca or by telephone: 250-885-1575. You may also contact my Supervisor, Dr. Tara Ney at tney@uvic.ca if you have any questions or concerns about the project.

Sincerely,

Crystal White

MA Candidate, Institute for Dispute Resolution
Appendix B

Focus Group Questions

**Crystal White - Master's Project – Institute for Dispute Resolution**

**Integrating Theory and Practice: Establishing Best Practices in the Evaluation of Community-Based Restorative Justice Programs**

**FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS**

Preface to Question 1: *My Master’s project is a result of local Restorative Justice (RJ) groups expressing a need for a comprehensive evaluation tool. As this is a community-based project, your input in this focus group will establish the foundation for the development of an evaluation tool.*

**Question 1:**

*Primary Question:*  
Do you think evaluation is important for Restorative Justice Programs? Why or why not?

*Secondary Question:*  
In your view, what is the primary purpose of this evaluation?

Preface to Question 2: *In a very general sense, evaluation begins with asking questions. Before an evaluation tool can be designed, it is first important to know what questions the person/organization needs an answer to.*

**Question 2:**

*Primary Question:*  
In your opinion, what questions need to be answered by this evaluation tool and why are they important? Try and provide the specific questions you have or specific information you wish to acquire.

*Secondary Questions:*  
The paradigm of restorative justice has many values which inform its practice. These embedded values guide practice, including the design and implementation of the structure and operation of specific processes. In your opinion, what are the underlying values of restorative processes and programs?

What does “success” mean for your RJ program?
Preface to Question 3: In terms of structure, there are various forms an evaluation can take. For example, if one wishes to measure a change in behaviour/attitude, it is important to have a pre-test and post-test (e.g., a questionnaire completed before the RJ intervention, and one completed after the RJ intervention). In addition to considering the goal of the evaluation, one must also balance the availability of resources to implement, analyze, and integrate the evaluation tool. An evaluation tool will not be helpful if the organization cannot properly implement and sustain its use.

Question 3:

Primary Questions:
What do you anticipate to be the greatest challenge in implementing the tool?
What will be your organization’s greatest strength in sustaining the evaluation program?

Secondary Questions:
Considering allotted resources (e.g., time, money, volunteer capacity), could your organization sustain a more complex evaluation tool? (e.g., pre-test/post-test; survey and interviews to program participants)
How will use the information acquired from the evaluation?
Appendix C
Focus Group Themed Responses – Why Evaluate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why Evaluate?</th>
<th>Supporting Focus Group Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Themes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Secure Funding/Resources</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG 1 P 8 “I do believe evaluation is very important for very pragmatic reasons, for money, or wanting to get money. You need to have some sort of proof that what you’re asking the money for is going to work.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- It is implied by the focus groups that evaluation will demonstrate the benefits/”superiority” of RJ, hence opening doors to public and private funding
- Evaluation is viewed as a tool which will produce a means to an end.
- Funding will build greater infrastructure will then allow for greater program development

FG 3 P 1 “Evaluation is important to demonstrate to people who hold provincial purse strings that this is an important and superior way of running criminal justice.”

FG 3 P 2 “And I want to emphasize the importance of evaluation for funding. I think that evaluation research increases or puts interventions, movements, on the radar screen in a society that is very focused on numbers and funding and being able to quantify things before they can say ‘yes, we support this’.”

FG 3 P 24 “If you’ve got a really good evaluation instrument you could make it a condition of receiving a provincial grant.”

FG 1 P 9 “From a pragmatic standpoint (we evaluate for) the resources, not just money, but the resources. And in my case officers, to get them to buy into the program and from the referral standpoint, there just has to be a clearly articulated reason that it works.”

FG 3 P 29 “My crew has suggested that you have to cooperate with evaluation if you want grants.”

