

Restorative Justice by the Numbers

A Data Collection Toolkit for Restorative
Justice Programs in Criminal Cases

Center
for
Justice
Innovation

Authors

November 2025

Darcy Hauslik
Center for Justice Innovation

Meg Phelps Walker
Center for Justice Innovation

Acknowledgments

This report was supported by funding from the Microsoft Justice and Community Safety Initiative.

This project grew out of conversations with the Restorative Justice Collaborative, a group of California-based prosecutors committed to reimagining the role of prosecution to advance equity, fairness, and integrity. Their insights and shared vision helped shape the direction of this work from the very beginning. We thank the Los Angeles City Attorney’s Office Neighborhood Justice Program team—especially Saminh Greenberg, Will Sheffie, Camillo Cruz, and Renee Williams—for their partnership and leadership early on in building this network. Special thanks as well to Dr. Astrid Heger, Maggie Cortes, and the Violence Intervention Program team for hosting the inaugural convening.

We extend our gratitude to our colleagues at the Center for Justice Innovation who generously reviewed early drafts of this paper and provided valuable feedback including Qualia Hugh, Kellsie Sayers, Hillary Packer, Alex Genty-Waksberg, Lenore Lebron, Viet Nguyen, and Jen Tallon. We also appreciate Lisa Vavonese and Tia Strozier for facilitating feedback roundtables and offering thoughtful reviews, as well as Hannah Strong, Kayla Foster, and Danielle Reynolds for supporting the synthesis of restorative justice research. We thank Amanda Cissner for her editorial guidance, and we are indebted to our communications team—Samiha A. Meah and Michaiyla Carmichael—for their design assistance.

We also thank the many practitioners and partners who contributed through roundtables and convenings, including Michael Works, Michael Begert, Kevin Bernal, Jenna Grigsby, Fanny Yu, Yoana Tchoukleva, Stephanie Johnson, and Daniel Alejandro Morales. We thank Nicole Kirkaldy and the whole Yolo County Restorative Justice Partnership team for letting us observe restorative justice in action and answering many questions.

Finally, we extend appreciation to Brett Taylor, Martin Marchiori-Wong, Chidinma Ume, and Oceana R. Gilliam for their contributions to this project and the founding of the original Restorative Justice Collaborative.

Center for Justice Innovation

520 Eighth Avenue
New York, NY 10018

p. 646.386.3100
f. 212.397.0985

innovatingjustice.org

Acknowledgements

Center for Justice Innovation 5

Introduction 6

Literature Review 9

How to Use This Guide 13

Structure of the Table 16

Who Should be Collecting Data? 17

Data Collection Toolkit 19

Adapting to the Local Context 20

Conclusion 32

Appendices 34

Responsible Party Survey Questions 34

Harmed Party Survey Questions 38

Community/Volunteer/Facilitator Survey 42

Stakeholder Interview 44

Endnotes 45

Center for Justice Innovation

The Center for Justice Innovation (the Center) promotes new thinking about how the justice system can respond more effectively to issues like substance use, intimate partner violence, mental illness, and juvenile delinquency. The Center achieves its mission through a combination of operating programs, original research, and expert assistance. For over two decades, the organization has been intensively engaged in designing and implementing problem-solving courts, and each year, it responds to hundreds of requests for training and technical assistance and hosts hundreds more visitors at its operating programs.

Our data analytics and applied research team collaborates with the Center's operating programs to inform new and existing programming through data tracking, analysis, evaluation, and surveys. Their work frequently includes measures such as case outcomes and program impacts, case processing, community needs and concerns, and perceptions of justice-involved individuals. This team also provides technical assistance to community justice efforts across the country.

RESTORATIVE JUSTICE BY THE NUMBERS

Introduction

Introduction

In 2022 the Center for Justice Innovation, with support from Microsoft’s Justice Reform Initiative, convened the Prosecutor-Led Restorative Justice Collaborative, which brought together 15 California prosecutors’ offices for an initial in-person meeting to discuss the use of restorative justice within the legal system. This convening grew into a series of three more meetings discussing prosecutors’ unique needs and challenges related to applying restorative justice approaches to diversion. Panels covered everything from engaging community partners to in-depth conversations about what it means for justice to be restorative. Some of the conversations addressed deeply philosophical questions about the role of prosecutorial discretion and how to co-create justice within communities, others centered pragmatic questions of how to operationalize restorative principles within existing legal frameworks and how to build capacity for sustaining restorative programming.

Amid these rich discussions, one theme consistently surfaced: data. Those at the convenings repeatedly raised their struggles with data collection and the desire to make data-driven decisions about programming. This toolkit is a response to the stated need for a clear data-driven framework to support the work of restorative justice diversion. Ultimately, data was seen as a clear path to establish impact and bolster the larger philosophical and policy conversations.

It is not surprising that data collection and an emphasis on data-informed programming was top of mind for this collaborative of

prosecutors’ offices; in recent years, prosecutors’ offices across the country have increasingly embraced a sustained commitment to data-driven reform. This trend is exemplified by the proliferation of data dashboards and measurement tools that empower prosecutors to demonstrate their impact through objective metrics and public accountability.

Among the most influential of these tools are the Prosecutorial Performance Indicators (PPIs)—a landmark collaboration between researchers at Florida International University and Loyola University Chicago, supported by the MacArthur Foundation’s Safety & Justice Challenge. Published in October 2020, the PPIs introduced 55 standardized performance measures across three foundational goals: Capacity and Efficiency, Community Safety and Wellbeing, and Fairness and Justice.^[1] This toolkit draws on the PPIs, but represents an effort to an opportunity to reflect the expanding roles of prosecutors in specialized diversion initiatives based in the principles of restorative justice.

This toolkit begins with a brief literature review to better understand the intellectual project of the PPIs, as well as the theoretical underpinnings of restorative justice and the interplay between theory and data. The next section describes how to use the framework presented in the remainder of the report. Finally, we present the data collection framework in the form of an expansive table organized around goals of restorative justice, domains within those goals, and the measures that operationalize these goals. Throughout the document, callout boxes offer insight into

common pitfalls, useful tips, and encouraging insights that were gleaned from the field.

In sum, this guide serves as both a conceptual and practical bridge: combining the aspirational rigor of data-driven projects like the PPIs with the restorative justice paradigm to empower prosecutor-led restorative justice programs to measure and demonstrate their impact.

RESTORATIVE JUSTICE BY THE NUMBERS

Literature Review



Literature Review

Building on the strong foundation of culture change and specific instruction heralded by efforts like the PPIs, the goal of this paper is a toolkit that will facilitate a deeper dive into the specific data needs to describe, evaluate, and ultimately improve restorative justice diversion programming. By centering restorative justice, this toolkit takes on a unique methodological challenge in operationalizing a deeply relationally driven response to crime^[2] that shows the potential to expand upon the success of the PPIs.

