



AGENDA
 Regular Meeting
 Thursday, January 17, 2008
 In the Vail High School Conference Room

Regular Meeting

1. Call to Order

- A. Pledge of Allegiance**
- B. Approval of Minutes**
- C. Reports**
 - * Member Reports**
 - * Administrative Report**

D. Call to the Public

Consideration and discussion of comments and concerns from the public. Those wishing to address the Council as a result of public comment will be limited to the Chairperson directing members to study the matter of rescheduling the matter for future consideration or decision at a later date. Public comments are limited to 3 minutes. (Acknowledgement of Public Requests to Speak.)
 The Council desires viewpoints of Parents/Staff/Students and considers the responsible presentation of the viewpoints to be viable to the efficient operation of the school. Any individual desiring to address the Council shall inform the Council at this time. Comments and questions may deal only with topics on the agenda of the meeting.

E. Recognitions

Staff, Students, and/or members of the community may be recognized at this time. Special announcements may be presented at this time.

2. Consent Agenda

ACTION

All items listed below are consent matters and will be considered by one motion at this time. There will be no discussion of consent items. Any council member may remove an item from the consent agenda by request. All items not accepted and approved, as part of the consent agenda will be considered individually.

3. Old Business

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--------|
| A. Enrollment Summary | INFORM |
| B. VDLP Update | INFORM |
| C. Student Volunteer Hours | STUDY |
| D. Relocation of VHS | INFORM |
| E. Accountability Conferencing | INFORM |

4. New Business

- | | |
|---|--------|
| A. Citi Bank and JA Partnership | INFORM |
| B. Breakaway Team | INFORM |
| C. Enrollment for 2007/2008 and 2008/2009 | ACTION |

5. Adjournment

ACTION

*NOTE NEXT MEETING FEBRUARY 28, 2008 at 4:30 pm



ANNOTATED AGENDA
Regular Meeting
Thursday, January 17, 2008
In the Vail High School Conference Room

Regular Meeting

1. Call to Order

- A. Pledge of Allegiance**
- B. Approval of Minutes**
- C. Reports**
 - * Member Reports**
 - * Administrative Reports**
- D. Call to the Public**
- E. Recognitions**

2. Consent Agenda

ACTION

Background:

All items attached are consent matters and will be considered by one motion at this time. There will be no discussion of consent items. Any council member may remove an item from the consent agenda by request. All items not accepted and approved, as part of the consent agenda will be considered individually.

Recommendation:

For council to approve the consent agenda as presented.

3. Old Business

A. Enrollment Summary

INFORM

Background:

Mr. Barger will present the council an update on student enrollment.

Recommendation:

None at this time: Information and discussion item.

B. VDLP Update

INFORM

Background:

Mr. Barger will inform the council on updates.

Recommendation:

None at this time: Information and discussion item.

C. Student Volunteer Hours

STUDY

Background:

Mr. Barger will present to the council an update on student volunteer hours.

Recommendation:

None at this time: Study item.

D. Relocation of VIIS INFORM
Background:
Mr. Barger will present to the council an update on the relocation of VIIS.

Recommendation:
None at this time: Information and discussion item.

E. Accounting Conferencing INFORM
Background:
Mr. Barger will present the council info that was requested at the previous site council meeting.

4. **New Business**

A. Citi Bank and JA Partnership INFORM
Background:
Mr. Barger will provide the information on the partnership.

Recommendation:
None at this time: Information and discussion item

B. Breakaway Team INFORM
Background:
Mr. Barger will update the council on Breakaway Team.

Recommendation:
None at this time: Information and discussion item

C. Enrollment for 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 ACTION
Background:
Mr. Barger will inform the council on the numbers for the 07-08 and the 08-09 school year.

Recommendation:
Approve

5. **Adjournment** ACTION

MINUTES



MINUTES
Regular Meeting
Wednesday, November 21, 2007
In the Vail High School Conference Room

Regular Meeting

1. Call to Order

Mr. Sorensen called the meeting to order at 3:43pm. Members present: Mr. Sorensen, Mr. Hilliker, Mrs. Sheehy, Mr. Aurand, Mrs. Petersen, Mr. Letcher, Mr. Barger (Admin). Members absent: Mrs. Reyes.

A. Pledge of Allegiance

Pledge was lead by Mr. Sorensen

B. Approval of Minutes

Mrs. Sheehy motioned to accept minutes, seconded by Mr. Hilliker. All approved.

