



**Restorative
Justice Week 2016**

November 20-27

**Semaine de la justice
réparatrice 2016**

20-27 novembre

www.csc-sec.gc.ca

Restorative Justice Basic Resource Kit

Edited by Manon Buck

#RJWeek

**Restorative
Justice
Week 2016
November 20-27**

**Semaine de
la justice
réparatrice 2016
20-27 novembre**



RESTORATIVE JUSTICE

Restorative justice (RJ) is a philosophy that views crime and conflict principally as harm done to people and relationships.

RJ is a non-adversarial, non-retributive approach to justice that emphasizes healing in victims, the meaningful accountability of offenders, and the involvement of citizens in creating healthier, safer communities.

RJ is about giving all parties involved in a conflict the opportunity to take an active role in a safe and respectful process that allows for open dialogue between the victim, the offender, and the community.

- RJ provides victims with an opportunity to tell their story, address the harm caused, and find answers to questions that are important to them.
- RJ provides offenders with an opportunity to take responsibility for their actions and to be held accountable by those they harmed.
- RJ empowers communities to gain a better understanding of the root causes of crime and allow the community to express and reduce its fears.

Principles and Values of Restorative Justice

Recognition of Harm
Inclusion
Accountability
Dialogue
Truth
Voluntary Participation
Safety
Choice
Holism
Humanism
Reparation



THE GOVERNOR GENERAL · LE GOUVERNEUR GÉNÉRAL

As some of you know, I was a lawyer by profession prior to becoming governor general. Throughout my life, I have developed a profound respect for the rule of law and all that it represents. I am therefore delighted to mark Restorative Justice Week 2016, held November 20–27 in Canada and around the world.

This year, the theme for the week is “Inspiring Innovation,” reminding us that restorative justice is ever-changing and seeks to improve the human condition through its non-adversarial, non-retributive approach. By emphasizing healing in victims, accountability in offenders and the involvement of citizens, it is helping to create a smarter, more caring society.

Thank you to all those working together to bring about the healthier and safer world to which we aspire.

I wish you all a wonderful week!

David Johnston

2016



Restorative Justice Week 2016

November 20-27

Inspiring
innovation

Author Biographies

Ivo Aertsen is a Full Professor of Criminology at the University of Leuven (Belgium). He holds degrees of psychology, law and criminology from the same university. At the Leuven Institute of Criminology (LINC) he co-ordinates the Research Line on 'Restorative Justice and Victimology'. His main fields of research and teaching are victimology and restorative justice. Ivo Aertsen has been chair of the European Forum for Restorative Justice (EFRJ) from 2000-2004, and has coordinated COST Action A21 on Restorative Justice research in Europe from 2002-2006. Dr. Aertsen acts as Editor-in-Chief of 'Restorative Justice: An International Journal' (www.tandfonline.com/toc/rrej20/current#).

Jennifer Thompson is the founder and president of Healing Justice, co-author of the New York Times Bestseller "Picking Cotton: Our Memoir of Injustice and Redemption" and is a commissioner of the North Carolina Innocence Inquiry Commission. Jennifer is a nationally known advocate for criminal justice reform, focusing on the human impact of wrongful convictions, the fallibility of eyewitness testimony, the need to combat sexual violence, and the healing power of forgiveness.

Jacob MacIsaac is Community Safety Officer with Dalhousie University Security Services, and focuses on promoting restorative approaches within campus security and with other campus stakeholders. Previously, Jake spent over five years as the Lead Caseworker at Nova Scotia's largest restorative justice agency, overseeing case work staff and managing 700+ youth justice referrals from police, the prosecution service and the courts annually.

Melissa MacKay is Associate Director of Student Life at Dalhousie University, and has extensive experience working in higher education administration, specializing in developing education and support on issues of gender, sexualized violence and consent, as well as conflict resolution and restorative processes and approaches.

Jacob and Melissa were part of a three person facilitation team overseeing the restorative justice process at Dalhousie's Faculty of Dentistry in 2015 addressing climate and culture within the faculty. They were also co-authors of the "Report from the Restorative Justice Process at the Dalhousie University Faculty of Dentistry".

Marlyn Ferguson is the Arborcare Coordinator at Valley View Funeral Home in Surrey BC. She supports the bereaved. Her son Graeme was murdered in 2005 and she began the first Homicide Support Group in BC at the Funeral Home. She is a member of BC Victims of Homicide and Vice President of the BC Bereavement Helpline. Marlyn co-designed the program and has trained facilitators throughout the Province. She is the first recipient of the "Light of Hope" award, presented by the BC Police Victims Services.

Imam **Michael AbdurRashid** Taylor is the Ontario Regional Chaplain for the Correctional Service of Canada and is current Secretary of the Canadian Council of Imams. He holds a Master of Theological Studies degree from Regis College of the University of Toronto and is a graduate of the Rotman School of Management's Leadership Development Program. Michael has held varied positions including management roles with the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health and the Ontario Multifaith Council. He was appointed an Honorary Witness to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission Canada in October 2011.

Editor

Manon Buck works with the Restorative Justice and Victims Services Division of the Correctional Service of Canada, raising awareness about restorative justice on a national scale, supporting community partners in the application of restorative practices, and contributing to guidelines, policies, procedures, and practices using a restorative lens. Formerly, Manon worked as a Conflict Resolution Advisor for Canada Revenue Agency where she coached and mediated employees in conflict. Manon has also volunteered with YOUCAN, promoting and facilitating non-violent conflict resolution in schools and communities, and with the Collaborative Justice Program, facilitating restorative justice processes.

Restorative Justice Week 2016

November 20-27

Inspiring innovation

Building Restorative Justice Nation Wide

by Ivo Aertsen

I have been invited to reflect on some elements of successful implementation of restorative justice (RJ) at a national level. This in itself is a key question, not only for a pioneer country such as Canada, but for all our nations. RJ has come to be accepted on the world stage as an innovative approach to crime and injustice. It is promoted by international and regional institutions such as the United Nations and the Council of Europe. Many countries have adopted legislation on RJ, and various countries do provide organisational frameworks and funding.

Despite this political endorsement and institutionalisation, RJ is far from mainstream in these countries. Whilst both legislation and evidence convincingly testify to the promise of RJ, it remains on the margins. This creates a paradox. Even in countries where there is a sound legal basis and an adequate infrastructure for RJ programmes, the number of cases dealt with remains very low compared to the number of cases that, according to legal provisions, could be referred. Why is RJ so frequently neglected as a tool for addressing injustice? How should this paradox be addressed?

What follows are some reflections on the basis of personal observations, research, and involvement in practice, training and policy-making. I have identified a few key points that, according to my understanding, are crucial in order to develop and implement RJ in a sustainable way.

How broad should we conceive RJ?

It is frequently observed that there is no single definition of RJ. Is this lack of consensus on precise definition so important? To formulate and adhere to clear principles

and values of RJ seems much more relevant to me. My observation is that despite disagreement on the definition of RJ, there is a broad consensus on its core elements. These include: equal and balanced participation by all direct stakeholders; supporting dialogue that is grounded in the complex life-world of those involved, giving room to open discussion of the harms, their causes and their consequences; and focusing on restoration to victim and community. Indeed, these core elements of RJ could guide the work of all persons and agencies active in the broad field of criminal justice, and even within a larger community context.

This being said, in recent years we have witnessed a broadening of the scope of RJ programmes to offering 'restorative practices' to all kinds of conflict, tensions and harmful behaviour. While this might be considered a positive evolution in the application of restorative values, principles and skills throughout society - it also creates a risk that RJ becomes a vague conglomerate of practices without a clear direction. Also the focus on, or relationship with, criminal justice processes can become blurred or neglected.

How to ensure victims' participation and interests?

A great deal of debate has been going on regarding the extent to which victims are sufficiently and adequately involved in RJ processes. The position of the victim is still the Achilles' heel of many RJ programmes. There isn't always an 'equal balance' between the focus on the victim and on the offender. A comparative study on RJ practices in 36 European countriesⁱ revealed that in most countries access to RJ is defined through offender related criteria, such as type of offence, severity of the offence, and offending history. The few European countries (5) in which RJ functions as a generally available service - irrespective of

the offence or the stage of the criminal justice process - started their RJ programmes from a victim oriented perspective.

Additional comparative research on the position of the victim in RJ programmes in Europe has demonstrated that in practice, the institutional framework of a programme (e.g. being part of probation or being part of a victim service) does not significantly influence the victim orientation of the programme. Rather, the personal skills and approach of practitioners appear to be the most important factorsⁱⁱ.