FG 2 P 8 “Unfortunately for people in the community, the RJ community, looking for funding from the people with the money, they want to know what the results are, they want to know.”
Unfortunately it may not be the best evaluation technique that’s been done, because you’re focusing on the trying to meet the needs of the people giving the money rather than the actual program itself and how effective it is.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Acquisition</th>
<th>FG 3 P 3 “Conducting this research can provide a knowledge base that can be used to challenge specific ideologies…. (research will provide) some ammunition to challenge it with.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are we making a difference?</td>
<td>FG 3 P 3 “Conducting this research can provide a knowledge base that can be used to challenge specific ideologies…. (research will provide) some ammunition to challenge it with.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge is a tool for social change</td>
<td>FG 2 P 9 “For me, the primary purpose of evaluation is to see whether or not the program itself is making a difference and to see if that difference is happening in the direction or towards the goals that we want them to see.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardization/Comparability</td>
<td>FG 3 P 3 “Conducting this research can provide a knowledge base that can be used to challenge specific ideologies.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FG 3 P 20 “There has to be a certain level of standardization, so that people, victim or offender, if they go into a circle no matter where they are, they know who is sitting there knows a bit about dispute resolution…there has to be a certain level of training and expertise that every program has.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ensure adherence to standards/process</th>
<th>FG 3 P 2 “(Evaluation is important) for ensuring efficacy in individual programs…evaluations for the purpose of feeding back into best practice of the</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide a feedback loop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Within programs themselves, we need to be going back to best practice and basic principles and following those basic principles, because RJ is so broad… I think individual programs need to say this is our mission statement so we can evaluate and constantly go back to whether we have strayed from this. If we are not clear on what we do, it’s very hard to convey the message to community and government.”

(We need evaluation) to provide feedback to our practitioners. We are losing people and I think (evaluation) gives them the greatest sense of satisfaction when they can see through evaluation that the work is effective.”

“Need to demonstrate to the community itself that RJ is a good thing.”

“I want this questionnaire to work for us when we speak to groups.”

“We want successful programs. We want community engagement. We want information about our programs. So hopefully, my understanding of what this tool is going to do is measure our outcomes, which then can hopefully be used for community engagement and selling RJ to people.”

- Justify the program
- Help “sell” RJ to the public

Community Engagement Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Engagement Tool</th>
<th>FG 3 P 1 “We need to demonstrate to the community itself that RJ is a good thing.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FG 1 P 22 “I want this questionnaire to work for us when we speak to groups.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FG 1 P 31 “We want successful programs. We want community engagement. We want information about our programs. So hopefully, my understanding of what this tool is going to do is measure our outcomes, which then can hopefully be used for community engagement and selling RJ to people.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D
Original RJ Victoria Evaluation Form

RESTORATIVE JUSTICE VICTORIA (RJ VICTORIA)

RJ Victoria Evaluation Form

We appreciate the time you take to fill out this form and return it to the RJ Victoria representative. The information will be confidential and used only for evaluating the program in our community and its future development.

☐ Victim/Victim Representative
☐ Victim Supporter
☐ Community Representative
☐ Other
☐ Offender
☐ Parent/Guardian of Offender
☐ Offender Supporter

AGE  GENDER

1. The Police officer’s explanation of the Restorative Justice program was:
   Very Satisfactory       Satisfactory       Somewhat Satisfactory       Not Satisfactory

2. The Restorative Justice pre-conference interview meeting was:
   Very Satisfactory       Satisfactory       Somewhat Satisfactory       Not Satisfactory

3. The Restorative Justice conference was:
   Very Satisfactory       Satisfactory       Somewhat Satisfactory       Not Satisfactory

4. The Restorative Justice contract agreement was:
   Very Satisfactory       Satisfactory       Somewhat Satisfactory       Not Satisfactory

5. How would you rank the RJ Victoria program from the initial contact to the conclusion?
   (Please circle one of the following numbers, where 1 = Very Satisfactory and 10 = Not Satisfactory)
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10

6. How do you feel the overall effect of this program was on you?
   Very Satisfactory       Satisfactory       Somewhat Satisfactory       Not Satisfactory

7. Would you take part in another Restorative Justice Conference if the need were to arise?
   Yes  No

8. Comments: (Use reverse if necessary)

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Thank you very much for your time.