C. Reports

*** Member Reports**

No member reports

*** Administrative Reports**

Mr. Barger informed the council on the after school chess club that Mr. Kestler has started. He is doing a good job of teaching the kids how to play. Today we had our annual "Field Day". One of our 301 goals was to increase the number of students taking the ACT. Nine students recently took the test and 8 of these students scored in the upper percentile; 4 were above 80%. EHS will be the host site for another ACT and hopefully we'll get more students to take the test. Another group retook the SAT and scores went up. Mr. Barger passed around a sample "Top Dog" ticket – our rewards system. Mr. Barger informed the council on the one day training at an accountability conference that he attended with Mr. Roberts. Basically it's called a "shaming" process where the offender admits what he did and talks about it. The victim, their parents and friends talk about how it affected them. They mediate the consequence. It is all done on a volunteer basis. We were able to try this process out last week with a situation we had with several girls. All three left positive and it seems to be working. Mr. Letcher asked if the council could get information on the conference.

D. Call to the Public

No Public

E. Recognitions

Mr. Barger recognized John Roberts, Don Adams and Tricia Kaparoff for organizing Field Day and help make it a success.

2. Consent Agenda

None

3. **Old Business**

A. Enrollment Summary

Current enrollment is 142

B. Relocation of VIIS

Mr. Baker, Mr. Flores and Phil Swain (Architect) met regarding the relocation of VIIS. Now that the site is set, we need to agree upon a number of students and send out an RFP for an architect, keeping in mind it also needs to include a preschool/day care. A committee needs to be formed that includes a cross section of parents, community members, and students. If council members are interested in being part of the committee, let Mr. Barger know. The committee should be 20 adults and 3 students.

C. VDLP Update

Mr. Barger informed the council on the VDLP. We hired a new employee, Kathy Watkins, to work part-time. She helps with testing, student progress and helps monitor the seniors during Advisor Base. We have started marketing with the help of Mrs. Rempfer's 3rd hour business class. They have designed the brochures, business cards and a new website. We currently have 17 full time and 7 part-time students enrolled in the program.

4. **New Business**

A. Graduation Policy Update

Currently Cienega, Empire and Vail High School require 22 credits to graduate and 20 at Pantano. VHS credits were revised last January from 21 to 22. The state is looking at increasing math and science credits to 3 each as well as 3 credits for Social Studies – which the Vail School District already requires. The district is wondering if the state does increase the requirements, should we also increase ours.

B. Vail Cares Update

The Vail Cares Grant is up in 2007. This grant helped fund the security mirrors, t-shirts, SSA (Safe School Ambassadors), Top Dog Tickets. We partnered with the UA and conducted a survey to find out where the school is, in different categories. The staff identified areas where we need to improve. The Core team met and designed an Action Plan and worked on a "9-12" matrix. One of the items was that Seniors should not be treated like Freshmen and more should be required of them. We came up with the PART Statement. All these things help develop the Top Dog program. Mr. Letcher requested that we add a study item for next month's meeting to include coming up with something, besides the beginning of the year syllabus, to help parents keep track of what is expected of their children in each particular class.

C. Stipends

Mr. Barger presented 4 additional stipends with the provision that Mr. Dees' stipend will go into effect once the guitar club starts. Mr. Letcher moved to approve the stipends, seconded by Mrs. Sheehy. Mr. Sorenson asked if fees are required. No fees are required, but tax deductions are always accepted. All approved.

5. **Adjournment**

Mr. Hilliker moved to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Letcher. All approved. Meeting was adjourned at 4:35pm.

CONSENT AGENDA

FIELD TRIP TRANSPORTATION REQUEST

Requests must be received in the Transportation Office at least 2 weeks prior to trip date. Non A.I.A. Field trips are only scheduled from 9:00 A.M. to 1:30 P.M. Eating/drinking on the bus is prohibited.

Teacher/ Sponsor Please Complete the Information Below

Pick-up location/school Vail High School Date 1-17-08
Teacher/Sponsor Campanile Grade 9-12 # of Passengers 19
Telephone # 879-1911 Number of Wheelchair Restraints if Needed 0
Destination C of T Park & Rec
Broadway / Alvernon
Address _____
Purpose of Trip Print Photography
Lunch

Date of Trip May 2008
Departure Time 8:00
Arrival Time 8:30
Return to Bus Time 1:25
Return to School Time 2:00

Driver Use Only	
Ending Mileage	_____
Beginning Mileage	_____
Total Miles	_____
Vehicle #	_____
# of Hours	_____
Driver Signature	_____

Trip Approval Receipt

Teacher / Sponsor
Complete this section for parent reply
School _____
Teacher _____
Date of Trip _____
Destination _____
Departure/Return Time _____

School Administrator complete this Section	
Administrator Approval	Date <u>1-17-08</u>
Signature <u>Dennis J. Bager</u>	_____
Site Council Approval	Date _____

Transportation Approval _____ Date _____
Signature _____

FIELD TRIP TRANSPORTATION REQUEST

Requests must be received in the Transportation Office at least 2 weeks prior to trip date. Non A.I.A. Field trips are only scheduled from 9:00 A.M. to 1:30 P.M.
Eating/drinking on the bus is prohibited.