The PPIs largely reconceptualized what is meant by “success” in prosecution—moving beyond traditional emphases on case counts, conviction rates, or sentence lengths to metrics that more holistically reflect justice, equity, and community impact. Underlying this framework is a belief that measuring meaningful outcomes helps prosecutors, policy makers, and the public to flag issues, craft effective solutions, and track progress over time.

Diversion is clearly addressed within the PPIs, nestled within all three foundational goals. The PPIs include metrics on diversion referral rates (PPI 8.2), racial/ethnic disparities (PPI 7.5), completions (PPI 2.5), and recidivism (PPI 4.4)—lending insight into trends in caseloads, equity gaps, procedural efficiency, and the overall effectiveness of diversion as an alternative to incarceration. While this is an incredible start to understanding diversion in prosecution writ large, the nuance of diversion programs, which are increasingly becoming a focus of prosecutors, requires special attention.

Restorative justice is an increasingly implemented approach to resolving criminal cases that shifts the focus from punishment for crime to accountability for violation of a relationship and intentionally explores how to make amends for this violation.^[3] Research suggests that restorative justice programs perform at least as well—if not slightly outperform—traditional criminal justice interventions when it comes to reducing recidivism.^[4] However, in studies where restorative justice was seen to reduce recidivism, there was often a modest effect size, and some of the difference can be attributed to methodological challenges.^{[5][6]} While important, recidivism is not where the research has shown restorative justice to be most impactful—outcomes such as victim satisfaction, offender accountability, restitution compliance, and perceptions of procedural fairness are all consistently higher among restorative justice participants.^[7]

To understand how restorative justice is best operationalized in criminal court, it is necessary to revisit the theoretical foundations of the movement. Restorative justice is a traditional practice in many Native American tribes as they focus on healing and reparations. Modern restorative justice theory both draws from traditional practice and emerges from a shift in perspective: crime came to be seen not simply as a violation of law against the state, but as harm done to relationships and communities. Contemporary articulations of restorative justice emphasize relational repair, inclusion, and the moral agency of all stakeholders.^[8] This theoretical grounding produced various conceptual

frameworks, one of the most enduring being the “Five R’s” of restorative justice!⁹¹

- **Relationships** highlight a paradigm shift where the focus is on a violation within a relationship rather than the legal code broken. Relationships connecting individuals with their greater community are also important to move forward from the harm caused.
- **Respect** emphasizes that all parties—harmed parties, responsible parties, and community members—are treated with dignity and heard in the process.
- **Responsibility** requires those who cause harm to acknowledge it and take ownership of their choices and actions.
- **Repair** focuses on addressing both the tangible and intangible harm caused by an offense.
- **Reintegration** ensures that responsible parties, once accountable, are reconnected to their community in a way that promotes belonging and reduces future harm.

Building on both theory and empirical research, this guide proposes a streamlining of the Five Rs into three overarching operational domains, particularly relevant to restorative justice programs within the court system.

- **Facilitating Respect and Dialogue** encompasses the processes that center mutual dignity and open communication; it acts as the “container” for all restorative practices and encompasses the procedural steps that set the scene for a meaningful restorative process.

- **Repairing Harms** focuses on tangible outcomes—understanding the nature of the harm, accepting responsibility, addressing root causes, and providing support to victims.
- **Rebuilding and Strengthening Relationships** goes beyond resolving individual cases to restoring relationships between harmed and responsible parties (where appropriate), reintegrating responsible parties into the community, and reinforcing transparency and accountability in the justice system.

These three domains bridge the values-based foundation of restorative justice and the practical demands of implementation by providing flexible, measurable criteria that apply across diverse models—from circles and community conferencing to hybrid or partial approaches—, support systematic tracking of process and outcomes, and honor the unique constraints and opportunities of court-based programs.

In addition to these three operational domains of restorative justice programming there is also a pressing first step relevant for prosecutors’ offices:

- **Maintaining Thorough Records** is the essential first step in evaluating or describing a restorative justice program. Ensuring the presence of sufficient data infrastructure, detailed and comprehensive plans for data collection, and strong buy-in to prioritize data collection is crucial for the success of the program.

No matter how well a program aligns with restorative principles, it cannot be systematically understood or evaluated without a strong data infrastructure that captures the legal context of each case, in addition to the restorative process. This goal would also fit nicely under the Capacity and Efficiency theme of the PPIs, but its centrality to the current project make it worth distinguishing as a distinct overarching domain.

Restorative justice programming within the legal system functions as a form of diversion, and its impact must be studied in dialogue with broader prosecutorial trends, including questions of net-widening or narrowing, reducing exposure to the justice system, and identifying when hybrid models may be most appropriate. Because many prosecutors' offices are already interested and engaged in activities related to data-driven reform^[10] and the role of the prosecutor is increasingly being held to a high standard of transparency,^[11] adopting rigorous, standardized recordkeeping for restorative justice is both feasible and timely. Even if only a handful of offices in one state implemented similar tracking practices, the resulting data could enable meaningful cross-jurisdictional comparisons, drive evidence-based improvements, and help clarify how close adherence to restorative justice models correlates with real-world gains in public safety and fairness.

RESTORATIVE JUSTICE BY THE NUMBERS

How to Use this Guide



How to Use This Guide

The following table is a framework for collecting, organizing, and communicating data about restorative justice programs within the court system. This guide aims to support day-to-day program improvement and transparency and enable larger-scale evaluations. It offers *one-size-fits-most* guidance: broadly applicable across different programs but meant to be tailored to fit the specific legal context, community dynamics, and restorative processes of each jurisdiction (SEE BOX 1). Generally, this guide assumes that programs will be systematically tracking data on programming, ideally in a case management system (SEE BOX 2), and strongly recommends that programs implement some mechanisms for feedback from participants in the restorative justice process. Finally, the guide also outlines avenues for deeper, more advanced explorations into specific aspects of restorative justice.

BOX 1. LET YOUR THEORY OF CHANGE BE YOUR GUIDE

The data you collect should reflect the program it describes. What is provided in this guide is a cheat sheet to get you closer to your goal, assuming your goals align with the values of restorative justice.

This guide should be used alongside your theory of change and/or logic model. These are foundational documents that visually describe the specific goals, activities, and intended impacts of a program or approach. While most effective when conceived at the start of the program, investing time and effort to understand and articulate program goals and activities at any point of implementation is helpful. For an overview of logic models and theories of change we recommend Chapter 2 from the [Community Tool Box](#) hosted by the University of Kansas.

Looking to your Theory of Change will help you to select which parts of the guide are appropriate, which are most important, and how to optimize what is there based on the specific context, activities, and goals of your program. Restorative justice programs can vary dramatically with different formats, emphases, and actors.