RJ has repeatedly demonstrated that it serves the interests of victims (and offenders), and many argue that the offer of access to such programmes should be a right. It therefore becomes hard to defend the position of criminal justice authorities as gatekeepers with unique powers to select and refer cases for RJ. All people with a direct interest in the case should be given referral rights to RJ programmes, thus access should not depend on one sector or agency in society.

Where is the 'community' in RJ?

Although a fundamental part of RJ (in theory), the role of the community is far from clear in many programmes. What 'community' means, is highly dependent on cultural, societal and institutional contexts, and also on personal beliefs and experiences. Many RJ programmes do include those who surround and support the victim and offender in the process. Are we content with the limited role of the 'community of care' or do we preserve a role for the larger (geographical or social) community as well? Society might have its own needs and interests in dealing with crime - needs and interests that cannot be reduced to or defined by the immediate environment of victim and offender alone. How should the community be involved in RJ in a practical way?

Canada has a rich history in applying and furthering peacemaking circles. We felt very much inspired by these when we initiated a model of peacemaking circles in three European countriesⁱⁱⁱ. However, after two years of experimenting we had to conclude that it was difficult to identify individuals who could represent the larger community in RJ processes. What was missing is an intermediate mechanism, such as a committee, that could help in identifying and involving representatives of the larger community. Creative solutions are needed in order to make this larger community involvement possible.

Developing a collaborative model

RJ should not be the monopoly of one agency. Instead we should opt for far-reaching cooperation at the local, national, and even the international level. At the local level, it makes most sense to set up partnerships where both public sector and civil society organisations play a role. This offers the best chances to create broad societal support for RJ, to enhance the number of referrals including non-judicial and self-referrals, and to develop practices in a comprehensive and balanced way.

In some countries there are good experiences with local steering committees, where representatives from police services, the court, the public prosecutor's office, the bar association, victim support, probation, prison services and community agencies, gather on a regular basis to discuss issues and to develop coherent RJ policies for that region. Usually, these partner organisations sign a cooperation agreement where the objectives, operating principles and tasks are defined after mutual consultation. Institutes for higher education can also be part of such committees. This offers, for example, interesting possibilities to set up action-research or evaluative research on RJ practices.

A similar partnership is needed at the national level, where central policy bodies meet in order to elaborate and implement RJ in a coordinated way across the country: a 'responsibility centre' that takes care of and has the legal power to adopt and implement a national strategy and action plan on RJ. National policies and local practices should go hand in hand. A further finding of the European overview studyⁱ might be relevant here: those countries (7) that have RJ available in a nationwide network providing decent caseloads are all countries with a clear bottom-up development followed by strong national policies including legislation. In these countries, RJ started with a few local pilot projects that gradually expanded and ultimately influenced national policy.

The role of the state

It is my opinion that the state's role is to facilitate RJ: (1) the state must provide a legal and institutional framework, including appropriate funding for local programmes, and a national forum for policy making, (2) the state must ensure the right of equal and effective access of all citizens to RJ programmes, and (3) the state must foresee legal safeguards and support practice standards for those participating in RJ processes.

Hence, the state should not restrict the applicability of RJ to some types of crimes or some types of offenders, but should enable it in the widest possible way while supporting ongoing development of good practice. Through RJ, justice can become an opportunity for citizens again, rather than a risk or a threat. It can help to restore criminal justice in its original function: as an effective system for restoring social peace under the rule of law.

References

- ⁱ Dünkel F., Grzywa-Holten J. & Horsfield P. (eds.) (2015). *Restorative Justice and Mediation in Penal Matters. A stock-taking of legal issues, implementation strategies and outcomes in 36 European countries* (Vol. 1+2). Monchengladbach: Forum Verlag Godesberg.
- ⁱⁱ Vanfraechem, I., Bolivar, D. & Aertsen, I. (eds.) (2015). *Victims and Restorative Justice*. New York: Routledge.
- ⁱⁱⁱ Weitekamp, E. (ed.) (2015). *Developing Peacemaking Circles in a European context* (Volume I: Main Report; Volume II: Additional Reports and Documents). Tübingen: Institut für Kriminologie der Universität Tübingen.

**Register for the
National Restorative
Justice Symposium
in Halifax, Nova Scotia on
November 21 and 22, 2016**

**Hosted by the Nova Scotia RJ Program, the Nova
Scotia Department of Justice, and the Schulich
School of Law**

Restorative Justice Week 2016

November 20-27

Inspiring **innovation**

From Harm to Healing: Journey to Restoration after Wrongful Conviction

by Jennifer Thompson

On June 30, 1995, I, like many others in North Carolina, sat glued to the television as a young man took his first steps of freedom after being wrongly imprisoned for a crime he had not committed. Ronald Cotton had been given two life sentences plus 50 years for a double rape that happened on July 29, 1984. Now, after eleven years, he was free, embracing his family and beginning the task of putting his life back together at the age of 33. I on the other hand became paralyzed, suffocating on fear, confusion, and shame.

My life had been turned upside down when the DNA test had revealed that the man I had picked in the police lineup eleven years ago - who I swore had raped me at knifepoint, threatened to kill me if I screamed, and then chased me through the dark as I ran for my life - was innocent. As I watched Ronald Cotton walk out of the Alamance County courthouse, tears rolled down my face. What would I do now? Were my children in danger? Where could I hide?

It would take two years before the answers would be clear, but in the meantime I was in full trauma mode. The children could not answer the phone, could not open the front door, and were not allowed in the yard unless I was there. Everyone was looking for the girl from the Cotton case, and I made sure I could not be found. By April 1997, I was tired and needed help. Although I did not know what that meant at the time, I knew who to call; Captain Mike Gauldin, the detective who had first investigated the case. He had anticipated this moment since the day Ronald was released.

Mike had been the person who met me at the hospital that night in 1984 and talked to me with respect and dignity. He had sat through both trials in 1985 and 1987 and worried about my emotional and spiritual health. Mike had also been tasked with telling me the news of the DNA test and watched me crumple to the ground in tears. Now I needed him again: Would he please arrange a meeting with Ronald and myself, somewhere private where journalists could not find me?

After dropping my seven-year old triplets off at the Burlington police department, I was taken to a church, about a mile from where my life had been forever changed thirteen years before. As I sat in the pastor's office I wondered what was about to unfold. I imagined that Ronald might threaten me, scream awful words of rage and anger, and tell me to go to hell. What I never expected was that he would forgive. When this giant of a man came through the door, my legs were weak as water, my eyes stung with tears flowing out, and my heart began to ache. "Ronald, if I spent every minute of every hour telling you how sorry I am, could you ever find it in your heart to forgive me?"

What happened next changed me forever as he looked in my eyes, took my hand, began to cry, and said: "Jennifer, I forgave you years ago, and I am not angry at you. You were a victim and I was a victim. I am sorry for what happened to you." And in that moment of sheer grace and mercy, I began to heal. The broken places of my heart and soul began to find their way back together after being in shambles for so long.

Ronald and I spent the next two hours talking about our losses, our hurts and our harms, all at the hands of a single person, a man named Bobby Poole. Bobby Poole had broken me, ripped apart all of my dreams and goals. He had raped me and another woman less than an hour later. He sat back and read the newspapers with full knowledge that an innocent man was being arrested, tried and

convicted for crimes he had committed. And while Ronald was standing in that courtroom being told he was the worst menace to society the judge had ever seen, Bobby Poole destroyed six other women's lives before being caught in April of 1985.

Ronald Cotton and I left that day hugging each other in the parking lot of the church, changed people, friends bound by overlapping harm and healing. Little did we know that we were engaging then in what is now known as restorative justice. And little did I know that this would become my life's work, my calling and passion for over two decades. Throughout this work I would be blessed to meet so many courageous and inspiring people who our justice system had failed. I would hear of unimaginable loss, pain, and horrors - from precious years lost to wrongful imprisonment to families irreparably devastated by both crime and injustice.

In the spring of 2015, Ronald and I received the Special Courage Award from the Office for Victims of Crime, an arm of the Department of Justice. As we walked across stage, I carried with me all those stories, the ones I had had the privilege to hear and the ones still hidden. And on that same day, I launched Healing Justice, a non-profit organization dedicated to turning all of the harm caused by wrongful convictions into healing. I was able to hire our Executive Director, Katie Monroe, whose story is as heartbreaking and redemptive as any out there. Katie spent more than a decade working tirelessly to free her mother after she was charged with murder for a death that was in fact a suicide.

Healing Justice is committed to addressing the harm and healing for all those touched by wrongful convictions - exonerees, original crime victims, both of their families, police, prosecutors, defenders, jurors, and judges. Healing Justice has three overarching goals: to explore the application of restorative justice principles in exoneration cases; to organize the provision of direct support and services to exonerees, original crime survivors and victims, and both of their families during and after exoneration; and to create opportunities for unifying the diverse voices of those affected by wrongful convictions in order to effect policy reform.