RJ Victoria, #45 Cambridge Street, Victoria, BC V8V 4A7  Tel 383 5801 Fax 383 5801
Appendix E
Survey 1 - Post Intervention

Survey 1 – Post Intervention                              Date ________________

This is a voluntary survey. You can stop at any time and there will be no consequence. If
you are having difficulty with a question, please ask a volunteer for help. The information
gathered from this survey will be used for program improvement/development and
education. Any information used outside of Victoria Restorative Justice Society will be
anonymous. Thank you very much.

1. VRJS File # __________________

2. Who first explained the option of Restorative Justice to you?
   o Police
   o Family Member
   o Victoria Restorative Justice Society Staff or Volunteer
   o Legal Counsel
   o Other (please specify) ________________________________

3. Where you given a choice to participate in this Restorative Justice program?
   o Yes
   o Somewhat
   o Not sure
   o Not really
   o No

4. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements when thinking about
your involvement with Restorative Justice?

I was listened to:
   o Strongly Disagree
   o Disagree
   o Neutral
   o Agree
   o Strongly Agree

I was able to talk freely:
   o Strongly Disagree
   o Disagree
   o Neutral
   o Agree
   o Strongly Agree
I felt safe:
   o Strongly Disagree
   o Disagree
   o Neutral
   o Agree
   o Strongly Agree

I was respected by the other participants:
   o Strongly Disagree
   o Disagree
   o Neutral
   o Agree
   o Strongly Agree

I was respected by the Restorative Justice staff and volunteers:
   o Strongly Disagree
   o Disagree
   o Neutral
   o Agree
   o Strongly Agree

I was treated fairly:
   o Strongly Disagree
   o Disagree
   o Neutral
   o Agree
   o Strongly Agree

5. Did you understand what would happen in this Restorative Justice process?
   o I didn’t understand
   o I understood a little
   o I’m not sure
   o I mostly understood
   o I understood

6. How do you feel about the conference agreement?
   o Very Dissatisfied
   o Dissatisfied
   o Neutral
   o Satisfied
   o Very Satisfied
7. Since the incident, how often have you experienced the following feelings?

**Anger**
- Never
- Infrequently
- Sometimes
- Frequently
- All the time

**Sadness**
- Never
- Infrequently
- Sometimes
- Frequently
- All the time

**Shame**
- Never
- Infrequently
- Sometimes
- Frequently
- All the time

**Fear**
- Never
- Infrequently
- Sometimes
- Frequently
- All the time

**Anxiety**
- Never
- Infrequently
- Sometimes
- Frequently
- All the time

8. Do you think the issue could have been handled better in court?
- Definitely Not
- Unlikely
- I'm not sure
- Probably
- Absolutely
9. Would you recommend the Restorative Justice process to someone else?
   o Definitely Not
   o Unlikely
   o I’m not sure
   o Probably
   o Absolutely

10. What was your role in this Restorative Justice process?
    o Person who was harmed
    o Person who committed the harm

11. What did you learn from participating in this Restorative Justice process?

12. If you could change anything about your experience, what would you change
    (please explain)?

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. The information that you have
provided will be used to enhance our program.

Sincerely,
Gillian Lindquist
Program Coordinator
Victoria Restorative Justice Society
Appendix F
Survey 2 – Post Agreement

Survey 2 – Post Agreement

Date ______________________

This is a voluntary survey. You can stop at any time and there will be no consequence. If you are having difficulty with a question, please ask a volunteer for help. The information gathered from this survey will be used for program improvement/development and education. Any information used outside of Victoria Restorative Justice Society will be anonymous. Thank you very much.

13. VRJS File # ________________

14. Who first explained the option of Restorative Justice to you?

- Police
- Family Member
- Victoria Restorative Justice Society Staff or Volunteer
- Legal Counsel
- Other (please specify) ______________________________

15. Where you given a choice to participate in this Restorative Justice program?

- Yes
- Somewhat
- Not sure
- Not really
- No

16. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements when thinking about your involvement with Restorative Justice?