BOX 2. CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS: HOW TO START WITH WHAT YOU HAVE

Across the country, prosecutors' offices have vastly different data infrastructures—some still rely on paper files, while others operate sophisticated digital case management systems. Even where sophisticated systems exist, their usefulness for tracking diversion or restorative justice programming varies widely.

In conversations with the Prosecutor-Led Restorative Justice Collaborative, a theme emerged: most case management systems are designed for traditional prosecution, not for tracking alternative pathways. While it is possible to update case management systems, change may require working with outside vendors, navigating internal IT priorities, and collaborating across city or county agencies.

BUT don't despair—start where you are:

No case management system?

- *This is your urgent priority. Even a basic database or spreadsheet is a start.*

Have a system?

- First, confirm it can answer all data points in Section 1 of the table below on the case level for every case—not just those referred or enrolled in restorative justice.
- Then, ensure that you can readily identify all individuals who were at all considered, screened, enrolled, or successful in restorative justice on the case level, not just the total number that completed diversion. Once restorative diversion is tagged accurately, you can at least compare volume and outcomes across pathways.

Once this groundwork is secure, start identifying the data limitations using the “program data” sections of the data collection framework below.

To address remaining gaps:

- You may need to be creative by tracking supplemental data using spreadsheets, sign-in sheets, program agreements, or shared documents. Remember: you are likely already collecting more data than you realize (SEE BOX 4). The goal is to collect it systematically and make it analysis ready.
- Start conversations about updating the case management system—sometimes claims that systems are “unchangeable” are not accurate, but change will not happen without an advocate and pressure. Change can also take time, so the sooner you start these conversations, the better.
- Think through the potential available partners for data tracking and evaluation. Community organizations that provide restorative programming might be the right stakeholder to collect certain data points (SEE BOX 3).
- Also, think about formal and informal research partnerships with non-profits and academic institutions, as they can help identify low-effort, high-impact ways to make your data usable.

The application of restorative practice can vary drastically from program to program, but the approach to restorative justice has underlying principles and goals that can serve as a scaffolding to understand multiple different applications. This guide is not meant to be an exhaustive operationalization of restorative justice principles. Instead, it identifies core goals, domains, and metrics that have broad relevance, while leaving room for local adaptation. These starting points will not only be immediately applicable for most jurisdictions, but by starting from this shared structure, prosecutors’ offices can contribute to future cross-program comparisons, building an evidence base and potentially preparing the field for meta-analyses similar to those that have been influential in international restorative justice research.^[12]

Structure of the Table

The table is organized around three main restorative justice domains:

1. **Facilitating Respect and Dialogue:** Creating the conditions for meaningful, fair, and respectful interaction.
2. **Repairing Harm:** Addressing the impacts of crime through acknowledgment of the harm caused, responsibility for individual actions contributing to harm, and tangible steps toward making amends, when possible.
3. **Rebuilding Relationships:** Restoring connections between parties, reintegrating participants into the community, and strengthening community ties.

Each domain is further translated into constituent domains, which are operationalized in three ways:

1. **Programmatic Data:** Concrete, countable data points that track activity and outputs. For the most part, these are data points that should be measured on the case level and recorded in the case management system if possible; certain exceptions are noted. These data points are the building blocks that can be aggregated to describe the day-to-day operations of restorative justice programs.
2. **Feedback Questions:**^[13] Because so much of restorative justice is relational and experiential, getting participant feedback is especially important. To this end, the guide provides example survey or interview items for harmed parties, responsible parties, and community members, as well as a suggested interview guide for stakeholders. A full list is available in Appendix A.
3. **Advanced Research Opportunities:** Stretch goals for programs with dedicated evaluation capacity or research partners to more fully interrogate aspects of the restorative process to describe impact in meaningful ways. These are largely meant to spark dialogue and provide references to existing research.

Not every domain contains all three elements; some domains are best expressed through programmatic data, and some require feedback. Programs should aim to track at least some combination of feedback and data points relevant to each domain, even if they are not yet able to pursue advanced research opportunities.

Who Should be Collecting Data?

While some offices run restorative justice programming in-house, many others refer cases to a community-based organization partner. There are many advantages to working with community-based partners who do not have the same statutory requirements and focus on punitive responses that prosecutors' offices often face. More neutral partners can encourage the truth-telling necessary to take meaningful accountability and support the healing of all parties, holding space for multiple perspectives to come together to reflect on what transpired, encouraging individual and collective accountability, and building a consensus to move forward. By putting the process in the hands of a community-based organization, facilitators can freely pursue the goals of the restorative justice process without system constraints. Community partners may be better positioned to gather honest participant feedback, as people may feel more comfortable responding to a service provider than the prosecutors' office.

Community-based partners may also have advantages when it comes to data collection, including having data systems that are already more geared toward case management than legal case processing. Additionally, community partners might not face the same bureaucratic issues in adapting their case management systems (see again BOX 2). Ultimately, many of the data points, especially in sections three and four of the data frameworks, are best collected by the direct service provider, be that the prosecutor's office or a community partner. The decision about who collects what should flow directly from each partner's role in programming; the decisions about what should be collected should be part of a holistic, pointed, and ongoing discussion between all stakeholders (see Box 3).

BOX 3. COMMUNITY PARTNERS AS EVALUATION PARTNERS

When building community partnerships for restorative justice programming, prosecutors should also plan for partners' role in data collection and evaluation if relevant. In most cases, the people performing the work are best positioned to record it.

At the same time, prosecutors should remain engaged and connected to the programmatic data to ensure that the information collected supports future evaluation and demonstrates program effectiveness.

Best practices to consider when approaching a data partnership:


- Involve partners early in evaluation planning.
- It should be clear who should be collecting what information, from whom, and when. There should also be a plan for data sharing and access.
- Keep communication channels open as data collection is an ongoing process.
- Everyone should be on the same page about future evaluations.

- Negotiate access agreements: Your office may not need every detail, but you should have enough aggregate data to tell the program's story and monitor effectiveness.
- Remember, ultimately, the ability of the program to be evaluated is more important than internal control of the data.

A data collection task that is rightfully owned by the prosecutor's office is described in the below foundational section, Maintaining Thorough Records (Legal Context), which lists general legal system data points relevant to all cases, not just cases diverted through restorative justice (e.g., charge type, criminal history, diversion history, disposition). Offices considering expanding their data and evaluation capacity related to their restorative justice programming should make sure that the larger infrastructure for data collection is sound; without the larger context of non-restorative options for comparison, the utility and impact of restorative justice cannot be well understood.

RESTORATIVE JUSTICE BY THE NUMBERS

Data Collection Toolkit



Data Collection Toolkit

Adapting to the Local Context

Because restorative justice programs differ—by offense eligibility, facilitator model, legal setting, and cultural context, among others—elements of this guide will need to be adapted to local contexts. Most obviously, these survey questions use the generic language of “restorative process”—this should be updated to reflect the actual process used in a locale (e.g., conference, circle, panel). Adapting this guide will likely need to go beyond superficial changes in language; ultimately the metrics and feedback should reflect specific processes, goals, priorities, and cultural contexts.

