



Rights-Based Restorative Practice:
Evaluation Toolkit

© 2008 Shannon A. Moore

Human Rights Center, University of Minnesota

OUT BEYOND IDEAS OF WRONGDOING AND RIGHTDOING,
THERE IS A FIELD. I WILL MEET YOU THERE ~ RUMI ¹



Shannon Moore of Brock University, Ontario, welcomes your use of this ToolKit to promote evaluation of restorative practices and requests your feedback regarding the context in which it is used as well as any recommendation you might have to improve these tools. Feedback regarding these tools may be sent to Shannon Moore:

**Dr. Shannon A. Moore, Assistant Professor
Dept. of Child and Youth Studies, Brock University,
St. Catharines, Ontario, Canada, L2S 3A1**

**Email: smoore@brocku.ca
Tel: 905-688-5550 ext 5396**

¹ RUMI cited in Coleman Barks (1995). *The Essential Rumi: Translations by Coleman Barks with John Moyne*. New York, NY: HarperCollins. p. 36.



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The impetus for this Rights-Based Restorative Practice ToolKit emerged from experiential insights I gained during involvement in grassroots restorative justice programs in British Columbia and Ontario, Canada. As ever I owe a debt of gratitude to many individuals and organizations that have supported my scholarly work and practice-based learning. I would like to make special mention of colleague Dr. Richard Mitchell for his inspirational collaboration on our Rights-Based Restorative Justice Projects as well as Jaime Nikolaou for her creative, scholarly and editorial contributions to this ToolKit. In addition special mention goes to Kristi Rudelius-Palmer, Co-director of University of Minnesota Human Rights Centre; as well as, Sarah Chandler of Lillooet Restorative Justice Program and Equitas in Canada for their inspiration, early feedback, and support in the dissemination of this ToolKit. My thanks also goes to Desmond and Etta Connor of Victoria, British Columbia as well as Mr. Mark Vander Vennen in Ontario for their mentorship and collegial support.

The questions included in this ToolKit were originally adapted with permission from evaluation tools created by Richard Kelly at George Brown College and Community Justice Initiatives of Ontario. Surveys informing the work of Richard Kelly were previously developed by Andrew Taylor from the Centre for Research in Education and Human Services, Waterloo, Ont., and the International Institute for Restorative Justice. While similar principles guide the ToolKit that follows, these notions are expanded to reflect the interdependence and connections among and between the principles of human rights and restorative justice practices.

Please also see the following publications for more information about Rights-Based Restorative Practices:

Moore, S.A . (2007). Restorative Justice. In R. B. Howe and K. Covell (eds.), *A Question of Commitment: Children's Rights in Canada* (Wilfred Laurier University: Waterloo , ON). pp. 179-208.

Moore, S. A . & Mitchell, R. C. (2007a). Rights-Based Restorative Justice: Towards Critical Praxis with Young People in Conflict with the Law. In A. Ang, I. Delens-Ravier, M. Delplace, C. Herman, D. Reynaert, V. Staelens, R. Steel and M. Verheyde (Eds.), *The UN Children's Rights Convention: theory meets practice. Proceedings of the International Interdisciplinary Conference on Children's Rights, 18-19 May 2006, Ghent , Belgium* (pp. 50-78). Mortsel , Belgium: Intersentia. pp. 549-563.

Moore, S.A. & Mitchell, R.C. (2007b) "Herstelrecht volgens de mensenrechtenprincipes" (or "Rights-Based Restorative Justice", *Het Tijdschrift voor Jeugdrecht en Kinderrechten* (or TJK - Flemish Journal for Youth and Children's Law) 5(4): 251-259.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title Page.....	1
Acknowledgements.....	3
Table of Contents.....	4
About ToolKit.....	5
Background Information.....	6
Suggestions for Analysis of Surveys	11
Survey Part One: Short Answer.....	14
Participant.....	15
Facilitator.....	18
Hosting Environment.....	20
Survey Part Two: Long Answer.....	22
Person Harmed.....	23
Person Who Caused Harm.....	31
Supporter.....	39
Neutral Party/Participant.....	47



ABOUT THIS TOOLKIT

Individuals using this ToolKit might be curious about the repeated motif of the feather and the inclusion of a quotation from the 13th century Sufi poet and mystic Rumi. Similar to restorative practices the feather is a symbol represented in diverse indigenous and aboriginal cultures around the world; for example, in ancient times the feather represented transcendence within my Celtic heritage, and restorative practices were central aspects of conflict resolution. Similarly, as a Canadian I have benefited from learning from Aboriginal Elders from diverse First Nations cultures here and have found feathers are often associated with processes of conflict resolution, traditional healing and notions of voice, dignity and respect. It is for these reasons the feather motif represents the processes and goals of Rights-Based Restorative Practices. The Rumi quote “*out beyond ideas of wrongdoing and rightdoing, there is a field. I will meet you there*”,² poignantly articulates my aspiration for this work in local, national and international conflict transformation.