I was listened to:

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

I felt safe:

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly Agree
I was respected by the other participants:
  o Strongly Disagree
  o Disagree
  o Neutral
  o Agree
  o Strongly Agree

I was respected by the Restorative Justice staff and volunteers:
  o Strongly Disagree
  o Disagree
  o Neutral
  o Agree
  o Strongly Agree

I was treated fairly:
  o Strongly Disagree
  o Disagree
  o Neutral
  o Agree
  o Strongly Agree

17. Did you understand what would happen in this Restorative Justice process?
  o I didn’t understand
  o I understood a little
  o I’m not sure
  o I mostly understood
  o I understood

18. How do you feel about the conference agreement?
  o Very Dissatisfied
  o Dissatisfied
  o Neutral
  o Satisfied
  o Very Satisfied

19. Since the incident, how often have you experienced the following feelings?

Anger
  o Never
  o Infrequently
  o Sometimes
  o Frequently
  o All the time
Sadness
  o Never
  o Infrequently
  o Sometimes
  o Frequently
  o All the time

Shame
  o Never
  o Infrequently
  o Sometimes
  o Frequently
  o All the time

Fear
  o Never
  o Infrequently
  o Sometimes
  o Frequently
  o All the time

Anxiety
  o Never
  o Infrequently
  o Sometimes
  o Frequently
  o All the time

20. Do you think the issue could have been handled better in court?
  o Definitely Not
  o Unlikely
  o I’m not sure
  o Probably
  o Absolutely

21. Would you recommend the Restorative Justice process to someone else?
  o Definitely Not
  o Unlikely
  o I’m not sure
  o Probably
  o Absolutely
22. What was your role in this Restorative Justice process?
   - Person who was harmed
   - Person who committed the harm

23. What did you learn from participating in Restorative Justice?

24. If you could change anything about your experience, what would you change (please explain)?

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. The information that you have provided will be used to enhance our program.

Sincerely,
Gillian Lindquist
Program Coordinator
Victoria Restorative Justice Society
Appendix G
Survey 3A – Case Overview – Facilitator/Co-facilitator

CASE FACILITATOR/CO-FACILITATOR

Survey 3 – Case Overview

Date _______________

This is a voluntary survey. You can stop at any time and there will be no consequence. If you are having difficulty with a question, please ask a volunteer for help. The information gathered from this survey will be used for program improvement/development and education. Any information used outside of Victoria Restorative Justice Society will be anonymous. Thank you very much.

25. VRJS File # __________

26. Please indicate your role in this RJ case:
   o VRJS Staff
   o Police Officer
   o Case Facilitator/Co-facilitator
   o Mentor

27. How many hours was the Community Justice Conference/Panel?
   __________

28. Please indicate if the following individuals attended the RJ Conference:
   (circle the appropriate answer)
   Police  Yes / No
   Mentor  Yes / No
   Community Member  Yes / No

29. What was the format of the RJ intervention?
   o Community Justice Conference (aka family group conference)
   o Community Justice Panel
   o Victim/Offender Dialogue
   o Healing Circle
   o Other

30. Approximately how many hours did you spend working on this case?
   ______
31. Overall, how do you feel about the outcome of this case?
   - Very Dissatisfied
   - Dissatisfied
   - Neutral
   - Satisfied
   - Very Satisfied

32. What was your greatest challenge on this case?

33. What was your greatest success on this case?

Thank you for completing the survey. The information collected from the surveys is an essential component of our VR|S program evaluation.
Appendix H
Survey 3B – Case Overview - Mentor

VRJS MENTOR

Survey 3 – Case Overview

Date ______________

This is a voluntary survey. You can stop at any time and there will be no consequence. If you are having difficulty with a question, please ask a volunteer for help. The information gathered from this survey will be used for program improvement/development and education. Any information used outside of Victoria Restorative Justice Society will be anonymous. Thank you very much.

34. VRJS File # __________

35. Please indicate your role in this RJ case:
   - VRJS Staff
   - Police Officer
   - Case Facilitator/Co-facilitator
   - Mentor

36. Was an extension required to complete this file?
   - Yes
   - No

37. What was the primary reason for the extension?
   - Offender delay – out of his/her control (e.g. Illness)
   - Offender delay – within his/her control
   - Conference Agreement too difficult
   - Difficulty arranging community work/resources

38. Were there any amendments to the original conference agreement?
   Yes / No
39. Approximately how many hours did you spend working on this case?