1. MAINTAINING THOROUGH RECORDS (LEGAL CONTEXT)

The first step toward evaluating or describing a restorative justice program is to make sure the larger data infrastructure is in place. Below is a short list of the most important data points/types of data that will be helpful for understanding prosecutorial effectiveness generally.^[14] After you have confirmed that all these data points are being tracked accurately and completely on the case level, the next more advanced step is to make sure that all of these basic data points can be disaggregated by restorative justice programming status (i.e., that participants in restorative justice are being tagged in the system in a clear way. This can include identifying those who are eligible and those are ineligible or fail to complete the full restorative justice process. Identifying different case outcomes is an important step and will help to distinguish unique samples for further, more in-depth evaluations). The overarching question you are asking is: Can you use this information to describe your restorative program specifically?

1.1. Case Information

These are the basic data points needed to describe a restorative justice program and situate the restorative justice program in the larger jurisdictional context. The programmatic data needs to be collected on the case level for all cases considered for restorative justice programming and all other cases in the jurisdiction.

Program Data

- Charge type and severity
- Criminal history
- Diversion history
- Variables influencing eligibility
- Key dates (including arrest, arraignment, etc.)
- Disposition/Outcome
- Demographic information
- Diversion decision
- Type of diversion offered
- Date diversion offered
- Diversion closed date
- Diversion closed reason

Advanced Research Opportunities

- Quantitative analysis of net-widening/net-tightening^[15]

2. RESPECT AND DIALOGUE

A foundation of respect and mutual understanding are necessary for restorative justice practices to be meaningful and serve their core purpose. This domain focuses on the implementation of restorative justice and the ability to host dialogues that are meaningful, respectful, fair, and productive.

2.1. Screening and Engagement

This section builds on established PPIs to answer questions about diversion rates and the capacity of the restorative program to meet needs of responsible and harmed parties.

The data points here will allow for reporting on total volume of referrals, volume and outcomes of screenings, volume of participants, as well as a description of participant needs.

Program Data

- Restorative justice referral status/outcome
- Restorative justice screening status/outcome
- Outcome of individualized assessment/risk assessment
- Reason case did not move forward with process
- # of outreaches to harmed party
- Time until the first harmed party outreach
- Outreaches/engagement with support people for harmed and/or responsible party

Responsible party survey questions

- Why did you decide to participate in this program? (Open ended)

Harmed party/surrogate survey

- Why did you decide to participate in this program? (Open ended)
- The prosecutor’s office reached out to ask me about participating in this process in a timely manner. (Likert scale)

Stakeholder feedback questions (prosecutors, defense, judges, CBOs)

- What do you think makes a successful restorative justice program? (Open-ended)
- What do you look for when you’re referring or screening a case for diversion? (Open-ended)
- What do you look for when you’re referring or screening case for restorative diversion? (Open-ended)
- What are the biggest successes you’ve seen with restorative justice diversion? (Open-ended)
- What are the biggest challenges facing restorative justice diversion? (Open-ended)

Advanced Methods

- Surveys or interviews with individuals (responsible and harmed parties) who did not move forward with restorative process compared to those who did move forward with the process.

<p>2.2. Procedural Justice Seeks to understand the experience of those involved as influencing their perception of fairness and legitimacy. Survey questions are a combination of perceived respect and attempts to make sure the process is clear and accessible.</p>	<p>Responsible party survey questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The process was explained to me in a way that I could understand. (Likert scale) ● It felt like I had a choice to participate in this process. (Likert scale) ● This was a fair way to resolve my case. (Likert scale) ● Staff worked to overcome any barriers to my participating in the process. (Likert scale) <p>Harmed party/surrogate survey questions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The restorative justice process was explained to me in a way I could understand. (Likert scale) ● It felt like I had a choice to participate in this process. (Likert scale) ● I felt well-prepared to participate in the process. (Likert scale) ● Staff worked to overcome any barriers to my participation in the process. (Likert scale) <p>Community/Support People/Facilitator survey questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● All parties were treated with respect. (Likert scale) ● I felt well-prepared to participate in the process. (Likert scale)
	<p>Advanced Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Court/conference observation of physical space, environment, interactions between case managers and participating parties, etc.^[16]

<p>2.3. Process This domain focuses on the ability to describe the restorative practice and eventually evaluate if that practice resembles the stated program goals.</p>	<p>Program Data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Type of restorative process (e.g., circle, conference, restorative informed programming) ● # of pre-conferences/circle or panel prep sessions/other pre-process meetings ● # of circles/conferences/etc. ● Setting or method of restorative process (e.g., remote vs. in person; in community vs. in-custody) <p>Responsible party survey questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● I felt comfortable expressing myself during the conference/circle/panel. (Likert scale) <p>Harmed party/surrogate survey questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● I was able to express myself during the conference. (Likert scale) <p>Community/Support People/Facilitator survey questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● All parties participated meaningfully in the conference. (Likert scale) <p>Advanced Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Interviews with stakeholders about implementation process^[17]
<p>2.4. Equity Measurements of disparities in an effort to correct a long-standing legacy in the criminal legal system. Comparing the demographics of those referred to restorative alternatives vs. those not referred gives insight into systemic bias, while comparing the demographics of those who are accepted and complete restorative programming vs. all those referred can shed light on potential program bias.</p>	<p>Program Data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Harmed party demographics (e.g., age, race/ethnicity, gender, zip code) ● Demographics in cases screened for but not completing restorative process (e.g., age, race/ethnicity, gender, zip code) ● Demographics of responsible parties referred and engaged in restorative process (e.g., age, race/ethnicity, gender, zip code) <p>Responsible party survey questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Everyone involved in this process was treated with respect regardless of their race, sex, orientation, or age. (Likert scale) <p>Harmed party/surrogate survey questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Everyone involved in this process was treated with respect regardless of their race, sex, orientation, or age. (Likert scale) <p>Community/Support People/Facilitator survey questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Everyone involved in this process was treated with respect regardless of their race, sex, orientation, or age. (Likert scale) <p>Advanced Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Applying the framework of race-blind charging analysis to diversion decisions^[18] ● Analysis of equity in diversion decisions

3. REPAIRING HARM

Repairing harm can be measured by the immediate outcomes from the restorative justice process including understanding harms, taking responsibility, addressing root causes, and offering support to victims.