In March 2016, we held our first restorative justice retreat. Seventeen men and women attended, five of whom were original crime victims and twelve of whom were exonerees or their support people. For forty-eight hours we sat in circle to share our harm, talk about the hurt, and help each other heal. One original victim expressed: "Never have I been able to share my story and thoughts in such a safe and caring space. To be able to sit with others and share my experiences was just incredible. The support allowed me to move forward in my healing process."

Similarly, an exoneree described the retreat as "the best therapy I have had in my decade of freedom." Another said, "It gave me strength to see all of the love in these human hearts. It made me go way back to a more happy time I had forgot."

Restorative justice is a set of practices that helps participants to explore, in depth and in safety, the nature of the harms they have endured, the extent of the damage done, and the types of remedies to help them to move forward in the aftermath of those harms. Healing Justice's retreats aim to do just this.

However, beyond our retreats, we know that much more must be done. The vast majority of original victims have still not been identified or helped in any way. And exonerees still struggle in many ways to recover and rebuild their lives. We are actively working with both government and private partners to explore and address the wide spectrum of needs present in the aftermath of wrongful convictions. But at the end of the day, perhaps the most important tool we have is simply to provide witness to these very important stories, to share space together and be present to the harm, and to thereby create a pathway for the journey back home.

**Register for the
National Restorative
Justice Symposium
in Halifax, Nova Scotia on
November 21 and 22, 2016**

Hosted by the Nova Scotia RJ Program, the Nova
Scotia Department of Justice, and the Schulich
School of Law

www.NovaScotia.ca/just/Restorative-Justice-Symposium-2016
Terry.Rice@novascotia.ca — 902-424-0123

Restorative Justice Week 2016 November 20-27

Inspiring **innovation**

More than a Circle Meeting at Dalhousie University

*Reflections from the restorative
facilitators leading the breakthrough
change process at Dalhousie
University's Faculty of Dentistry.*

by Jacob MacIsaac & Melissa MacKay

Much has been written about the use of the restorative response to the offensive Facebook posts made by a group of fourth year male dentistry students toward their female classmates. We should know, we wrote a whole report about it. You can find it here: rahalifax2016.com/resources.html. It's well worth a careful read as a case study, detailing the initial rounds of the process, the underpinning values, and the robust way a restorative approach was used as an agent of change on the various interconnected issues that inform the climate and culture within the Faculty of Dentistry.

Restorative processes usually begin with a certain amount of "prep" work focused on getting participants ready for an upcoming restorative conference. Part of this prep work entails getting to the truth of what happened. This approach was more than a traditional "just the facts" investigation asking, "What happened?" but focused on answering, among many other questions, "What matters most about what happened?", "What are the connections between the involved parties?" and "What are their responsibilities to one another?" We set out to find truth as it was held relationally. This allowed us to tailor a process to the needs of the participants and better understand the context and climate in the Faculty of Dentistry.

Thus, much of the truth finding phase was completed using a restorative approach, gathering certain participants together, often

using a circle format, to provide access to educational workshops and opportunities, engage in careful self-reflection, and to develop commitments and norms as process participants. All of this was necessary restorative work. Rather than prep work in advance of a main-event final restorative conference, all of this combined was the main-event. This hard work would take the men responsible for causing harm past the initial impulse to "say sorry" to do the hard work of truly "being sorry". It took months to accomplish. Every step involved engaging in restorative work before ever sitting in circle with the women to hear how they've been impacted.

It was immediately clear during this initial phase of the process that the women impacted by the Facebook posts were most interested in using this incident to transform their faculty into a safe and healthy learning communityⁱ. This would take the restorative process beyond the classroom or clinic floor and out into the profession, engaging the community in reflection and discussions around professionalism, patient care, and public trust.

There were many voices, both internal and external to the institution that weighed in about the suitability of a restorative approach in this situation. During this time, we found it extremely helpful as process facilitators, to intentionally anchor ourselves to two groups of restorative experts, one local and the other international. These groups served as knowledge keepers and process advisers. We made ourselves accountable to these intentional learning communities and routinely checked in to ensure our approach stayed consistent with our values throughout.

As outlined in more detail within the RJ report, in order to assess the work within the process and its outcomes, it is important to clarify the misconceptions and misinformation about the scope and nature of the processⁱⁱ.

- The restorative process established under Dalhousie's Sexual Harassment Policy was not limited to the specific conduct of the male students in the Facebook group.
- The process began with, and involved throughout, a robust and in-depth relationally based investigation of what happened leading up to and within the Facebook group, the impacts of the group, and the related climate and culture.
- The 12 Facebook group members in the restorative process participated fully in, and were fully cooperative with, the investigation from its earliest stages.
- Apart from the 12 men, not all participants engaged with the process in the same manner or with each of the many components of the process. The level of participation was determined by the party based on their capacity and ability to participate. For some this meant only being kept informed of the progress of the process, or selecting which aspects were important for them to join in on, while others felt it was important to be involved and engaged in every stage of the process. For those who chose not to participate in the process it was imperative that we arranged other supports for them, and that we met their needs for safety. It was also critical that we offered a constant point of entry and that the level of participation was entirely flexible.
- Many parts of the restorative process were held in private in order to ensure safe space conducive to open and honest discussion among the parties. It was not, however, a "secret" process.
- Given the broad scope of effects and harms related to the content of the men's Facebook group and the intense publicity surrounding it, there were many people affected and harmed by this situation. The restorative process was attentive and responsive to both the breadth and depth of the harms.

- The restorative process was not mandated to determine punishment but, rather, to engage those who caused or contributed to harm in a process to understand and address that harm.
- The restorative process involved bringing parties together into circle processes. However, this was only one element of the process.
- Those who chose to participate were not required to admit guilt in the restorative process or any other process. While the restorative process did not require an admission of “guilt”, it did require participants to reflect and give account of their actions, role and responsibilities for the harms identified.
- The restorative process at Dalhousie did not violate the letter or spirit of the Provincial Moratorium on the referral of cases to restorative justice within the criminal justice system in which gender and sexual violence is involved.

It was never our intention to produce a report with a fixed set of recommendations to be implemented along a standardized timeline. Throughout the process participants were encouraged to consider deeply how what they have found and learned should be used to address the harms and impacts and to improve climate and culture moving forward. The ideas and commitments they decided upon regarding the way forward that emerged from the restorative process are not intended as a “to do” or “check” list. Instead they reflect ideas about the ways things might be done differently because addressing climate and culture is about doing the things we do differently, not just doing different things.

The intensive process undertaken has been complete for over 19 months as of this writing however, we remain engaged using the collective and continued learnings to support participants as they build a healthier community within the faculty and strive to work differently. It was important to us that we did not “cut and run” after issuing a report. We chose a path consistent with restorative principles. Indeed, this path is consistent with how restorative processes work; there is a plan to do the work or restoration, the plan must be fulfilled, and that takes support.

Just as the “prep” work described earlier is core restorative work, the follow up is essential to the work of restorative justice. The last year has allowed us to support truly meaningful work with a new group of Dentistry and Dental Hygiene students as they consider their roles and responsibilities in shaping the culture within the faculty and the academic and social community to which they belong. We have also had the opportunity to work with a group of faculty interested in disrupting harmful aspects of structural systems in favor of relationships, values and transparency.

As members of the Dalhousie community ourselves, we see this work as an important example for other units and departments at our university and among post-secondary campuses generally. We are keenly aware of the need to create campus communities that are just and healthy and which allow students, staff and faculty to learn and grow safely.

If there is one innovation to pass on from our experience as facilitators of this continuing process, we would highlight the possibilities to expand restorative approaches to build healthy communities before there is a crisis to respond to. Our challenge and work ahead relies in asking ourselves, “How can we be thinking more relationally in and across classrooms, residences, athletics or operations (like Security Services and Human Resources) to create a climate and culture that is authentic, inclusive, safe and resilient?”

Video clips from offering a more fulsome exploration of the potential for restorative approaches on campuses and elsewhere can be found here:

www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLFcZjYDP_3PhJsPzRI8CsFapxUEuPJocp&app=desktop.

References

- ⁱ Llewellyn, J, A Dempsey and J Smith. "An Unfamiliar Justice Story: Restorative Justice and Education Reflections on Dalhousie's Facebook Incident 2015." Our Schools/Our Selves Fall (2015): 43-56. web. <https://www.policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/National%20Office/2015/12/OS121_Restorative_Justice.pdf>.
- ⁱⁱ Llewellyn, J, J MacIaac and M MacKay. Report from The Restorative Justice Process at the Dalhousie University Faculty of Dentistry. Halifax, 2015. web. <<http://rahalifax2016.com/docs/Dentistry%20Report.pdf>>.