This ToolKit is intended for use by restorative practice stakeholders in community-based, school-based, and/or justice contexts. Readers of the ToolKit will find it organized into four major parts: Background Information, Suggestions for Analysis, Survey Part One: Short Answer, and Survey Part Two: Long Answer. In Background Information, the reader is introduced to the applicability of human rights in young peoples’ lives. Principles embedded in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, and the UN Basic Principles of Restorative Justice and the integration of Rights-Based Restorative Justice are each discussed in turn.³ In the sections Survey Part One and Survey Part Two, tools are provided for use following restorative practice processes/conferences. The surveys provided in Part One are short and are to be administered after the conference at the community/school hosting site. The set of surveys in Part Two are largely based on the shorter tools, are longer, and are administered by a telephone or in-person interviewer. Both survey sets reflect the language and principles of Rights-Based Restorative Practice.

It is important to acknowledge some limitations of this Toolkit. It is challenging to complete a comprehensive evaluation when human and financial resources are constrained for volunteer run, community-based restorative justice organizations. It may be necessary to modify the Toolkit in relation to length and scope—Please share modification suggestions (see p.2 contact information). This Toolkit is offered as a starting point for the important process of evaluation and is downloadable without fee thanks to the Human Rights Center at the University of Minnesota. I have made an effort to also make the language of the Toolkit accessible yet a flexible and creative approach to deploying this ToolKit may increase its utility. Likewise, participants may need support to comprehend and respond to the questions so that their human rights and voice may find full expression.

² See Rumi cited in Coleman Barks from P. 2 of this ToolKit.

³ See Moore, S.A . (2007). Restorative Justice. In R. B. Howe and K. Covell (eds.), *A Question of Commitment: Children's Rights in Canada* (Wilfred Laurier University: Waterloo , ON). pp. 179-208.

Moore, S. A . & Mitchell, R. C. (2007a). Rights Based Restorative Justice: Towards Critical Praxis with Young People in Conflict with the Law. In A. Ang, I. Delens-Ravier, M. Delplace, C. Herman, D. Reynaert, V. Staelens, R. Steel and M. Verheyde (Eds.), *The UN Children's Rights Convention: theory meets practice. Proceedings of the International Interdisciplinary Conference on Children's Rights, 18- 19 May 2006, Ghent , Belgium* (pp. 50-78). Morsel , Belgium: Intersentia. pp. 549-563.

Moore, S.A. & Mitchell, R.C. (2007b) "Herstelrecht volgens de mensenrechtenprincipes" (or "Rights-based Restorative Justice", *Het Tijdschrift voor Jeugdrecht en Kinderrechten* (or TJK - Flemish Journal for Youth and Children's Law) 5(4): 251-259.



BACKGROUND INFORMATION

RESTORATIVE JUSTICE & RESTORATIVE PRACTICE

Restorative justice is a philosophy that is focused on healing harm among individuals and communities. It is ancient and sourced in aboriginal and indigenous cultures around the world. Restorative justice is an aspect of restorative practice that responds to crime by bringing persons harmed, persons who caused harm, and the wider community together through dialogue. By connecting people impacted by harm restorative practices aim to transform relationships, heal harm, increase safety, and build capacity in communities. Contrasting mainstream-formal systems of justice, restorative practice recognizes the therapeutic value of having all impacted parties respond to a crime; when people can share their stories of impact meaningful change can begin. A key element of restorative justice is that it is practiced in ways that are meaningful and specific to the community. As such, although they may widely differ, all restorative practices reflect basic principles⁴.

THE UN CONVENTION ON THE RIGHTS OF THE CHILD

In 1989, the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) specified that all children (individuals under the age of 18) have the same rights as their elders. This convention is almost universally ratified by UN member states. As stated within the CRC, parents, adults, and the state have the responsibility to protect, maintain, and educate children and the public about, those rights.

In 1991, Canada ratified the CRC - one of 193 nations to date - and in so doing through legislation, policy and practice agreed to recognize young people under 18 years of age to be bearers of rights. Only two nations to date have not ratified the CRC though each has signed the document formally – Somalia and the United States. As with all nations committed to implementing the CRC within domestic legislation, Canada is legally responsible to ensure that all children (in all areas of their lives) do not experience discrimination (Article 2); have their best interests (well-being) considered in all decisions (Article 3); are able to grow and develop safely and in the best of health (Article 6); and are able to participate fully and age appropriately as citizens in issues that affect them (Article 12). These are the four core and guiding principles of the treaty for all signatories.

RIGHTS-BASED RESTORATIVE JUSTICE

Rights-Based Restorative Justice (RBRJ) integrates the principles of both restorative justice and the CRC. As such, this model may be used by community groups as a guide for restorative practices with young people in conflict with the law, in conflict with school or community rules, or in conflict interpersonally. Restorative justice and children's rights similarly encourage the voices of persons harmed, persons who caused harm, and young people to be heard through non-discriminatory, safe, authentic and full participation in matters that impact them. This ToolKit is intended to guide rights-based approaches to programming and assessment.