<p>3.1. Understanding and Acknowledging Harm Restorative justice affords harmed and responsible parties an opportunity to understand each other’s perspectives. Most importantly as part of a criminal case is the responsible party understanding the harms that were caused in an effort to avoid causing similar harm in the future.</p>	<p>Program Data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Formal letter of apology written by responsible party (can be documented via a checkbox or scanned copy into data system) ● Victim/surrogate impact statement (can be documented via a checkbox or scanned copy into data system) ● Victim/surrogate present at process
	<p>Responsible party survey questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● I have a better understanding of the harm I caused because I went through this process. (Likert scale) ● I felt like people were trying to understand me rather than judge me. (Likert scale) ● This process helped me process the shame I felt around the harm I caused. (Likert scale) <p>Harmed party/surrogate survey</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● I had the chance to describe how the crime impacted my life. (Likert scale) ● I felt like the responsible party understood the harm they caused me. (Likert scale) <p>Community/Support People/Facilitator survey questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● I felt that the responsible party genuinely understood the harm they caused. (Likert scale)
	<p>Advanced Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Observational coding of content and sentiment of apologies (written and verbal)

<p>3.2. Accepting Responsibility Building on the acknowledgement and understanding of harm is the acknowledgement of responsibility.</p> <p>In practice the responsible party's willingness to accept responsibility may be part of the screening process. The lack of this should be documented as the reason for ineligibility (see 2.1).</p>	<p>Program Data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Screening outcomes related to whether responsible party was open to taking responsibility
	<p>Responsible party survey questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● I am grateful for the opportunity to talk with the harmed party. (Likert scale) ● I had the opportunity to take accountability for my actions that led to harm. (Likert scale) ● This process offered me the support I needed to take accountability. (Likert scale) ● I felt heard and understood by the harmed party/the community. (Likert scale)
	<p>Harmed party/surrogate survey</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● I felt like the responsible party took accountability for the harm they caused/their actions. (Likert scale) ● I received a meaningful and sincere apology. (Likert scale)
	<p>Community/Support People/Facilitator survey questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The responsible party took responsibility for their actions. (Likert scale) ● I felt that the responsible party was genuine when they took responsibility. (Likert scale)
	<p>Advanced Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Observational coding of content and sentiment of statements related to responsibility^[19]

<p>3.3. Addressing Harm Commonly in restorative practice one of the outcomes of the process are steps for the responsible party to take to address the root causes that led to the situation.</p> <p>The harmed parties are also often offered services that repair harm.</p>	<p>Program Data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Type of action steps (e.g., essays, community service, additional programming) ● Number/frequency of action steps (e.g., 100 hours of community service) ● Descriptions/types of action steps aligned with types of offenses and/or flagged needs (answering do action steps fit with circumstances?) ● Compliance with action steps ● Type and number of supportive services offered to harmed party (e.g., trauma support groups) ● Type and number of supportive services offered to responsible party to complete actions steps (e.g. mental health referrals, employment support)
	<p>Responsible party survey questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● I feel like I had a voice in what the action steps would be. (Likert scale) ● I feel like the action steps will be helpful in preventing this incident from happening again. (Likert scale) ● I feel like I have everything I need to accomplish the action steps (including the time, transportation, information, money, etc.) (Likert scale)
	<p>Harmed party/surrogate survey</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● I felt like I had a voice in what the action steps would be. (Likert scale) ● I am hopeful the action steps will be helpful in preventing this incident from happening again. (Likert scale) ● I am satisfied with the outcome of the restorative process. (Likert scale)
	<p>Community/Support People/Facilitator survey questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The action steps were reached collaboratively and by consensus. (Likert scale) ● The action steps address some of the root causes that led to this situation. (Likert scale) ● The group had an adequate selection of appropriate action steps to choose from. (Likert scale)
<p>Advanced Research Opportunities^[20]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Validated tools measuring PTSD symptoms^[21] ● Interviews with harmed parties about their perception of safety and longer-term coping^[22] 	

<p>3.4. Closure</p> <p>Ideally, the resolutions of the restorative process would allow for both the harmed party and the responsible party to move forward from the incident of concern with greater emotional wellbeing and overall satisfaction with the program.</p> <p>The speed at which the case is resolved is also a factor.</p>	<p>Program Data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Disposition ● Time between arrest and major restorative justice milestones (e.g., screening, offer, preliminary discussions/pre-programming, restorative practice) ● Time between arrest and disposition ● Outcome of restorative process (i.e., considered successful) ● Harmed party retention (did the harmed party participate throughout the process?) ● Details about restitution <p>Responsible party survey questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● I feel like I have the tools I need to help me process this situation. (Likert scale) ● I am optimistic that I can move on from this situation. (Likert scale) ● The restitution I'm required to make feels fair, reasonable, and achievable. (Likert scale) <p>Harmed party/surrogate survey</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● I feel like I can move forward. (Likert scale) ● This process felt like a fair way to resolve this case. (Likert scale) <p>Advanced Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Interviews with harmed parties about their view of closure^[23] ● Detailed surveys/validated tools about anger and resentment
---	--

4. REBUILDING RELATIONSHIPS

An underlying assumption of restorative justice is that crime is inherently relational.

This goal also contains the principle of reintegration understood here as restoring the responsible party’s relationship to community.

In keeping with PPIs, the relationship of the prosecutor’s office to the larger community is also considered along with the impact that restorative programs can have on the larger system.

4.1. Restoring harmed party/ responsible party relationships

Restorative justice can help to build or restore all sorts of relationships.

The options provided are very general and assume that family was somehow involved in either the original incident or the process.

This is an area where the specifics of the program should be reflected: consider dynamics like co-parenting and responsible parties who are youth.

Program Data

- Relationship between responsible and harmed parties
- Relationship between responsible party and support people
- Relationship between harmed party and support people

Responsible party survey questions

- The restorative justice process has brought my family/friends/the community closer together. (Likert scale)
- I was grateful for the opportunity to include my supporters in this process. (Likert scale)

Harmed party/surrogate survey

- The restorative justice process has brought my family closer together. (Likert scale)
- I felt like my family/friends/the community were here to support me through this process. (Likert scale)

Community/Support People/Facilitator survey questions

- I feel optimistic about my relationship with the responsible party going forward. (Likert scale)
- I have a better sense of how to support the harmed party going forward. (Likert scale)
- I have a better sense of how to support the responsible party going forward. (Likert scale)

Advanced Methods

- Follow up surveys or interviews that measure ongoing family dynamics


<p>4.2. Addressing current needs and preventing future harm Restorative justice views accountability as multi-layered. The responsible party must take steps to repair the harm and make amends (where possible) in the original instance of harm as well as identify and address any patterns or habits that led to the harm and take steps to change. The measure here focuses on the steps that may contribute to long-term change and growth.</p>	<p>Program Data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Harmed party successfully engaged with services related to housing, employment, substance use, mental health, etc. ● Responsible party successfully engaged with services related to housing, employment, substance use, mental health, etc.
	<p>Responsible party survey questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● I have been connected with services that are helping me address my needs. (Likert scale) ● Thinking back to why you decided to do this program, did you get what you hoped for out of participating? (Open ended)
	<p>Harmed party/surrogate survey</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● I feel a sense of relief as a result of participating in this process. (Likert scale) ● I have been connected with services that are helping me address my needs. ● Thinking back to why you decided to do this program, did you get what you hoped for out of participating? (Open ended)
	<p>Advanced Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Longitudinal study of long-term impacts of restorative process on harmed party and responsible party ● Pre-post survey design^[24]