**Register for the
National Restorative
Justice Symposium
in Halifax, Nova Scotia on
November 21 and 22, 2016**

**Hosted by the Nova Scotia RJ Program, the Nova
Scotia Department of Justice, and the Schulich
School of Law**

Restorative Justice Week 2016

November 20-27

Inspiring **innovation**

Seating Arrangements

by Marlyn Ferguson

When you enter a church do you know where you are going to sit, or do you stand at the back, ponder and then decide? Will it be the back, the front, right or left, far side or centre? Hmmmm. Our family has always sat centre aisle, left hand side, and three quarters of the way down.

On July 9th 2005, my husband Ian and I got to sit in the very front row, centre aisle, left hand side. Behind us sat many family and friends waiting anxiously for the ceremony to begin. In the centre aisle stood our soon to be son-in-law and our daughter. The **Bride's** family on the left – **Groom's** family on the right.

Those are the seating arrangements for weddings.

Sixteen days later Ian and I were again sitting in the front row, centre aisle, but this time on the right hand side. Behind us sat many family and friends waiting anxiously... In the centre aisle stood our son Graeme's casket. The **Deceased's** family on the Right – **Pall Bearers** on the left.

Those are the seating arrangements for funerals.

In the following months, we were told that Graeme had been transporting 40 kilos of cocaine on a Greyhound bus from Vancouver to Ottawa. On reaching Ottawa he changed his mind, left the suitcases containing the cocaine on the bus and hitchhiked back to Vancouver. About two weeks later he was "ordered" back to Ottawa to retrieve the suitcases. He refused. He was then kidnapped from a hotel in Ottawa and taken to a warehouse in Montreal where he was stripped, chained to the floor, strapped into a chair, and beaten and starved for six days until he finally agreed to go to the bus depot to retrieve the suitcases.

He collapsed on the street in front of the bus station and died from a clot in his lungs because of the beating.

Over the next four years, seven men were arrested and charged. Five of the accused were caught and sentenced quickly, the other two were on the run for quite some time. We thought one in particular might have left the country or be dead. The police told us never to give up hope, that they were determined to catch these men and this gave us much encouragement.

All seven were ultimately apprehended. They pled guilty to numerous offences and were sentenced to federal prison terms. We travelled Delta to Ottawa three times in four years for these sentencing hearings.

We were again sitting in the front row right hand side, this time in a Courtroom in Ottawa. In the same row sat our daughter, other family members and some friends. Behind us sat four police officers who were involved in the investigation – We were all waiting, anxiously. In the centre sat the Judge. The **Victim's** family on the right – the **Accused** on the left.

Those are the seating arrangements for sentencing hearings.

Following the sentencing hearings, trying to process everything that had happened to our family, I remember two books a Mennonite pastor had shared with me many years ago: Howard Zehr's *The Little Book of Restorative Justice* and *Changing Lenses: Restorative Justice for Our Times*. As a result, I started the process of trying to connect with one of the offenders who was only 19 years old when he was involved in Graeme's murder. We had been shocked to learn that someone so young could be involved in such a violent crime. We thought that if we met with him maybe he would have a chance to turn his life around; he would see that being involved in that kind of life, you end up in jail or dead.

In July 2008, Ian and I were sitting in a room in a prison in Québec. To the left of us sat David Gustafson, a mediator from Community Justice Initiatives Association who had accompanied us from Langley, BC. In front of us, across a table, sat the youngest of the offenders – We communicated with great intensity.

Those are the seating arrangements for "face to face meetings".

One day later (2 days before the 3rd anniversary of Graeme's death),

Ian and I were sitting in a room in another Québec prison. To the right of us is a Parole Officer, the youngest of the offenders, his lawyer and his parents. In front of them sat the Parole Panel. Behind us sat David Gustafson, and two others. In front of us there is man who is in control of the sound system and behind him in a glass box are the interpreters – That day we could only listen, intently.

Those are the seating arrangements for parole hearings.

In March of this year, Ian and I, accompanied by mediators Dave Gustafson and Serge Charbonneau, met face-to-face with two of the other offenders. We met with one in the prison where he is still incarcerated, and the following day we met with the other in a half-way house. Having these two meetings take place a day apart felt like the right thing to do.

These two men were the key players in our son's death. We needed to meet with them. This time, walking into another prison somehow seemed familiar – weird I know. The offender was awaiting our arrival in a hallway outside the room where we would be meeting. He put out his hand in greeting and thanked us for coming. He was also the father of the offender who we met in 2008. As I reflect on this and write about it, it was as though he was welcoming us to his home – well really he was! We weren't scared, more anxious to hear what he had to say.

The next day, I was more anxious, especially driving to the half-way house. We knew that the man we were meeting was responsible for beating Graeme. I wondered how I would feel coming face to face with this man. Would I be strong enough to bear hearing the details of what he had done? I prayed for wisdom and peace.

Restorative justice – what did that mean to us? Our desire to meet these men was generated by wanting to know more of the facts surrounding our son's death and telling them of the impacts this has had on our family. We wanted to hear these two men take full responsibility for their violent actions. We hoped to see genuine remorse. We were anxious to hear, as well, about the impact their violent, criminal behavior had had on their own families and how they desired to have these relationships healed. Most importantly, we wanted to hear that they were taking major steps to change their lives.

We believe that we received all of that. These two men recognized, acknowledged, and took full responsibility for the harm they had done to Graeme and our family. Their apologies seemed heartfelt and sincere. They described the steps they are taking to change their lives and promised us that they would not be involved in violent behavior again or be responsible for another person's death. What did these two men receive from us? What one described as a meeting he had long desired. Beyond that, a gift of grace: our encouragement and our genuine forgiveness, a handshake and a hug. And a month later: a letter thanking them for having the courage to meet with us and be honest, not just with us but with themselves. Again, we encouraged them to strive to change – no more harm, ever, at their hands. We had no desire to meet any of the other four accused.

We believe in restorative justice. What other chance is there for victims and offenders to come together face to face, eye to eye (and in one of our meetings, knee to knee)?

Those were the seating arrangements for our victim offender mediation.

We have received full support from our daughter and son in law, from our extended family, and from our friends. We feel we have an opportunity and maybe a duty – in sharing our story – to show what restorative justice can do for all those involved. I'm not quite sure that Graeme's friends fully understand this process. We hope that one day they will.

Note: Marlyn was able to access victim-offender mediation through the Correctional Service of Canada's Restorative Opportunities Program; a program originally developed by the Fraser Region Community Justice Initiatives Association (www.cjibc.org) in 1990.

**Register for the
National Restorative
Justice Symposium
in Halifax, Nova Scotia on
November 21 and 22, 2016**

**Hosted by the Nova Scotia RJ Program, the Nova
Scotia Department of Justice, and the Schulich
School of Law**

www.NovaScotia.ca/just/Restorative-Justice-Symposium-2016
Terry.Rice@novascotia.ca — 902-424-0123

Restorative Justice Week 2016

November 20-27

Inspiring innovation

A Restorative Approach for Terrorism Offences?

by Michael Taylor

As a society, we can accept that the challenge of responding to religiously motivated terrorism probably lies at the far limits of our collective imagination. In this reflection, I seek to plant the seeds for considering restorative justice as a potential means of starting to heal the massive damage caused by terrorism-related offences.

Taking responsibility for harm caused lies at the very heart of restorative justice, but one sad reality is that many people who commit acts of religiously motivated terrorism feel justified in their actions because of those religious beliefs. Before a restorative approach can bear any fruit, a theological shift in radicalized beliefs must occur. While these individuals are often unwilling to make that shift, I remain optimistic that it is possible given time, space and opportunity.

Restorative approaches offer opportunities for victims who seek to understand why they were victimized and for offenders to be held morally accountable for their actions and to make amends. For those who seek it, restorative approaches offer a means of returning to, or creating, right relationships.

In Canada we have been victims of actual and planned acts of terrorism and individuals have been convicted and incarcerated. Considering a restorative approach to address the harm caused by those individuals seems a particularly onerous undertaking but it is important to go beyond the initial apprehension and abhorrence in order to find some hope of righting at least some of the harm caused.

The root of societal apprehension and abhorrence probably lies in the nature of the crime of terrorism. The public generally experiences crime from the vantage point of third party observers, but in cases of

terrorism, the general public “are more likely to experience terrorism as their own victimization”.¹ The impact of the crime is personal; the population is terrorized and are in fact vicarious victims. Thus, in the grand scheme of potential restorative approaches to terrorism-related offences, the public has a role and a resulting stake in any restorative efforts.