⁴ See Moore, S.A . (2007). Restorative Justice. In R. B. Howe and K. Covell (eds.), *A Question of Commitment: Children's Rights in Canada* (Wilfred Laurier University: Waterloo , ON). pp. 179-208.

Shannon A. Moore (2008). *Rights-Based Restorative Practice Evaluation ToolKit*.



PRINCIPLES OF RIGHTS-BASED RESTORATIVE JUSTICE

Non-Discrimination, Equality, and Mutuality: CRC Article 2

Whether they are persons harmed or persons who caused harm, and regardless of their social or cultural background, all young people have the same human rights. To achieve balance and heal harm all stakeholders are considered equally and mutually in restorative processes.

Best Interests, Well-Being, and Restoration: CRC Article 3

The best interests (well-being) of young participants are considered in restorative processes. The aim is to safely heal harm and imbalance within human relationships.

Survival, Development, and Safety: CRC Article 6

Restorative processes consider the healthy development and safety of young people who may be vulnerable in circumstances of victimization. All stakeholders must feel a sense of safety throughout the process.

Participation, Voice, and Volunteerism: CRC Article 12

Persons harmed, persons who caused harm, and the community must have an opportunity to fully participate and experience their views being meaningfully heard. All stakeholders participate voluntarily.



CONTEXTS FOR RIGHTS- BASED RESTORATIVE PRACTICE

The first step to integrating principles of human rights into practice is to have accurate knowledge. A rights-based framework can then guide program planning and design including setting of goals, objectives and strategies; implementation, monitoring and evaluation. Human rights principles include: universality and inalienability; indivisibility; inter-dependence and inter-relatedness; non-discrimination and equality; participation and inclusion; accountability and the rule of law and are examined below.

COMMUNITY CONTEXTS: THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS (UDHR)

Children and young people interact with adults within institutions, family and community contexts, and it is of the utmost value to understand how the Universal Declaration of Human Rights may guide these interactions with its premise that all people are entitled to its rights regardless of age and without discrimination. Ample research findings also inform us that healthy adult-child relationships are founded upon age appropriate and non-abusive exchanges of interpersonal and systemic power, and so the realization of human rights must include awareness of the important dynamics within rights-based relations. Therefore, community groups working with young people towards good practice may be guided by the overarching principles of human rights from the UDHR and CRC, as well as an understanding of the impact of any abuses of power young people have experienced. The following is a summary of principles found in the UNDR:

Universality and Inalienability: Everyone everywhere has them. Article 1 of the UDHR states that: “All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights”.

Indivisibility: All human rights have equal value. They are about the inherent dignity of every human person and cannot be ranked or prioritized.

Inter-Dependence and Inter-Relatedness: Rights are realized through each other. The right to health is often interlinked with rights to education and accurate information.

Equality and Non-Discrimination: All human beings are equal. Discrimination of any kind violates the inherent dignity of the human person.

Participation and Inclusion: The right to participate leads to the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Active and meaningful participation facilitates enjoyment of civil, economic, social, cultural and political liberties.

Accountability and Rule of Law: States are responsible to uphold citizens’ human rights. If human rights are violated, rights-holders are entitled to legal proceedings before a court of law.



JUSTICE CONTEXTS: RESTORATIVE JUSTICE and CHILDREN'S HUMAN RIGHTS

Since it was introduced to the General Assembly in 1989, the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child has been ratified by 193 nations. Canada ratified the Convention in 1991 and adopted the UN Basic Principles of Restorative Justice in 2002. In 2003, the Canadian federal government also enacted the Youth Criminal Justice Act (YCJA), together these actions express Canada's commitment to a system of youth justice that integrates principles of restorative practice and human rights. The YCJA is innovative as the first piece of federal legislation integrating both UN meta-narratives – the core CRC principles and those of restorative justice. The YCJA specifies that alternatives to the criminal justice system are to be the initial response for young people in conflict with the law for the first time.

Justice Contexts: CRC Articles 40 and 2, 3, 6 and 12

Youth justice that is guided by CRC Article 40 specifies that any legal processes for young people in conflict with the law should:

promote ... the child's sense of dignity and worth, which reinforces the child's respect for the human rights and fundamental freedoms of others and which takes into account the child's age and the desirability of promoting the child's reintegration and the child's assuming a constructive role in society.

The language of CRC Article 40 is also largely indicative of the principles of restorative practice. Notions of respect, dignity, construction and reintegration evoke restorative collaboration, community stakeholder involvement, and dialogue—especially in combination with CRC articles 2, 3, 6 and 12.

EDUCATION CONTEXTS: CRC Articles 28, 29 also interdependent upon 2, 3, 6 and 12

Similar to restorative justice which focuses on basic principles and healing harm, restorative practices in schools emphasize building community, connectedness, and perceptions of safety⁵. For instance, rather than first suspending a student for an act of wrongdoing, impacted parties are encouraged to engage in constructive dialogue that leads to greater understanding of the conflict among individuals or against school rules. Where retributive punishment isolates young people and is based on a single act of wrongdoing, restorative dialogue can facilitate meaningful change, is engaging and educational.