<p>4.3. Community Involvement Restorative justice is a rare opportunity for the community to be invited into the justice process and fill diverse roles in the community.</p> <p>On the case level, this can be seen in an increasing diversity in where cases are originating and in longer term engagement with participants after their case is completed.</p> <p>However, most data points that reflect community involvement are beyond individual cases and may need to be tracked outside of the standard case management system. Simple means of gathering this information such as keeping a list of community partners or tracking outreach and volunteer events is a good place to start.</p>	<p>Program Data (from case management system)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Original referral source of case ● Responsible party and/or harmed party engagement post case (e.g., become volunteers, continued programming on a voluntary basis) <p>Program Data (may need to be collected outside of case management system)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● # of community outreach activities ● # of volunteer/facilitator trainings offered and completed ● # of community partners facilitating or collaborating on restorative practices ● Volunteer/Facilitator demographics ● # of community partners providing action steps and/or wrap around services <p>Responsible party survey questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● I feel more connected with my community after this process. (Likert scale) <p>Harmed party/surrogate survey questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● I feel more connected with my community after this process. (Likert scale) <p>Community/Support People/Facilitator survey questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● I feel more connected with the people I supported/ other community members after this process. (Likert scale) <p>Advanced Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Community listening sessions about the uses of restorative justice
---	---

<p>4.4. System Impacts</p> <p>System impacts are classic areas of evaluation and often focus on comparative recidivism rates. However, in the context of restorative justice, system impacts could also mean that interest in restorative justice is growing or that the number of cases resolved by restorative justice is increasing. In many ways, the system impacts can include paradigm shifts in how to respond to crime.</p> <p>Picking up from 1.1, consider also getting feedback via surveys or interviews from stakeholders to see both how the program is perceived, and the larger impact restorative justice is having.</p>	<p>Program Data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Rearrest/reconviction at 6 months, 1 year, and 3 years (recidivism)^[25] <p>Program Data (may need to be collected outside of case management system)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● External interest in restorative practices (e.g., from local school district, requests for restorative options by defense attorneys)
	<p>Stakeholder feedback questions (prosecutors, defense, judges, CBOs)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● How would you rate the restorative justice program offered through the prosecutor's office? (Likert scale) ● Do you have any reservations about referring defendants to complete the restorative justice program? If yes, please describe. ● Has your involvement in the restorative program changed your approach to your job? How? (Open ended)
	<p>Advanced Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cost benefit analysis^[26] ● Rigorous recidivism analysis (comparing restorative justice participants to an appropriate comparison group)^[27] ● Comparison of survey questions throughout this guide from those engaged in restorative programming to those who go through traditional case processing or a different diversion program.

RESTORATIVE JUSTICE BY THE NUMBERS

Conclusion



Conclusion

By linking restorative justice theory directly to measurable indicators, this toolkit seeks to help ensure that the data collected reflects the unique nature of this novel intervention. The framework in this guide is designed to move prosecutors’ offices beyond ad hoc recordkeeping toward a systematic approach that can support larger data-driven efforts.

Perhaps counterintuitively, adopting this framework does not have to mean adding layers of complexity to an already busy administrative environment. In fact, when integrated thoughtfully, many of the suggested measures can streamline processes that offices already undertake—such as referral tracking, case screening, and compliance monitoring—by converting them into standardized, analysis-ready formats (SEE BOX 4). In practice, approaching programmatic information as data can reduce duplicative efforts, create clearer communication channels, and improve the accessibility of program information for staff, stakeholders, and ultimately the public, funders and policy makers.

By building on the momentum of the PPIs, this toolkit extends the same spirit of measurable reform into the realm of restorative justice diversion. The goal is to create feedback loops that allow prosecutors, partners, and communities to see where programs are thriving and where they can improve.

BOX 4. TURNING PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION INTO DATA COLLECTION

If you are running a restorative justice program, you are almost certainly already collecting more data than you think—you just may not be calling it “data.”

Many operational records are evaluation goldmines:

- Volunteer Logs: Not just scheduling tools, but records of community engagement.
- Service Referral Lists: A map of participant needs, available services, and potential service gaps.
- Compliance Tracking for Action Steps: Shows which interventions are most common and which are most likely to be completed.

When administrative systems are designed with data in mind, they do not just help with data collection and evaluation, they can streamline program operations. Moving from an informal email chain to capture each new referral to a standardized digital intake form submitted using, for example, Microsoft Forms, is both more efficient and, as all responses are automatically stored in a spreadsheet, yields immediately usable data.

In practice, the better your administrative records are set up, the less extra work “data collection” becomes. These improvements also have the added benefit of making the program more easily scalable.

Appendix A: Responsible Party Survey Questions

Reminder: These questions are meant as an overview of how to probe the different domains of restorative justice. You should update, remove, and add questions that best reflect your restorative justice program and evaluation goals.

1. Why did you decide to participate in this program?

For each of the following statements, please select the option that best reflects how strongly you agree or disagree.

2. The process was explained to me in a way that I could understand.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

3. It felt like I had a choice to participate in this process.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

4. This was a fair way to resolve my case.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

5. Staff worked to overcome any barriers to my participation in the process.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

CENTER FOR JUSTICE INNOVATION

6. I felt comfortable expressing myself during the conference/circle/panel.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

7. Everyone involved in this process was treated with respect regardless of their race, sex, orientation, or age.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

8. I have a better understanding of the harm I caused, because I went through this process.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

9. I felt like people were trying to understand me, rather than judge me.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

10. This process helped me process the shame I felt around the harm I caused.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

11. I am grateful for the opportunity to talk with the harmed party.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

12. I had the opportunity to take accountability for my actions that led to harm.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

13. This process offered me the support I needed to take accountability.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

14. I felt heard and understood by the harmed party/the community.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

15. I feel like I had a voice in what the action steps would be.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

16. I feel like the action steps will be helpful in preventing this incident from happening again.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

17. I feel like I have everything I need to accomplish the action steps (including the time, transportation, information, money, etc.)