Teacher/ Sponsor Please Complete the Information Below

Pick-up location/school Vail High School Date 1-17-08
Teacher/Sponsor Campanile Grade 9-12 # of Passengers 19
Telephone # 520-879-1911 Number of Wheelchair Restraints if Needed 0
Destination Cof T Park & Rec
Broadway / Alvernion
Address _____
Purpose of Trip Print Photography
Lunch ✓

Date of Trip May 2008
Departure Time 8:00
Arrival Time 8:30
Return to Bus Time 1:25
Return to School Time 2:00

Driver Use Only	
Ending Mileage	_____
Beginning Mileage	_____
Total Miles	_____
Vehicle #	_____
# of Hours	_____
Driver Signature	_____

Trip Approval Receipt

Teacher / Sponsor	
Complete this section for prompt reply	
School	_____
Teacher	_____
Date of Trip	_____
Destination	_____
Departure/Return Time	_____

School Administrator complete this Section	
Administrator Approval	Date <u>1-17-08</u>
Signature	<u>James J. Bays</u>
Site Council Approval	Date _____

Transportation Approval _____ Date _____
Signature _____

FIELD TRIP TRANSPORTATION REQUEST

Requests must be received in the Transportation Office at least 2 weeks prior to trip date. Non A.I.A. Field trips are only scheduled from 9:00 A.M. to 1:30 P.M. Eating/drinking on the bus is prohibited.

Teacher/ Sponsor Please Complete the Information Below

2 vans

Pick-up location/school Bus Yard Date _____
Teacher/Sponsor Pen Adams/Terry Jensen Grade _____ # of Passengers 18
Telephone # 879-1907, 1906 Number of Wheelchair Restraints if Needed _____
Destination Maryland - A2 Memorial Coliseum

Address _____
Purpose of Trip First Robotics Competition

Lunch _____

Date of Trip March 6, 7, 8, 2008
Departure Time 5:00 am
Arrival Time _____

Driver Use Only	
Ending Mileage	_____
Beginning Mileage	_____
Total Miles	_____
Vehicle #	_____
# of Hours	_____
Driver Signature	_____

Return to Bus Time _____
Return to School Time 8:00 pm 3/8/08

Trip Approval Receipt

Teacher / Sponsor
Complete this section for prompt reply
School _____
Teacher _____
Date of Trip _____
Destination _____
Departure/Return Time _____

School Administrator complete this Section	
Administrator Approval	Date <u>1-17-08</u>
Signature <u>[Signature]</u>	
Site Council Approval	Date _____

Transportation Approval _____ Date _____
Signature _____

**OLD
BUSINESS**

PowerSchool

School: Vail High School

Term: 07-08 Semester 2

[Logout](#) ?

Start Page > Reports > Run Reports > Enrollment Summary

Kaparoff, Tricia

Functions

- Absentee Report
- Daily Bulletin
- Enrollment Summary
- Master Schedule
- PowerLunch
- Reports
- Special Functions
- Teacher Schedules

Setup

- Personalize
- PowerScheduler
- School
- Staff
- System
- Dashboard

Enrollment Summary

as of 1/17/2008 (A)
Vail High School

Grade Level	TOTAL IN GRADE	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black or African-American	Hispanic or Latino	American Indian	White (Not Hispanic)	Unclassified
9	47 31 / 16	2 2 / 0	2 1 / 1	4 2 / 2	0 0 / 0	39 26 / 13	0 0 / 0
10	34 17 / 17	0 0 / 0	2 1 / 1	5 3 / 2	0 0 / 0	27 13 / 14	0 0 / 0
11	41 25 / 16	2 0 / 2	2 2 / 0	10 7 / 3	0 0 / 0	27 16 / 11	0 0 / 0
12	23 19 / 4	3 3 / 0	0 0 / 0	2 2 / 0	0 0 / 0	18 14 / 4	0 0 / 0
TOTAL	145 92 / 53	7 5 / 2	6 4 / 2	21 14 / 7	0 0 / 0	111 69 / 42	0 0 / 0

© 2006 Pearson School Systems. All rights reserved.