Though this might be considered a daunting task, I believe that restorative justice should not be ruled out in these cases. If, as a society, we aspire to peace and right relationships with all people and national realities, even the painful and difficult ones, we must understand that there are possibilities of holding perpetrators responsible beyond the debt that they might pay to society by incarceration. We must also reach awareness that moral harms – the betrayal of membership to a shared society, the random targeting of the public to instill fear, the disruption of the general feeling of safety and security, and the grotesque use of religion to justify harming the public – can be repaired.

While incarceration provides society with a tool to hold convicted people responsible for their actions, it also provides correctional programming that helps individuals develop cognitive skills that allow them to reflect on their actions and recognize and change the kind of distorted thinking that can lead to acts of harming others. However, in the case of radicalized offenders, this process is incomplete without an accompanying resetting of religious perspectives. Access and exposure to religious leaders that model moderate, mainstream interpretations of religious texts and religious practice and beliefs, is a critical aspect of this reset. The wider community might also play a part in modelling mainstream religious belief and offering support during incarceration.

These three planks: correctional programming, access to religious leaders and community involvement can lead to the possibility of a terrorism offender being open to a restorative justice approach to righting the harm that they caused. It is seeking those possibilities that call for a closer examination of the crime of terrorism, those impacted, and those causing the harm.

Concentric Circles of Victims

In my own reflection on seeking possibilities, I visualize concentric circles of victims harmed by terrorist acts, the widest circle of victims being the general public.

Moving inwardly, a second circle of victims formed of people that have similar ethnic origins, political or religious adherence to the perpetrator. They are harmed by the actions of the perpetrator in that they might be blamed or found guilty by association by the wider society.

The families of the perpetrator form the next, tightening, circle. They might experience tremendous shame, and feel a sense of guilt or responsibility for the perpetrator's actions. In religiously motivated terrorism crimes, they are regularly ostracised by the public and labelled. They too are victims of the crime.

In the circle that is closest to the perpetrator are the direct victims or targets of the acts themselves. They live with the aftermath of the acts or planned acts. Finally, at the center is the person doing the harm.

In view of seeking a restorative justice approach to righting the harms caused, each circle of people has their own unique needs and each should be presented with opportunities for healing.

Nationwide Healing

There have been instances of restorative work done in the case of nationwide harm. The landmark Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) of South Africa sought to mend an entirely broken society that had been fractured by decades of racism and marginalization that resulted in unspeakable violence. Here in Canada, the recent TRC sought to address the harms caused by residential schools. The Commission's aim was to "reveal to Canadians the complex truth about the history and the ongoing legacy of the church-run residential schools... and guide and inspire a process of truth and healing, leading toward reconciliation within Aboriginal families, and between Aboriginal peoples and non-Aboriginal communities, churches, governments, and Canadians generally"ⁱⁱ.

In retrospect, these two national restorative initiatives were tremendous undertakings by governments that sought to right historic wrongs and eventually grabbed the attention of most of the people impacted by those wrongdoings. Eventually, both Commissions achieved the best possible outcome from a seemingly daunting and insurmountable undertaking.

The approach of a powerful entity (government) to a victimized public (Black and Aboriginal people) seeking reconciliation, with many observers (general public), seems like an impossible task, but the stakes were high enough. Everyone concerned knew that without something being done, the historic harm would continue without abatement leaving an unhealed wound in our society.

Restorative justice as "a non-violent form of community empowerment that can help promote reconciliation between mutually hostile communities"ⁱⁱⁱ remains a model for international restorative justice initiatives.

There were many people that doubted whether the South African government and later the Government of Canada could ever do enough to address the tremendous harm that was caused; however the results of these two TRCs have allayed those early fears. The architects of the South African and Canadian Commissions worked beyond what was an extremely difficult task to air and correct extraordinary harms with the aim of making right relationships.

Our society has been deeply impacted by terrorism cases and we can become immobilized when considering what might happen after individuals are convicted. With the TRCs as examples, we must seek answers and find a way to hold perpetrators of terrorism responsible while finding opportunities for those who have caused harm to make amends driven by their own remorse. We must seek a more complete justice that can heal broken parts of our society. This will lead to a society that is safer from catastrophic harms.

There is a growing urgency for broader restorative justice engagement from Muslim faith leaders and communities. *Spiritual roots of restorative justice – an Islamic perspective*^{iv}, provides a foundation for this work. Furthermore, Victims with Diverse Voices^v presents a small demonstration project. These responses can serve as building blocks for a much larger response to increasingly complicated needs that result from religiously motivated crime.

References

- ⁱ Pemberton, Antony, Terrorism, Forgiveness and Restorative Justice (July 16, 2014). *Oñati Socio-Legal Series*, Vol. 4, No. 3, 2014. P. 372
- ⁱⁱ Truth and Reconciliation Canada. *Honouring the Truth, Reconciling for the Future: Summary of the Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*. Winnipeg: Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2015. P. 23
- ⁱⁱⁱ Johnstone, Gerry and Daniel W Van Ness. 2007. *Handbook Of Restorative Justice*. Cullompton: Willan. P. 383
- ^{iv} *Spiritual roots of restorative justice – An Islamic Perspective: A collection of faith community perspectives*, 22-24. Ontario, Canada: Ontario Multifaith Council on Spiritual & Religious Care. 2000
- ^v *Victims with Diverse Voices* <http://iqra.ca/2010/restorative-justice-project-for-gta-muslim-community/>

**Register for the
National Restorative
Justice Symposium
in Halifax, Nova Scotia on
November 21 and 22, 2016**

**Hosted by the Nova Scotia RJ Program, the Nova
Scotia Department of Justice, and the Schulich
School of Law**

www.NovaScotia.ca/just/Restorative-Justice-Symposium-2016
Terry.Rice@novascotia.ca — 902-424-0123



Restorative Justice Week 2016

November 20-27

Inspiring **innovation**

Recent News and Developments

Canadian Highlights

Release of a Data Collection Report on Restorative Justice in the Canadian Criminal Justice Sector

The Federal-Provincial-Territorial (FPT) Working Group on Restorative Justice (RJ) has released a data collection report that presents a “snapshot” of RJ practices in the criminal justice sector that were funded, supported or provided by FPT governments in 2009/10. The report shows that 13 ministries funded or supported over 400 RJ programs and that about 34,000 adult and youth criminal matters were facilitated with RJ in Canada. This report is crucial as it helps demonstrate the extent to which RJ is being used across Canada.

The Department of Justice is creating a Map of Restorative Justice in Canada

Justice Canada is developing a comprehensive inventory of RJ programs currently operating throughout the country that deal directly with those harmed in criminal matters. This project will utilize GIS software to map each of the program locations. The map will depict different variables including whether the program serves Indigenous Peoples only, whether the program serves youth, adults or both, etc. The map is projected to be complete by winter 2016.

In collaboration with Public Safety and the Correctional Service of Canada, the Department of Justice will also be reaching out to these RJ programs via an online survey to collect detailed operational data with the intention of addressing the large information gaps that exist with regards to Canadian RJ programs. Survey results are expected to be compiled in 2017.

Victim-Sensitive Standards for Restorative Justice in British Columbia

For the past 2 years, a group of BC community-based RJ providers initiated a project to develop victim-sensitive standards in RJ. The project emerged in response to growing interest in quality assurance from victim-serving agencies and other RJ referral sources, as well as RJ practitioners themselves.

The working group has been conducting focus groups, individual interviews, and an online survey among crime victims, victim services representatives, RJ providers, and other stakeholders across the province. They also conducted extensive documentary research on existing standards in RJ and related fields within Canada and internationally. As of the summer of 2016, the group has finalized a document outlining a series of recommended principles and practice standards for RJ services in BC. You can obtain a copy by emailing Aaron Lyons, Fraser Region Community Justice Initiatives, at aaronlyons@cjibc.org.

Alberta Produces Resources to Help Further Restorative Practices in Schools

Alberta Education created a short video that introduces the use of restorative practices in schools. The goal is to encourage the use of these practices to build school staff's capacity to deal with problem behavior and nurture healthy relationships among students. To watch the video, visit: education.alberta.ca/restorative-practices/what-are-restorative-practices/everyone/video.

The Alberta Centre for Child, Family and Community Research released the Supporting Every Student Learning Series, a set of resources for educators aimed at enhancing welcoming, caring, respectful and safe learning environments. The series provides information on research and evidence-based practices through recorded "TedTalk" style presentations and conversation guides, with links for further information.

One of the volumes focuses on restorative practices and features Dr. Brenda Morrison from Simon Fraser University. The series discusses RJ principles as well as practical ways of applying restorative practices in schools. For more information on the series, visit: www.research4children.com/theme/common/page.cfm?i=10003043.

Manitoba Proclaims First-of-its-kind Restorative Justice Act

Manitoba has officially proclaimed its RJ Act to rehabilitate offenders through reconciliation with victims and the community at large. The foundation of the Act is that cases can be handled outside of the traditional criminal prosecution process to provide an opportunity for the offender and the victim and/or community to seek a resolution that repairs the harm caused by the offense, and to address underlying mental health conditions, addictions or other behavioural issues. The focus is on the needs of the victims and the offenders rather than on punishment.

The RJ Act also creates an advisory council made up of community and government representatives to oversee the implementation of a five-year strategy that includes:

- Creating a new nine-person prosecution unit to help significantly increase referrals to RJ programs.
- Funding new and expanded mental health and drug courts.
- Supporting RJ programs in the Bloodvein First Nation, in Portage la Prairie, and in Morden.
- Investing \$320,000 to create RJ opportunities in the Westman and Parkland regions, and for Métis residents of Winnipeg, including \$10,000 for Candace House to help create a business plan to help deliver victim supports.
- Establishing a restitution recovery program to help victims collect court-ordered payments.
- Creating 5 RJ hubs throughout the province to support existing programs and coordinate services.
- Improving training and building awareness.
- Enhancing supports for victims through the entire process.
- Identifying supports for chronic, low-risk offenders.

New Restorative Justice Court Planned for Winnipeg

Work is underway to establish Winnipeg's North End as the future home of the first RJ court in the country.

Crown prosecutors at the new court will work closely with community partners to determine which individuals would benefit most from the RJ model.

It is anticipated that minor crimes will be heard before the new court, as well as crimes that can be linked to larger social issues. The RJ court will also help divert cases away from the courthouses in order to ease the present backlog.

Lanark County School and Youth Centre Outreach

The Lanark County Community Justice Program has recently expanded their services to provide support for the implementation of RJ approaches in schools and youth centres. The Be Strong initiative engages youth and other stakeholders in learning and applying practices that develop individual social and emotional skills that are fundamental to the creation of healthy relationships in a caring and safe community. Strategies for implementation are developed collaboratively, and may include direct work with groups of students, development of learning modules to incorporate into existing curricula, training of school staff, and outreach to parents and other community members. For further information visit: www.commjustice.org.

Nova Scotia Announces the Expansion of its Restorative Justice Program to Adults across the Province

In 2011 the province established two pilot sites for adult RJ. The intention of the pilot project was to better support victims, reduce court load, impact positively on offenders, reduce repeat offenses, and enhance public confidence in the justice system. After careful evaluation it is clear that all these objectives have been met. Based on these positive results and success in youth RJ, Nova Scotia is working toward making RJ available to adults across the province, with a target date of November 1, 2016.

Official Launch of Relationships First Consortium of Newfoundland

Newfoundland and Labrador has launched the Relationships First: RJ in Education Consortium. The Consortium brings together educational stakeholders across the province with a shared goal of encouraging healthy and inclusive relationships in schools and promoting individual worth and well-being through RJ practices. Relationships First offers professional development sessions, comprised of hands-on learning experiences that will support professionals in taking steps towards change and transformation. The Consortium also provides facilitation services in cases of serious harm. For information, videos, and more, visit: relationshipsfirstnl.com.

**Register for the
National Restorative
Justice Symposium
in Halifax, Nova Scotia on
November 21 and 22, 2016**

Hosted by the Nova Scotia RJ Program, the Nova Scotia Department of Justice, and the Schulich School of Law

www.NovaScotia.ca/just/Restorative-Justice-Symposium-2016
Terry.Rice@novascotia.ca — 902-424-0123



Restorative Justice Week 2016

November 20-27

Inspiring **innovation**

Recent News and Developments

International Highlights

The Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Adopts a Resolution on Restorative Justice

On May 26, 2016, the United Nations (UN) Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice adopted a resolution on restorative justice (RJ) in criminal matters, which was tabled by Canada and co-sponsored by Costa Rica, Ecuador, Finland, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Peru, Thailand United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States. The resolution was then submitted to the UN Economic and Social Council for final adoption on July 26, 2016.

The resolution requests the Secretary-General to seek comments on the use and application of the 2002 “Basic principles on the use of RJ programmes in criminal matters” and on national experiences and best practices in using and applying RJ processes. It also proposes to convene a meeting of RJ experts to review the use and application of the principles as well as new developments and innovative approaches in the area of RJ.

Restorative Justice and Domestic Violence - Updates

“Restorative Justice in cases of domestic violence: Best practice examples between increasing mutual understanding and awareness of specific protection needs”, is a two-year EU-funded project that began in 2014. The project aims to generate new knowledge on practices of RJ and domestic violence and to identify criteria for offering restorative approaches to such cases, in accordance with the Victims’ Directive.

The project has seen numerous updates in the last year, including the completion of RJ and Domestic Violence: A Practitioners Guide. The guide was presented on January 26th at the RJ and Domestic Violence: Challenges for Implementation international conference, where the project partners also presented their project’s findings.

The guide, information on the conference, as well as information on the project can be found here:

jars.org.uk/content/RJandDV.

Multi-million Dollar Boost for Restorative Justice in New Zealand

The New Zealand Government has announced an increase in funding of \$16.2 million over the next 4 years to help RJ providers meet the growing demand for their services. The investment recognizes the increasing popularity of RJ as an effective tool for reducing reoffending and harm. Data from 2008 to 2013 shows the reoffending rate for offenders who participated in RJ was 15% lower over the following 12 month period than comparable offenders, with 26% fewer offences per offender.

The number of cases referred for a RJ assessment has tripled since 2014. This follows changes to the Sentencing Act in December 2014 that requires courts to refer eligible cases for an assessment to see whether RJ is appropriate.

The United States Steps Closer to Healing with a National Trust and Reconciliation Commission

This February, 23 leaders convened in Richmond, Virginia, to plan a national commission on racial violence against black people, a first of its kind in the United States (US). The ultimate goal is to provide healing for victims affected by racism and to address the harm that historically has been caused to people of colour in the US.

According to the organizers, the timing is appropriate as people are becoming increasingly aware of racial issues in the U.S. In 2010, a report by the Pew Research Center indicated that only 27% of white people believed that racism was a “big problem”; however, with the recent rise of the Black Lives Matter movement, this number has increased to 44%. The organizers believe that the nation is ready and that it will lead them to accept their history, as has been accomplished in other countries like South Africa and Canada.

The commission’s organizers are comprised of many experienced leaders, some of which have been working on similar initiatives for years. The hope is that that commission will be ready in time for the presidential election, but dates are still being decided.

Building and Sustaining a Restorative City in Detroit

The International Institute for Restorative Practices (IIRP) is embarking on an unprecedented initiative to improve the lives of children and families in Detroit. The goal of the program, "Toward a Restorative City: Focus on Schools and Sustainability for the City of Detroit," is to embed restorative practices in neighborhoods, schools and systems. These include the Department of Human Services, police, and the juvenile justice and criminal justice systems.

The Skillman Foundation is underwriting a multi-year grant in support of this project, beginning with \$250,000 for 2016. IIRP partner, Detroit non-profit, Black Family Development, Inc., will collaborate on the project.

Chicago Court to Experiment with Restorative Justice Model

The Cook County Court system plans to set up a first of its kind community court, giving residents a role in resolving crimes in their midst. Only certain cases are eligible. The defendant must be between 18 and 26 years old, and be charged with a non-violent felony or misdemeanor. The defendant sits with the victims, and other community members, to talk about what would satisfy the victim and find out why the offender felt driven to do wrong. The approach will also help reintegrate offenders back into the community by connecting them with services including mental health counseling, substance abuse treatment, education, job training, and parenting classes. Offenders may have the opportunity to have their charges dropped and arrest expunged.

The pilot program will be funded by a \$200,000 Justice Department grant and that will cover a two-year period. Cook County Judge Colleen Sheehan will preside over the RJ Community Court which will be in session early next year.

Two-part Review on Restorative Justice by the Victims' Commissioner's Office

The United Kingdom Victims' Commissioner is currently undertaking a review of RJ. In March 2016, the first part of the review was published, highlighting what service providers said about the quality of RJ services available to victims. It found that the number of victims who had taken part in RJ was low compared to the number of individuals who became victims of crime. However, the relatively small number of participants enabled RJ service providers to tailor services to address victims' needs. The second part of the review, to be published later this year, focuses on victims' experiences participating in RJ, which will provide a full picture of RJ service delivery.

Both parts of the review look at the provision of RJ services in accordance with the Victims' Code. The Code sets out the entitlement for victims of crime to be given the opportunity to participate in RJ as a way 'to find a positive way forward'. You can access the report at:

victimscommissioner.org.uk/review/current-review.

The United Kingdom Justice Committee Launches Inquiry into Restorative Justice

On November 6, 2015, the United Kingdom Justice Committee announced an inquiry into RJ. The Committee welcomed views on any aspects of the use or potential use of RJ in the criminal justice system, focusing on specific points:

- Progress made by the Government in implementing the 2014 RJ Action Plan, including any changes that have been made to this plan
- How the entitlements to RJ in the Victims' Code are working, and their implications for any such entitlements in any future Victims' Law
- The impact and effectiveness of the National Offender Management Service's RJ programme to promote the development of victim-offender conferencing
- The effectiveness of delivery of RJ across the range of service providers and funding arrangements, including provision made by Police and Crime Commissioners, the Prison Service, the National Probation Service, and Community Rehabilitation Companies

Deadline for submissions was January 31st, 2016, leading to the announcement of an upcoming Green Paper setting out plans for a Victim's Law that may offer victims to have a say in offenders' punishments. The Green Paper will likely include references to the right to access to RJ.

**Register for the
National Restorative
Justice Symposium
in Halifax, Nova Scotia on
November 21 and 22, 2016**

**Hosted by the Nova Scotia RJ Program, the Nova
Scotia Department of Justice, and the Schulich
School of Law**

www.NovaScotia.ca/just/Restorative-Justice-Symposium-2016
Terry.Rice@novascotia.ca — 902-424-0123

Restorative Justice Week 2016

November 20-27

Inspiring innovation

Books, Articles & Films

Most Recent Resources

This list includes a small selection of recently published books, chapters, articles, films, and videos related to restorative justice.

Alberta Restorative Justice Association. (2015). *Guide for Developing Restorative Justice Programs in Alberta*. Alberta, ARJA.

Austin Walters, M. (2015). 'I THOUGHT "HE'S A MONSTER"... [BUT] HE WAS JUST... NORMAL'. *British Journal of Criminology*, 55, 1207-1225.

Butler, M. & Maruna, S. (2016). Rethinking Prison Disciplinary Processes: A Potential Future for Restorative Justice. *Victims & Offenders*, 11, 126-148.

C. J. (2016). What Is It Like to Meet the Man who Murdered Your Brother? *Psychologist*, 29, 102-102.

Cario, R. (2016). Ruptures et promesses de la Justice Restaurative. *Les sens de la peine*.

Chapman, T. (2016). The Sustainability of Restorative Justice. *Restorative Justice: An International Journal*, 4, 134-136.

Clairmont, D. & Waters, K. (2015). *The Nova Scotia Restorative Justice Program: Assessment of Current and Future Directions*. Nova Scotia, Canada: Atlantic Institute of Criminology, Dalhousie University.

Courtemanche, Z. T. (2015) Restorative Justice Act: An Enhancement to Justice in Manitoba. *Manitoba Law Journal*, 38, 1-16.

Daly, K. (2016). What is Restorative Justice? Fresh Answers to a Vexed Question. *Victims & Offenders*, 11, 9-29.

Deer, S. (2015). The Trouble with Peacemaking: False Dichotomies and the Politics of Restorative Justice. In *The Beginning and End of Rape: Confronting*

Sexual Violence in Native America (pp. 123-136). University of Minnesota Press.

Dekker, S. & Breakey, H. (2016). 'Just culture:' Improving Safety by Achieving Substantive, Procedural and Restorative Justice. *Safety Science*, 85, 187-193.

Dhami, M.K. (2016). Apology in Victim-Offender Mediation. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 19, 31-42.

Drewery, W. (2016). Restorative Practice in New Zealand Schools: Social Development Through Relational Justice. *Education Philosophy & Theory*, 48, 191-203.

Duncan, S. H. & Brandeis, L. D. (2016). Cyberbullying and restorative justice. In Navarro, R., Yubero, S. & Larrañaga, E. (Eds.), *Cyberbullying across the globe: Gender, family, and mental health* (pp. 239-257). Springer International Publishing.

Dzur, A. (2016). Conversations on Restorative Justice: A Talk with Tim Chapman. *Restorative Justice: An International Journal*, 4, 115-129.

Elias, R. (2015). Restorative Justice in Domestic Violence Cases. *DePaul Journal for Social Work*, 9, 67-84.

Evans, C. B. R., Smokowski, P. R., Barbee, J et al. Restorative Justice Programming in Teen Court: A Path to Improved Interpersonal Relationships and Psychological Functioning for High Risk Rural Youth. *Journal of Rural Mental Health*, 40, 15-30.

Evans, K. & Vaandering, D. (2016). *The Little Book of Restorative Justice in Education: Fostering Responsibility, Healing, Hope in Schools*. Good Books. 112.

Fronius, T., Persson, H., Guckenberger, S. et al. (2016). *Restorative Justice in U.S. Schools: A Research Review*. WestED, 40.

Gavrielides, T. (2016). Repositioning Restorative Justice in Europe. *Victims & Offenders*, 11, 71-86.

Green, S. (2016). Restorative Justice in Transition. *Restorative Justice: An International Journal*, 4, 137-139.

Gregory, P. (2016). But Does It Work? The Influence of Presumed Goal Attainment Effectiveness on Willingness to Use Legalistic and Restorative Responses to Offensive Behavior. *Communication Studies*, 67, 239-258.

Gonzales, T. (2015). Reorienting Restorative Justice: Initiating a New Dialogue of Rights Consciousness, Community Empowerment and Politicization. *Cardozo Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 16, 457-478.

Halsey, M., Goldsmith, A. & Bamford, D. (2015). Achieving Restorative Justice: Assessing Contrition and Forgiveness in the Adult Conference Process. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 48, 483-497.

Hipple, N. K., Gruenewald, J. & McGarrell, E.F. (2015). Restorativeness, Procedural Justice, and Defiance as Long-Term Predictors of Reoffending of Participants in Family Group Conferences. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 42, 1110-1127.

Holt, A. (2016). A Restorative Justice Approach to Family Violence: Changing Tack. *Restorative Justice: An International Journal*, 4, 130-133.

Hoyle, C. & Rosenblatt, F. F. (2015). Looking Back to the Future: Threats to Success of Restorative Justice in the United Kingdom. *Victims & Offenders*, 11, 30-49.

Institute for Criminal Policy Research. (2016). *Mapping report of restorative justice provision in England and Wales*. UK.

Jara, P., Garcia, G. & Villaneuva, L. (2016). Impact of Type of Intervention on Youth Reoffending: Are Gender and Risk Level Involved? *Psychiatry, Psychology & Law*, 23, 215-223.

- Joyce-Wojtas, N. & Keenan, M. (2016). Is Restorative Justice for Sexual Crime Compatible with Various Criminal Justice Systems? *Contemporary Justice Review*, 19, 43-68.
- Karp, D. R. & Frank, O. (2015). Anxiously Awaiting Restorative Justice in the United States. *Victims & Offenders*, 11, 50-70.
- Keenan, M., Zinsstag, E. & O'Noland, C. (2016). Sexual Violence and Restorative Practice in Belgium, Ireland and Norway: A Thematic Analysis of Country Variations. *Restorative Justice: An International Journal*, 4, 86-114.
- Kirby, A. & Jacobson, J. (2015). *Evaluation of the Pre-Sentence RJ Pathfinder: February 2015 – May 2015*. London, ICPR.
- Kline, D. M. S. (2016). Can Restorative Practices Help to Reduce Disparities in School Discipline Data? A Review of the Literature. *Multicultural Perspective*, 18, 97-102.
- Koska, G. (2016). Corporate Accountability in Times of Transition: The Role of Restorative Justice in the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission. *Restorative Justice: An International Journal*, 4, 41-67.
- Langdon, J. J. (2016). Talk it Out: Toward a Narrative Theory of Community Conferencing. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 19, 19-30.
- Lewis, T. & Umbreit, M. (2015). A Humanistic Approach to Mediation and Dialogue: An Evolving Transformative Practice. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 33, 3-17.
- Luzon, G. (2016). Restorative Justice and Normative Responsibility. *Restorative Justice: An International Journal*, 4, 27-40.
- Mayo, M. (2015). *The Limits of Forgiveness: Case Studies in the Distortion of a Biblical Ideal* (pp. 207-214). Augsburg Fortress, 254.
- Moyle, P. & Tauri, J. M. (2016). Māori, Family Group Conferencing and the Mystifications of Restorative Justice. *Victims & Offenders*, 11, 87-106.
- O'Neill, W. (2016). "First Be Reconciled": Restorative Justice and Deliberative Democracy. In Schuck M. & Crowley-Buck J. (Eds.), *Democracy, Culture, Catholicism: Voices from Four Continents* (pp. 249-264). Fordham University Press.
- Ortega, L., Lyubansky, M., Nettles, S. et al. (2016). Outcomes of a Restorative Circles Program in a High School Setting. *Psychology of Violence*, 6, 495-468.
- Osakabe, Y. (2016). Restoring Restorative Justice: Beyond Theology of Reconciliation and Forgiveness. *International Journal of Public Theology*, 10, 247-271.
- Poama, A. (2015). La justice restaurative: le tournant institutionnel. *Raisons politiques*, 59, 7-16.
- Restorative Justice Council. (2016). *Restorative Justice in Custodial Settings*. [Information Pack]. UK.
- [Upcoming]. *Restorative Justice: Another Way*. [Documentary]. 2017. France: Talweg Production.
- RJI Working Group. (2016). *Restorative Policing* [White Paper]. United States: Paul McCold.
- Rossner, M. & Bruce, J. (2016). Community Participation in Restorative Justice: Rituals, Reintegration, and Quasi-Professionalization. *Victims & Offenders*, 11, 107-125.
- Rourke, J., Grant-Warmald, S. & Kerr, A. (2016). *Strengthening Ties to Better Serve Victims: A Partnership Guide for Police-Based Victim Services & Restorative Justice Agencies in British Columbia*. Restorative Justice Victoria, 40.
- Saulnier, A. & Sivasubramaniam, D. (2015). Restorative Justice: Underlying Mechanisms and Future Directions. *New Criminal Law Review: An International and Interdisciplinary Journal*, 18, 510-535.
- Sherman, L. W., Strang, H., Barnes, G. et al. (2015). Twelve Experiments in Restorative Justice: The Jerry Lee Program of Randomized Trials of Restorative Justice Conferences. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 11, 501.
- Sideria, M. (2016). Restorative Justice: Where Do We Go From Here. *Maine Bar Journal*, 31, 32-38.
- Stockdale, K. (2015). Police Understandings of Restorative Justice – the Impact of Rank and Role. *Restorative Justice: An International Journal*, 3, 212-232.
- Tamarit, J. & Luque, E. (2016). Can Restorative Justice Satisfy Victims' Needs? Evaluation of the Catalan Victim-Offender Mediation Programme. *Restorative Justice: An International Journal*, 4, 68-85.
- Tores, F. (2015). *Pour une éducation à la justice réparatrice*. LBL Éditions, 111.
- Une approche différente: la justice réparatrice/restaurative. (2016). *La porte ouverte*, [Édition spéciale] 28.
- Van de Kerchove, M. (2015). La justice restauratrice au coeur du conflit des paradigmes de la peine. *Histoire de la justice*, 25, 123-133.
- Walle, G. V. (2016). Les victims de la criminalité d'entreprise: le conflit ignore. *Criminologie*, 49, 99-121.
- Wenzel, M. & Okimoto, T. G. (2015). "We Forgive": A Group's Act of Forgiveness and its Restorative Effects on Members' Feelings of Justice and Sentiments Towards the Offender Group. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 18, 655-675.
- Wong, D. S. (2016). Restorative Justice at Different Levels of the Criminal Justice System in China: Challenges and Paths Forward. *Restorative Justice: An International Journal*, 4, 10-26.
- Wood, R. W. (2016). Editor's Introduction: The Future of Restorative Justice? *Victims & Offenders*, 11, 1-8.
- Wood, R. W. & Masahiro, S. (2016). Four Challenges in the Future of Restorative Justice. *Victims & Offenders*, 11, 149-172.
- Wright, M. (2015). Hate Crime and Restorative Justice: Exploring Causes, Repairing Harm. *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 54, 542-543.

**Register for the
National Restorative
Justice Symposium
in Halifax, Nova Scotia on
November 21 and 22, 2016**

**Hosted by the Nova Scotia RJ Program, the Nova
Scotia Department of Justice, and the Schulich
School of Law**

Restorative Justice Week 2016

November 20-27

Inspiring **innovation**

Internet Resources

Some Relevant Links

Alberta Restorative Justice Association:
www.arjassoc.ca

Art of Hosting: www.artofhosting.org

Australian Institute of Criminology –
Restorative Justice:
www.aic.gov.au/criminal_justice_system/rjustice.html

Canadian Families and Corrections Network:
www.cfcn-rcafd.org

Canadian Institute for Conflict Resolution:
www.cicr-icrc.ca

Canadian Resource Centre for Victims of
Crime: www.crcvc.ca

Canadian Restorative Justice Consortium:
crjc.ca

Peacemaking and Conflict Studies – Fresno
Pacific University:
www.fresno.edu/programs-majors/graduate/peacemaking-and-conflict-studies

Centre for Restorative Justice – Simon Fraser
University: www.sfu.ca/crj.html

Centre for Restorative Justice and
Peacemaking – University of Minnesota:
www.cehd.umn.edu/ssw/rjp

Centre international de criminologie
comparée: www.cicc.umontreal.ca

Church Council on Justice and Corrections:
ccjc.ca

Correctional Service Canada – Restorative
Justice: www.csc-scc.gc.ca/restorative-justice

Department of Justice – Policy Centre for
Victim Issues: www.justice.gc.ca/eng/cj-jp/victims-victimes

European Forum for Restorative Justice:
www.euforumrj.org

Heartspeak Productions:
heartspeakproductions.ca

International Institute for Restorative
Practices: www.iirp.edu

Justice Institute of British Columbia –
Bibliographies:
www.jibc.ca/library/research-help/bibliographies

Living Justice Press:
www.livingjusticepress.org

Mennonite Central Committee Canada –
Restorative Justice:
mcccanada.ca/restorativejustice

Parole Board of Canada – Victims of Crime:
pbc-clcc.gc.ca/victims/victims-eng.shtml

National Association of Community and
Restorative Justice: www.nacrj.org

New Zealand Ministry of Justice –
Restorative Justice:
www.justice.govt.nz/policy/criminal-justice/restorative-justice

Nova Scotia Restorative Justice Community
University Research Alliance: www.nsrj-cura.ca

Peace of the Circle: peaceofthecircle.com

Public Safety Canada – Restorative Justice:
www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/cntrng-crm/crctns/rstrtv-jstc-eng.aspx

Regroupement des organismes de justice
alternative du Québec: www.rojaq.qc.ca

Restorative Christian Ministries – M2/W2
Association: m2w2.com

Restorative Forum:
www.restorativeforum.org.uk

The Consortium on Negotiation and Conflict
Resolution – Georgia State University:
law.gsu.edu/centers/consortium-on-negotiation-and-conflict-resolution/programs-and-research/

Restorative Justice Council:
www.restorativejustice.org.uk

Restorative Justice Database – University of
Toronto:
link.library.utoronto.ca/criminology/restorative_justice

Restorative Justice in British Columbia:
www.rjbc.ca

Restorative Justice International:
www.restorativejusticeinternational.com

Restorative Justice New Brunswick:
www.prjac.ca

Restorative Justice Online:
www.restorativejustice.org

Restorative Practices International:
www.rpiassn.org

Royal Canadian Mounted Police –
Restorative Justice: www.rcmp-grc.gc.ca/pubs/ccaps-spcca/restjust-justrepar-eng.htm

Victim-Offender Reconciliation Program
Information and Resource Centre:
www.vorp.com

You can find a variety of
restorative justice groups,
resources and information
on social media.

Facebook, Twitter,
LinkedIn, YouTube



**Restorative
Justice
Week 2016
November 20-27**

**Semaine de
la justice
réparatrice 2016
20-27 novembre**

**For more information about this resource or
Restorative Justice Week, contact:**

**Restorative Justice Unit
Correctional Service Canada
340 Laurier Avenue West
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0P9
Telephone: (613) 947-7309**

Email: restorativejustice@csc-scc.gc.ca

Website: www.csc-scc.gc.ca/restorative-justice

**Register for the
National Restorative
Justice Symposium
in Halifax, Nova Scotia on
November 21 and 22, 2016**

**Hosted by the Nova Scotia RJ Program, the Nova
Scotia Department of Justice, and the Schulich
School of Law**

www.NovaScotia.ca/just/Restorative-Justice-Symposium-2016
Terry.Rice@novascotia.ca — 902-424-0123