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

18. I feel like I have the tools I need to help me process this situation.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

19. I am optimistic that I can move on from this situation in time.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

20. The restitution I'm required to make feels fair, reasonable, and achievable.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

21. The restitution I'm required to make feels fair and reasonable.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

22. The restorative justice process has brought my family/friends/the community closer together.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

23. I was grateful for the opportunity to include my supporters in this process.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

24. I have been connected with services that are helping me address my needs.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

25. Thinking back to why you decided to do this program, did you get what you hoped for out of participating?

26. I feel more connected with my community after this process.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

Appendix B: Harmed Party Survey Questions

Reminder: These questions are meant as an overview of how to probe the different domains of restorative justice. You should update, remove, and add questions that best reflect your restorative justice program and evaluation goals.

1. Why did you decide to participate in this program?

For each of the following statements, please select the option that best reflects how strongly you agree or disagree.

2. The prosecutor's office reached out to ask me about participating in this process in a timely manner.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

3. The restorative justice process was explained to me in a way I could understand.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

4. It felt like I had a choice to participate in this process.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

5. I felt well-prepared to participate in the process.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

6. Staff worked to overcome any barriers to my participating in the process.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

7. I was able to express myself during the conference.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

8. Everyone involved in this process was treated with respect regardless of their race, sex, orientation, or age.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

9. I had the chance to describe how the crime impacted my life. (Likert scale)

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

10. I felt like the responsible party understood the harm they caused me.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

11. I felt like the responsible part took accountability for the harm they caused/their actions.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

12. I received a meaningful and sincere apology.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

13. I felt like I had a voice in what the action steps would be.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

14. I am hopeful the action steps will be helpful in preventing this incident from happening again.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

15. I am satisfied with the outcome of the restorative process.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

16. I feel like I have the tools I need to help me process this situation.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

17. I feel like I can move forward.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

18. This process felt like a fair way to resolve this case.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

19. The restorative justice process has brought my family closer together.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

20. I felt like my family/friends/the community were here to support me through this process.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

21. I have a sense of relief as a result of participating in this process.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

22. I have been connected with services that are helping me address my needs.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Agree

23. Thinking back to why you decided to do this program, did you get what you hoped for out of participating?

24. I feel more connected with my community after this process.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Agree

Appendix C: Community/Volunteer/Facilitator Survey

Reminder: These questions are meant as an overview of how to probe the different domains of restorative justice. You should update, remove, and add questions that best reflect your restorative justice program and evaluation goals.

For each of the following statements, please select the option that best reflects how strongly you agree or disagree.

1. All parties were treated with respect.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

2. I felt well-prepared to participate in the process.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

3. All parties participated meaningfully in the conference.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

4. Everyone involved in this process was treated with respect regardless of their race, sex, orientation, or age.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

5. I felt that the responsible party genuinely understood the harm they caused.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

6. The responsible party took responsibility for their actions.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

7. I felt that the responsible party was genuine when they took responsibility.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

8. The action steps were reached collaboratively and by consensus.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

9. The action steps address some of the root causes that led to this situation.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

10. The group had an adequate selection of appropriate action steps to choose from.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

11. I feel optimistic about my relationship with the responsible party going forward.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

12. I have a better sense of how to support the harmed party going forward.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

13. I have a better sense of how to support the responsible party going forward.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

14. I feel more connected with the people I supported/ other community members after this process.

Strongly Disagree *Disagree* *Neutral* *Agree* *Strongly Agree*

Appendix D Stakeholder Interview

Reminder: These questions are meant as an overview of how to probe the different domains of restorative justice. You should update, remove, and add questions that best reflect your restorative justice program and evaluation goals.

Questions for stakeholders tend to contribute to a greater understanding of the process of restorative justice and are more open-ended. For this reason, we have presented this instrument as a brief interview guide rather than a survey.

1. What do you think makes a successful restorative justice program?
2. What do you look for when you're referring or screening a case for diversion?
3. What do you look for when you're referring or screening a case for restorative diversion?
4. What are the biggest successes you've seen with restorative justice diversion?
5. What are the biggest challenges facing restorative justice diversion?
6. How would you rate the restorative justice program led by the prosecutor's office?
7. Do you have any reservations about referring defendants to complete the restorative justice program? If yes, please describe.
8. Has your involvement in the restorative program changed your approach to your job? How?

Endnotes

- [1] Prosecutorial Performance Indicators. 2025. *Prosecutorial Performance Indicators*. Retrieved October 1, 2025 (<https://prosecutorialperformanceindicators.org/>).
- [2] The process undertaken to develop this toolkit could be reproduced for diversion programs operating under the more conventional diversion theory of Risk-Need-Responsivity. In fact, some of the metrics betray a merging of these two theories including an emphasis on screening for needs and action steps as responses to said needs.
- [3] Daly, Kathleen. 2002. "Restorative Justice: The Real Story." *Punishment & Society* 4(1): 55-79.
- [4] Sherman, Lawrence W., Heather Strang, Evan Mayo-Wilson, Daniel Woods, and Barak Ariel. 2015. "Are Restorative Justice Conferences Effective in Reducing Repeat Offending? Findings from a Campbell Systematic Review." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 31(1):1-24.
- [5] Fulham, Leah, Julie Blais, Tim Ruggie, and Emily A. Schultheis. 2023. "The Effectiveness of Restorative Justice Programs: A Meta-Analysis of Recidivism and Other Relevant Outcomes." *Criminology & Criminal Justice* 0(0). <https://doi.org/10.1177/17488958231215228>
- [6] For a notable example of a study with both methodological rigor and statistically significant reductions in recidivism see: Shem-Tov, Yotam, Steven Raphael, and Alissa Skog. 2024. "Can Restorative Justice Conferencing Reduce Recidivism? Evidence from the Make-it-Right Program." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 92(1):61-78.
- [7] Strang, Heather, Lawrence W. Sherman, Evan Mayo-Wilson, Daniel Woods, and Barak Ariel. 2013. "Restorative Justice Conferencing (RJC) Using Face-to-Face Meetings of Offenders and Victims: Effects on Offender Recidivism and Victim Satisfaction." *A Systematic Review. Campbell Systematic Reviews* 9(1):1-59.
- [8] Zehr, Howard. 2002. *The Little Book of Restorative Justice*. Old Philadelphia Pike, PA: Good Books.
- [9] The Conflict Center. n.d. *The Five R's of Restorative Justice*. The Conflict Center.
- [10] See for example the efforts of the Prosecutorial Data Collaborative which brings together interested prosecutor offices and local research and data experts. CUNY Institute for State & Local Governance. 2025. "Case Study: Prosecution." Institute Intelligence, The City University of New York. Retrieved 2025 (<https://islg.cuny.edu/case-study-prosecution>)
- [11] Glass, Caitlin, Kat M. Albrecht, and Perry Moriearty. 2024. "Prosecutorial Data Transparency and Data Justice." *Northwestern University Law Review* 119(1):193-220.
- [12] Syahwami, Syahira and Hamirul Hamirul. 2024. "A Meta-Analysis of the Effectiveness of Restorative Justice Programs in Reducing Recidivism: A Global Perspective." *Enigma in Law* 2(1):64-74.
- [13] The list of survey questions provided as part of the Reintegrative Shaming Experiments (RISE) project were a very helpful starting off point for the feedback questions in this guide. A full supplemental list of related survey questions can be downloaded as part of the metadata documentation from ICPSR (<https://www.icpsr.umich.edu/web/NACJD/studies/2993/export#>). For the full study see: Sherman, Lawrence W., John Braithwaite, Heather Strang, and Geoffrey C. Barnes. 2006. *Reintegrative Shaming Experiments (RISE) in Australia, 1995-1999*. Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor]. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR02993.v1>
- [14] Examples of comprehensive guides include:
- Center for Justice Innovation. 2025. *An Introduction to Court-Based Program Data*. Center for Justice Innovation.
- Nugent-Borakove, Mary E., Laura M. Budzilowicz, and Gregory Rainville. 2009. *Exploring the Feasibility and Efficacy of Performance Measures in Prosecution and Their Application to Community Prosecution*. Alexandria, VA: American Prosecutors Research Institute.
- Prosecutorial Performance Indicators. n.d. *The Prosecutorial Performance Indicators. Prosecutorial Performance Indicators*. Retrieved October 2, 2025 (<https://prosecutorialperformanceindicators.org/>).