At the October 18, 2007 Site Council Meeting the Council discussed possible options for how to increase student interest in completing the expectation of Community Service.

The possible options to increase the success of the program were:

1. Including the expectations into the current Social Studies Program.
2. Have more staff organized and led events to help student awareness.
3. Create some type of competition system to increase enthusiasm.
4. Offer advisor base credit, and make it part of the grade for advisor base.
5. Adding a component to the Senior Project that events the grade earned.

At a staff meeting all 5 options were discussed, and unanimously staff supported option 5.

Currently Senior Exit Project is made up of three components:

1. The Research Paper worth 100 points.
2. Portfolio worth 100 points.
3. The presentation worth 100 points.

In order to graduate a student must pass all three parts individually. The overall score of the three is graded on the normal school scale of 10%.

90-100 =A

80-89 =B

70-79 =C

60-69 =D

If were to add it to SEP, the questions that need to be answered are:

What years do students need to do the hours?

When does a 'year' start and stop?

How many points is it worth?

Can a student fail this component and still graduate?

How do we handle transfer students?

And perhaps another question or two.

Conference Facilitator's Script

I. Introduce participants:

“Welcome. As you know, my name is (facilitator) and I will be coordinating this conference. Before the conference begins, I will work my way around the group, introduce participants and indicate their reason for being here today. (*Introduce each participant and indicate relationship to victim or offender.*)

“At this stage, I would like to thank you all for making the effort to attend. This is difficult for all of us, but your presence here will help us deal with the matter that has brought us together.”

“Today, this conference will focus on an incident which happened (*date, place and nature of offense – no elaboration*). It is important to understand that we will focus on what (offender) did and how his/her unacceptable behavior has affected others. We are not here to decide whether (offender) is a good or bad person. We want to explore in what way people have been affected and hopefully work toward repairing the harm that has resulted. Does everyone understand this?”

“(Offender) has admitted his/her part in the incident. Prior to commencing the formal part of this conference, I am obliged to tell you that you do not have to participate in this conference and are (free to leave at any stage.) If you do leave, the matter may be referred to court (or disciplinary procedures).”

“This matter, however, may be finalized by this conference, subject to your positive participation and satisfactory compliance with the conference agreement. Do you understand that (to offender)?”

“This is an opportunity for all of you here to be involved in repairing the harm that has been done.”

II. Offender:

Offender is asked to give his/her version of the incident. If more than one offender, they are asked to speak in turn.

“To help us understand who has been affected, we will start by asking (*offender*) to tell us what happened. Could you tell us how you came to be involved?”

Key questions:

- Tell us what happened?
- What were you thinking about at the time?
- What have you thought about since the incident?
- Who do you think has been affected by your actions?
- In what way have they been affected?

III. Victim:

Victim is then asked for his/her version of the event. “Now let’s find out from (victim) in what way he/she has been affected? (Victim), would you tell us about that?”

Key questions:

- What was your reaction at the time of the incident? Immediately afterward?
- How do you feel about what happened?
- What has happened to you since the incident?
- How did your family and friends react when they heard about the incident?

IV. Victim Supporters:

Victim’s supporters, in turn, are then asked:

- What did you think when you heard about the incident?
- How did you feel about what happened?

- What has happened to you since the incident?
- What are the main issues for you?

V. Offender Supporters:

Offender's supporters are then asked for their reactions. Start with the parents (mother first, if possible), caregivers and then the other supporters, in turn.

To the parents/caregivers:

"It has been difficult for you, hasn't it?
Would you like to tell us about it?"

Key questions:

- What did you think when you heard?
- How do you feel about the incident?
- What has happened since?
- What are the main issues for you?

VI. Agreement:

a) Ask the offender:

"Is there anything you want to say to (the victim)?"

Restitution and reparation are now negotiated.

b) Start with the victim.

"What would you like to get from today's conference?"

c) After each point check with the offender. "Are you okay with that? Do you think it is fair?"

d) Ask the victim's supporters: "What would you like to see come from today's conference?" Check with the offender after each point.

e) Allow plenty of time for discussion at this phase. Plans to repair the harm may begin to be developed. If necessary, allow for negotiation. Solicit comments from other participants.

f) When an agreement seems to be reached, ask the offender's supporters: "Is that a fair arrangement?"

g) Generally to all: "How do people feel about that?"

VII. Closing the Conference:

a) Facilitator summarizes the outcomes of the conference regarding restitution and reparation:

"What I'm hearing is (nature of agreement). I want to prepare an agreement to record what's been decided. This will make it formal and put an end to this incident."