Educational contexts and young people's human rights intersect with the CRC's education Articles 28 and 29. Article 28 recognizes a basic human right that is attended to by equal and progressive means to ensure primary education be compulsory and free; secondary education be accessible and diverse in orientation; post-secondary education be made as accessible as possible; and that guidance and information are easily attainable. Article 28 stresses every child's right to education delivered "in particular with a view to contributing to the elimination of ignorance", and Article 29 extends the means of delivery by stating such education will aid in developing young people's respect for themselves and to their fullest potential; fundamental human rights and freedoms; their cultural identity and values; "understanding, peace, tolerance, equality and respect for the natural environment. Notions of respect, tolerance and equality are also central principles of restorative practice as students are encouraged to assume and value others' perspectives so they may understand the sources of conflict more fully.

⁵ McCold, Paul. School Safety Survey: Comparing Public Middle Schools to Community Service Foundation Restorative Alternative Schools. International Institute for Restorative Practices. Retrieved September 05, 2007, from <http://www.sfu.ca/cfri/fulltext/mccold.pdf>



SOME REASONS TO EVALUATE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES

When we evaluate our actions or programs we are critically questioning whether we accomplished what we set out to do. In relation to restorative practices we can refer to specific program goals and to the basic principles of restorative justice as indicators for assessment. What follows are reasons to evaluate restorative justice programs⁶.

Accountability

We are engaging the central principle of accountability in restorative practice when we ask the question “did we do what we said we will do?”. By comparing our policies and practices against standards, we allow fair judgments to be made about the integrity, strengths and weaknesses of our work.

Credibility

We are credible when we examine whether the aims and goals of restorative justice were met, integrated, clearly outlined, and whether participants were satisfied with the success of these goals.

Authenticity

Restorative practice is authentic when actions are harmonious with participants’ voices and experiences, and the goals and principles of restorative programming.

Criticality

Restorative practice is critical when evaluation invites participants, communities, schools and justice stakeholders to voice what they believe was accomplished, or did not work, in order to improve effective implementation.

Ethicality & Sensibility

We are ethical and sensible when evaluation accounts for the human rights and needs of all participants. A balance must occur between considering participants’ needs, understanding the rights of self and others, and providing opportunities to take fuller responsibility for healing conflict.

Improve Understanding

Restorative practice improves understanding when the impact of harm is understood by individuals and communities, and their inter-relationships. By evaluating progress we improve understanding about what processes should be continued or discontinued.

⁶ Moore, S. A.. (2003). Restorative Justice Program and Process Evaluation: An Integral Approach. *6th International Conference on Restorative Justice*. Retrieved September 05, 2007, from <http://www.sfu.ca/cfrj/fulltext/moore.pdf>

Shannon A. Moore (2008). Rights-Based Restorative Practice Evaluation ToolKit.



RECOMMENDATIONS FOR USE & ANALYSIS OF SURVEYS

As discussed in the background information for this ToolKit, both surveys enclosed are developed from core principles of Rights-Based Restorative Justice⁷. Accordingly, questions in both the short and long surveys correspond to the organizing principles articulated in the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989), and the UN Basic Principles of Restorative Justice (2002). The following information may also prove helpful when conducting a rights-based analysis of data:

Non-Discrimination, Equality, and Mutuality: CRC Article 2

e.g., Question 1 (short survey) and Question 1a (long survey)

Best Interests, Well-Being, and Restoration: CRC Article 3

e.g., Question 4 (short survey) and Question 1d (long survey)

Survival, Development, and Safety: CRC Article 6

e.g., Question 9 (short survey) and Question 3 (long survey)

Participation, Voice, and Volunteerism: CRC Article 12

e.g., Question 2 and Question 1b (long survey)

In the long answer surveys, Question 6 (for Persons Harmed and Persons Who Caused Harm), Question 4 (for Supporters) and Question 1 (a-c Final Thoughts Section) relate to holistic change processes pertaining to psychological, behavioral, and social well-being. Accordingly, during Analysis of the Long Answer Surveys the Interviewer may wish to make special note of these questions:

- **How well do you feel the conference satisfied the needs of others?**
- **What has changed for you, if anything, as a result of participating?**
- **Giving and receiving respect?**
- **Giving and receiving support?**
- **Relying on others and others relying on you?**

Finally, to safeguard the integrity of the evaluation process it is important to be aware of the possible influence of the interviewer on the interviewee. The interviewer may be seen as a person of authority with more power than the interviewee. To help sustain an atmosphere of safety and mutuality the interviewer needs to be conscious of these role dynamics. Congruent with the principles of restorative practice the interviewer should sustain a supportive yet neutral stance and exercise measured caution when prompting during the interview schedule.