40. Overall, how do you feel about the outcome of this case?
   - Very Dissatisfied
   - Dissatisfied
   - Neutral
   - Satisfied
   - Very Satisfied

41. What was your greatest challenge on this case?

42. What was your greatest success on this case?

Thank you for completing the survey. The information collected from the surveys is an essential component of our VR|S program evaluation.
Appendix I
Survey 3C – Case Overview – Police Representative

POLICE REPRESENTATIVE

Survey 3 – Case Overview                             Date ________________

This is a voluntary survey. You can stop at any time and there will be no consequence. If you are having difficulty with a question, please ask a volunteer for help. The information gathered from this survey will be used for program improvement/development and education. Any information used outside of Victoria Restorative Justice Society will be anonymous. Thank you very much.

43. VRJS File # __________

44. Please indicate your role in this RJ case:
   o VRJS Staff
   o Police Officer
   o Case Facilitator/Co-facilitator
   o Mentor

45. Approximately how many hours did you spend working on this case?
   __________

46. Overall, how do you feel about the outcome of this case?
   o Very Dissatisfied
   o Dissatisfied
   o Neutral
   o Satisfied
   o Very Satisfied

47. Do you think this issue would have been handled better in court?
   o Definitely Not
   o Unlikely
   o I'm not sure
   o Probably
   o Absolutely
48. What was your greatest challenge on this case?

49. What was your greatest success on this case?

Thank you for completing the survey. The information collected from the surveys is an essential component of our VRIS program evaluation.
Appendix J
Survey 3D – Case Overview – VRJS Staff

VRJS STAFF
Survey 3 – Case Overview

Date ________________

50. VRJS File # __________

51. Referral Source:
   o Police
   o Crown
   o School
   o Community
   o ICBC
   o Other

52. Against whom was the offence committed?
   o Business (Business Participating)
   o Business (Business Not Participating)
   o Person (Offence against Property)
   o Person (Offence against Person)

53. Was the file returned to the referring agency?  
(If “Yes” selected, proceed to question 5. If “No” selected, skip to question 6)
   o Yes
   o No

54. If file was returned, please check reason(s) for return:
   o Unable to contact offender
   o Wrong jurisdiction
   o Offender has untreated mental health issues
   o Offender is in active addiction
   o Offender does not have required supports
   o Not appropriate-victim pursuing civil litigation
   o Not appropriate-offender does not consent
   o Not appropriate-offender disputes fact/no accountability
   o Other
55. **This series of questions will measure the elapsed time in days for key intervention points in the RJ process.** (If file returned, please enter FR for 4b & 4c)
   a. How many days elapsed from the incident to VRJS receipt of referral? _____
   b. How many days elapsed from receipt of referral to the RJ intervention? _____
   c. How many days elapsed from RJ intervention to file closure? _____

56. **Did a victim participate in the VRJS intervention?**
   - o Yes
   - o No
   (If you answered “yes” proceed to question 8. If you answered “no” proceed to question 9).

57. **Victim(s) Information:**
   If age is unknown, please enter either: “Unknown minor” or “Unknown adult”.
   Minor is considered under 18, adult is 18 and over.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victim(s) Info</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Support Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victim 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

58. **Offender(s) Information:**
   If age is unknown, please enter either: “Unknown minor” or “Unknown adult”.
   Minor is considered under 18, adult is 18 and over.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offender Info</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Support Present</th>
<th># of items in Agreement</th>
<th># of items Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

59. To what extent did the offender comply with the conference agreement?

- Offender completed all measures
- Offender partially completed measures
- Offender did not complete any measures

60. Approximately how many hours did you spend working on this case?

61. Overall, how do you feel about the outcome of this case?

- Very Dissatisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Neutral
- Satisfied
- Very Satisfied
- N/A

62. What was your greatest challenge on this case?

63. What was your greatest success on this case?