CENTER FOR JUSTICE INNOVATION

Nguyen, Viet, and Jennifer A. Tallon. 2024. *A Practitioner's Guide to Evaluating Prosecutor-Led Diversion Programs*. New York, NY: Center for Justice Innovation. Retrieved October 2, 2025 (https://www.innovatingjustice.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/CJI_Guide_Evaluating_Diversion_Programs_06052024_pageview.pdf).

- [15] See: Nguyen, Viet. 2022. "The Efficacy of Prosecutor-Led, Adult Diversion for Misdemeanor Offenses." April 13. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4083068>.
- [16] For an introduction to observational methods and procedural justice see: LaGratta, Elizabeth G., and Erica Jensen. 2015. *Measuring Perceptions of Fairness: An Evaluation Toolkit*. New York, NY: Center for Court Innovation. Retrieved October 2, 2025 (https://www.innovatingjustice.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/P_J_Evaluation.pdf).
- [17] For an example of a process evaluation including stakeholder feedback in schools see: Ayoub, Lama Hassoun, Lina Villegas, Elise Jensen, and Andrew Martinez. 2022. *Restorative Justice in NYC Schools: An Evaluation*. National Institute of Justice. Retrieved October 2, 2025 (<https://nij.ojp.gov/library/publications/restorative-justice-nyc-schools-evaluation>).
- [18] For promising research into race blind prosecution more generally see: Goel, Sharad, Julian Nyarko, Alex Chohlas-Wood, Todd Rogers, Charles Dorison, and Joe Nudell. 2024. *Blind Justice RCT: Algorithmically Masking Race in Prosecutorial Charging Decisions*. New York, NY: Arnold Ventures. Retrieved October 2, 2025 (<https://www.arnoldventures.org/stories/blind-justice-rct-algorithmically-masking-rac%20-in-prosecutorial-charging-decisions>).
- [19] Dhami, Mandeep K. 2012. "Offer and Acceptance of Apology in Victim-Offender Mediation." *Critical Criminology* 20(1):45–60.
- [20] See for validated PTSD tools: U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs. 2014. *PTSD Screening Instruments- PTSD: National Center for PTSD*. U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs. Retrieved October 2, 2025 (<https://www.ptsd.va.gov/professional/assessment/screens/index.asp>).
- [21] Angel, Claire M., Lawrence W. Sherman, Heather Strang, Barak Ariel, Stephanie Bennett, Nicola Inkpen, Anthony Keane, and Tessa S. Richmond. 2014. "Short-Term Effects of Restorative Justice Conferences on Post-Traumatic Stress Symptoms among Robbery and Burglary Victims: A Randomized Controlled Trial." *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 10(3):291–307. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-014-9200-0>
- [22] See: Wemmers, Jo-Anne, Isabelle Parent, and Marie Lachance Quirion. 2023. "Restoring Victims' Confidence: Victim-Centered Restorative Practices." *International Review of Victimology* 29(3):466–86.
- [23] For an example of interviews with youth see: Choi, Jung J., Deborah L. Green, and Michelle J. Gilbert. 2011. "Putting a Human Face on Crimes: A Qualitative Study on Restorative Justice Processes for Youths." *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal* 28(5):335–55.
- [24] For an example of pre/post study design in the education context see: Morrison, Melissa L., Katherine Cota, and Cheryl S. Austad. 2011. "Help Increase the Peace, a Youth-Focused Program in Peace Education." *Journal of Peace Education* 8(2):177–91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17400201.2011.589251>.
- [25] The concept and operationalization of recidivism is often more complicated than it first appears. Different funders or agencies might have different approaches to how they define and measure recidivism. For a helpful overview of different measurements of recidivism see this helpful guide from Urban Institute: Urban Institute. 2015. *Measuring Recidivism at the Local Level: A Quick Guide*. Retrieved October 2, 2025 (https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/2015/02/11/recidivism-measures_final-for-website.pdf).
- For a more comprehensive discussion of some of the limitations of recidivism see: Butts, Jeffrey A., and Vincent Schiraldi. 2018. *Recidivism Reconsidered: Preserving the Community Justice Mission of Community Corrections*. Program in Criminal Justice Policy and Management, Harvard Kennedy School. Retrieved from https://www.hks.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/centers/wiener/programs/pcj/files/recidivism_reconsidered.pdf and Boswell, Suzanne. 2022. *They Can't Quit Recidivism: A New Vision for Evaluating Community Safety Work*. New York: Center for Court Innovation. Retrieved from https://www.innovatingjustice.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/Recidivism_Cant_Quit_101322.pdf.

Ultimately, recidivism is an important metric for measuring programmatic success and it is important to have a comprehensive plan to define and operationalize recidivism that is accepted by all relevant parties.

CENTER FOR JUSTICE INNOVATION

- [26] See: Sherman, Lawrence W., Heather Strang, Evan Mayo-Wilson, Daniel Woods, and Barak Ariel. 2015. "Are Restorative Justice Conferences Effective in Reducing Repeat Offending? Findings from a Campbell Systematic Review." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 31(1):1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10940-014-9222-9>
- [27] For a helpful meta-analysis see: Fulham, Leah, Julie Blais, Tim Ruggie, and Emily A. Schultheis. 2023. "The Effectiveness of Restorative Justice Programs: A Meta-Analysis of Recidivism and Other Relevant Outcomes." *Criminology & Criminal Justice*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17488958231215228>

Activating ideas.
Strengthening communities.



innovatingjustice.org