⁷ see S.A. Moore (2007)

S.A. Moore & R.C. Mitchell (2007a)

S.A. Moore & R.C. Mitchell (2007b)



POST INTERVIEW ANALYSIS (PERSON HARMED)

As the interviewer, you may want to note the following questions as part of your analysis of the interview.

This is a list of things that people who participate in conferences sometimes say.

- a. Conferencing allowed me to express my feelings about being harmed.
- b. Conferencing allowed me to be heard and allowed action to be taken based on what I said.
- c. Too much pressure was put on me in the conference.
- d. I felt I had no choice about participating in the conference.
- e. The person(s) who caused harm was not sincere in his/her participation.
- f. I have a better understanding of why the offence was committed against me.
- g. Conferencing allowed me to have more of a say in what happened.
- h. I felt pushed around in the conference.
- i. The person(s) who caused harm participated only because he/she was trying to avoid punishment.
- j. I would like to get back at the people who were accusing me at the conference.
- k. The person(s) who caused harm understands better how he/she hurt me because of the conference.
- l. I was nervous during the conference.
- m. Everyone got a fair chance to talk.
- n. I understood what was going on at the conference.
- o. I am afraid of the person(s) who caused harm



POST INTERVIEW ANALYSIS (PERSON WHO CAUSED HARM)

As the interviewer, you may want to note the following responses to previous restorative practices, and formulate your own questions to be congruent with your own interview analysis.

This is a list of things that people who participate in conferences sometimes say.

- a. The person(s) harmed participated only because s/he wanted the money back or to be paid for damages.
- b. Conferencing allowed me to be heard and allowed action to be taken based on what I said.
- c. Too much pressure was put on me to do all the talking in the conference.
- d. I felt I had no choice about participating in the conference with my person(s) harmed.
- e. The person(s) harmed was not sincere in her/his participation.
- f. I have a better understanding of how my behaviour affected the person(s) harmed.
- g. Without conferences I probably would have gotten punished much worse.
- h. I felt pushed around in the conference.
- i. The offence I committed was not that big a deal.
- j. I would like to get back at the people who were accusing me at the conference.
- k. The offence I committed hurt the person(s) harmed.
- l. The offence I committed hurt my family.
- m. In the conference, I felt ashamed of my actions.
- n. After the conference, I felt ashamed of my actions.
- o. In the conference agreement, I got what I deserved.

Survey Part One: SHORT ANSWER

POST CONFERENCE PROCESS SURVEYS



Hosting Restorative Justice: Participant Process Survey



File No: _____

Please **X** Your Role:

Person Harmed

Person Who Caused Harm

Supporter

Neutral Participant

Please check the box that best represents your response. If you would like to comment further, please use the space provided.

1. Was the process fair, impartial, and unbiased?

Yes

Sometimes

No



Please explain:

2. Did you feel listened to and that the outcomes reflected what you said?

Yes

Sometimes

No



Please explain:

3. Was the process explained to you?

Yes

Sometimes

No



Please explain:

4. Did you have a feeling of well-being or that your best interests served?

Please explain:

5. Did you participate voluntarily or did you feel any pressure to participate? Please explain.

Please explain:

6. Please rate your degree of satisfaction with the process.

Dissatisfied Somewhat Dissatisfied Unsure Somewhat Satisfied Satisfied

Please explain:

7. How well do you feel the conference satisfied the needs of others?

Please explain:

8. What has changed for you, if anything, as a result of participating?

Please explain:

9. Did you feel safe, comfortable and supported?

Please explain:

If you are interested in being contacted for a telephone interview regarding the conference, please provide the following information:

Telephone #: _____

Date/Time Available: _____

Thank you!



Hosting Restorative Justice: Facilitator Process Survey

File No: _____

Name of Facilitator

Location of Conference

Please check the box that best represents your response. If you would like to comment further, please use the space provided.

1. Was the process fair, impartial, and unbiased?

Yes Sometimes No



Please explain:

2. Were all participants listened to and did the outcomes reflect what was said?

Yes Sometimes No



Please explain:

3. Did you have a feeling of well-being or that your best interests served?

Please explain:

4. Please rate your degree of satisfaction with the process.

Dissatisfied Somewhat Dissatisfied Unsure Somewhat Satisfied Satisfied

5. Please comment on any change you experienced as a result of participation.

Please explain:

If you are interested in being contacted for a telephone interview regarding the conference, please provide the following information:

Telephone #: _____

Date/Time Available: _____

Thank you!

Hosting Restorative Justice: Hosting Environment Process Survey



File No: _____

Name of Hosting Environment
(ie. school, community, faith community)

Host Site

Please check the box that best represents your response. If you would like to comment further, please use the space provided.

1. Did Participating in this RJ Hosting bring new insights to you or your community context?

Yes Sometimes No



Please explain:

2. Would you be open to participation in RJ Hosting again in the future?

Yes Sometimes No



Please explain:

3. What were the benefits of participating in this RJ Hosting event for you and your community context?

Please explain:

4. What were the challenges of participating in this RJ Hosting event for you and your community context?

Please explain:

5. Please rate your degree of satisfaction with the process.

Dissatisfied Somewhat Dissatisfied Unsure Somewhat Satisfied Satisfied

6. Please comment on any change (thinking, feeling, being) you experienced as a result of participation.

Please explain:

If you are interested in being contacted for a telephone interview regarding the conference, please provide the following information:

Telephone #: _____

Date/Time Available: _____

Thank You!