"At this point I would like to move toward a formal close of this conference. Before doing so, I would like to provide everyone with a final opportunity to say something. Is there anything else anyone wants to say? (*Work your way around the group.*)"

"In closing this conference, I would like to thank all of you for your contributions in dealing with this difficult matter. You are to be congratulated for the way you worked through the many issues and were able to reach an agreement."

- Do not hurry participants out of the conference room as much informal reintegration is likely to happen after the conclusion of the conference.



New Juvenile Justice Alternative

Police accountability conferencing has great potential

BY ANDREW C. REVERING

Every day in America, approximately 25% of the people arrested are teenagers: 5404 children and youths under age 18 are arrested; 327 are for violent crimes. According to Professor Mark Cohen, Vanderbilt University, "High risk youth kept out of trouble through intervention programs could save society as much as \$2 million a youth per lifetime."

A concept called Police Accountability Conferencing may well be a time tested juvenile justice alternative that appears to be preventing juvenile crime — one kid at a time. It was first used by the Maori people of New Zealand hundreds of years ago to solve family, tribal and community problems. Although native peoples in other parts of the world have employed similar processes, in the Maori process, the extended network of family and friends share the responsibility for a young person's behavior while involving the

victims of that behavior in the process of resolution.

This creative use of traditional methods to address contemporary problems was promoted by the perception that entirely different approaches were needed in juvenile justice. The outcome achieved in the formal court systems was seen as inadequate and inappropriate for victims, for many young offenders, and other people affected by offending behavior.

What has set New Zealand's conferencing model apart is the emphasis on collective responses to social problems. While other efforts focus on the rights and needs of the individual, this model seeks to mobilize the support of local communities, the family, and social networks. The model was passed into legislation in 1989 as the Children's Youth Persons and Their Families Act.

The practical realities of the Act were observed in 1990 by John McDonald of the New South Wales Police Ser-

vice. He took the idea to Australia and adapted the practice and elaborated the accompanying theory with the aid of Sergeant Terry O'Connell and others. New South Wales police began a trial of Police Accountability Conferencing in 1991 in the city of Waga Waga. The practice, known as the Waga model, spread to suburbs in Sydney and other rural towns.

Re-Integrative Shaming

The power of a successful Police Accountability Conference is shown by John Braithwaite's (1989) theory of "Re-integrative Shaming" and by Silvan Tomkins (1962-92) "Affect and Script Theories", as summarized and extended by Donald Nathanson (1992). Both theories hold that shame plays a key role in the regulation of social behavior. According to Braithwaite, it does this in two ways. It puts pressure on individuals both from within and from without.

First, social disapproval deters offending behavior by threatening a loss of status and affection. This is the source of external pressure; the individual whose behavior offends is threatened with disgrace.

Secondly, attacks of conscience also deter offending behavior. This is the source of internal pressure; the individual who might consider committing a crime is prompted by conscience to exercise discretion and to avoid offending behavior.

Shame is generated both by social disapproval and by exercise of conscience. The shame of social disapproval, however, is much more painful than is the pain caused by exercise of conscience. Most people avoid the more painful shame of disgrace by regularly exercising their conscience. They endure the lesser pain of exercise of conscience in order to avoid the greater shame that would befall them were they to ignore their conscience and act in an offensive manner.

Consequently, they do not engage in offending behavior. But, people are deterred less by the threat of official punishment than by the threat of public disgrace. The threat of the loss of status, respect and affection is significant. And this is not a threat that can be made by state officials. It can only be made by those who have a significant personal relationship with the person whose behavior may cause harm.

An effective Police Accountability Conference employs these insights. It threatens the offender with social disapproval. But in making the distinction between unacceptable behavior and the potentially good, the person responsible for that behavior, the Conference offers the possibility of social re-integration. It is a ritual in which victims, offenders and those closest to them can deal with their shame and anger. Having done so, they can then remove the labels of victim and offender.

An American Model

In 1994, the Anoka, Minnesota, Police Department became the first law enforcement agency in North America to implement this diversionary process for juveniles, which is based on the Australian's model.

Within two weeks after an offender admits guilt to the police and with parental consent, he/she takes part in an Accountability Conference. At this very focused and intense meeting, the offender, parents and support group and the victim and his/her family and support group are all present. The meeting is facilitated by a specially trained, uniformed officer.

During the meeting, the offender experiences the re-integrative shaming described earlier. This is not the humiliating and degrading kind of shame described by Dr. James Gilligan in his book, *Violence, Our Deadly Epidemic*

and Its Causes. That kind of shaming, according to Gilligan may actually cause criminality. Braithwaite and Gilligan agreed that the type of shaming which takes place during the Conferencing process is the same as which takes place in loving families. During the Conference, the offender is surrounded and supported by family members and role models.

Shame is something far different than legal guilt. When shame is used properly with the process of re-integration, most offenders experience true remorse. Given the opportunity to amend their actions, they do.

During the past three years, more than 170 young people between the age of eight and 18 have experienced the conferencing process in Anoka. Only three have re-offended. Those are powerful numbers when you consider that in Minnesota alone more than 90% of juveniles released from the state's two major holding facilities have adult felony records by age 24 and more than 70% end up in adult prisons.

Using shame to instill responsible behavior is still controversial. Shame has a finger-wagging moral connotation considered by some to be detrimental to a person's ego. But the pendulum seems to be swinging, this time it is away from making offenders feel good when they do bad. If the means of provoking shame are rooted in hard-headed compassion, the result may indeed be redemptive. That certainly appears to be the case in the Australian experience: since 1992, in 95% of the cases, juveniles do not re-offend.

American law enforcement must be willing to look to other country's successful concepts in juvenile justice which may be just as effective here. It must come to the realization that what has occurred over the past several years has not been effective. Hard-nosed rhetoric such as "locking them all up" is simply not a solution.

If the youthful first or second time offender is dealt with early, effectively and held accountable, changing behavior in a positive fashion is possible. L&O

Andrew C. Reveria is Chief of Police in Anoka, Minnesota.

restorative justice: the evidence

By Lawrence W Sherman and Heather Strang

Jerry Lee Program of Randomized Trials in
Restorative Justice

In collaboration with

Geoffrey Barnes

Sarah Bennett

Caroline M Angel

Dorothy Newbury-Birch

Daniel J Woods

Charlotte E Gill

Please direct all correspondence to

Heather.Strang@anu.edu.au

A note on format

This report follows a modified UK Cabinet Office format of unpacking the content like a website: a one-page abstract, a three-page executive summary, and a detailed introductory section that summarises the findings of the full report. This format enables the users of the document to read – or circulate – either the abstract alone, the abstract plus the three-page executive summary, the abstract plus the introductory overview (Section 1) of the full report, or the entire document. This format is designed to provide different levels of detail for different kinds of readers, and to support the different ways in which information is digested for different stages and levels of discussion and decision making.

Published by the James Mason
Fellowship 2019-2024

This report, like all JMF publications, is copyright of the authors, and not a creation of the JMF itself.

© The James Mason Fellowship 2019

Executive summary

Purpose and scope

This is a non-governmental assessment of the evidence on restorative justice in the UK and internationally, carried out by the Jerry Lee Center of Criminology at the University of Pennsylvania for the Smith Institute in London, with funding from the Esmée Fairbairn Foundation. The purpose of this review is to examine what constitutes good-quality restorative justice practice, and to reach conclusions on its effectiveness, with particular reference to reoffending.⁴

Varieties of restorative justice

The review employs a broad definition of restorative justice (RJ), including victim-offender mediation, indirect communication through third parties, and restitution or reparation payments ordered by courts or referral panels. Much of the available and reasonably unbiased evidence of RJ effects on repeat offending comes from tests of face-to-face conferences of victims, offenders and others affected by a crime, most of them organised and led by a police officer; other tests cited involve court-ordered restitution and direct or indirect mediation.

What we found

Repeat offending

The most important conclusion is that *RJ works differently on different kinds of people*. It can work very well as a general policy, if a growing body of evidence on “what works for whom” can become the basis for specifying when and when not to use it. As tables 1 to 3 show, rigorous tests of RJ in diverse samples have found substantial reductions in repeat offending for both violence and property crime. Other tests have failed to find such effects, but with different populations, interventions or comparisons. In one rare circumstance, a small sample of Aboriginals in Australia, an offer of face-to-face RJ (and its partial completion) appears to have caused higher rates of repeat offending than CJ. This very limited evidence of backfiring can be balanced against the potential RJ may have as a full or partial alternative to incarceration for young adult offenders, who had much lower two-year reconviction rates (11%) in one Canadian study (N = 128) than a matched sample (37% reconviction) who served their sentence in prison.

In general, *RJ seems to reduce crime more effectively with more, rather than less, serious crimes*. The results below (tables 1 to 3) suggest RJ works better with crimes involving personal victims than for crimes without them. They also suggest that it works with violent crimes more consistently than with property crimes, the latter having the only evidence of crime increases. These findings run counter to conventional wisdom, and could become the basis for substantial inroads in demarcating when it is “in the public interest” to feel RJ rather than CJ.