SURVEY PART TWO: LONGANSWER
TELEPHONE / IN PERSON POST CONFERENCE SURVEYS



POST CONFERENCE TELEPHONE/ IN PERSON SURVEY: PERSON HARMED



Date of Conference: _____

Today's Date: _____

NOTES

- When interviewing, ask the question and wait for the respondent to answer on their own before prompting. If prompted, check the appropriate box and jot the response.
- Prior to the interview, refer to the respondent's shorter process evaluation. Drawing from Questions 1 to 4, record the respondent's answers (Yes / Sometimes / No) as they correspond to Questions 1 (a to d) in this questionnaire.
- As the interviewer, refer to p. 9-10 to complete a brief post-interview analysis.

YOUR THOUGHTS AND EXPERIENCES

1. You answered a short questionnaire after the conference. We'd like to go back to some of your answers and ask you to expand on them.

a. Was the process fair, impartial, and unbiased? (Answer: _____)

Notes:

b. Did you feel listened to and that the outcomes reflected what you said? (Answer: _____)

Notes:

c. Was the process explained to you? (Answer: _____)

Notes:

d. Did you have a feeling of well-being or that your best interests served?
(Answer: _____)

Notes:

2. Why did you choose to participate in the conference?

Notes:

Prompts:

- To let the person(s) who caused harm know how I felt about the offence.
- To get paid back for losses.
- To receive answers to questions I had.
- To help the person(s) who caused harm.
-
-
-
- To receive an apology.
- Because I felt I had no choice.
- Other: (Specify) _____

3. Did you decide on your own to take part in the conference, or did you feel pressured to participate in the conference?

Notes:

Prompts:

- Yes, I decided to take part in the conference.
- I decided to take part in the conference, but someone or something put pressure on me to participate.
- I did not want to participate in the conference, but someone or something made me participate.

4. How would you describe the general feeling or atmosphere of the conference?

Notes:

Prompts:

- Friendly
- Unfriendly
- Other: (Specify) _____

5. Was it helpful to meet with the person(s) who caused harm in a conference setting?

Notes:

Prompts:

- Not at all helpful
- Somewhat helpful
-
- Very helpful

6. What changed for you, if anything, as a result of your participation in the conference?

Notes:

Prompts:

- In your thinking?
- In your feeling?
- In your behaving?
- In your relating to others?

THE CONFERENCE SESSION

1. How would you describe the conference session in general?

Notes:

Prompts:

- Friendly
- Unfriendly
- Other: (Specify) _____

2. Did you receive an apology at the conference session?

- Yes
- No
- Unknown

Notes:

6. Do you think the person(s) who caused harm will do the kind of behaviour that led to the conference again?

Notes:

Prompts:

- Very likely
- Likely
- Unlikely
- Very unlikely

FINAL THOUGHTS

1. Looking back on the conference did you experience any of the following:

a. Giving and receiving respect?

Notes:

b. Giving and receiving support?

Notes:

c. Relying on others and others relying on you?

Notes:

2. Overall, how would you describe the conference?

Notes:

Prompts:

- Very positive
- Positive
- Mixed
- Negative
- Very negative

3. If you had it to do over again, would you take part in a conference?

- Yes
- No

4. Would you recommend restorative justice to others as a way to resolve conflict?

- Yes
- No

5. Is there anything else you would like to say about the conference session or about how your case was handled?

Notes:



POST CONFERENCE TELEPHONE/ IN PERSON SURVEY: PERSON WHO CAUSED HARM

Date of Conference: _____

Today's Date: _____

NOTES

- When interviewing, ask the question and wait for the respondent to answer on their own before prompting. If prompted, check the appropriate box and jot the response.
- Prior to the interview, refer to the respondent's shorter process evaluation. Drawing from Questions 1 to 4, record the respondent's answers (Yes / Sometimes / No) as they correspond to Questions 1 (a to d) in this questionnaire.
- As the interviewer, refer to p. 9-10 to complete a brief post-interview analysis.

YOUR THOUGHTS AND EXPERIENCES

1. You answered a short questionnaire after the conference. We'd like to go back to some of your answers and ask you to expand on them.

a. Was the process fair, impartial, and unbiased? (Answer: _____)

Notes:

b. Did you feel listened to and that the outcomes reflected what you said?
(Answer: _____)

Notes:

c. Was the process explained to you? (Answer: _____)

Notes:

d. Did you have a feeling of well-being or that your best interests served? (Answer: _____)

Notes:

2. Why did you choose to participate in the conference?

Notes:

Prompts:

- To pay back the person(s) harmed.
- To let the person(s) harmed know why I did it.
- To help the person(s) harmed.
- To apologize.
- To make things right.
- Because I felt I had no choice.
- Other: (Specify) _____

3. Did you decide on your own to take part in the conference, or did you feel pressured to participate in the conference?

Notes:

Prompts:

- Yes, I decided to take part in the conference.
- I decided to take part in the conference, but someone or something put pressure on me to participate.
- I did not want to participate in the conference, but someone or something made me participate.

4. How would you describe the general feeling or atmosphere of the conference?

Notes:

Prompts:

- Friendly
- Unfriendly
- Other: (Specify) _____

5. Was it helpful to meet with the person(s) harmed in a conference setting?

Notes:

Prompts:

- Not at all helpful
- Somewhat helpful
- Very helpful

6. What changed for you, if anything, as a result of your participation in the conference?

Notes:

Prompts:

- In your thinking?
- In your feeling?
- In your behaving?
- In your relating to others?

2. How do you feel about the person(s) harmed now that the conference is over?

Notes:

Prompts:

- Very positive
- Positive
- Mixed
- Negative
- Very negative
- Other: (Specify) _____

3. Please tell us how much you agree with the following statements:

- a. “The person(s) harmed has a better opinion of me after the conference”.**
- Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree
- b. “The person(s) harmed understands my point of view better after the conference”.**
- Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree
- c. “My family/friends have a better opinion of me after the conference”.**
- Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree
- d. “I understand the person(s) harmed point of view better after the conference”.**
- Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree

4. To what degree do you think the incident that brought you to the conference was your fault?

- Not at all my fault Partly my fault Mostly my fault Totally my fault

5. Do you think you will ever again engage in the kind of behaviour that led to the conference?

Notes:

Prompts:

- Very likely
- Likely
- Unlikely
- Very unlikely

FINAL THOUGHTS

1. Looking back on the conference did you experience any of the following:

a. Giving and receiving respect?

Notes:

b. Giving and receiving support?

Notes:

c. Relying on others and others relying on you?

Notes:

2. Overall, how would you describe the conference?

Notes:

3. If you had it to do over again, would you take part in a conference?

- Yes
- No

4. Would you recommend restorative justice to others as a way to resolve conflict?

- Yes
- No

5. Is there anything else you would like to say about the conference session or about how your case was handled?

Notes:

POST CONFERENCE TELEPHONE/ IN PERSON SURVEY: SUPPORTER



Date of Conference: _____

Today's Date: _____

NOTES

- When interviewing, ask the question and wait for the respondent to answer on their own before prompting. If prompted, check the appropriate box and jot the response.
- Prior to the interview, refer to the respondent's shorter process evaluation. Drawing from Questions 1 to 4, record the respondent's answers (Yes / Sometimes / No) as they correspond to Questions 1 (a to d) in this questionnaire.
- As the interviewer, refer to p. 9-10 to complete a brief post-interview analysis.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Were you a supporter for a person harmed or for a person who caused harm?

- Person harmed
- Person who caused harm
- Other: (Specify) _____

2. What is your relationship to him/her?

- Family
- Friend
- Other: (Specify) _____

YOUR THOUGHTS AND EXPERIENCES

1. You answered a short questionnaire after the conference. We'd like to go back to some of your answers and ask you to expand on them.

- a. Was the process fair, impartial, and unbiased? (Answer: _____)**

Notes:

b. Did you feel listened to and that the outcomes reflected what you said?

Notes:

c. Was the process explained to you? (Answer: _____)

Notes:

**d. Did you have a feeling of well-being or that your best interests served?
(Answer: _____)**

Notes:

2. Why did you choose to participate in the conference?

Notes:

3. Did you decide on your own to take part in the conference, or did you feel pressured to participate in the conference?

Notes:

Prompts:

- Yes, I decided to take part in the conference.
- I decided to take part in the conference, but someone or something put pressure on me to participate.
- I did not want to participate in the conference, but someone or something made me participate.

4. What changed for you, if anything, as a result of your participation in the conference?

Notes:

Prompts:

- In your thinking?
- In your feeling?
- In your behaving?
- In your relating to others?

THE CONFERENCE SESSION

1. How would you describe the conference session in general?

Notes:

Prompts:

- Friendly
- Unfriendly
- Other: (Specify) _____

2. Was an apology to the person(s) harmed made at the conference?

- Yes
- No

4. Were you surprised by anything that occurred in the conference session?

- Yes
- No
- Unknown

If YES, what surprised you?

Notes:

Prompts:

- It went better than I expected
- The person(s) who caused harm seemed sincere
- It was worse than I expected
- The person(s) who caused harm was arrogant
- The person(s) harmed seemed to care about the person(s) who caused harm
- The person(s) harmed was so angry
- Other: (Specify) _____

5. Do you believe that people listened and heard what you had to say during the conference?

- Yes
- No

CONFERENCE OUTCOMES

1. Was a (plan) negotiated during the conference?

- Yes
- No

If YES, was the agreement fair to the person(s) harmed?