Victim effects

The evidence consistently suggests that victims benefit, on

average, from face-to-face RJ conferences. The evidence is less clear about other forms of RJ, with no unbiased estimates of the effects of indirect forms of RJ on victims. But when victims willingly meet offenders face to face, they obtain short-term benefits for their mental health by reduced post-traumatic stress symptoms (PTSS). This may, in turn, reduce their lifetime risks of coronary disease (which PTSS causes in military veterans), as well as reducing health costs paid by taxpayers.

Offences brought to justice

When RJ has been offered to arrestees before charging in New York and Canberra, RJ has always brought at least twice as many offences to justice – and up to four times as many. Whether such effects could be even greater with widespread take-up of RJ across a community is a major question to be answered.

A way forward

There is far more evidence on RJ, with more positive results, than there has been for most innovations in criminal justice that have ever been rolled out across the country. The evidence now seems more than adequate to support such a roll-out for RJ, especially if that is done on a continue-to-learn-as-you-go basis. Such an approach could be well supported by a “Restorative Justice Board” (RJB), modelled on the Youth Justice Board but on a smaller scale. An RJB could prime the pump for RJ, proposing new statutes and funding new solutions to the obstacles that now limit victim access to RJ. An RJB could monitor RJ practices, design tests of new RJ strategies, and continue to recommend systemic changes needed to make RJ as effective as possible. It could, in effect, take RJ from the drawing board to its widespread construction, while also remaining at the drawing board for on-going improvements in design based on new evidence.

How we found it

Searching for evidence

The search process for this review built on the literature search protocol approved by the International Campbell Collaboration for the authors’ registered and on-going review of the effects of face-to-face restorative justice for personal victim crimes.⁵ The search has been expanded for this review to encompass other forms of restorative justice and other kinds of crimes.

The following search strategies were used to identify evaluations of the effectiveness of RJ at helping victims and reducing reoffending

- searches of online databases,
- searches of online library catalogues,

4 All opinions and conclusions in this document are those of the author, and not of any governmental or private agencies that have funded any part of the research or the document review.

5 <http://www.campbellcollaboration.org/for-practitioners/protocol>

- searches of existing reviews of the literature on the effectiveness of RJ,
- searches of bibliographies of publications,
- examination of publications already in our possession,
- referrals by experts in the field

Both published and unpublished reports were considered in these searches. The searches were international in scope, but were limited to studies written in English

Weighing the evidence

For all questions of the causal effect of RJ on such outcomes as victim mental health and repeat offending, we restricted our review to reasonably unbiased estimates of the difference that RJ made in comparison to some form of CJ. We followed the methods used by the National Institute of Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) to assess evidence on the effectiveness of medical treatments. These methods (NICE, 2006) require us to use the "PICO" principle (population, intervention, comparison and outcome), asking, with every study examined, for exactly what *population* the RJ *intervention*, in contrast to what *comparison group*, produced what *outcomes*.

In assessing the strength of the evidence in each study that offered a reasonably unbiased PICO analysis, we were able to apply the Home Office (2004) standards for reconviction studies. These standards are based in part on the Maryland scientific methods scale (Sherman et al, 1997), which set a minimum threshold of level 3 for the Maryland report to the US Congress, *Preventing Crime*. Level 3 requires that the outcomes of at least two relatively similar P and C (population and comparison) groups are compared with (P) and without (C) the intervention. This review adopts that threshold, so that all statements about what works to reduce repeat offending or improve victim outcomes are based on a comparison between reasonably similar cases receiving RJ or not receiving RJ. For questions of implementation and description, the report incorporates both qualitative and before/after quantitative research designs.

Studies selected

The search process and eligibility criteria resulted in the identification of 36 tests eligible for inclusion in our quantitative review of the impact of RJ. These consisted of 25 reasonably unbiased estimates of the impact of RJ on repeat offending, six reasonably unbiased estimates of the effects of RJ on victims, and five estimates of the effects of diversion from prosecution to RJ on offences brought to justice. These studies and point estimates are listed in tables 1 to 5 in the "Summary" section below

Synthesising the evidence

As the NICE (2006) manual for developing guidelines for practice indicates, it is important to avoid over-mixing of results from substantially heterogeneous populations, interventions, comparisons or outcomes ("PICOs"). Equations that lump together studies into "meta-analyses" with great differences on these dimensions may yield an overall estimate of "effect", but remain unclear as to the effect of what variety of intervention on which outcome for which population. A more conservative approach is to limit combinations of studies into "average" effects only when they share similar "PICOs". Given the diverse nature of the studies identified for this review, it is usually necessary to treat each study as the only point estimate of its particular PICO characteristics.

The review makes cautious exceptions to that rule on a limited basis. We report the findings on repeat offending grouped separately by property and violent crime, so that the reader may look for patterns in relation to this basic distinction in the kind of harm (physical or non-violent) that offenders do to victims. What we do not do is "vote count" the studies, declaring a verdict about whether RJ "works" or does not "work", either in general or in relation to specific characteristics of populations or interventions. The reason for that rule is that the available tests are by no means a fair "vote" from all possible tests. We do total the numbers of findings in different directions within broad domains, but this is merely for the convenience of the reader, who will want to do it anyway. We provide it only to emphasise the caution that is needed in interpreting the numbers.

**NEW
BUSINESS**

To: VHS-Site Council, Mr. Barger
From: Jann Rempfer
Re: Banks in Action/Citigroup/Junior Achievement

Vail High School has been selected by Junior Achievement and Citigroup to be the first high school in the State of Arizona to learn and compete on a National level in the Banks in Action Program.

Volunteers from Citigroup, who comprise the upper level management team, have volunteered to come in one day a week for eight weeks and teach the program in all five of Mrs. Rempfer's business classes. The students will be learning all about finance, credit, the use of money and the banking industry from these professionals. The culminating event will be a real time simulation where teams of students will compete to see whose bank is the most profitable. One team from each class will be chosen to compete in the regional trials and possibly earn a trip to New York City where they would compete on an International Level and win a trip to Hong Kong.

As a school we are very fortunate to have this opportunity. The community exposure that has come about and the relationship building that will transpire are extremely advantageous for us. The experience the students will have is first class, with free curriculum and more importantly prepare them for their real-life outside of high school.

To follow is one of the emails I received from Junior Achievement outlining who the cooperating member's are that are making this happen.

Jann

First of all, on behalf of Junior Achievement, my thanks to each of you for making the Citigroup-sponsored Banks in Action launch at Vail High School possible. We're very excited about this new partnership, as well as the upcoming launch, scheduled for next Friday, January 18.

For the sake of efficiency, I wanted to introduce our PR people to our team in one e-mail. Please meet:

Jon Levy
Vice President
Citigroup
PH: 662-2863
E: Jon.levy@citi.com

(Jon serves on the Board of Junior Achievement, and has been a prime mover in bringing some great opportunities, including Banks in Action, to JA)

Jason Ott
Public Affairs Officer
Citibank, NA
PH: 662-2717
E: Jason.ott@citi.com

(Jason was instrumental in carrying the BIA proposal for Vail High School forward and ensuring its success within the Citi structure. Jason is the PR point-of-contact for Citi here in Tucson; I believe he and Jon have already discussed some great ideas for next Friday's launch.)

Jan Howard

Strong Point Public Relations

PH: 795-1566

E: janh@strongpt.com

(We are fortunate to have Jan as Junior Achievement's PR lead this year. She and Jason will work together to ensure we have successful media coverage of the 1/18 launch)

Jann Rempfer

Business Management Instructor

Vail High School

PH: 879-1927 or 548-7200 (cell)

(Jann is the wonderful teacher who is allowing us access to her classes as we implement Banks in Action for the first time.)

Angie Record

Junior Achievement

PH: 792-2000, ext 102

E: angier@jaaz.org

(Angie is our Operations Manager responsible for implementation of the program in the classroom)

Best regards,

-Rita

Rita Weatherholt

Executive Director

Junior Achievement of Arizona,

Southern District

(520) 792-2000 ext. 101

ENROLLMENT FOR 2007 – 2008

In January 2007, the Site Council capped enrollment for the year and set enrollment caps for each grade level for the 2007 -08 school year. Each grade was capped at 46 with a school cap of 170.

The enrollment on that day was as follows:

	9 th	10 th	11 th	12 th	Total
Jan '07	43	53	25	24	145
Today	47	34	41	23	145

Our plan is to accept 45 freshmen next year.

We expect to have our largest graduating class in school history (35).

Empire and Cienega will both be facing over crowding.

The VDLP is growing and presents itself as a funding source for an additional teaching position, which would allow us to grow 15-20 kids and not increase class size.

ENROLLMENT FOR 2008 – 2009

With that it is the recommendation of the Vail High School Administration that the site council freeze freshmen enrollment for the remainder of this year with a cap of 45, keep enrollment open until rodeo break for sophomores through seniors, and set individual grade level caps of 42 next year with the exception of a freshmen class of 45, with a school cap of 170 students.