1 2 3 4 5

Very Unfair Very Fair

If YES, was the agreement fair to the person(s) who caused harm?

1 2 3 4 5

Very Unfair Very Fair

If YES, was the agreement fair to you?

1 2 3 4 5

Very Unfair Very Fair

2. How do you feel about the person(s) who caused harm now that the conference is over?

Notes:

3. Please tell us how much you agree with the statement: “The person(s) who caused harm understands the person(’s’) harmed experience better after the conference”.

- Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree

4. Please tell us how much you agree with the statement: The person(s) who caused harm understands my experience better after the conference”.

- Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree

5. To what degree were the events that led to the conference the person(s) who caused harm’s fault?

- Not at all their fault Partly their fault Mostly their fault Totally their fault

6. Do you think the person(s) who caused harm will do the kind of behaviour that led to the conference again?

- Very likely
 Likely
 Unlikely
 Very unlikely

FINAL THOUGHTS

1. Looking back on the conference did you experience any of the following:

a. Giving and receiving respect?

Notes:

b. Giving and receiving support?

Notes:

c. Relying on others and others relying on you?

Notes:

2. Overall, how would you describe the conference?

Notes:

Prompts:

- Very positive
- Positive
- Mixed
- Negative
- Very negative

3. If you had it to do over again, would you take part in a conference?

- Yes
- No

4. Would you recommend restorative justice to others as a way to resolve conflict?

- 5. Yes
- 6. No

5. Is there anything else you would like to say about the conference session or about how the case was handled?

Notes:

POST CONFERENCE TELEPHONE/ IN PERSON SURVEY: NEUTRAL PARTY/PARTICIPANT



Date of Conference: _____

Today's Date: _____

NOTES

- When interviewing, ask the question and wait for the respondent to answer on their own before prompting. If prompted, check the appropriate box and jot the response.
- Prior to the interview, refer to the respondent's shorter process evaluation. Drawing from Questions 1 to 4, record the respondent's answers (Yes / Sometimes / No) as they correspond to Questions 1 (a to d) in this questionnaire.
- As the interviewer, refer to p. 9-10 to complete a brief post-interview analysis.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. What is your role in community in relation to this conference?

- Justice Official
- Community Member
- Other: (Specify) _____

YOUR THOUGHTS AND EXPERIENCES

2. You answered a short questionnaire after the conference. We'd like to go back to some of your answers and ask you to expand on them.

a. Was the process fair, impartial, and unbiased? (Answer: _____)

Notes:

b. Did you feel listened to and that the outcomes reflected what you said?

Notes:

c. Was the process explained to you? (Answer: _____)

Notes:

d. Did you have a feeling of well-being or that your best interests served? (Answer: _____)

Notes:

3. Why did you choose to participate in the conference?

Notes:

4. Did you decide on your own to take part in the conference, or did you feel pressured to participate in the conference?

Notes:

Prompts:

- Yes, I decided to take part in the conference.
- I decided to take part in the conference, but someone or something put pressure on me to participate.
- I did not want to participate in the conference, but someone or something made me participate.

CONFERENCE OUTCOMES

7. Was a (plan) negotiated during the conference?

21. Yes

22. No

If YES, was the agreement fair to the person(s) harmed?

	1	2	3	4	5	
Very Unfair						Very Fair

If YES, was the agreement fair to the person(s) who caused harm?

	1	2	3	4	5	
Very Unfair						Very Fair

If YES, was the agreement fair to you?

	1	2	3	4	5	
Very Unfair						Very Fair

8. How do you feel about the person(s) who caused harm now that the conference is over?

Notes:

9. Please tell us how much you agree with the statement: “The person(s) who caused harm understands the person(’s’) harmed experience better after the conference”.

Strongly agree
 Agree
 Disagree
 Strongly disagree

10. Please tell us how much you agree with the statement: The person(s) who caused harm understands my experience better after the conference”.

Strongly agree
 Agree
 Disagree
 Strongly disagree

11. To what degree were the events that led to the conference the person(s) who caused harm’s fault?

Not at all their fault
 Partly their fault
 Mostly their fault
 Totally their fault

12. Do you think the person(s) who caused harm will engage again in the kind of behavior that led to the conference?

- Very likely
- Likely
- Unlikely
- Very unlikely

FINAL THOUGHTS

6. Looking back on the conference did you experience any of the following:

d. Giving and receiving respect?

Notes:

e. Giving and receiving support?

Notes:

f. Relying on others and others relying on you?

Notes:

7. Overall, how would you describe the conference?

Notes:

Prompts:

- Very positive
- Positive
- Mixed
- Negative
- Very negative

Shannon A. Moore (2008). Rights-Based Restorative Practice Evaluation ToolKit.

8. If you had it to do over again, would you take part in a conference?

- 23. Yes
- 24. No

9. Would you recommend restorative justice to others as a way to resolve conflict?

- 25. Yes
- 26. No

10. Is there anything else you would like to say about the conference session or about how the case was handled?

Notes: