

**Review of
State Restorative Justice Initiatives
& Recommendations for a
Massachusetts Restorative Justice Office**



November 2023

**Research Report of
Restorative Justice Advisory Committee (RJAC)**

**Prepared by
RJAC State Office of Restorative Justice Subcommittee**

Table of Contents

Restorative Justice Advisory Committee.....	3
Executive Summary	4
Introduction.....	5
Findings.....	7
Recommendations	13
Conclusion	16
Attachment I: <i>Recommended</i> MA Office of Restorative Justice Enabling Statute.....	17
Attachment II: <i>Recommended</i> MA Office of Restorative Justice Operating Budget	19
Attachment III: <i>Recommended</i> MA Office of Restorative Justice Program Design	20
Appendix A: Research Methodology	27
Appendix B: MA Research Data Summary	34
Appendix C: Other State Systems and MA Models Secondary Research Data	38
Appendix D: Other State Systems and MA Models Primary Research Data	54
Bibliography	68

Restorative Justice Advisory Committee

Seat	Member	Appointed By:
Secretary, EOPSS	Undersecretary Andrew Peck	Ex Officio
Secretary, HHS	Scott Taberner (State Office of RJ Subcommittee)	Ex Officio
House of Representatives, Speaker	Representative Simon Cataldo (formerly Representative Sean Garballey)	Legislature
Senate, Senate President	Senator Robyn Kennedy (formerly Senator Jamie Eldridge)	Legislature
President, MA District Attorney's Association	DA Marian Ryan	Ex Officio
Chief Counsel, Committee for Public Counsel Services	Atty. Allison S. Cartwright	Ex Officio
Commissioner of Probation	Dianne Fasano (formerly Lorna Spencer)	Ex Officio
President, MA Chiefs of Police Association	Ret. Chief Fred Ryan	Ex Officio
Executive Director, MOVA	Stephanie McCarthy (formerly Dianne Coffey)	Ex Officio
MA Sheriffs Association	Andrea Berte	Ex Officio
Retired Trial Court Judge	Peter Agnes (State Office of RJ Subcommittee)	Governor
Restorative Justice	Kara Hayes (State Office of RJ Subcommittee)	Governor
Restorative Justice	Dennis D. Everett Jr (State Office of RJ Subcommittee)	Governor
Restorative Justice	Susan Jeghelian, MOPC (State Office of RJ Subcommittee, Chair)	Governor
Restorative Justice	Samuel Williams (State Office of RJ Subcommittee)	Governor
Restorative Justice	Vacant	Governor
Restorative Justice	Vacant	Governor

Subcommittee Researcher: Karina Zeferino, MOPC

Executive Summary

The Massachusetts (MA) Restorative Justice Advisory Committee (RJAC) was established by Section 202 of Chapter 69 of the Acts of 2018, An Act Relative to Criminal Justice Reform. The RJAC is charged with monitoring and assisting community-based restorative justice (RJ) programs to which a juvenile or adult defendant may be diverted pursuant to M.G.L. Ch. 276B, tracking the use of community-based RJ programs through a partnership with an educational institution, and making legislative, policy and regulatory recommendations to aid in the use of community-based RJ programs.

In its 2021 and 2022 annual reports, the RJAC identified the need for a state-level RJ office to guide system-level stakeholders and individuals seeking alternatives to resolve harm, for embedding RJ in schools, courts, and communities, and to support MA RJ programs. To inform a policy recommendation for the creation of such an office, the RJAC, through its Subcommittee, reviewed data on MA RJ initiatives and conducted research on other states to understand the structure and functions of comprehensive RJ systems. This research informed the RJAC's proposed program design, enabling statute, and funding request to establish the MA Office of Restorative Justice in the FY 2025 state budget. The RJAC's recommendations incorporate public input collected during a public comment period.

For its study, the RJAC investigated a total of 27 state RJ initiatives through secondary research and conducted primary research to benchmark nine against desired criteria for a MA state RJ office. The benchmarking showed that most comprehensive state RJ systems are supported by state operational funding for a range of core institutional functions and staffing leveraged to raise additional diverse public and private investment. Comprehensive state RJ offices are established by legislation to ensure stability, public accountability, and quality of services. These offices are reservoirs of best practices, providing centralized fundraising, grant-making, standards, technical assistance, training, research, evaluation, advocacy and responsiveness to communities.

Based on this research, the RJAC is recommending the creation of the MA Office of RJ as a knowledge-based statutory entity with statewide jurisdiction serving communities and all branches of government; located in a neutral place within state government; and funded by a state appropriation, supplemented by grants and fees. Furthermore, the RJAC recommends that the office function as the primary administrative and funding agency for public RJ initiatives in MA and that it have authority for policymaking, fundraising, grant-making, standard setting, program development, research, training, capacity-building, public education, and convening. To enable authentic stakeholder voice and participation, the RJAC recommends that the office be guided by an advisory committee of system holders and community representatives, including indigenous communities, survivors and incarcerated populations. The RJAC is recommending an operating budget to support these functions of \$3 million for ten full-time staff and grants to fund agency, court and community-based RJ programs. Sources of the office's funding would be justice reinvestment initiatives (JRI) and the Cannabis Social Equity Trust Fund.

Establishing a MA Office of Restorative Justice would create a centralized, evidence-based mechanism for stabilizing, sustaining and broadening MA RJ programs and practices that foster healing, reduce recidivism and uphold public safety and accountability in furtherance of existing public policy in the Commonwealth.

Introduction

In 2018, the MA Legislature passed a landmark criminal justice reform legislation: An Act Relative to Criminal Justice Reform. This Act aims to serve MA communities and residents in a way that fosters rehabilitation and reintegration into society in the hope of fostering a more fair and equitable society. More specifically, Section 202 of Chapter 69 offers additional diversion opportunities for adults and juveniles charged with eligible offenses. This Section gives qualifying defendants the opportunity to avoid the criminal justice system by participating in community-based restorative justice (RJ) programs. According to Section 202 of Chapter 69, “Restorative Justice” refers to “A voluntary process whereby offenders, victims and members of the community collectively identify and address harms, needs and obligations resulting from an offense, in order to understand the impact of that offenses; provided, however, that an offender shall accept responsibility for their actions and the process shall support the offender as the offender makes reparation to the victim or the community in which the harm occurred.”¹

To promote the use of RJ in the state, Section 202 of Chapter 69 established the Restorative Justice Advisory Committee (RJAC) and charged the RJAC with tracking the use of community-based RJ programs through a partnership with an educational institution and making legislative, policy and regulatory recommendations to aid in the use of community-based RJ programs. Community-based RJ programs refer to “voluntary programs established on restorative justice principles that engages parties to a crime or members of the community in order to develop a plan of repair that addresses the needs of the parties and the community.”² The RJAC’s mission is to promote and expand RJ education, practices, and programming statewide in collaboration with practitioners, sponsors, stakeholders, and the general public, for the purpose of fostering healing for people and communities impacted by harm and systemic/structural violence with an aim towards promoting public safety and accountability.³

In its 2021 annual report, the RJAC recommended the establishment and annual funding of a statutory state RJ office under the leadership of an executive director to serve as a knowledge-based resource and clearinghouse, administrative and funding agency, and mechanism to develop RJ programming and conduct capacity building, evaluation and research. In the spirit of reinvestment, the 2021 report stated that the MA office of RJ and its programs could be funded by resources saved from reduced incarceration rates invested in justice alternatives, including RJ practices. The report further noted that the MA office of RJ could also play a pivotal role in securing buy-in for justice alternatives from the criminal justice system, identifying and mobilizing community assets, and redressing the structural harms inflicted by the traditional justice system. The 2022 RJAC annual report set as a priority for 2023 the drafting of an enabling statute for the state office of RJ to be adopted through an outside section of the state budget tied to an operational funding request. To carry out this priority, the RJAC formed the State Office of Restorative Justice Subcommittee (Subcommittee) in January 2023.

¹ <https://malegislature.gov/Laws/SessionLaws/Acts/2018/Chapter69>

² Ibid.

³ 2021 and 2022 RJAC Annual Reports.

During the period of February to October 2023, the Subcommittee Chair deployed a researcher to investigate MA and other state RJ initiatives to inform the Subcommittee's work.⁴ The researcher gathered data on 25 RJ systems/functions in other states, with a particular focus on initiatives sponsored by governments and/or codified in statutes/legislation, as well as information on two MA state office models in related fields – the Massachusetts Office of Victim Assistance and the Massachusetts Office of Public Collaboration.⁵ The researcher also reviewed initial data on local MA RJ initiatives collected by the RJAC Questionnaire Subcommittee and by Roxbury Community College (RCC) for the RJAC and information on individual RJ practitioners in MA provided by a knowledgeable RJAC member. The RJAC study of other state RJ systems was done through secondary and primary research to understand the key components and benchmark them against the following desired criteria set by the RJAC for a sustainable MA office of RJ:

1. State-sponsored (*funded by budget appropriation/possibly savings from reduced incarceration*)
2. Statutory (*established by statute*)
3. Knowledge-based resource (*houses expertise to inform/promulgate policy, standards, programming*)
4. Clearinghouse (*best practices, programs, trainings, activities, funding opportunities*)
5. Program developer and grant-maker (*designs and funds of statewide/local programs*)/ Fundraiser and funder (*applies for funding and disburses the funding statewide*)
6. Educator and capacity builder (*public awareness campaigns; conferences*)
7. Researcher (*conducts program evaluation and research to demonstrate impact/accountability*)
8. Convener/leader (*criminal justice system and community in redressing structural harms*)
9. Victim-centered/offender accountable & compassionate (*truly restorative*)
10. Integrates/Implements diversity, equity and inclusion (*in staffing, programs, partners*).

In addition to a review of preliminary data on local MA RJ programs, the researcher looked into current MA state-funded RJ grant programs under the Executive Office of Public Safety and Security (EOPSS) and the Massachusetts Probation Service (MPS) and a new state-funded grant program initiative for court RJ pilots under the Supreme Judicial Court Committee on Restorative Justice. Examples of cost savings from RJ and cost savings from reduced incarcerated rates invested in justice alternatives, including RJ practices, were also investigated.

Drawing on all of this research, the RJAC created a program design, enabling statute, operating budget and funding request for a MA Office of Restorative Justice which were finalized after a public comment period and consideration of close to 120 comments, many of which were adopted by the RJAC.

⁴ In undertaking this research, the Subcommittee Chair and researcher, both from the Massachusetts Office of Public Collaboration (MOPC) at the University of Massachusetts Boston, drew on the office's expertise and experience as the state's dispute resolution agency and university research center in conducting a legislative study that created an evidence-based framework for the successful establishment and annual funding of the statutory, state-sponsored MA community mediation system in 2012. Because of this experience and the fact that MOPC functions as a state-level, knowledge-based organization in the conflict resolution field and has done RJ work through state-funded local community mediation centers, MOPC was selected as a benchmarked state office model for the RJAC's research.

⁵ Ibid.

This report describes the research findings and considerations that influenced the RJAC's recommendations for the establishment and funding of a MA Office of Restorative Justice in the FY 2025 state budget. A proposed implementation plan and timeline are provided with the findings and recommendations outlined below.

For a detailed description of how the secondary and primary research were conducted and the process for developing the state office of RJ design documents from the research findings, please see *Appendix A: Research Methodology*.

Findings

I. MA RJ Initiatives

The following are findings from the preliminary investigation of three MA state-funded RJ grant program initiatives in the executive and judicial branches, two surveys attempting to inventory community-based RJ programs in the Commonwealth, and a limited list of individual RJ practitioners. For more information on these MA state RJ grant programs, local RJ initiatives and practitioners, see *Appendix B: MA Research Data Summary*.

Number of MA RJ organizations/programs: The surveys conducted by the RJAC Questionnaire Subcommittee and the RCC engaged 29 and 10 RJ respondents respectively, the EOPSS RJ grant program 14 RJ grantees and the MPS diversion grant program only 1 RJ grantee. Not all of these respondents refer to themselves as RJ programs. Based on this data and accounting for some duplication among the data sets, there appear to be about two dozen MA community-based RJ programs, with a concentration of RJ organizations/programs in the eastern part of the state.⁶

Mixture of RJ organizations/programs: The data collected and reviewed by the RJAC Questionnaire Subcommittee on MA RJ initiatives indicates RJ services and programs are being delivered by a mixture of both public and private organizations working on a range of social issues, including youth and gang violence, juvenile and adult diversion, reentry, housing instability, and healthcare access. These organizations include police departments, sheriff departments, district attorney offices, law offices, schools, universities, youth services agencies, courts, community-based nonprofits and community mediation centers. The RJAC Questionnaire Subcommittee survey found that the majority of RJ initiatives were founded in the last ten years and most fit within the operational structure of diversion, receiving referrals from the Departments of Correction, district attorney offices, parole offices, police departments, probation offices, sheriff departments, and community and faith partners. The RCC data showed yearly budgets for 10 respondents as ranging from \$0 (volunteer effort) to \$750,000 (university center), and that the cost per person/per year of conducting their RJ program was mostly unknown.

Number Individual RJ Practitioners: MA community-based RJ work has been done predominately by volunteers, educators and individual providers rather than programs according to RJAC members who have worked with local RJ programs and facilitators for many years. There appear to be at least 20 experienced individual RJ practitioners, currently working within

⁶ The data on MA community-based RJ programs drawn on for this report is incomplete in that the number of respondents to the RCC and RJAC Questionnaire Subcommittee surveys was small and did not capture all of the local RJ programs and initiatives going on in the state. According to RJAC members who have worked in RJ for years, the number of RJ organizations/programs is more likely two to three times this estimate.

the Commonwealth, mostly in Middlesex, Suffolk, and Essex counties. Since the survey data shows that some local RJ programs in other regions of the state, there are likely additional individual RJ practitioners beyond these three counties. Of these 20 practitioners, some also deliver training, and most work in multiple settings including schools, law enforcement, corrections, courts, and community healthcare.

Range of RJ activities: The data indicates that there is a wide variety of RJ methodologies and RJ-related activities taking place in various locations and broad range of settings in Massachusetts. These include: utilizing art to create social change; focusing on gang-involved youth and young adults; serving as a leader in court-alternative RJ practices; working with justice-involved individuals; serving survivors of violence and impacted communities; providing case management and culturally responsive re-entry services; offering an alternative to traditional school disciplinary processes; serving families struggling with food and housing insecurity and health inequities; implementing RJ programs in correctional institutions; providing college and reentry programs for formerly incarcerated individuals; and developing a drop-in center in response to gang violence; holding circles; sharing healing journeys; using RJ for sexual misconduct on campus or bringing RJ practice into their legal representation/process for parole; utilizing RJ circles in crisis intervention/stabilization work under the public health model; and providing community mediation services.

Low funding levels: There are currently only three publicly funded grant programs that award RJ funding in the state. One awards grants exclusively for community-based RJ initiatives serving low-income communities, another awards grants to municipalities partnering with community non-profits for diversion initiatives, including RJ and a third funds RJ pilots in the courts. All three grant programs are relatively young (in operation for an average of under five years) and the two for which information is available have relatively low funding levels for their statewide scopes (approximately 400,000-\$500,000 annually). The grants awarded by these two programs for local RJ initiatives are in the area of \$20,000 - \$50,000, which is less than the average annual salary for one community non-profit staff member.⁷

Lack of Support: The survey and interview data collected and reviewed by the RJAC indicates a lack of operational and programmatic support for community-based RJ programs in Massachusetts. Participants in post-survey interviews held by the RJAC noted the barriers they were facing in their work as access to stable funding, the necessity of RJ training for system-holders and RJ practitioners, and awareness-raising in communities about RJ services, and mentioned that having an association for RJ in MA or list of RJ practitioners in the state, and access to more in-depth training would be helpful to their programs. Most of the local RJ programs do not collect statistics regarding the demographics (race/ethnicity, age, gender, and income) of the population served and do not compile data regarding the recidivism rates of participants completing their programs. Without data on the impact of their services advocacy and fundraising for RJ are a challenge for local programs.

⁷ The U.S. Department of Labor announced proposed new regulations on Sept. 8, 2023 that would increase the minimum salary level that executive, administrative, and professional employees must be paid from \$35,568/year to \$55,068/year and proposes raising the minimum salary level for “highly compensated employees” from \$107,432/year to nearly \$144,000/year plus establishing a mechanism for automatically raising these salary levels in the future. <https://www.regulations.gov/document/WHD-2023-0001-0001>

Overall, the MA data reviewed for this report indicates that there are a relatively small number of RJ programs and practitioners in the state, mostly in the eastern region; that they are working on a wide range of issues within a variety of settings; that many are volunteer-based; and that most are in need of stable operational funding, staffing, and support for training; and that there is a relatively low level of public funding being invested in MA RJ work.

II. Other State RJ Initiatives

The secondary research on other states conducted by the RJAC showed that out of the 27 state-sponsored, statewide RJ initiatives studied, the majority (15 out of 27) are located within a state agency while the remaining 12 are either an independent state agency or a non-profit organization with a statewide mission. In terms of public authority, approximately half of the state RJ initiatives (13 out of 27) have statutory authority due to establishment through legislation while for the remaining 14, this information was non-applicable because they are 501(c)(3) non-profits or coalitions/networks of practitioners. Regarding jurisdiction, the majority of the RJ initiatives serve communities (20 out of 27) as well as the state (14 out of 27). A smaller percentage of RJ initiatives served courts, the criminal justice system, and schools.

The studied RJ systems perform various functions such as program development and administration, grant administration, research and education, training and technical assistance, policymaking, and advocacy. The majority of the state RJ initiatives (16 out of 27) do not have a formal reporting process. The remaining 11 do submit annual reports on their work/impact. Lastly, the majority of the RJ initiatives (15 out of 27) are funded through an annual state budget or state grant awards while the remaining 12 are federally funded, funded through membership fees, or this information was not available.

For more information on the 27 RJ initiatives studied, including their history, mission, partners, stakeholders, and impact, see *Appendix C: Other State Systems and MA Models – Secondary Research Data*.

III. Comprehensive State RJ Systems & MA State Office Models

The following are common features of comprehensive state-sponsored, statewide RJ systems that emerged from primary research on nine RJ initiatives selected by the RJAC for further investigation. For more information about each of these initiatives, see *Appendix D: Other State Systems and MA Models – Primary Research Data*.

Statutory Authority. Six out of nine RJ initiatives were established through statute or legislation. For example, the Dispute Resolution Act (1991) created Nebraska's ODR within the Judicial Branch while House Bill 07-1129 established Colorado's RJ Council. Similarly, SF 2909 includes funding for establishing and maintaining Minnesota's Office of Restorative Practices while H.P. 1380 – L.D. 1870, an Act Regarding the Maine School Safety Center, established MSSC as a permanent office funded by the state budget. MOPC was established by M.G.L. Ch. 75 § 46, while MOVA was created through the Victim Rights Law (M.G.L. Ch. 258b).

State-Sponsorship. Seven out of nine RJ initiatives are funded through budget appropriations or court filing fees. For example, the newly established Minnesota ORP will be funded \$500,000 each year through a budget appropriation. MOVA has a total budget of \$25 million in state and federal funding and MOPC's budget is \$3.6 million, and this includes annual state operational

funding through UMass Boston, an annual state budget appropriation for community mediation, government grants and contracts. Colorado's RJ Council is funded through a \$10 surcharge (cash fund) and their spending authority is slightly over \$1 million while Nebraska's ODR is funded in part by a \$0.75 dispute resolution filing fee and a \$50 parental proceeding filing fee as well as a \$270,000 budget appropriation, amounting to an overall budget of \$1,447,318.

Knowledge-Based Resource. Eight out of nine RJ initiatives house expertise to inform and/or promulgate policy as well as develop standards and programming by relying on experts within the RJ field to develop and implement resources for system actors and the general public. For instance, Nebraska's ODR works with the University of Minnesota and receives their training and knowledge-based foundation for RJ through this partnership. Similarly, MSSC's RJ coordinator partners with juvenile and adult RJ coordinators in the DOC and CDC to gain additional RJ expertise. Similarly, Vermont's NCORJ relies on local, regional, and national partnerships with experts within the RJ field to develop and implement their RJ resources.

Clearinghouse for Best Practices. Eight out of nine RJ initiatives provide training and technical assistance as well as develop best practices and policies for several RJ stakeholder groups. For example, MSSC offers free restorative practices training across schools in the state and runs a series of free workshops for schools to learn how to use restorative language in their Code of Conduct while KIPCOR's RSI provides training for districts, schools, teachers, and educational personnel in restorative practices. Similarly, the Scottish Government provides guidance on the delivery of RJ for service providers in the country while Colorado's RJ Council provides technical assistance and coordination to five pilot sites for their Juvenile RJ Diversion program.

Fundraising and Grant-making. Seven out of nine RJ initiatives apply for federal and/or state funding and distribute this public funding through grants to RJ programs in their states. For instance, MOVA funds about 140 programs throughout Massachusetts while MSSC was given a \$1 million grant to help schools develop restorative practices in Maine. Similarly, Colorado's RJ Council offers micro-grants for specific program development or capacity development for programs. MOPC functions as both a grant-maker and program administrator with funding raised from both state and federal sources.

Public Education. Eight out of nine RJ initiatives participate in activities such as hosting conferences and webinars and posting resources on websites to raise public awareness of RJ. For example, Vermont's NCORJ runs a webinar series focused on RJ in the criminal legal system while KIPCOR's RSI hosted the inaugural Restorative Kansas Conference. Additionally, Nebraska's ODR promotes RJ education on their website, state bar association, and magazines.

Evaluation and Research. Five out of nine RJ initiatives do not conduct regular program evaluation and research to demonstrate impact and accountability, although several incorporate research in their functions. MOPC, being located with the state university system, has its own research unit. Two RJ initiatives, although not conducting research regularly, have conducted program evaluation and research for specific initiatives in the past. Similarly, Colorado's RJ Council did a five-year pilot research study which consisted of research and evaluation while the Scottish Government completed a national opinion survey on RJ to inform key messages and plans on accrediting training and ensuring its continuous monitoring and evaluation.

Convening. Five out of nine RJ initiatives do not serve as conveners for bringing the criminal justice system and community together to redress structural harms because they are solely administrative or focus on specific areas. For example, Nebraska's ODR is truly administrative and simply a court-connected service. Similarly, MSSC is conscious of staying in their lane which is schools and education. Alternatively, MOPC, does serve as a neutral forum for convening problem-solving among public agencies, stakeholders and community members.

Centering Victims. Six out of nine RJ initiatives explicitly center victims and hold offenders accountable through policy documents and specialized trainings. For example, Colorado's RJ Council adopted a "Victim-Centered Restorative Justice" document which provides guidance for RJ programs and practitioners who are supporting victims/survivors or harmed parties through RJ. Similarly, Nebraska's ODR offers a training through the University of Minnesota that addresses this topic.

Prioritizing DEI. Six out of nine RJ initiatives implement trainings and policies to help increase diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) in their staffing, programs, and partners. For instance, MOPC includes DEI goals in its strategic plan and has an inclusive workplace policy. In MOVA's strategic plan, DEI is a key focus and out of that came the expansion of their board to include more survivors. Similarly, Colorado's RJ Council is currently undergoing significant DEI training and MSSC is currently working on expanding DEI in its staffing.

Publicly Resourced. Operating budgets across the nine state RJ system/functions studied range between \$1 million to \$4 million and the funding is for both staffing and programs. For instance, MOPC's operating budget is \$3.6 million of which approximately \$2 million is awarded in grants to local programs, while Colorado's RJ Council budget is around \$700,000 and Nebraska's ODR is around \$1.4 million. Minnesota's ORP budget is \$500,000 for the office and \$2.5 million for grants.

Core Staffing. The staffing level across the nine RJ initiatives average approximately nine staff members who cover a range of functions. For example, MSSC has nine staff members, including a director, assistant director, five coordinators (one for each area they specialize in), a food security champion, and an office manager. Similarly, Vermont's NCORJ has 11 core team members, including an assistant director, a team member that focuses on initiatives surrounding RJ in higher education, a team member that manages their Restorative Justice Research Community, and more, plus additional collaborators and working partnerships. MOPC has 10 staff members, which include an executive director, operations director, research director, research associate, four program managers, and department administrative assistant.

In sum, findings from the RJAC's research show that most of the comprehensive state RJ systems are supported by state operational funding for core institutional functions and staffing which is leveraged to raise additional diverse public and private investment. Comprehensive state RJ offices are established by legislation to ensure stability, public accountability, and quality of services. These offices are reservoirs of best practices, providing centralized fundraising, grant-making, standards of practice, technical assistance, training, research, evaluation, advocacy and responsiveness to communities.

IV. Cost Savings from RJ and Reinvestment Initiatives

In addition to researching the 27 state-sponsored/statewide RJ systems and the MA RJ initiatives discussed above, the RJAC investigated examples of cost savings from RJ initiatives and cost savings from reduced incarcerated rates⁸ invested in justice alternatives, including RJ practices. The following are a few examples.

In England and Wales, a recent economic evaluation analyzed the impacts of RJ interventions for adults and young people using 2021 costs. Researchers Jones and Harris (2022) found that overall, the cost-social benefit ratio of RJ was £14 per £1 invested, which is approximately \$17.61 per \$1.26 invested. Likewise, an evaluation of a victim/witness advocate program in Arizona revealed that the program produced \$127,222 in annual social benefits, which refer to savings from the use of societal resources, benefits to taxpayers, and benefits to individual participants (Brewster, 1980).

Additionally, the 36 states in the United States that have participated in the Justice Reinvestment Initiative (JRI)⁹ have saved or averted more than \$1 billion and invested half of that in strategies to improve system outcomes (U.S. Department of Justice, 2021). For instance, Oregon engaged in JRI in 2018 and passed targeted reforms through S.B. 973 in 2019 (Hull & Harvell, 2020). Through these bills, Oregon reinvested in local public safety solutions and community-based services. More specifically, Oregon invested almost \$100 million in JRI cost savings in local strategies to reduce recidivism including housing and reentry services, employment and education supports, behavioral health treatment and more than \$9 million in community-based victim services.

Similarly, with technical assistance through JRI, Pennsylvania engaged in JRI in 2016, passing S.B. 500 (Act 114) and S.B. 501 (Act 115) in 2019 to expand recidivism reduction practices in county probation, implement alternatives to incarceration for people with substance use disorders, and update sentencing guidelines (Sakala & Harvell, 2020). Through these bills, Pennsylvania reinvested in local public safety solutions and community-based victim services. For instance, Pennsylvania invested more than \$3.7 million in victim services.

In terms of Massachusetts, with technical assistance through JRI, the state enacted two laws in April 2018, one stemming directly from JRI (H. 4012) and one informed by JRI (S. 2371), to address high recidivism rates and avert nearly \$10 million in corrections spending by 2023 (Khalid & Harvell, 2020). In addition, M.G.L. Ch. 94G § 14A establishes a Cannabis Social Equity Trust Fund to “encourage the full participation in the commonwealth’s regulated marijuana industry of entrepreneurs from communities that have been disproportionately harmed by marijuana prohibition and enforcement”. Section 14(b) directly states that money in the fund should be expended for “programming for restorative justice, jail diversion, workforce development, industry specific technical assistance, and mentoring services for economically

⁸ According to a report on MA DOC expenditures and staffing levels for FY 2022, the average annual cost per state prisoner in FY 2022 was \$127,736 (Haas, 2022).

⁹ Justice reinvestment is a data-driven approach to criminal justice reform designed to examine and address correctional cost and population drivers to generate cost savings that can be reinvested in high-performing public safety strategies. The Justice Reinvestment Initiative (JRI) is funded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA)—with support from The Pew Charitable Trusts (Pew) and Arnold Ventures—and utilizes experts from The Council of State Governments (CSG) Justice Center and the Crime and Justice Institute (CJI) to achieve these goals.

disadvantaged persons in communities disproportionately impacted by high rates of arrest and incarceration for marijuana offenses pursuant to chapter 94C”.

The above examples of cost savings from RJ and reduced recidivism and the examples of the reinvestment of those funds in public safety and victim-related initiatives show ways that RJ can be publicly funded by states and provide a rationale for using public funding to support RJ programming.

Recommendations

The following recommendations for a MA Office of Restorative Justice were developed from the research undertaken by the RJAC. Collectively they represent a comprehensive evidence-based framework for a state-sponsored, state-funded RJ system to implement the mission and vision¹⁰ for restorative justice in Massachusetts.

1. **The Commonwealth should enact legislation to establish and fund the MA Office of Restorative Justice.** Establishing a statutory state-funded office of RJ would demonstrate the state’s commitment to making RJ a public resource available to all and would institutionalize RJ to ensure its effectiveness and sustainability across changing public priorities and transitioning public administrations. Such an office would be a vehicle for building RJ infrastructure and capacity within communities and public institutions statewide and would provide a funding framework for investment in RJ and for ensuring sound stewardship of RJ initiatives and funding in Massachusetts.
2. **The MA Office of Restorative Justice should have statewide jurisdiction and be located in a neutral place within state government.** The MA Office of RJ should have statewide jurisdiction with a public mandate to assist legislative, judicial, executive and municipal entities and communities with designing and implementing RJ initiatives. Since the office’s work would build RJ capacity across multiple sectors and disciplines (public safety, human services, education, and criminal justice), it should either be established as an independent agency or be housed under a neutral administrative agency, such as the Executive Office for Administration and Finance, which oversees human resources, state buildings, and other functions across government branches and agencies.
3. **The MA Office of Restorative Justice should be the primary administrative and funding agency for RJ in the Commonwealth.** The purpose of the MA Office of RJ should be to serve as the primary administrative and funding vehicle for publicly sponsored restorative justice initiatives in the state. Centralizing administration and funding of public RJ initiatives through this office would ensure public accountability and safeguard RJ’s accessibility by ensuring independence against pressures of anyone set of sponsors and funders from monopolizing RJ programming and expertise and shaping RJ practice. It would ensure

¹⁰ 2021 and RJAC Annual Reports. Mission: Promote and expand restorative justice education, practices, and programming statewide in collaboration with practitioners, participants, sponsors, stakeholders, and the general public, for the purpose of fostering healing for people and communities impacted by harm and systemic/structural violence and with an aim towards promoting public safety and accountability. Vision: A Commonwealth where community accountability for harm is based on healing and not on retribution, effective restorative practices are embedded within schools, public institutions and communities and supported by public policy, programming, funding, and infrastructure.

consistency of standards since the field of RJ is relatively new (outside of indigenous practices). It would also minimize competing RJ priorities and initiatives, avoid creating additional bureaucracies, and capture economies of scale and statewide impacts that multiple administrative and funding agencies would not be able to capture on their own.

4. **The MA Office of Restorative Justice should be authorized to carry out a comprehensive set of functions in support of its public mission.** The office should be authorized for a range of public duties, first and foremost, the authority to secure diverse funding sources to enable leveraged public investment in restorative justice and administer public grant programs to develop and fund agency, court and community-based RJ initiatives. It should have authority to set standards to ensure the quality of publicly funded RJ programming, facilitation and training, which should be developed in collaboration with practitioners, and authority to provide training and technical assistance to public employees and community members. To promote access and education, the office should maintain a centralized repository of RJ resources and host educational events and conferences. To share knowledge of effective RJ practices and demonstrate social and economic impact, the office should conduct research and program evaluation of RJ programs assisted by higher education institutions and should report regularly to policymakers, funders and stakeholders. Additional functions that should be authorized include convening dialogues to address systemic barriers to transformative justice and working to integrate diversity, equity and inclusion into the framework of the MA restorative justice system.
5. **There should be an advisory role for system holders and community members in the MA Office of Restorative Justice.** There should be a statewide advisory committee for the MA Office of RJ consisting of government and community representatives trained in RJ. Government members should be drawn from the executive, legislative and judicial branches, and government-related statewide associations, in the areas of public safety, law enforcement, victim assistance, health and human services, education, child welfare and legal agencies. Community members should include representatives of indigenous communities, survivors, returning citizens, incarcerated populations, community-based RJ programs and practitioners working in communities, schools, and criminal justice systems. An advisory committee would give system holders, stakeholders and community members a voice in the office's mission and a mechanism for providing input, feedback, advice, and guidance. The committee would serve as a sounding board and a place for accountability, transparency, and collaboration with the community and stakeholders in recognition of the interdependence of the diverse organizations and practitioners and the Commonwealth in promoting healing and accountability for harm. Members of the advisory committee should be recruited from diverse ethnicities, races, religions, ages, sexual orientations, gender identities, abilities, socio-economic backgrounds, and geographical regions in the state.
6. **There should be sufficient core staffing for the MA Office of Restorative Justice to direct and manage programming and operations.** The office should be provided with sufficient staffing to develop RJ policies and programming; launch and evaluate programs; carry out grant-making; deliver training and technical assistance; lead public education and public awareness campaigns; conduct research and fundraising; manage state and non-state funding; compile comprehensive reports to state leaders, funders and stakeholders;

coordinate its advisory committee; and collaborate with practitioners. Staffing should be at the level of at least 10 full-time staff, including an executive director, deputy director, directors of training and research, program/grant managers, outreach and training coordinators, and financial and administrative staff. The office leadership and program staff should have extensive RJ expertise and experience.

7. **The Commonwealth should be the main funder of the MA Office of Restorative Justice to ensure success and sustainability.** The Governor and the Legislature should annually appropriate funding for the operation of the MA Office of RJ in the state budget. The annual state funding should be leveraged by the office through fundraising to bring in other types of funding such as government and foundation grants and fees-for-services to public agencies in order to maximize the state's investment. State investment would ensure ongoing operations and reassure other funders of the state's commitment. The office's annual appropriation should be at a sufficient level to cover operational, staffing and programmatic expenses, including grants for RJ initiatives, RJ database for program evaluation and research, centralized RJ information repository, public education and research activities, and training and technical assistance carried out by the office. The public RJ grant funding currently appropriated annually through the Executive Office of Public Safety and Security should be redirected to the MA Office of RJ and expanded to invest in more community-based RJ programs as well as court and agency-sponsored RJ initiatives. The initial state funding level for the office should be \$3 million. Funding should be found through cost savings from justice reinvestment initiatives and from the Cannabis Social Equity Trust Fund which specifically provides for expenditures for restorative justice purposes.

The above RJAC recommendations for establishing a MA Office of Restorative Justice are built into the proposed enabling statute, operating budget, and program design developed by the RJAC. See *Attachments I, II, and III*.

Proposed Implementation Steps and Timeline

Step 1. FY 2024: The MA Office of Restorative Justice is established through the FY 2025 budget process with the enabling statute adopted through an outside section tied to a separate funding line item. During FY 2024, the RJAC works with the relevant state agency under which the Office will operate to locate office space and create approved benefited staff positions.

Step 2. FY 2025 (Quarters 1 & 2): The RJAC working with the relevant state agency under which the Office will operate assists with hiring the executive director and other core staff for the Office and with the appointment of the advisory committee.

Step 3. FY 2025 (Quarters 1 & 2): The Office, in consultation with its advisory committee and other stakeholders, designs and implements grant-making for state-funded RJ programs which includes development of eligibility criteria and guidelines for effective programs.

Step 4. FY 2025 (Quarters 3 & 4): The Office, in consultation with its advisory committee and other stakeholders, initiates development of data collection and evaluation systems, a central RJ repository, outreach and education initiatives, and fundraising to leverage the state's investment.

Step 5. FY 2025 (Quarter 3 & 4): The Office reports on its implementation, grant-making, evaluation, outreach, education, fundraising activities to the Governor, the Legislature, and the Court, and submits a funding request for FY 2026.

Conclusion

To design a MA state office of RJ, the RJAC reviewed preliminary data on local MA RJ initiatives and state-funded grant programs in the executive and judicial branches, and conducted research on 27 state RJ initiatives, particularly comprehensive systems sponsored by governments and codified in legislation, and benchmarked nine, including two MA state office models in related fields, to identify the common features for structuring those systems. The RJAC learned that MA RJ programs are in need of resources and that other states have offices that support local and statewide RJ initiatives. Most of these state RJ systems are statutory and state-sponsored through appropriations and filing fees, and most function as a knowledge-based resource and clearinghouse for best practices, and mechanisms for funding programs and delivering public education in their states. Across the nine initiatives, their core staff average nine and their operating budgets cover both staff and programming and range between \$1 million to 4 million. The RJAC research found that there are measurable cost-savings from RJ, and cost-savings from reduced recidivism that are being reinvested in justice alternatives such as RJ.

The research findings outlined in this report informed the RJAC's recommendations that the MA Office of Restorative Justice be established by statute; serve the three branches of state government and communities statewide; be located in a neutral place within state government; be funded primarily by a state appropriation that leverages government and foundation grants and fees-for-services; be an administrative and funding agency for public RJ initiatives in MA; have authority in policymaking, fundraising, grant-making, standards of practice, program development, research, technical assistance, training, capacity-building, public education, and convening; be guided by an advisory committee of system holders and community members; have an executive director as well as program, grant, research, training, outreach, and financial staff; and be funded by an initial budget appropriation of \$3 million with funding from justice reinvestment initiatives and/or the Cannabis Social Equity Trust Fund. These recommendations are incorporated in the proposed program design, enabling statute, and operating budget for the office submitted by the RJAC for adoption in the FY 2025 state budget.

Restorative justice is more cost effective than incarceration. It reduces recidivism, prioritizes rehabilitation over retribution, promotes community healing, empowerment and social equality, and humanizes justice. By enacting the legislation creating the RJAC, the Commonwealth recognized that promoting RJ is sound public policy. The establishment and annual funding of a state RJ office would significantly expand RJ practices and programming within the state and serve as an effective vehicle for implementing the Commonwealth's commitment to RJ.

The RJAC recognizes that the work of promoting, strengthening, and expanding RJ would just be beginning with the establishment of the state-level office. There are many outstanding historical and structural issues that need to be addressed by MA citizens, communities, and institutions. The MA Office of RJ would be a catalyst for dialogues and circles to engage in these critical discussions and take necessary actions toward healing and accountability.

Attachment I: *Recommended* MA Office of Restorative Justice Enabling Statute

CHAPTER 51. EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE

SECTION 63. Office of restorative justice; director; advisory committee; powers and duties.

There shall be an office of restorative justice funded by the commonwealth under the supervision and control of a director who shall be appointed by the secretary for administration and finance. The director shall be a person with substantial training and professional experience in restorative justice, who shall maintain complete impartiality with respect to the matters coming before the office of restorative justice and who shall devote full time to the duties of the office.

The office of restorative justice shall build restorative justice capacity across multiple disciplines and jurisdictions and serve as the primary administrative and funding vehicle for publicly sponsored restorative justice initiatives in the commonwealth. The office shall be available to assist legislative, judicial, and executive branch agencies of the commonwealth, counties, cities, towns, community organizations and members of the public with developing and expanding restorative justice initiatives. The office shall promote the implementation of G.L. chapter 276B of the general laws and any other statutes that provide for the use of restorative justice.

For purposes of this section, restorative justice shall include restorative practices rooted in community values and incorporating restorative principles. Restorative practices include but are not limited to victim-offender conferences, family group conferences, circles, community conferences, and other similar victim-centered practices. Restorative justice practices may be used at any point before, during and after court involvement, to prevent court involvement, and to support the healing of harm within communities.

The office may in collaboration with communities and government agencies and consistent with restorative justice values: (a) design, develop, launch and/or fund restorative justice programs; (b) create standards and guidelines for best practices for administration, training and facilitators of restorative justice programs operated or funded by the office; (c) conduct restorative justice educational programs and provide other technical assistance; (d) serve as a centralized repository for restorative justice resources; (e) establish policies and procedures to effectuate the purposes of this section, including provisions for grant making, data collection, and evaluation of restorative justice programs operated or funded by the office; and (f) take other action to promote restorative justice within local communities and public entities of the commonwealth.

There shall be a statewide advisory committee of members trained in restorative justice to guide the office of restorative justice in carrying out its mission. The advisory committee shall be convened by the director and shall consist of up to 18 members who shall serve without compensation except for reimbursement of expenses related to serving on the committee. There shall be an equal number of government members and community members of the advisory committee. Government members shall be drawn from the legislative, judicial, and executive branches and government-related statewide associations including representatives of public safety, law enforcement, victim services, health and human services, education, child welfare, and legal agencies. Community members shall be representatives of indigenous communities, survivors, returning citizens, incarcerated populations, community-based restorative justice

programs and practitioners working with juveniles and adults in communities, schools, and criminal justice systems. Advisory committee members shall be selected from diverse ethnicities, races, religions, ages, sexual orientations, gender identities, socio-economic status, differently abled, and geographical backgrounds from throughout the commonwealth.

The director of the office of restorative justice may establish reasonable fees to be charged to public agencies for the provision of the restorative justice education, consultation, or other services authorized herein, and may apply for and accept on behalf of the commonwealth any federal, local, or private grants, bequests, gifts, or contributions to aid in the financing of any of the programs or activities of the office. Fees, grants, bequests, gifts, or contributions shall be received by the office and deposited in a separate fund and shall be expended, without further appropriation, at the direction of the director, for the cost of operation of the office, including personnel and for programs funded by the office. The office may make agreements with public agencies and officers and may contract with other persons, including private agencies, corporations, or associations, to carry out any of the functions and purposes of this section.

The office shall annually prepare a report on its activities, including all income and expenditures, and file the report with the governor, the secretaries for administration and finance, public safety and security, health and human services and education, the chief justices of the supreme judicial court and the trial court, and the chairs of the house and senate committees on ways and means, public safety, human services, and education, on or before December 31.

Attachment II: *Recommended* MA Office of Restorative Justice Operating Budget

Name	MA State Office of Restorative Justice				
Subject	Annual Operating Budget - Year 1 Start-up Budget				
Budget line	Programming Expenses	UOM	No. of Units	Rate	Budgeted Amt:
1	Agency and court-based program grants	per program	15	\$50,000	\$750,000
2	Community-based program grants	per program	15	\$50,000	\$750,000
3	Outreach, trainings & educational conferences	lump sum	3	\$40,000	\$120,000
4	Database-tracking system	lump sum	1	\$100,000	\$100,000
5	Centralized information repository	lump sum	1	\$15,000	\$15,000
	Subtotal				\$1,735,000
Budget line	Staffing Expenses	UOM	No. of Units	Rate	Budgeted Amt:
6	Executive Director	per person	1	\$150,000	\$150,000
7	Deputy Director	per person	1	\$120,000	\$120,000
8	Research Director	per person	1	\$100,000	\$100,000
9	Training Director	per person	1	\$100,000	\$100,000
10	Grant Program Managers	per person	2	\$75,000	\$150,000
11	Outreach Manager	per person	1	\$75,000	\$75,000
12	Business Manager	per person	1	\$75,000	\$75,000
13	Research Associate	per person	1	\$75,000	\$75,000
14	Administrative Assistant	per person	1	\$50,000	\$50,000
					<u>\$895,000</u>
15	Fringe benefits (est. 39%) - (pension, healthcare, workers comp)	lump sum	1	\$349,050	\$349,050
	Subtotal				\$1,244,050
Budget line	Administrative Expenses	UOM	No. of Units	Rate	Budgeted Amt:
16	Telecommunications, equipment, supplies, travel & logistical expenses	lump sum	1	\$30,000	\$30,000
	Subtotal				\$30,000
17	Total State Office Budget - Year 1 Start-up				<u>\$3,009,050</u>
	Budget Notes				
[1]	Colorado annually budgets \$1M; \$45,000 for central repository/website and \$360,000 for educ & training				
[2]	Nebraska annual budget \$1.5M; only 2 staff members				
[3]	Minnesota \$500,000 for office operations annually; RJ grants \$4 million annually				
[4]	Maine has 9 staff that make between \$75,000-\$100,000 per year				
[5]	Kansas has 5 staff; 3 F-T and 2 P-T				
[6]	MOPC annual budget \$3M (\$2M for grants); 10 F-T staff: ex.dir, assoc.dir, 2 prog. dirs., res. assoc., 4 prog mgrs, 1 prog. assistant				
[7]	MOVA \$25M budget; 28 staff: exec. dir, policy/legis. team, grants team, monitoring team, fiscal team, victim-services team, training/outreach team				

Attachment III: *Recommended* MA Office of Restorative Justice Program Design

Importance of Prioritizing Restorative Justice for Massachusetts

- 1) Rehabilitation over retribution in programming
- 2) Community empowerment
- 3) Reduction in recidivism
- 4) More cost effective than incarceration
- 5) Social equality – address systemic bias
- 6) Humanization of justice

Goal

The goal of the Massachusetts state office of restorative justice, established by G. L. Ch. __, Section __, is to serve as a survivor and victim-centered knowledge based resource that fosters community healing and accountability for harm in the commonwealth by building restorative justice infrastructure drawing on restorative practices rooted in indigenous cultures and promoting effective restorative justice policy, education, research, practices, and programming within communities, schools, and public institutions (courts, correctional facilities and agencies), in collaboration with practitioners, government agencies, and other stakeholders.

Clarifications and Values

- ☐ State office will guide, support, and empower community-directed, community-based RJ initiatives but will not regulate RJ practice.
- ☐ State office will lead the strategic expansion of RJ in MA and concentrate public funding behind those efforts but will not preclude other public or private entities from securing their own RJ funding.
- ☐ State office will adopt an approach of serving others and promoting the growth of individuals and community; will recognize that RJ is about community, connection, and relationships.
- ☐ State office will provide leadership and support already established and effective practices; will partner with existing practitioners rather than supplant them.
- ☐ State office will uphold truly restorative values/practices and include indigenous practitioners and people from communities of color in creating its knowledgebase.
- ☐ State office will recognize that offenders, especially violent offenders, are also victims themselves.
- ☐ State office will prioritize diversity, equity, and inclusion in staffing, programming, and partnerships.
- ☐ State office will promote programming that serves those closest to harm and acknowledges the centrality of victims and the importance of responsible parties in the RJ process.
- ☐ State office would run programming for capacity building and technical assistance purposes vs. to replace community-based programs.
- ☐ State office could support and participate in programs.

Objectives

- A. Secure diverse funding sources to enable leveraged and sustainable public investment in restorative justice.
- B. Implement public grant programs for agency/court-based and community-based restorative justice initiatives including programming within communities, schools, and public institutions (courts, correctional facilities, and agencies).
- C. Ensure adherence to and faithful implementation of restorative justice practices and quality of restorative justice facilitation and training through standards/guidelines for best practices developed in collaboration with practitioners and stakeholders including confidentiality standards.
- D. Ensure public accountability through establishing restorative justice program evaluation systems and reporting to stakeholders and policymakers.
- E. Promote public education through conferences and educational events, a centralized repository of restorative justice resources and learning communities in the three branches of government and in communities for individuals and families involved in the criminal justice system.
- F. Create and share knowledge through peer-reviewed research and program evaluation of restorative justice practices and programming working with local higher education institutions.
- G. Build restorative justice capacity within correctional facilities, agencies working with adult and youth populations and in schools.
- H. Engage and consult with Indigenous leaders and practitioners of RJ.
- I. Convene dialogue forums to address systemic harms and barriers to transformative justice.
- J. Integrate diversity, equity and inclusion values and framework into MA restorative justice systems.

Activities

Planning – FY 2024 (RJAC)

- 1. Develop state office statute, program design, implementation plan and timeline.
- 2. Develop state office budget for operational, administrative and program expenses and funding request.
- 3. Integrate Roxbury Community College survey results on restorative justice programs in Massachusetts.
- 4. Secure adoption of state office enabling statute and funding through FY 2025 state budget process.
- 5. Recommend funding through justice reinvestment initiatives (JRI) and Cannabis Social Equity Trust Fund.

Implementation – FY 2025 (RJAC)

- 6. Create job descriptions for state office benefited FTE staff positions.
- 7. Hire state office director and other staff positions (recruitment based on DEI values and with required RJ training and experience as relevant to the position) and institute continuing education and professional development and ongoing learning opportunities within the office.
- 8. Locate physical space for the state office in Boston as the main office and regional office locations in Lowell/Lawrence, Fitchburg/Leominster, Worcester (Central MA) and Springfield (Western MA); Southeastern MA/South Coast; consider virtual offices in different geographic regions for remote connections
- 9. Furnish, equip and supply other state office locations.

10. Consider creating four units within the state office: 1. Victims, survivors, harmed persons; 2. Responsible Parties; 3. Storytelling (research, best practice guidelines); and 4. Nurturing (funding, education, promotion, support).
11. Coordinate appointment of advisory committee (see below).

Advisory Committee:

12. Work with state and community leaders to identify and appoint advisory committee members (consider re-appointing RJAC members as to capture historical knowledge and interest in staying involved); recruit members based on DEI values and aim for community leaders and practitioners from each region as well as survivors and incarcerated individuals who have been impacted by RJ.
13. Develop state office advisory committee policies and procedures (director convenes and develops with committee); consider term of 2-3 years; shorter terms to enable more rotation of members.
14. Prepare periodic progress reports and presentations to advisory committee.
15. Convene periodic (quarterly or more frequently as needed) advisory committee meetings to engage the input of members in the office's work; hold meetings in different parts of the state; permit members to have designees attend and participate in meetings as feasible.
16. Consult with advisory committee on grant-making policies, procedures and criteria and funding allocations.
17. Create policies and criteria and parameters to enable advisory board members to be eligible for funding through grants awarded by the office.
18. Seek advisory committee input and guidance on meeting regional needs for communities.

Grant-Making:

19. Transition existing EOPSS state-funded RJ grant program to the office.
20. Collaborate with communities and public agencies with existing restorative justice initiatives to establish new initiatives, support existing initiatives, and identify effective initiatives. Restorative justice initiatives include restorative practices, victim-offender conferences, family group conferences, circles, community conferences, and other similar victim-centered practices.
21. Design grant programs to fund agency, court, and community-based restorative justice initiatives that support programming within communities, schools, and public institutions (courts, correctional facilities and agencies).
22. Develop grant-making policies and procedures with relevant state fiscal/procurement department(s).
23. Develop funding eligibility criteria and grant requirements in consultation with sponsors and practitioners (Minnesota, Colorado, Nebraska).
24. Consider developing a policy for percentage allocation of funding between government and community grants with potentially more for community initiatives.
25. Appoint grant application review committees with stakeholder representation and administer grant application processes.
26. Work with networks of restorative justice practitioners to promote grant opportunities.
27. Collect and review grant applications for restorative justice programs and make grant awards.
28. Enter into contracts with grantees and distribute grant awards to grantees (tied to data reports).

Program Evaluation and Research:

29. Engage RJ practitioners and other stakeholders in discerning ways to measure the effectiveness of restorative efforts throughout the state including collaborative and participatory research methods.
30. Design evaluation plans to assess implementation and impact of restorative justice programs.
31. Design data collection instruments and protocols (surveys, focus groups, community gatherings) (Vermont).
32. Develop and launch activity tracking database for restorative justice programs and provide training and technical.
33. Prepare periodic program evaluation reports to Governor, Legislature and Court and stakeholders.
34. Obtain relevant approvals to conduct research.
35. Convene and engage in research projects in partnership with higher education institutions (community, state and private colleges/universities) (Vermont, Maine).
36. Publish research.

Fundraising/Development:

37. Secure annual state budget appropriation for operation of state office and grant programs (Minnesota).
38. Secure federal government and private grant awards to leverage the state's investment (Maine, Vermont).
39. Partnerships with public agencies, restorative justice organizations and higher education institutions.
40. Develop fees-for-service schedule for public agencies but no fees for members of the public.
41. Make fundraising experience required for the executive director and/or other positions in the office.

Outreach and Education:

42. Develop state office website, social media networks (YouTube channel), digital content/platforms (tablets) and outreach materials.
43. Conduct restorative justice public awareness campaigns, including educational programs to inform students and adults of the various ways in which RJ practices are being used throughout the state, for criminal justice system, department of corrections agencies and criminal justice system-involved individuals and families.
44. Convene restorative justice learning communities and dialogues to address structural harm (Kansas) and root societal causes of harm within communities.
45. Create a centralized repository of restorative justice resources and best practices developmentally tailored to youth, trauma-informed and healing-centered practice; provide technical support (Minnesota, Colorado); repository to be accessible for use and contributions by all community-based RJ programs and RJ practitioners; maintain RJ participant privacy when posting data/information to repository.
46. Create a statewide directory of restorative justice programs/practitioners (Minnesota, Colorado).

Quality Assurance and Training:

47. Encourage collaboration by creating a statewide network, led by restorative practitioners, to share effective methods and practices to acknowledge and repair harm (Colorado, Nebraska, Minnesota).
48. Design/implement restorative justice facilitator and trainer standards to guide but not govern best practices when RJ organizations conduct their own training (Colorado).
49. Design and conduct training for restorative justice facilitators and programs.
50. Provide conferences for education and shared learning and training to practitioners and stakeholders on restorative practices, victim-centered restorative practices, and trauma-informed care (Minnesota, Maine, Kansas).

Inputs

- ☐ Restorative justice advisory committee of state leaders and practitioners with EOPSS leadership/support.
- ☐ RJAC recommendation for creating statutory state RJ office.
- ☐ Legislative champions in House and Senate for securing budget appropriation and outside section.
- ☐ \$380,000 in state funding for restorative justice grants through EOPSS for 14 RJ programs awarded in FY 2023.
- ☐ Research and contacts with other state RJ systems and in MA collected by RJAC subcommittee.
- ☐ Roxbury Community College research and inventory contacts with MA community-based RJ programs.

Outputs: Years 1-2

- ☐ Framework for public investment and statewide public education on restorative justice.
- ☐ Statutory authority establishing the state office of restorative justice (G. L. Ch. __, s. __).
- ☐ State office of restorative justice funding through annual state budget appropriation of \$3,000,000.
- ☐ Restorative justice government and philanthropic grants, fees-for-services, gifts, and contributions.
- ☐ Relationships with restorative justice sponsors, funders, practitioners, and stakeholders.
- ☐ Knowledge-based administrative funding agency located in two regions of the state.
- ☐ Intergovernmental advisory committee of public leaders and stakeholder representatives.
- ☐ Approx. \$1.5 million public grant-funding supporting agency/court-based and community-based programs.
- ☐ Approx. 30 RJ programs in schools, communities, and government institutions across the state.
- ☐ Approx. 300 trained program staff, trainers and facilitators providing high-quality RJ services.
- ☐ Model restorative justice program administration, facilitator and training standards.
- ☐ State-wide RJ website, social media networks, outreach campaigns, digital/technology and materials.
- ☐ Restorative justice activity tracking database system and data on restorative justice programs.
- ☐ Monitoring and evaluation of grant-funded restorative justice programs.
- ☐ Reports, presentations, research and scholarly publications on restorative justice in Massachusetts.

- ☐ Strategic fundraising to serve public needs and leverage the state's investment.
- ☐ Annual statewide restorative justice conferences/events.

Outcomes

- ☐ Centralization and integrated statewide network of restorative justice policymaking, programming, education, funding, and research to support public institutions and local communities.
- ☐ Sustainability and broader utilization of restorative justice resources and programs in the state.
- ☐ Formal restorative justice program partnerships among public agencies, communities, and stakeholders.
- ☐ Forum for engaging those who have experienced harm and cause harm in RJ policymaking.
- ☐ Increased public safety and public accountability for impacts of crime and community healing.
- ☐ Increasing connection to community, restoring relationships, and increasing empathy; considering all perspectives involved; and taking responsibility for impact of actions by all parties involved.
- ☐ Providing solutions and approaches that affirm and are tailored to specific cultures.
- ☐ Implementing policies and procedures that are informed by the science of the social, emotional, and cognitive development of children.

Means of Verification

- ☐ Program design documents with implementation plan/timeline.
- ☐ Job descriptions of state office staff members.
- ☐ Administrative and programmatic policies, procedures, and forms.
- ☐ Outreach materials and state office website.
- ☐ Grant guidelines and grant application processes.
- ☐ Grant applications, supporting documents and award notifications.
- ☐ Grant contracts with and payments to restorative justice program grantees.
- ☐ Restorative justice facilitator and training standards.
- ☐ Program evaluation plans, instruments, and reports.
- ☐ Summaries of meetings and dialogue forums.
- ☐ Restorative justice activity tracking database system.
- ☐ Data entered into restorative justice activity tracking database system.
- ☐ Reports and presentations to the advisory committee.
- ☐ Program evaluation reports and annual state office reports to Legislature, Governor and Court.
- ☐ Research reports and publications on restorative justice in Massachusetts.

Additional Information for Planning Purposes:

Director qualifications (from Minnesota statute SF 2909):

[consider adopting for other MA RJ state office program staff as well]

1. Experience in the many facets of restorative justice and practices such as peacemaking circles, sentencing circles, community conferencing, community panels, and family group decision making.
2. Experience in victim-centered and trauma-informed practices.
3. Knowledge of the range of social problems that bring children and families to points of crisis such as poverty, racism, unemployment, and unequal opportunity.
4. Knowledge of the many ways youth become involved in other systems such as truancy, juvenile delinquency, child protection; and
5. Understanding of educational barriers.
6. Demonstrated knowledge and experience with restorative justice for adults.
7. Demonstrated commitment to utilizing restorative justice for serious harm.
8. Truly committed to restorative justice values.

Suggestions for future planning

- ☐ Establish regional RJ offices rather than one statewide office; give access closer to local communities.
- ☐ Transition the office from being within or under an executive branch agency into being an independent agency.
- ☐ Develop and implement strategies for longer term system change.

Appendix A: Research Methodology

MA Research

The researcher studied two MA state funded RJ grant programs – one administered under the Executive Office of Public Safety and Security (EOPSS) and the other administered under Massachusetts Probation Services (MPS). The study of the Commonwealth Restorative Justice Community Grant Program entailed review of the Office of Grants and Research FY 2023 grant solicitation, and the grant applications and grantee reports from the 14 local RJ programs funded by EOPSS. The study of the MPS diversion grant program entailed review of the state budget appropriations for the program between FY 2018 to FY 2024 and review of a summary about the grant program provided by the MPS. No other information was available online. The researcher was informed by RJAC members of a third state-funded grant program initiative in the judicial branch to fund RJ pilots in select court MA court divisions under the oversight of the Supreme Judicial Court (SJC) Committee on Restorative Justice.

Local MA RJ initiatives were not originally part of the Subcommittee’s research since the RJAC had already engaged Roxbury Community College (RCC) to create a comprehensive inventory of MA community-based RJ programs. The Subcommittee intended to include the RCC inventory in this report. However, after learning that RCC’s work is still ongoing, the Subcommittee directed the researcher to compile available data on local MA RJ initiatives collected by the RJAC and RCC so that some MA information could be included in this report. The researcher reviewed and summarized data collected through the RJAC Questionnaire Subcommittee’s FY 2022 survey and follow-up interviews which aimed to learn more about local RJ work going on in the Commonwealth and preliminary RCC data from a FY 2023 survey of community-based RJ programs in specific regions of the state and a description of RCC’s work, which built off the work of the Questionnaire Subcommittee. The researcher also reviewed information contained in a brief list of experienced individual RJ practitioners in MA provided by an RJAC member with extensive MA RJ experience. The practices of these individuals are primarily in Middlesex, Suffolk, and Essex counties.

See Appendix B: MA Research Data Summary.

Other States Secondary Research and MA State Office Models

The researcher used secondary research to identify state RJ initiatives to study. As several other states had already implemented RJ systems and functions, the researcher undertook an investigation of these systems and functions to inform the design of the MA office of RJ, focusing particularly on those sponsored by governments and/or codified in statutes/legislation. This research involved studying these systems to understand the key components that make these other state systems effective, including the extent of their authority, programming and resources.

The researcher relied heavily on the Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability’s (OPPAGA) “Review of Restorative Justice in Florida and Other States” 2020

report¹¹ to narrow down states with comprehensive RJ systems/functions. The researcher also investigated state initiatives that were mentioned in previous RJAC meetings by members and two MA state office models in RJ-related fields with representatives on the RJAC. For each RJ initiative the researcher collected the following information by visiting the organization’s website and/or reviewing publicly available documents:

Name and Description

1. Location (*E.g., within state agency, court system, university; independent state agency*)
2. Authority (*E.g., enabling statute, other legislation, executive order, court rule*)
3. Jurisdiction (*E.g., criminal justice system, schools, communities, state, municipalities*)
4. Functions (*E.g., policymaking, advocacy, program development, fundraising, grant making/administration, training, education, standards, research/evaluation*)
5. Reporting (*E.g., governor, legislature, court, funders, partners, stakeholders*)
6. Funding (*E.g., annual state budget appropriation, government/foundation grants, other*)
7. Other – includes history/mission (*how and why established*), partners/stakeholders (*who they work with/support*), and impact (*how they define and demonstrate impact/success*)

Through this secondary research, the researcher identified 25 RJ systems/functions and two MA state office models for the design of the MA state RJ office. The researcher created a summary research chart organizing the studied initiatives into the following categories: (1) MA State office models; (2) State-sponsored RJ systems; (3) State-sponsored RJ functions; (4) Statewide RJ systems; (5) Statewide RJ functions; (6) Local RJ systems; and (7) Other RJ systems. In this research, “state-sponsored” refers to RJ systems and functions that are funded by the state (appropriations or filing fees) while “statewide” refers to statewide RJ systems and functions that are funded through federal or private grants. The researched RJ initiatives include the following:

MA State Office Models

1. Massachusetts Office for Victim Assistance (MOVA)
2. Massachusetts Office of Public Collaboration (MOPC)

State-Sponsored RJ Systems (RJ systems funded by the State)

3. Colorado - Restorative Justice Coordinating Council (RJ Council)
4. Minnesota – Office of Restorative Practices (ORP)¹²
5. Nebraska Supreme Court – Office of Dispute Resolution (ODR)
6. New York State Unified Court System – Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Office

State-Sponsored RJ Functions (RJ functions funded by the State)

7. Colorado Department of Corrections (CDOC)
8. Kansas Department of Corrections (KDOC) – Office of Victim Services (OVS)

¹¹ OPPAGA. (2020, January). A Review of Restorative Justice in Florida and Other States.

<https://oppaga.fl.gov/Documents/Reports/20-02.pdf>

¹² This system was suggested later on by a Subcommittee member and was therefore added in *Appendix B: Restorative Justice Initiatives – Secondary Research Chart* once the chart had already been drafted.

9. Maine School Safety Center (MSSC)
10. Maryland – The Restorative Approaches Collaborative
11. Massachusetts - Commonwealth Restorative Justice Community Grant program
12. New Hampshire Department of Corrections (NHDOC) – Office of Victim Services (OVS)
13. Oregon – Restorative Justice (RJ) Grant Program
14. Pennsylvania – Office of Victim Advocate (OVA)
15. Vermont Department of Corrections (VTDOC)

Statewide RJ Systems (Statewide RJ systems that are either federally funded or funded through other means)

16. Florida Restorative Justice Association (FRJA)
17. Georgia – Restorative Justice Advocates of Georgia (RJAG)
18. South Carolina Restorative Justice Initiative (SCRJI)
19. Texas – National Association of Community and Restorative Justice (NACRJ)
20. Vermont – The National Center on Restorative Justice (NCORJ)
21. Washington – PointOneNorth

Statewide RJ Functions (Statewide RJ functions that are either federally funded or funded through other means)

22. Arizona Department of Corrections, Rehabilitation and Reentry (ADCRR) – Office of Victim Services (OVS)
23. California – Impact Justice Restorative Justice Project
24. Kansas Institute for Peace and Conflict Resolution (KIPCOR) - Restorative Schools Initiative (RSI)¹³
25. Texas Department of Criminal Justice (TDCJ) - Victim Services Division

Local RJ Systems (RJ systems that operate locally)

26. New York - Center for Justice Innovation

Other RJ Systems

27. The Scottish Government – Cabinet Secretary for Justice and Veterans

The researcher presented the results of the secondary research to the Subcommittee and members were given the opportunity to suggest additional RJ initiatives for the researcher to investigate. See *Appendix C: Other State Systems and MA Models – Secondary Research Data*.¹⁴

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Please note that the information in this chart is a summary of the information the researcher mined and is not intended to be a full description of these RJ initiatives.

Other States Primary Research and MA State Office Models

Benchmarking Criteria

The researcher used primary research to benchmark select state RJ initiatives. Drawing on the RJAC's 2021 and 2022 annual reports, the Subcommittee created the following list of desired criteria for a sustainable MA state RJ office which was confirmed by the RJAC:

- 1) State-sponsored (*funded by budget appropriation/possibly savings from reduced incarceration*)
- 2) Statutory (*established by statute*)
- 3) Knowledge-based resource (*houses expertise to inform/promulgate policy, standards, programming*)
- 4) Clearinghouse (*best practices, programs, trainings, activities, funding opportunities*)
- 5) Program developer and grant-maker (*designs and funds of statewide/local programs*)/
Fundraiser and funder (*applies for funding and disburses the funding statewide*)
- 6) Educator and capacity builder (*public awareness campaigns; conferences*)
- 7) Researcher (*conducts program evaluation and research to demonstrate impact/accountability*)
- 8) Convener/leader (*criminal justice system and community in redressing structural harms*)
- 9) Victim-centered/offender accountable & compassionate (*truly restorative*)
- 10) Integrates/Implements diversity, equity and inclusion (*in staffing, programs, and partners*).

The researcher administered an online survey to Subcommittee members using these criteria to collect feedback on the RJ initiatives summarized in the secondary research chart and to determine which initiatives to benchmark. The survey asked respondents to refer to the research chart and for each of the initiatives listed, check the benchmark criteria that were met. It also asked respondents to make note of any components that stood out to them as well as any components that were particularly concerning. Since not all Subcommittee members were able to complete the survey, the Chair and the researcher used the next Subcommittee meeting to gather this information from members verbally.

Of the 27 RJ initiatives, it was determined that 11 would be further investigated – nine through primary research (interviews, written responses, and review of documents) and two through presentations to the Subcommittee in place of interviews. This plan was agreed to by the RJAC. These 11 were as follows:

1. Massachusetts Office of Public Collaboration (MOPC)
2. Massachusetts Office for Victim Assistance (MOVA)
3. Colorado Restorative Justice Coordinating Council (RJ Council)
4. Minnesota – Office of Restorative Practices (ORP)
5. Nebraska Supreme Court – Office of Dispute Resolution (ODR)
6. Maine School Safety Center (MSSC)
7. Texas – National Association of Community and Restorative Justice (NACRJ)
8. Vermont – The National Center on Restorative Justice (NCORJ)

9. California – Impact Justice Restorative Justice Project
10. Kansas Institute for Peace and Conflict Resolution (KIPCOR)-Restorative Schools Initiative (RSI)
11. The Scottish Government – Cabinet Secretary for Justice and Veterans

The Subcommittee determined that these initiatives should be further investigated for various reasons. For example, the Subcommittee members agreed that for the two MA state office models, MOPC and MOVA, presentations would be helpful due to their role as administrative and/or funding agencies and their authority, structure and mission-driven programs and activities. In terms of state-sponsored RJ systems, the Subcommittee members agreed that both Colorado's RJ Council and Nebraska's ODR should be further investigated because these systems are both the type of comprehensive statewide, state-sponsored/statutory and stakeholder-involved RJ office that the Subcommittee is seeking to develop in MA. Similarly, regarding state-sponsored RJ functions, the Subcommittee members agreed that MSSC should be further investigated because although its jurisdiction is limited to schools, MSSC is a permanent office that is funded by the state and established by statute and performs many of the functions (knowledge-based resource, research, training, technical assistance, etc.) that the RJAC is interested in for the MA state RJ office. The Subcommittee members also agreed to further investigate three federally funded statewide RJ systems/functions (Texas's NACRJ, Vermont's NCORJ, and California's Impact Justice Restorative Justice Project) due to their mission to advance RJ and build capacity of community-based organizations. Lastly, the Subcommittee members wanted to further investigate the Scottish Government due to the county's high-level policy commitment to RJ.

The Subcommittee concluded that it would be helpful to further investigate the following five RJ initiatives for their programming, once the institutional components of the MA state RJ office had been developed: (1) Maryland's Restorative Approaches Collaborative for its collaborative capacity building program that serves schools (2) Oregon's RJ Grant Program for its RJ grant program (3) Pennsylvania's OVA for its advocacy and educational function (4) Arizona's OVS for its victim offender dialogue function and (5) Texas's DCJ Victim Services Division for its victim offender dialogue function. The remaining RJ systems/functions were not selected for deeper research mainly because their RJ functions were not as comprehensive as what was envisioned for the MA office.

Interviews

Of the eleven systems selected for further investigation, nine were engaged through primary research since two did not respond (California and Texas). The researcher set up virtual interviews with either the Executive Director or RJ specialist for four organizations with RJ systems/functions that required further investigation and received written responses to the interview questions from two organizations due to their inability to participate in a virtual interview. One system (Minnesota) had been established by a recent public safety bill and sufficient information was available online such that an interview was not held. In reaching out to the selected state RJ systems, the researcher explained the nature of the research being done by the RJAC to create a MA state RJ office.

Prior to the interviews, the researcher drafted interview questions and adapted them for each organization. The interview questions were drafted according to the benchmarking criteria. For example, each organization was asked about their funding source, more specifically, whether they were state-sponsored, to discover whether the “state-sponsored” criterion was met. It is important to note that the researcher was able to find some of this information through secondary research. Therefore, some of the questions simply required the interviewee to confirm that the information found online was accurate and to expand if necessary.

Given that each organization was unique and did not fulfill every benchmark criterion (e.g., some organizations did not function as a researcher while others did not act as a convener/leader), the researcher slightly adjusted each interview question for each organization. For those who agreed to participate in virtual interviews, the interview questions were sent to the interviewees approximately one week before the interview. Following interviews, interviewees provided the researcher with foundational documents such as a copy of their statute, a copy of their annual budget, and other important documents such as standards/policies.

Presentations

Rather than interviews, the leaders of the MA Office of Victim Assistance (MOVA) and the MA Office of Public Collaboration (MOPC), who were both members of the RJAC, gave presentations to the Subcommittee on their offices based on the benchmark criteria. Subcommittee members were able to ask questions for clarification and further elaboration. During these presentations, the researcher took detailed notes.

At the conclusion of the primary research, the researcher created a primary research chart to record and summarize responses to interview questions (verbal and written) based on the benchmarking criteria and presented a summary of the information to the Subcommittee and gave members an opportunity to give their feedback.

Additionally, the Subcommittee Chair and researcher presented a high-level research summary and highlights from the two presentations to the RJAC and confirmed the key components that had emerged for the framework of a MA state RJ office.

See *Appendix D: Other State Systems and MA Models – Primary Research Data* for data collected through interviews, presentations and documents. See *Bibliography* for documents obtained from interviews, presentations and websites for the primary research phase.

Cost Savings and Reinvestment Initiatives Research

In addition to researching current MA RJ grant programs and local RJ Initiatives and 27 state-sponsored/statewide RJ initiatives in other states, the researcher searched for examples of cost savings from RJ initiatives and cost savings from reduced incarcerated rates invested in justice alternatives, including RJ practices.

State Office Design based on the Research

Drawing on research findings and documents from other state RJ systems/functions that align with the RJAC’s criteria, the Subcommittee Chair and the researcher drafted the following MA

Office of Restorative Justice design documents: a) program design (*logic model* integrating research and key components into picture of how the office will work); b) enabling statute (*statutory framework* creating the office within government, its public mandate, jurisdiction and authority); c) operating budget (*spending plan* projecting the office's operating, staffing and programming expenses); and d) funding request for a state appropriation and outside section enabling statute for the office enacted through the state budget process.

The Chair and researcher reviewed the proposed MA state RJ office documents with the Subcommittee and presented them to the RJAC. The RJAC adopted the documents as drafts and posted the program design and enabling statute for 30 days (from mid-August to mid-September 2023) to collect public comments through an online survey and at a virtual public meeting designated for this purpose. The RJAC reached out to various stakeholder groups and organizations to notify them of the opportunity for public comment. The Subcommittee reviewed approximately 120 individual comments submitted by the public and brought suggested edits in response to the RJAC for further discussion and a vote to adopt final versions of the MA Office of Restorative Justice program design, enabling statute, operating budget and funding request to present to the Governor and the Legislature for adoption in the FY 2025 state budget.

Appendix B: MA Research Data Summary

EOPSS Commonwealth Restorative Justice Grant Program: A state-sponsored grant program administered under Executive Office of Public Safety and Security (EOPSS) delivers state funding to community-based organizations that provide RJ programming in low-income communities in MA. State funding of \$380,000 was awarded under this competitive grant program in FY 2023 and the program funding has been renewed for FY 2024. The FY 2023 grant applications and grantee reports submitted by the 14 local RJ programs¹⁵ funded by EOPSS indicate that grantees included non-profits and groups of organizations working on a range of social issues and deploying a variety of methodologies including utilizing art to create social change, focusing on gang-involved youth and young adults, serving as a leader in court-alternative RJ practices, working with justice-involved individuals, serving survivors of violence and impacted communities, providing case management and culturally responsive re-entry services, serving as an alternative to traditional schools guided by RJ philosophy, serving families struggling with food and housing insecurity and health inequities, utilizing community mediation, organizing the community to shift punitive school discipline policies and practice, implementing RJ programs in correctional institutions across MA, providing college and reentry programs for formerly incarcerated individuals, and developing a drop-in center in response to gang violence. Of the 14 grantees, nine requested \$20,000 in grant funding while the remaining five requested \$30,000 - \$50,000. The funded projects covered a range of RJ activities such as, administering and attending RJ trainings and events, developing new partnerships, expanding RJ programs, and hiring more staff to support RJ efforts. One example, Legacy Lives On, received funding in FY 2023 for a partnership with Suffolk University's Center for Restorative Justice to increase online and in-person support circle processes for survivors of violence, returning citizens, incarcerated people and students experiencing school discipline processes and create a curriculum for in-person trainings for up to 80 community members in Boston and Brockton.

MPS Diversion Grant Program: A competitive grant program administered by the Massachusetts Probation Service (MPS) for diversion initiatives has been funded through a state budget appropriation since FY 2018. The FY 2023 and FY 2024 state appropriations for this program were \$500,000. Since the program's inception, the MPS has provided small grants ranging from \$30,000 to \$50,000 to support municipalities and non-profits to partner together to divert juveniles and young adults from the criminal justice system, with the primary focus on high school, junior high, and elementary school age children. The grants support initiatives to pilot or expand multidisciplinary approaches to divert juveniles and young adults from the juvenile and criminal justice systems prior to arrest or arraignment through coordinated programs

¹⁵ FY 2023 EOPSS RJ Grantees: (1) Beheard.world – The Belonging Project (2) College Bound Dorchester – Boston Uncornered (3) Communities for Restorative Justice – C4RJ Case Process (4) Fresh Start Wellness, Inc. – Resurrected (5) Legacy Lives On (6) Legendary Legacies – Restorative Justice Training Initiative (7) Lighthouse Holyoke (8) Maverick Landing Community Services (9) Metropolitan Mediation Services – Youth Program (10) Pa'lante Transformative Justice (11) Transformation Prison Project (12) Transition House – Restorative Justice Responses to Gender Based Violence (13) Tufts University – MyTERN (Tufts Educational Reentry Network) and (14) UTEC, Inc.- Merrimack Valley Restorative Justice Initiative

for prevention and intervention serving youths and their families, including: (a) connecting youths to mental health services; (b) providing youth development activities and mentoring; (c) promoting school safety, family home visits, juvenile diversion programs and restorative justice and mediation programs; and (d) providing assistance for families and schools to navigate the legal system. The only local RJ initiative that the MPS has funded through this program is a partnership between Lowell Public Schools and the Center for Restorative Justice and Urban Assembly, which received grants from FY 2018 to FY 2022. This partnership aimed to identify students in the Lowell School system at risk of academic failure, dropping out, or engaging in inappropriate behaviors and to provide teachers and administrators with tools and frameworks needed to implement restorative justice practices to assist these youth. Activities included after-school programming and implementation of the Circles Forward curriculum, under the Lowell Public Schools Social Emotional Learning framework.

The Supreme Judicial Court (SJC) Committee on Restorative Justice – Court RJ Grants:

The judicial branch has established a committee to develop, implement, and oversee pilot programs to incorporate restorative justice practices in selected criminal cases in the Massachusetts courts. The committee is currently tasked with designing and managing a pilot program to offer a victim-centered restorative justice option in criminal cases prior to disposition. Participation in the pilots will require agreement from the district attorney, the defendant, and any identified victim, although the victim's direct participation in the restorative process is not required. A case selected for participation in the pilot would be temporarily diverted to a community provider trained in restorative practices to conduct the restorative process, which will focus on exploring the layers of harm caused by the defendant, the reasons that led to the defendant's actions, and alternative methods of accountability and repairing the harm the defendant caused. Successful completion of the restorative justice process may result in dismissal or may be taken into account at the time of the defendant's plea or sentencing. The pilot programs are slated to run over three years in the Plymouth and Suffolk Superior Courts, the Brockton District Court, and the Boston Municipal Court in Roxbury. The committee is expected to release a request for proposals (RFP) in November 2023. In developing the plan for the pilots, the committee held a public meeting. At the meeting, the idea of collaboration was stressed, i.e., RJ providers bidding to be selected for the pilots should be collaborating with other RJ providers. The court recognizes the challenge that most RJ providers, unlike mediators, are not associated with programs and that it has an obligation to ensure that any third party who provides services is qualified.

RJAC Questionnaire Subcommittee Survey and Interviews: In FY 2022, to learn more about local RJ work going on in the Commonwealth, a subcommittee of the RJAC was formed and administered a survey to community-based RJ programs. The subcommittee also conducted follow-up interviews with survey respondents who expressed a willingness to discuss their work further by phone. Through 29 survey responses¹⁶, the Questionnaire Subcommittee discovered

¹⁶ RJAC survey responses came from the following: (1) Berkshire County Regional Housing Authority's Dispute Resolution Center (2) Blackstone Valley Connector (3) Communities for Restorative Justice (C4RJ) – 5 responses in total (4) Center for Restorative Justice at Suffolk University (5) Community Based Program (6) Hampden County

the following: the respondents consisted of individuals from community mediation centers, police departments, sheriff departments, district attorney offices, universities, youth services, courts, and community-based nonprofits; the majority of programs were founded in the last ten years (14 out of 22 responses); most programs fit within the operational structure of diversion (14 out of 27 responses); and programs received referrals from the Departments of Correction, district attorney offices, parole offices, police departments, probation offices, sheriff departments, and community and faith partners. Additionally, the Questionnaire Subcommittee conducted follow-up interviews with five respondents. They found that among those interviewed, there is a range of different types of work: including holding circles, sharing healing journeys and RJ healing/accountability work in a broad range of settings; doing work in the context of their job - using RJ for sexual misconduct on campus or bringing RJ practice into their legal representation/process for parole; utilizing RJ circles in crisis intervention/stabilization work under the public health model; volunteering with C4RJ; and providing community mediation services. When asked about what barriers they were facing in their work, several respondents noted the necessity of RJ training for system-holders and RJ practitioners as well as access to funding and communities in order to raise awareness about RJ services. Respondents shared that having an association or list of RJ practitioners in the state, stable funding as well as funding for schoolwork and youthwork, and access to more in-depth training would be helpful to their programs.

Roxbury Community College (RCC) Inventory Survey: To build on the work of the Questionnaire Subcommittee, the RJAC engaged RCC to develop an inventory of community-based RJ programs in the following regions of the Commonwealth: Boston, Southeast, MetroWest, Northwestern, Western, and Central. During the Spring and Summer of 2023 RCC administered an online survey and received ten responses, half of which were respondents from the Questionnaire Subcommittee's survey. Through RCC survey responses from the ten community-based RJ programs¹⁷, RCC learned the following: all of the MA regions of interest were served by these programs, with the half of the programs located in the Boston Region; the number of people, direct victims and offenders, and other community members served yearly varied, with some programs serving only a handful of individuals while others served hundreds and thousands; yearly budgets ranged from \$0 (volunteer effort) to \$750,000; the cost of conducting the program per person/per year was mostly unknown; the majority (7 out of 10) do not collect statistics regarding the demographics (race/ethnicity, age, gender, and income) of the

Sheriff's Department (7) Independent RJ Facilitator in MA DOC facilities (8) Jeanne Geiger Family Safety Project (IPAEP Program) (9) Juvenile Diversion Program (10) Law Office of Amy M. Belger – Parole Practice (11) MA Department of Youth Services – Metro Region (12) Martha's Vineyard Mediation Program (13) MASTLE/CIT (14) Middlesex Community College Law Center (15) North Shore Community Mediation Center (NSCMC) (16) Plymouth County District Attorney's Diversion Program (17) Region one Parole Office (18) Repairing Harm (19) Restorative Justice (20) Restorative/Transformative Justice & Domestic Violence Working Group (21) RK Resolution (22) Suffolk County District Attorney's Office Restorative Justice Practices (23) Transformational Prison Project (24) Visioning B.E.A.R Circle Intertribal Coalition (25) Wakefield Police Department

¹⁷ RCC survey responses came from the following: (1) Ad hoc group of trained facilitators delivering RJ programs inside MA State Prisons and to the Federal courts in Boston (2) Center for Restorative Justice at Suffolk University (3) Communities for Restorative Justice (C4RJ) (4) Massachusetts Parole Board (5) Martha's Vineyard Mediation Program (6) No official name (7) Repairing Harm (8) RK Resolution (9) The Juvenile Diversion and Restorative Justice Program & Adult Diversion and Restorative Justice Program (10) A C4RJ partner

population served; all programs introduced their participants to their program through avenues such as community partners, schools, Departments of Correction, Departments of Parole, police departments and word of mouth; the majority of programs did not have a participation fee (7 out of 10), an age requirement (8 out of 10), or geographic restrictions (8 out of 10), however, the majority (6 out of 10) did require permission from a parent or guardian for underage participants; and the majority of programs (7 out of 10) do not compile data regarding the recidivism rates of participants since completion of the program.

List of Individual RJ Practitioners in MA: To supplement the information on the local MA RJ programs, one of the RJAC members working in RJ for over two decades compiled a list for this report of 20 individual MA RJ practitioners who have extensive RJ knowledge and experience, several of who are also RJ trainers. These practitioners focus their work primarily in Middlesex, Suffolk, and Essex counties. Most of these practitioners were trained by community partners and experienced community circle keepers (9); universities (e.g., Suffolk University's Center for Restorative Justice) (6); organizations that aim to disrupt incarceration, poverty, and racism at the center of urban violence (e.g., Roca) (3); and First Nation Leaders (1). Of these 20 individual MA RJ practitioners, 8 practice RJ within their own organizations (e.g., Legacy Lives On); 4 practice RJ in a law enforcement or correctional setting (e.g., Concord prison, Suffolk Sheriff's Office, Boston Police Department); 3 practice RJ in the health service setting (e.g., East Boston Neighborhood Health Center); 3 practice RJ within schools or universities (e.g., Cambridge public schools, Suffolk University); 3 are independent RJ facilitators or community activists; and 2 practice RJ within the court system (e.g., Suffolk Superior Court). Many of these individuals practice RJ in multiple settings.

The data in this report on MA community-based RJ programs is incomplete in that not all active RJ programs and local RJ initiatives in MA responded to the RCC and RJAC Questionnaire Subcommittee surveys. According to RJAC members who have worked with local RJ programs and practitioners for years, the number is more likely two to three times the two-dozen estimated in this report based on those surveys.

Appendix C: Other State Systems and MA Models Secondary Research Data

MA State Office Models & State-Sponsored/Statewide RJ Systems & Functions

I. State Office

Name & Description	Location	Authority	Jurisdiction	Functions	Reporting	Funding	Other
Massachusetts Office of Public Collaboration (MOPC) MOPC assists state and local government agencies, courts and legislators with establishing and administering dispute resolution programs and initiatives. MOPC is the statutory state administrator for the community mediation system in Massachusetts. MOPC also provides effective forums for collaborative problem-solving and community involvement on contentious public issues. https://www.umb.edu/mopc	Within existing state agency - University of Massachusetts Boston	Enabling statute	State and local government agencies, Courts	Program Development, Grant Administration, Research and Evaluation	Annual report to Legislature and Governor	Annual state budget appropriation	<u>-History:</u> Established by statute in 1990, MOPC is a state office and applied research center at the University of Massachusetts Boston <u>-Mission:</u> Assist state and local government with the design, development, and operation of dispute resolution programs and to provide effective forums for collaborative problem-solving and community involvement on contentious public issues <u>-Partners/Stakeholders:</u> State and local government agencies, courts, legislators, community mediation centers, and more <u>-Impact:</u> MOPC's work build capacity and public infrastructure within the Commonwealth for managing conflicts and deploying collaborative approaches on important policy issues within government and across sectors. MOPC's work results in cost savings for MA and its citizens through reduced litigation and settlement expenses and enhanced ability for effective problem-solving and civic engagement
Massachusetts Office for Victim Assistance (MOVA) MOVA ensures all victims and survivors of crime across the Commonwealth have access to high-quality services that are trauma-informed, culturally responsive, and reflective of diverse communities. MOVA achieves this by administering Victim of Crime Act (VOCA), SAFEPLAN and Drunk Driving Trust Fund (DDTF) funds in Massachusetts; providing training opportunities for service providers to ensure those who work with victims and survivors are	Independent state agency - governed by the Victim and Witness Assistance Board	Commonwealth's Victim Bill of Rights	State, Communities	Grant Administration, Training, Policymaking, Advocacy	Three-year Strategic Plan (most recent: 2021 – 2024)	Annual state budget appropriation	<u>-History:</u> Established in 1984 with the enactment of the Commonwealth's first Victim Bill of Rights, MOVA is a state office governed by the Victim and Witness Assistance Board <u>-Mission:</u> To empower all victims and survivors of crime across the Commonwealth by ensuring they have access to high-quality services that are trauma-informed, culturally responsive, and reflective of diverse communities <u>-Partners/Stakeholders:</u> Agencies and individuals working to empower victims and survivors of crime (service providers), legislators, policymakers, and more <u>-Impact:</u> MOVA envisions a Commonwealth in which all victims and survivors of crime can access rights and high-quality services that are reflective of our diverse communities; culturally responsive and

compassionate, informed, and are able to collaborate with one another to meet victim and survivor needs; and driving public policy and legislative advocacy on both the state and federal levels to promote the rights of crime victims in Massachusetts.							trauma-informed; and in which their voices and experiences are heard, valued, and amplified
https://www.mass.gov/orgs/massachusetts-office-for-victim-assistance							

II. State-Sponsored RJ Systems – *RJ systems funded by the State*

Name & Description	Location	Authority	Jurisdiction	Functions	Reporting	Funding	Other
Colorado - Restorative Justice Coordinating Council (RJ Council) The Colorado RJ Council serves as a central repository for information, supports the development of RJ programs, assists with education and training, and provides technical assistance as needed. The RJ council is made up of 19 appointed board members representing a diverse group of stakeholders who work with communities, state and local organizations to support the implementation of restorative justice practices across the state of Colorado. https://rjcolorado.org/	Within existing state agency – State Court Administrator’s Office (SCAO)	Legislation – HB 07-1129	State and local organizations, Communities	Program Development, Education, Training, Technical Assistance	On their website they report on the number of restorative justice practices being delivered across settings (governments, schools, universities, for-profits, non-profits, and private practices) in Colorado	A \$10 surcharge on court fees statewide provides available funding of approximately \$1 million per year	- <u>History</u> : On March 29, 2007, then Governor Bill Ritter, signed into law HB 07-1129 which established the RJ Council - <u>Mission</u> : To advance restorative justice principles and practices throughout Colorado by providing gateways to information, networking and support - <u>Partners/Stakeholders</u> : The RJ council is made up of 19 appointed board members representing a diverse group of stakeholders (state government agencies, restorative justice practitioners and victim services) who work with communities, state and local organizations - <u>Impact</u> : (1) <i>System-level impact</i> : system-level stakeholders will be guided by restorative values; restorative practices will be the foundation of all system encounters; and all system-level stakeholders will be involved in addressing harm (2) <i>Individual-level impact</i> : all people will have access to restorative practices
Minnesota – Office of Restorative Practices (ORP)	Within existing state agency – Department of Public Safety	Legislation – SF 2909	Criminal Justice Systems, Communities	Capacity building, Education, Training, Technical Assistance, Grant Administration	“By February 15 of each year, the director shall report to the chairs and ranking minority members of the legislative committees and divisions with jurisdiction over public safety,	Annual state budget appropriation	- <u>History</u> : On May 19, 2023, Minnesota Gov. Tim Walz signed a public safety bill that includes funding for establishing an Office of Restorative Practices (\$500k/year) and for Restorative Practices Initiatives Grants (\$4 million/year). - <u>Mission</u> : “The Office of Restorative Practices shall promote the use of restorative practices across multiple disciplines...” - <u>Partners/Stakeholders</u> : “The Office of Restorative Practices shall collaborate with Tribal communities, counties, multicounty agencies, other state agencies,

					human services, and education, on the work of the Office of Restorative Practices, any grants issued pursuant to this section, and the status of local restorative practices initiatives in the state that were reviewed in the previous year.”		nonprofit agencies, and other jurisdictions, and with existing restorative practices initiatives in those jurisdictions...” <u>-Impact:</u> (1) Establishment of new restorative justice initiatives (2) Support of existing restorative justice initiatives (3) Identification of effective restorative practices initiatives.
<p>Nebraska Supreme Court - Office of Dispute Resolution (ODR)</p> <p>The Nebraska Supreme Court ODR promotes mediation and restorative justice in the courts and in Nebraska’s families and communities. The ODR website provides information on approved mediation centers and family mediators, as well as statutes, policies, standards and other publications related to dispute resolution in the state.</p> <p>The ODR adopted the Nebraska Restorative Justice Facilitators Standards of Practice in 2020. The purpose of these Standards is fourfold: (1) to inform the practice of individual facilitators; 2) to guide the training of new facilitators; 3) to provide confidence to the participants in restorative processes; and 4) to promote public confidence in these practices.</p> <p>https://supremecourt.nebraska.gov/programs-services/odr</p>	Within existing state agency – Nebraska’s Administrative Office of the Courts	Legislation – Dispute Resolutions Act	Courts, Communities, State	Program Development, Education, Standards	<i>Not available</i>	Annual state budget appropriation	<p><u>-History:</u> The Nebraska Supreme Court ODR was created as part of Nebraska’s Administrative Office of the Courts in 1991 by the Dispute Resolution Act. Under the Office’s charge to “adopt policies and procedures” to determine “best practices” in restorative justice, the Office adopted the Nebraska Restorative Justice Facilitators Standards of Practice in August 2020</p> <p><u>-Mission:</u> To promote mediation and restorative justice in the courts and in Nebraska’s families and communities</p> <p><u>-Partners/Stakeholders:</u> Nonprofit mediation centers, dispute resolution advisory council, and more</p> <p><u>-Impact:</u> Ensure all Nebraskans have access to mediation and restorative justice processes</p>
New York State Unified Court System – Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Office	Within existing state agency – Unit within the Division	<i>Not available</i>	Courts, Communities, State	Program Development,	Community Dispute Resolution Centers – Annual statistical	Annual state budget appropriation	<u>-History:</u> The Statewide ADR Office is a unit within the Division of Professional and Court Services in the New York State Unified Court System’s Office of

<p>The Statewide ADR Office supports the court to promote the appropriate use of mediation and other forms of ADR such as restorative justice as a means of resolving disputes and conflicts peacefully. The main functions of the ADR Office are: partnering with Community Dispute Resolution Centers (CDRCs) throughout the state; supporting court staff and court programs around training, policy, and serving as the court’s hub for ADR information; overseeing the Attorney-Client Fee Dispute Resolution Program; reviewing and approving ADR training and qualifications; facilitating public access to information about ADR and related matters; and supporting training for judicial and non-judicial court staff and ADR neutrals who service in their courts.</p> <p>https://ww2.nycourts.gov/ip/adr/about-us.shtml</p>	<p>of Professional and Court Services in the New York State Unified Court System’s Office of Court Administration</p>			<p>Training, Education</p>	<p>report, Special reports</p>		<p>Court Administration. One of their functions is to operate and fund CDRCs, which were established in 1981. CDRCs provide restorative justice-based programming for youth who have committed criminal offenses and guide schools in implementing restorative justice practices</p> <p><u>-Mission:</u> Supports the court to promote the appropriate use of mediation and other forms of alternative dispute resolution, such as restorative justice, as a means of resolving disputes and conflicts peacefully</p> <p><u>-Partners/Stakeholders:</u> Judges, court administrators, bar leaders, non-profit organizations, communities, etc.</p> <p><u>-Impact:</u> ADR saves money and speeds settlement. It also results in creative solutions, longer-lasting outcomes, greater satisfaction, and improved relationships</p>
--	---	--	--	----------------------------	--------------------------------	--	---

II. State-Sponsored RJ Functions - <i>RJ functions funded by the State</i>							
Name & Description	Location	Authority	Jurisdiction	Functions	Reporting	Funding	Other
<p>Colorado Department of Corrections (CDOC)</p> <p>In 2011, legislation encouraged CDOC to create and implement various restorative justice programs for adult offenders such as Victim-Offender Dialogue, which is a victim-centered, confidential face-to-face meeting between a victim/survivor and the offender of a</p>	<p>Independent state agency – CDOC, Victim Services</p>	<p>Legislation - HB 1032, Chapter 296 An Act Concerning restorative justice</p>	<p>Criminal Justice System, Communities</p>	<p>Program Administration</p>	<p><i>Not available</i></p>	<p>Annual state budget appropriation</p>	<p><u>-History:</u> In 2011 the Colorado 68th General Assembly enacted HB 1032, Chapter 296 which created restorative justice programs for adult offenders in the CDOC. This legislation encouraged CDOC to implement various restorative justice practices such as Victim-Offender dialogue and an Apology/Accountability Letter Bank</p> <p><u>-Mission:</u> These programs aim to provide continued healing, a personal sense of justice, and answers to questions victims/survivors are unable to obtain in the traditional criminal justice system</p>

<p>severe or violent crime. In addition to this program, the CDOC Victim Services Unit (VSU) manages an Apology/Accountability Letter Bank program which provides victims and survivors a potential opportunity to receive a written letter of apology and accountability from the offender in their case.</p> <p>https://cdoc.colorado.gov/victim-services/victim-offender-dialogue-program</p>							<p><u>-Partners/Stakeholders:</u> Victims/Survivors</p> <p><u>-Impact:</u> Victims/survivors experience a personal sense of justice and increased wellbeing and healing. Offenders take accountability and therefore create new, meaningful purpose in their lives</p>
<p>Kansas Department of Corrections (KDOC) – Office of Victim Services (OVS)</p> <p>OVS provides victim notification and offers liaison services, restorative justice programming and batterer intervention programming.</p> <p>The KDOC operates several restorative justice programs for adult offenders under the OVS, including victim-offender dialogues, which provides an opportunity for eligible victims of severe violence to meet with an offender through the assistance of trained facilitators; a letter bank of apology letters from offenders; and victim impact classes, which provides the opportunity for victims to share their story and help educate offenders participating in victim impact classes understand the impact crime has had on the victim. These programs are available to adult offenders in Kansas prisons.</p> <p>https://www.doc.ks.gov/victim-services</p>	<p>Within existing state agency – KDOC</p>	<p>Enabling Statute</p>	<p>Criminal Justice System, Communities</p>	<p>Program Administration</p>	<p><i>Not available</i></p>	<p>State general revenue</p>	<p><u>-History:</u> On October 1, 2001, KDOC established OVS. OVS has expanded from providing victim notification, the original statutory requirement, to offering liaison services, restorative justice programming and batterer intervention programming</p> <p><u>-Mission:</u> Giving Kansas crime victims a voice in corrections by providing information, services and support with compassion and respect</p> <p><u>-Partners/Stakeholders:</u> Facilitators/volunteers and inmate graduates as co-facilitators</p> <p><u>-Impact:</u> Provides an opportunity for eligible victims of severe violence to meet with an offender through the assistance of trained facilitators; allows victims to receive and respond to letters from offenders; and provides victims the opportunity to share their story and help educate offenders participating in victim impact classes understand the impact crime has had on the victim</p>

<p>Maine School Safety Center (MSSC)</p> <p>MSSC assists schools in their efforts to provide for the overall safety of their community. This includes providing training in Restorative Practices to schools in the state. The purpose of the MSSC is to serve as; a central location for school safety and security information, including research, training, and technical assistance related to successful implementation of school safety and security programs; a resource for the prevention of youth violence and dysregulated behavior; a promoter of overall school safety including positive school climate, multi-hazard mitigation and response; and a resource to facilitate and assist local schools and public safety stakeholders in preventing, preparing for and responding to threats and acts of violence including self-harm, through a holistic solutions-based approach to improving school safety.</p> <p>https://www.maine.gov/doe/safety</p>	<p>Within existing state agency – Maine Department of Education (DOE)</p>	<p>Enabling statute - H.P. 1380 - L.D. 1870</p>	<p>Schools, Communities, State</p>	<p>Training, Education</p>	<p><i>Not available</i></p>	<p>State budget</p>	<p><u>-History:</u> In 2020, DOE and MSSC wrote a report to the Joint Committee on Education and Cultural Affairs recommending a transition from a federal grant supported program to a permanent office funded by the state budget. In 2022, An Act Regarding the Maine School Safety Center established MSSC as a permanent office funded by the state</p> <p><u>-Mission:</u> To develop a safe school infrastructure that will deliver high quality, up-to-date best practices, procedures, training (including training in restorative justice practices) and technical assistance and support to Maine Schools</p> <p><u>-Partners/Stakeholders:</u> Schools in the state</p> <p><u>-Impact:</u> Strengthened relationships, improved connection to school, strong sense of accountability, students learn from their mistakes, understand the impact of their actions on others and find opportunities to repair the harm they have caused through their misbehavior</p>
<p>Maryland – The Restorative Approaches Collaborative</p> <p>The Restorative Approaches Collaborative increases the capacity of school districts around the state to implement restorative approaches to discipline. This includes “technical assistance and training to county boards regarding the use of restorative approaches” as well as assistance to “each county board with the implementation of the guidelines.” The Collaborative’s comprehensive approach involves a</p>	<p>Collaboration between Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) and the Center for Dispute Resolution at the University of Maryland Francis King Carey School of Law (C-DRUM)</p>	<p>Legislation – HB 725</p>	<p>Schools, State</p>	<p>Technical Assistance, Training, Education</p>	<p>Annual student discipline data report to the Governor and General Assembly</p>	<p>Annual state budget appropriation</p>	<p><u>-History:</u> In May 2019, the Maryland General Assembly passed legislation directing MSDE to provide significant support to Maryland schools in the implementation of restorative approaches</p> <p><u>-Mission:</u> Increase the capacity of school districts around the state to implement restorative approaches to discipline</p> <p><u>-Partners/Stakeholders:</u> MSDE, C-DRUM, and schools</p> <p><u>-Impact:</u> Help schools at every level of restorative approaches integration move toward fully restorative learning communities</p>

series of programs, educational tools, and services aimed at supporting local school and school leaders as well as educators and staff.							
https://www.marylandpublicschools.org/about/Pages/DSFSS/SSSP/RAC/index.aspx							
<p>Massachusetts - Commonwealth Restorative Justice Community Grant program</p> <p>The Commonwealth Restorative Justice Community Grant program provides state funding to 501(c)3 nonprofits and groups of organizations that provide community-based restorative justice programming.</p> <p>https://www.mass.gov/info-details/commonwealth-restorative-justice-community-grant-program</p>	Within existing state agency – Office of Grants and Research (OGR), a state agency that is part of the Executive Office of Public Safety and Security (EOPSS)	Legislation - Fiscal Year 2023 General Appropriation Act, Chapter 276B of the Acts of 2022	Nonprofits and Community-based Organizations in the State	Grant Administration	<i>Not available</i>	Annual state budget appropriation	<p><u>-History:</u> The Fiscal Year 2023 General Appropriation Act, Chapter 276B of the Acts of 2022, established a grant program to be administered by the executive office of public safety and security, in consultation with the restorative justice advisory committee, for community-based restorative justice programs, provided, that funds shall be prioritized for community-based restorative justice groups in low-income communities. On February 2, 2023, grants were distributed to nonprofits across the Commonwealth for the first time</p> <p><u>-Mission:</u> Provide state funding to 501(c)3 nonprofits and groups of organizations that provide community-based restorative justice programming</p> <p><u>-Partners/Stakeholders:</u> Nonprofits</p> <p><u>-Impact:</u> This grant program is designed to allow those who have experienced harm and those who have caused it to participate in a restorative process. These restorative justice programs will improve the safety of communities impacted by crime</p>
<p>New Hampshire Department of Corrections (NHDOC) – Office of Victim Services (OVS)</p> <p>The OVS within the NHDOC provides restorative justice programs per the victim’s bill of rights in state statute. The office operates a victim-offender dialogue program, an accountability letter bank, and a victim impact educational program for prison inmates.</p> <p>https://www.nh.gov/nhdoc/divisions/victim/services.html</p>	Within existing state agency – NHDOC	Victim’s Bill of Rights in State Statute (NH Rev Stat Section 21-M:8-k)	Criminal Justice System, Communities	Program Administration	<i>Not available</i>	Federal funding – Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) & state funds	<p><u>-History:</u> <i>Not available</i></p> <p><u>-Mission:</u> Strives to continuously improve assistance and support for people who are crime victims or survivors</p> <p><u>-Partners/Stakeholders:</u> Victims/Survivors, Communities</p> <p><u>-Impact:</u> Increased ability to recover from the effects of crime</p>

<p>Oregon – Restorative Justice (RJ) Grant Program</p> <p>The RJ grant program awards grants to public and private entities for restorative justice programs offering an alternative to the criminal and juvenile legal systems.</p> <p>https://www.oregon.gov/cjc/rj/Pages/default.aspx</p>	<p>Within existing state agency – The Oregon Criminal Justice Commission (CJC)</p>	<p>Legislation – HB 2204</p>	<p>Public and private entities</p>	<p>Grant Administration</p>	<p>“No later than September 15, 2022, the Oregon CJC shall report to the interim committees of the Legislative Assembly related to the judiciary, concerning the commission’s progress”</p>	<p>State funding</p>	<p><u>-History:</u> In 2021, the Oregon Legislature passed HB 2204, which created the RJ grant program <u>-Mission:</u> Award grants to public and private entities for restorative justice programs offering an alternative to the criminal and juvenile legal systems <u>-Partners/Stakeholders:</u> Public and private entities and system partners (local law enforcement entities, courts, district attorneys, and defense attorneys) <u>-Impact:</u> Fund applicants that demonstrate coordination with community-based organization; an ability to work collaboratively with system partners; and that they will center the experiences of those harmed, encourage those who have caused harm to take responsibility and repair the harm, and support persons who have been harmed, impacted community members, and responsible parties in identifying solutions that promote healing, including promoting dialogue and mutual agreement</p>
<p>Pennsylvania – Office of Victim Advocate (OVA)</p> <p>The Pennsylvania OVA is the state agency with the authority and duty to advocate for the rights and needs of crime victims. OVA facilitates several restorative justice programs and services (inmate apology bank; victim offender dialogue, and resilient voices) through trained OVA professionals. They also provide training on restorative justice with the goal of preparing communities to work and communicate effectively with victims and treat them with dignity and respect. Educational workshops are offered across the state, including inside state prisons, community events, and more.</p> <p>https://www.oa.pa.gov/RestorativeJustice/Pages/default.aspx</p>	<p>Independent state agency - OVA</p>	<p>Enabling statute - Act 8</p>	<p>State, Communities, Community Justice System</p>	<p>Advocacy, Program Administration, Training, Education</p>	<p><i>Not available</i></p>	<p>State funding</p>	<p><u>-History:</u> The Pennsylvania Office of Victim Advocate (OVA) was created by Act 8, of 1995 during Governor Tom Ridge's Special Session on Crime <u>-Mission:</u> Authority and duty to advocate for the rights and needs of crime victims <u>-Partners/Stakeholders:</u> Prisons, communities, victims/survivors, etc. <u>-Impact:</u> Programs that promote resilience and healing</p>

Vermont Department of Corrections (VTDOC) In partnership with municipalities, VTDOC delivers restorative justice to and with communities through Community Justice Centers. VTDOC also awards state grants to city governments or nonprofit organizations to manage the Community Justice Centers throughout the state. https://doc.vermont.gov/content/restorative-justice	Independent State Agency - VTDOC	<i>Not available</i>	Criminal Justice System, Communities	Program Administration, Grant Administration	On VTDOC's website, they include a Community Justice Center programs evaluation report, and a report on the restorative justice programs	State grant awards	<u>-History:</u> In 1998, the Vermont Department of Corrections (DOC) initiated partnerships with municipalities to develop Community Justice Centers to deliver restorative justice to and with communities. DOC manages a portfolio of state grants, which they award to city governments or nonprofit organizations to manage the Community Justice Centers throughout the state. <u>-Mission:</u> Broaden and strengthen Vermont's restorative practices <u>-Partners/Stakeholders:</u> Community Justice Centers <u>-Impact:</u> Repair the harm caused by crime and conflict in communities throughout Vermont
--	----------------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	--	--	--------------------	---

III. Statewide RJ Systems – *Statewide RJ systems that are either federally funded or funded through other means*

Name & Description	Location	Authority	Jurisdiction	Functions	Reporting	Funding	Other
Florida Restorative Justice Association (FRJA) FRJA is a statewide association of restorative justice facilitators, practitioners, advocates and community members working to create equitable connections in their community that provide a safer and healthier environment. FRJA advances the field of Restorative Justice by utilizing the art of circle facilitation and storytelling to create connections, share knowledge, advance accountability after harm, make amends, and advocate for change. In 2022, a Guidelines Working Group of the FRJA shared a “Guidelines for Facilitation and Training in Restorative Justice Practices” that describes what FRJA consider most effective practices	Independent statewide non-profit organization	501(c)(3) non-profit organization	State, Communities	Training, Education, Guidelines	<i>Not applicable</i>	Membership fees	<u>-History:</u> FRJA is the statewide professional membership organization founded in Tallahassee in 2014 by the collective visioning of Dr. Cindy Bigbie, Jula Rose Taylor Denholm DeMaria, and Kelly McGrath, Esq.; three friends and colleagues dedicated to creating a just and peaceful world <u>-Mission:</u> Expand the understanding and use of restorative justice and restorative practices, and promote diverse approaches to conflict resolution, community building, and effective communication in all systems and organizations throughout Florida <u>-Partners/Stakeholders:</u> Restorative justice facilitators, practitioners, advocates, community members, etc. <u>-Impact:</u> Create equitable connections in Florida's community that provides a safer and healthier environment

and offers some standards by which newcomers, practitioners, students, potential participants, and the public may gain understanding and trust in these processes. https://www.floridarestorativejustice.com/about-frja.html							
Georgia – Restorative Justice Advocates of Georgia (RJAG) RJAG is a group of individuals who advocate for the adoption of restorative justice policies, programs, and practices across the State of Georgia. On their website, they have a list of RJ books and resources available to the public. https://restorativejusticeadvocatesofgeorgia.org/?page_id=11	Independent statewide organization	<i>Not available</i>	State, Communities	Advocacy, Education	<i>Not applicable</i>	<i>Not available</i>	<u>-History:</u> RJAG was formed by a group of individuals with one common idea – social justice instead of retribution. Recognizing the failure of the criminal legal system to administer equal justice, the group organized around known historical successes of other states that have developed policies, programs and practices and adopted laws that shift emphasis from merely punishing offenders to addressing the harm done to people and relationships as a way of building community and resolving conflict <u>-Mission:</u> RJAG promotes the values of restorative justice and advocates for programs in schools, the criminal legal system and the community that build and support those values <u>-Partners/Stakeholders:</u> Groups include community, criminal justice, law enforcement, corrections, workplaces, and educational organizations <u>-Impact:</u> Accountability, participation, and community peace
South Carolina Restorative Justice Initiative (SCRJI) SCRJI research issues relating to restorative justice theory and implementation, provide opportunities for community stakeholders to learn more about restorative justice and to become trained as restorative justice facilitators, and work with community activists, service providers, and grassroots organizers to research and support the design of the restorative practices that work best for their constituencies. https://scrji.org/	Within existing state agency – University of South Carolina Law School	<i>Not available</i>	State, Communities	Research, Training, Program Development	<i>Not available</i>	<i>Not available</i>	<u>-History:</u> SCRJI was founded to respond to the growing need for alternative pathways to justice in South Carolina <u>-Mission:</u> To Educate and promote dialogue about the concepts of restorative and transformative justice and to facilitate the development of restorative justice practices in South Carolina’s community <u>-Partners/Stakeholders:</u> Community activists, service providers, grassroot organizers, etc. <u>-Impact:</u> Restorative justice serving people of all ages and in multiple contexts; better serving communities through alternatives to retributive justice; and promoting justice through acknowledgement of indigenous and global roots of restorative approaches

<p>Texas – National Association of Community and Restorative Justice (NACRJ)</p> <p>NACRJ is a non-profit corporation that provides a support system for educators, practitioners and others interested in restorative and community justice. The primary means to fulfill this purpose are membership services, including a mini-grant program, and educational services to the field and general public carried out through the National Conference on Community and Restorative Justice, networking tools, resources available on its member accessible website and publications.</p> <p>https://nacri.org/</p>	Independent non-profit corporation	501(c)(3) non-profit organization	State, Communities	Grant Administration, Education	<i>Not available</i>	Membership fees	<p><u>-History:</u> On November 2, 2012, NACRJ was incorporated in the State of Texas. An application for federal non-profit status was prepared, submitted and approved by the Internal Revenue Service. On June 19, 2013, the NACRJ was publicly presented to the attendees at the 4th National Conference on Restorative Justice hosted by the University of Toledo and the Lourdes University, Toledo, OH. The NACRJ was created to serve as the parent organization for the biannual “National Conference on Restorative Justice”</p> <p><u>-Mission:</u> To advance community and restorative justice as a social movement by serving people and organizations committed to building community and addressing harm</p> <p><u>-Partners/Stakeholders:</u> Members (educators, practitioners, others interested in restorative and community justice)</p> <p><u>-Impact:</u> Safe and equitable world where restorative interactions transform individuals, relationships, communities and systems through the prevention, repair and deep healing of harm</p>
<p>Vermont – The National Center on Restorative Justice (NCORJ)</p> <p>NCORJ educates and trains the next generation of justice leaders and supports and leads research focusing on restorative justice and addressing social inequities to improve criminal justice policy and practice in the United States.</p> <p>NCORJ improves criminal justice policy and practice in the United States through supporting education, research, and training to further restorative approaches.</p> <p>https://ncorj.org/</p>	Within existing state agency – Vermont Law School (VLS)	<i>Not available</i>	State, Communities, Schools	Education, Training, Research	2021 NCORJ Impact Report	Federal grant	<p><u>-History:</u> In 2018 the Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) issued a solicitation for congressional funding, championed by Senator Patrick Leahy, to launch NCORJ. In response, Vermont Law and Graduate School (VLGS) submitted a proposal in collaboration with the University of Vermont and the University of San Diego. In March of 2020, the BJA awarded the grant to VLGS and its partners. Soon thereafter, the BJA announced additional grant funding was appropriated by Congress to manage the NCORJ. VLGS and partners submitted another competitive application and, in February 2021, received a second BJA award to manage and expand the work of the NCORJ</p> <p><u>-Mission:</u> Improves criminal justice policy and practice in the United States through supporting education, research, and training to further restorative approaches</p> <p><u>-Partners/Stakeholders:</u> Vermont Law and Graduate School, the University of Vermont, the University of San Diego, the U.S. Office of Justice Programs, the National Association of Community and Restorative Justice (NACRJ)</p>

							- <u>Impact:</u> Advancing restorative justice education in higher education, advancing restorative justice education for the general public, and advancing restorative justice research
Washington – PointOneNorth PointOneNorth is a statewide restorative justice organization that focuses on consulting, training, and technical assistance for restorative justice practices in schools, communities, and criminal justice systems. https://www.pointonenorth.com/ (please note website is currently under construction)	Consulting agency	<i>Not available</i>	Schools, Communities, Criminal Justice System	Consulting, Training, Technical Assistance	<i>Not available</i>	<i>Not available</i>	- <u>History:</u> <i>Not available</i> - <u>Mission:</u> Creating space that allows untapped individual and collective wisdom to emerge - <u>Partners/Stakeholders:</u> <i>Not available</i> - <u>Impact:</u> <i>Not available</i>
III. Statewide RJ Functions - <i>Statewide RJ functions that are either federally funded or funded through other means</i>							
Name & Description	Location	Authority	Jurisdiction	Functions	Reporting	Funding	Other
Arizona Department of Corrections, Rehabilitation and Reentry (ADCRR) – Office of Victim Services (OVS) The OVS in the ADCRR advocates change within the inmate population by illustrating the real impact of crime on victims through education, Victim-Offender Dialogues (VOD), a restorative justice program, and dedicated services to the community. The Victim-Offender Dialogue program provides an opportunity for eligible victims/survivors, at their request, to meet with an inmate face-to-face in a safe and secure environment with the assistance of a trained facilitator. https://corrections.az.gov/sites/default/files/documents/policies/500/0526.pdf	Within existing state agency – ADCRR	<i>Not available</i>	Criminal Justice System, Communities	Education, Program Administration	<i>Not available</i>	Federal funding – Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) through the Arizona Department of Public Safety and the US Department of Justice, Office for Victims of Crime	- <u>History:</u> <i>Not available</i> - <u>Mission:</u> Advocate change within the inmate population by illustrating the real impact of crime on victims through education, VOD, and dedicated services to the community - <u>Partners/Stakeholders:</u> Communities, ADCRR - <u>Impact:</u> All crime victims are treated with fairness, dignity and respect

<p>California – Impact Justice Restorative Justice Project</p> <p>The Restorative Justice Project at Impact Justice is the only national technical assistance and training project that partners with communities across the nation to address harm using pre-charge restorative justice diversion programs. The Restorative Justice Project leads the expansion of restorative justice diversion (RJD) programs across the country through direct training and technical assistance and the development of their National Training and Innovation Center.</p> <p>In September 2022, Impact Justice was awarded a \$1,000,000 grant for FY 2022 by the Office of Justice Programs’ Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) to implement their new project that will deliver and evaluate a new training and technical assistance strategy for pre-prosecution restorative justice diversion programs focused on youth and young adults. This project will build capacity and readiness among community-based organizations led by people of color, along with local systems partners, to launch restorative justice diversion programs in their own communities.</p> <p>https://impactjustice.org/innovation/restorative-justice/</p>	Independent non-profit organization	<i>Not available</i>	Criminal Justice System, Communities	Technical Assistance, Training	<i>Not available</i>	Federal grant – Office of Justice Programs - BJA	<p><u>-History:</u> Since 2011, through the Restorative Justice Project, Impact Justice has provided training and technical assistance to sites across the country, with additional sites being added each year</p> <p><u>-Mission:</u> Committed to building pathways toward healing, safety, and wellbeing for communities across the country, especially communities of color disproportionately impacted by the criminal legal system</p> <p><u>-Partners/Stakeholders:</u> Community-based organizations, leaders from the criminal and juvenile legal systems, victims/survivors, etc.</p> <p><u>-Impact:</u> Survivors have a voice in their healing process and people who have caused harm are accountable for the harm they’ve caused without being pushed into the juvenile or criminal legal systems</p>
<p>Kansas Institute for Peace and Conflict Resolution (KIPCOR) - Restorative Schools Initiative (RSI)</p>	Affiliated with Bethel College, a four-year liberal arts college associated with	<i>Not available</i>	Schools	Education, training, Convening	<i>Not available</i>	Several streams – DOE grants, funding through the College,	<p><u>-History:</u> KIPCOR was founded in 1985 and is one of the oldest regional peace institutes in the United States. The Institute offers an array of resources in conflict resolution and peacebuilding, as well as an extensive networking system for consulting and intervention.</p>

The RSI trains and supports districts, schools, teachers, and educational personnel in restorative practices.	Mennonite Church USA					donations, etc.	<u>-Mission:</u> KIPCOR endeavors to strengthen conflict resolution and peacebuilding capacities in the communities and institutions it serves. <u>-Partners/Stakeholders:</u> Districts, schools, teachers, educational personnel <u>-Impact:</u> N/a
<p>Texas Department of Criminal Justice (TDCJ) - Victim Services Division</p> <p>The TDCJ Victim Services Division is dedicated to providing direct, personal service to victims and their families throughout Texas.</p> <p>The Victim Offender Mediation Dialogue (VODM), a restorative justice program, in accordance with Code of Criminal Procedure art. 56A.602, provides an opportunity for victims or surviving family members of violent crime to initiate an in-person meeting with the TDCJ offender responsible for their victimization.</p> <p>In addition to the VODM program, the TDCJ Victim Services Division also operates another restorative justice program, an offender apology bank.</p> <p>https://www.tdcj.texas.gov/divisions/vs/vomd.html</p>	Within existing state agency – TDCJ	<i>Not available</i>	Criminal Justice System, Communities	Providing Services	Victim Services Division - Annual Report	Federal funding – Victims of Crime Act funds & State – part of the state funding is used to meet the state’s matching requirements for federal funds	<p><u>-History:</u> Victim Services was first established as a section in the Parole Division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice in 1993. The creation of the Victim Services Section was a result of victims requesting services, the foresight of staff and the passage of victims’ rights by the Texas Legislature. The Victim Offender Mediation Dialogue (VODM) program was formed within the section in 1993 after a victim requested this service. In 2001, the 77th Legislature passed legislation providing victims of violent crime the right to request victim offender mediation dialogue through this program. In November 1997, the Victim Services Section was elevated to division status, allowing the new division to provide services more efficiently</p> <p><u>-Mission:</u> Provide a central mechanism for crime victims to participate in the criminal justice system</p> <p><u>-Partners/Stakeholders:</u> Victims and their families</p> <p><u>-Impact:</u> Providing direct, personal service to victims and their families throughout Texas. Victims are not left behind at the crime scene, but can be involved in all parts of the criminal justice system if desired</p>

IV. Local Restorative Justice Systems/Program Models – RJ systems/program models that operate locally							
Name & Description	Location	Authority	Jurisdiction	Functions	Reporting	Funding	Other
<p>New York - Center for Justice Innovation</p> <p>The Center for Justice Innovation helps design, implement, and run dozens of programs, produces original research about justice</p>	Independent non-profit	Established by the New York State Unified Court System	Criminal Justice System, Communities, Courts, Schools	Research, Program Development and Administration, Training	Annual Report	State (New York State, other government sources, and the New York State Unified	<u>-History:</u> Originally called the Center for Court Innovation, they grew out of the Midtown Community Court, which was created in 1993 to address crime and safety issues in and around Times Square. The project’s success in reducing both crime and incarceration led the New York State Unified Court System to establish the Center for Court

<p>initiatives, and hosts visitors interested in justice reform.</p> <p>One of the Center’s focus areas, engaging communities, includes several restorative justice initiatives including their Peacemaking Program, Project Reset, Restorative Justice in Schools, Restorative Justice and Intimate Partner Violence and Manhattan Justice Opportunities.</p> <p>One of their programs, the Red Hook Community Justice Center is the nation’s first multi-jurisdictional community court which seeks to solve neighborhood problems in southwest Brooklyn. The Justice Center’s programs include peacemaking, community service and a youth court where teenagers are trained to resolve real-life cases involving their peers.</p> <p>https://www.innovatingjustice.org/</p>						<p>Court System); Federal; Local (New York City); and Private and fee-for-service</p>	<p>Innovation as an independent non-profit dedicated to justice reform. In 2023, they changed their name to the Center for Justice Innovation to reflect how their work has evolved from primarily court-based to a combination of justice system- and community-based programming that emphasizes local leadership, community empowerment, prevention, equity, and safety</p> <p><u>-Mission:</u> The Center for Justice Innovation works with communities and justice systems to advance equity, increase safety, and help individuals and communities thrive</p> <p><u>-Partners/Stakeholders:</u> Representatives of the justice system (police, prosecutors, defenders, judges, probation, etc.), government officials, community members, victims, those with direct experience of the justice system, etc.</p> <p><u>-Impact:</u> Reduce the need for justice system involvement in the first place, identify and resolve as early as possible the challenges that bring people into the criminal and civil legal systems</p>
---	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

V. Other Restorative Justice Systems/Program Models							
Name & Description	Location	Authority	Jurisdiction	Functions	Reporting	Funding	Other
<p>The Scottish Government – Cabinet Secretary for Justice and Veterans</p> <p>The Scottish Government is the developed government for Scotland and has a range of responsibilities including justice.</p> <p>The Scottish Government published a restorative justice action plan in June 2019. It describes a range of actions including training for restorative justice facilitators, public awareness and understanding of</p>	Government – Cabinet Secretary for Justice and Veterans	The Cabinet is the main decision-making body of the Scottish Government	Country	Training, Education, Guidelines	<i>Not available</i>	The Scottish Budget – Annual Funding from the UK government	<p><u>-History:</u> It was by means of crime victims’ policy that in 2017 the Scottish Government fully recognized the existence of Restorative Justice</p> <p><u>-Mission:</u> The Scottish Government aims to have high quality restorative justice services available to all those who wish to access it, at a time appropriate to the people and case involved</p> <p><u>-Partners/Stakeholders:</u> Community Justice Scotland, stakeholders across the justice sector</p> <p><u>-Impact:</u> Restorative Justice processes are available and delivered consistently and, in a trauma-informed way</p>

<p>restorative justice, and information sharing between justice services.</p> <p>They have also produced guidance on the delivery of restorative justice for service providers. This is designed to ensure that where restorative justice processes are available, these are delivered consistently and, in a trauma-informed way.</p> <p>In 2022, Justice Secretary Keith Brown welcomed the launch of two hubs that will pave the way for restorative justice services to be rolled out across Scotland. The new National Hub within Community Justice Scotland will have a strategic oversight role. It will also manage delivery of an initial test project in the Edinburgh, Lothian and Borders area establishing best working practices before services are developed in other regions. In addition, a Thriving Survivors hub is being set up to offer a safe, trauma-informed service to support cases involving sexual harm.</p> <p>https://www.gov.scot/policies/victims-and-witnesses/restorative-justice/</p>							
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Appendix D: Other State Systems and MA Models Primary Research Data

Through four structured interviews, three written responses, two presentations, and one review of upcoming legislation, the researcher learned the following from these nine organizations:

1. Massachusetts Office for Victim Assistance (MOVA)

The Chief Advisor of MOVA, Diane Coffey, and MOVA Deputy Chief of Staff Stephanie McCarthy gave a presentation on MOVA during the May 2nd, 2023, Subcommittee meeting. During the presentation, Diane presented the following:

State-sponsored: MOVA has several funding sources such as (1) the Human Trafficking Trust Fund, where forfeitures, fines, and fees are deposited into the fund to support programming that supports survivors of human trafficking (2) the Drunk Driving Trust Fund, where fines and fees from prosecutions related to drunk driving support both direct service programming for victims of drunk driving and prevention, education, and training programming (3) state funding for the SAFEPLAN program, which supports survivors of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking (4) administrative funding through a separate line item which supports agency operations in their Boston and Northampton offices and (5) federal funding through the Victims of Crime Act, in which MOVA administers VOCA assistance dollars which allows them to support 140 programs throughout MA. MOVA has a total budget of \$25 million, although this varies year to year. In terms of staffing, MOVA has a total of 28 employees, including an Executive Director, policy and legislative team, grants team, monitoring team, fiscal team, victims service team, and training outreach and communication team.

Statutory: MOVA is an independent state agency created in 1984 through the Victim Rights Law (M.G. L. Ch. 258 b.). MOVA is governed by the Victim and Witness Assistance Board (VWAB).

Knowledge-based resource: In house, MOVA has staff who establish expertise around the delivery of victim services, legislative/policy initiatives, and more. However, they do not have any standards for the delivery of victim advocacy.

Clearinghouse: MOVA administers several training programs throughout the year. They administer the MOVA Training Academy, a weeklong training where they teach victim service providers the essentials of advocacy, skill building, and help them understand their distinct roles. They also have a new advocate training designed for advocates who work in the criminal legal system. They train and certify all the SAFEPLAN advocates that work in the courts and provide continuing education for advocates.

Program developer and grant-maker & fundraiser and funder: They fund about 140 programs throughout the state.

Educator and capacity builder: MOVA has a Victims Rights Conference, which consists of a series of webinars that promote skill building. They also have a monthly victim service bulletin that contains updates on resources and community events. Additionally, they organize a Victims

Rights Events where they honor people in the field. It is ultimately a public awareness event. They also have an active social media presence as well.

Researcher: MOVA requires the 140 programs they fund to report data to them quarterly, as their federal funding stream requires it. Additionally, even for programs that are not funded federally, they still require them to report data so they can understand the impact of these programs. MOVA files annual reports to the legislature based on this data. More recently, they have also been using this data to inform and develop policy.

Convener/leader: This function was not applicable to MOVA.

Victim-centered/offender accountable & compassionate: MOVA's board originally had five members (the attorney general as the chair, two district attorney members that are appointed by the Governor, and two members of the public, one of which is required to be a survivor of crime). Last year, MOVA underwent statutory change to allow their board to expand. The language added two additional public members, both of which are required to be survivors and at least one member must be representative of an underserved community. By doing so, they were able to level the playing field between the elected members on their board (which lacks diversity) and survivor members. Additionally, their Executive Director is a survivor of crime, which means that MOVA is survivor led.

Integrates/implements diversity, equity, and inclusion: DEI was a key focus in their most recent strategic plan. They have also set aside money to fund culturally specific victim service programs. They have piloted this in the western part of the state which are programs that are run by and served by marginalized communities.

2. Massachusetts Office of Public Collaboration (MOPC)

The Executive Director of MOPC, Susan Jeghelian, who is also the Chair of the State RJ Office Subcommittee, gave a presentation on MOPC during the May 2nd, 2023, Subcommittee meeting. During the presentation, she presented the following:

State-sponsored: MOPC has several funding sources: (1) annual state operational funding through UMass Boston; (2) an annual state budget appropriation for community mediation; (3) government grants; (4) fee-for-service contracts; and (5) foundation awards. MOPC has an annual operating budget of \$3.6 million of which about \$2 million is awarded to local programs. MOPC's staff consists of ten full-time staff which includes an executive director, operations director, research director, research associate, four program managers, and department administrative assistant.

Statutory: MOPC is established by two statutes: G.L. Ch. 75, s. 46 (MOPC) and s. 47 (CMC Grant Program). MOPC's statewide mandate is to serve executive, legislative, and judicial branches as well as municipalities. MOPC has the authority to: (1) facilitate resolution of disputes through impartial dispute resolution (DR) services; (2) establish standards for selection, assignment, and conduct of DR practitioners; (3) conduct educational programs for public agencies; (4) design, develop and operate public DR programs; and (5) award grant funding to qualified community mediation centers (CMCs).

Knowledge-based resource: MOPC functions as a knowledge-based resource for public entities. MOPC: (1) provides technical assistance and services through experienced staff, affiliate practitioners and faculty/students as well as leverages expertise of national networks of researchers and practitioners; (2) conducts legislative and research studies to inform policy and program development; (3) assists public entities with designing, operating and evaluating DR programs; and (4) qualifies DR practitioners to serve on public contracts.

Clearinghouse: MOPC serves as a clearinghouse primarily for community mediation in MA. MOPC: (1) develops and shares best practices for DR processes and programming based on evaluation of center practices and public programs as well as research in the field; and (2) investigates and shares training and funding opportunities through memberships in national networks of government-funded systems, practitioners, and researchers.

Program developer and grant-maker: MOPC builds infrastructure for public dispute resolution in MA. MOPC: (1) establishes and administers evidence-based DR programs and leverages program funding; (2) builds capacity within public agencies and among DR practitioners; (3) ensures quality through establishing standards, effective practices, and learning communities; and (4) collaborates with sponsors and partners on development, implementation, and evaluation.

Fundraiser and funder: MOPC has authority to set fees, apply for grants, make awards, enter into contracts, and accept gifts. MOPC is the (1) administrative and funding agency for state-sponsored community mediation; (2) secures state funding for the MA youth conflict resolution and restorative practices program, MA housing program, MA reentry mediation program, and MA child access and visitation mediation program, and MA affordable housing development program; (3) secures federal funding for the MA agricultural mediation program and (4) secures foundation funding from local, statewide and national funders for deliberative dialogue projects and youth program through local community mediation centers.

Educator and capacity builder: MOPC has served as a centralized hub for awareness raising and education in numerous ways. MOPC: (1) promotes public awareness about community mediation through www.resolutionma.org; (2) provides centralized training for community mediation centers statewide; and (3) has delivered numerous trainings and conferences over the years for public employees and executive branch agency ADR coordinators, court employees and court-connected ADR programs, and DR practitioners in MA and nationally.

Researcher: MOPC uses quantitative, qualitative, and participatory research methods and program evaluation to promote learning, improve program implementation, and demonstrate impact. MOPC has conducted: (1) legislative studies on community mediation and municipal conflict resolution needs; (2) a trial Court-wide study to increase utilization of court-connected ADR; (3) CMC grant program evaluations showing \$22M return on investment in cost-savings and leveraged resources from \$3M in state funding; and (4) housing mediation program evaluations showing contributions to housing stability in MA.

Convener/leader: MOPC serves as a leader and convener for DR stakeholders in two ways. First MOPC is a convener for DR among public agencies and between agencies and the public and a convener of collaboration among sponsors, partners, and participants in DR programs. MOPC has promoted/supported: (1) ongoing collaborative engagement through facilitated meetings and

learning communities; (2) participatory program evaluation seeking assessments from parties utilizing services; (3) regular reporting to sponsors and partners and posting on websites; and (4) a community mediation advisory committee of centers, funders, and community partners.

Victim-centered/offender accountable & compassionate: MOPC sponsors RJ programs delivered through community mediation centers. MOPC (1) awards grants to centers to support youth restorative justice and restorative practices initiatives in partnership with community organizations (mostly schools); (2) holds a monthly learning community among center youth program coordinators for peer support and ensuring best practices; and (3) sponsors training for centers to establish good grounding in RJ principles and practices.

Integrates/implements diversity, equity, and inclusion: MOPC is committed to becoming an anti-racist organization promoting DEI in policies, programs, and practices. MOPC: (1) includes DEI goals in its strategic and performance plans and has an inclusive workplace policy (2) employs a full-time staff member with DEI expertise to coordinate DEI initiatives; (3) is engaging in DEI organizational assessment and training with its staff; (4) funds DEI grants to community mediation centers and hosts a DEI learning community for them; (5) conducted diversity research through community listening sessions with communities of color and published a report on its findings and recommendations; and (4) presents at conferences on research findings to help integrate DEI into community mediation.

3. Colorado – Restorative Justice Coordinating Council (RJ Council)

The researcher conducted a virtual interview with the State RJ Council Coordinator on April 18th, 2023. During the interview, the State RJ Council Coordinator shared the following:

State-sponsored: The RJ Council is funded through a \$10 surcharge (cash fund) that is paid through court fees on every adult conviction. According to the Coordinator, the benefit of a cash fund versus an allocation from the State Legislator is that the money carries over to the next fiscal year. Their spending authority is slightly over \$1 million, with approximately \$45,000 for their central repository/website and \$360,000 for education and training. Their revenue has been down since the COVID-19 pandemic, amounting to around \$700,000. In terms of staffing, they have one full-time staff position funded through the cash fund and an additional half-time staff position funded through a separate source of funding.

Statutory: House Bill 07-1129 set up the council itself without staffing or appropriation. Several years later, however, the surcharge appropriation was passed to fund the council.

Knowledge-based resource: The RJ Council meets their mandate as a central repository for information through their website. On their website, they seek to house as much information as possible related to RJ programming and practices in the state. This includes a directory of practitioners and programs which demonstrates where they provide services, what types of services they provide, the types of training they provide, their areas of focus, and more. They also have a YouTube channel where they post training videos. Additionally, in 2012, working with their practitioner's network, they adopted a statewide code of conduct and standards of practice for RJ in Colorado.

Clearinghouse: In terms of training and technical assistance, this has been an on and off activity; They do not have ongoing training. For example, for several years, each quarter they would offer training on a certain topic to anyone in the state. Similarly, one year they offered cross training between individuals with a victim-advocacy background and those with RJ facilitation experience. They have also provided restorative practices training for schools in the past. These trainings have happened in response to demand. One reason for this is that there are several programs and practitioners in the state that already provide excellent training to the public and they have been reluctant to compete with these. Additionally, they have a strong statewide network of programs and practitioners called the Colorado Coalition for Restorative Justice Practices and they are complementary to the Council's work.

Program developer and grant-make & fundraiser and funder: Several years ago, the legislature charged the Council with funding, overseeing, and collecting data specifically for Juvenile RJ Diversion programming. As a result, they funded and provided technical assistance and coordination to four pilot sites. Once this project ended, they decided to offer widespread funding to multiple sectors. They now offer micro-grants, more specifically, short-term funding (1-year) like seed funds for specific program development or capacity development for programs. These grants started at \$25,000 and are now up to \$65,000.

Educator and capacity builder: The RJ Council has hosted statewide conferences in the past. The RJ Coordinator and other council members provide short RJ education, 1-on-1 presentations, often with other state partners, and attend and present workshops at the annual statewide judicial conference.

Researcher: The RJ Council did a five-year pilot research study which consisted of research and evaluation. They contracted a professional evaluation consulting organization (OMNI) to lead the evaluation component of the study. The RJ Council has a data team and they have been working with a university-based researcher to identify a future evaluation research project.

Convener/leader: The council hopes to convene practitioners from around the state that do RJ work to talk about various practices and tension points between various organizations (e.g., system-based victim advocates and community-based organizations). They hope to take this role on in the future.

Victim-centered/offender accountable & compassionate: There has been some resistance to RJ and understanding that this is for victims. Their cross-training initiative mentioned above aimed to address this. Additionally, they have adopted a "Victim-Centered Restorative Justice" document which provides guidance for RJ programs and practitioners who are supporting victims/survivors or harmed parties through RJ. The 2012 standards document also maintains a strong balance between being victim-centered and supporting those who have caused the harm. They are also planning to create a community-based document that touches upon balancing the needs of the victim and holding offenders accountable in a compassionate manner.

Integrates/implements diversity, equity, and inclusion: The 19 council members are appointed by designated authorities, so as a council, there are very few seats that they can select. They have tried to open discussion about this through developing an appointment guideline which does include DEI elements. Additionally, they are going through significant DEI training for the

council itself. The members are diverse in the sense that they come from vastly different sectors and parts of state government.

4. Nebraska Supreme Court – Office of Dispute Resolution (ODR)

The researcher conducted a virtual interview with the Director on April 12th, 2023. During the interview, the Director shared the following:

State-sponsored: Nebraska's ODR has several funding sources such as (1) a \$0.75 DR filing fee to support the six approved centers through the Dispute Resolution Cash Fund (2) appropriation (\$270,000) in the FY 2022 budget and (3) a \$50 filing fee is collected for marriage dissolutions and paternity determinations, parental support proceedings, and modifications to fund the Parenting Act Fund. Their FY 2023 overall budget was \$1,447,318. In terms of staffing, Nebraska's ODR is truly administrative, with a Director and Program Specialist.

Statutory: The Dispute Resolution Act (DRA) (1991) created the Office of Dispute Resolution (ODR) within the Judicial Branch, an advisory council, and a statewide network of approved centers for mediation services. In 2019, LB595 explicitly incorporates RJ into the DRA and allows for RJ to be provided through the approved centers.

Knowledge-based resource: In 2015, Nebraska's ODR completed a pilot for RJ with three of their Centers. They worked with the University of Minnesota and Mark Umbreit (Professor at University of Minnesota) and received their training and foundation for RJ through this partnership. In terms of developing policies and standards, they first conduct research to see what others are doing and then collaborate with Center directors and members of the Advisory Council to determine what works best for the Centers.

Clearinghouse: Nebraska's ODR drafts policies and procedures for the Centers they have oversight on. They develop these policies and procedures, however, with insight from Centers. They must also receive approval from the Advisory Council, which then makes a recommendation to the State Court Administrator, who then approves it.

Program developer and grant-maker/fundraiser and funder: Part of the Director's statutory responsibility is funding. In 2015, the ODR had a \$1 million grant through a Nebraska Foundation (for the expansion of RJ statewide) and the Director currently has a \$1 million grant through the OJJDP (to further expand their Juvenile RJ work). In addition to these federal grants, they also have the Parenting Act Grant, which is internal, as well as the Dispute Resolution Grant, which goes to all the Centers.

Educator and capacity builder: Public education is usually offered through general outreach via the website, State Bar Association, magazines, and more. They work with Centers to provide this education, as they can cater to specific service areas and stakeholders.

Researcher: The ODR uses mediate.com as their caseload management system and all the Centers are required to use this for their data entry. The Centers also do party evaluations.

Convener/leader: The ODR is truly administrative, so this function does not apply.

Victim-centered/offender accountable & compassionate: Their training through the University of Minnesota addresses this challenge. Part of their RJ process requires meeting with everyone involved prior to participation. This includes listening to the person harmed and asking them what success would look like for them. On the offender side, it includes holding them accountable and helping them develop a reparation plan.

Integrates/implements diversity, equity, and inclusion: The DRA allows for efficient and effective delivery of service to all Nebraskans across 93 counties and four tribal nations. Data from the case management system show that from July 1, 2013, through June 30, 2022, the Centers have served 4,042 individuals with an annual income of less than \$10,000. That number more than doubles to 8,813 people served when querying on those who reported annual earnings of less than \$20,000. Nevertheless, they struggle with integrating DEI in their work. Their facilitators are not diverse. They have had some conversations around the barriers around becoming a facilitator (basic mediation training required - 30 hours; RJ training - 15 hours).

5. Maine School Safety Center (MSSC)

The researcher conducted a virtual interview with the Restorative Practices Coordinator on April 12th, 2023. During the interview, the coordinator shared the following:

State-sponsored: MSSC has several funding sources such as (1) two federal grants (GSEM and BJA Staff), \$5 million and \$2 million, respectively and an (2) ESSER grant for \$900,00 for restorative practices. Going forward for FY 2023 and FY 2024, the entire safety center will be funded through the state. In terms of staffing, they have a director, assistant director, behavioral threat assessment & management coordinator, school emergency management coordinator, school safety training coordinator, restorative practices coordinator, transportation coordinator, food security champion, and an office manager who make between \$75,000 - \$100,000 per year.

Statutory: Within the proposed biennial budget, the DOE requested funding to continue to support the MSSC Director, Assistance Director, and Secretary Specialist after the close out of the GSEM grant. This shift aimed to balance the need to draw down grant resources while transitioning the MSSC from a federal grant supported program to a permanent office funded by the state budget. H.P. 130 – L.D. 1970, an Act Regarding the Maine School Safety Center, established MSSC as a permanent office funded by the state budget.

Knowledge-based resource: The RJ coordinator partners with a juvenile and adult RJ coordinator in the DOC as well as someone in the CDC. They recently wrote a position paper on their expectations and understanding of what restorative practices could be. The position paper has not been approved yet but provides training standards for anyone that works with the schools.

Clearinghouse: MSSC offers training through a partnership with Eastern Maine Community College. Most of their classes are offered asynchronously for free for schools to access in a cohort format. For the Restorative Practices program, the coordinator is building a multi-tiered restorative practices training. As Maine has adopted a rule that school Codes of Conduct must use restorative language, MSSC ran a series of free workshops for schools to learn how to use restorative language in a Code of Conduct.

Program developer and grant-maker& fundraiser and funder: The RJ Coordinator handles grants from the State sometimes. For example, there was a \$1 million grant given to the RJ Coordinator and another department to help schools develop restorative practices and establish mentoring programs or job development programs for system-involved youth. The coordinator is currently overseeing this grant. They do not have funding to distribute, however.

Educator and capacity builder: The RJ Coordinator stated that she has not had time to work on the educational resources on the website, yet going forward, she will focus on adding RJ documents and training information to their website.

Researcher: The RJ Coordinator plans to conduct research related to the successful implementation of restorative practices once MSSC pilots their program.

Convener/leader: MSSC is conscious of staying in their lane, which are schools and education, but are partnering with DOC to create the juvenile review board and train police in each community in trauma-informed responses, crisis intervention, and restorative practices. They also partner with prosecutors and legislators to talk about culturally responsive training.

Victim-centered/offender accountable & compassionate: MSSC's goal is to keep people out of the system, if they can, but the true intention is rebuilding relationship and rebuilding community. In other words, the intention is always to restore the relationship and restore a piece of the community, which can then help the offender feel re-welcomed into the community.

Integrates/implements diversity, equity, and inclusion: Their services are available to all pre-k through 12th grade schools in Maine, public or private. They also partner with diverse stakeholders such as probation officers, prosecutors, community members, mental health professionals, addiction specialists, and community mentors/volunteers. In terms of expanding DEI in staffing, they are still working on it.

6. Vermont – The National Center on Restorative Justice (NCORJ)

The Assistant Director of the Training Division provided the following written responses to the interview questions:

State-sponsored: The funding for the NCORJ is not state-sponsored. Instead, it is provided by the U.S. Office of Justice Programs through cooperative agreements/grants of \$3 million and \$9 million. The annual budget varies depending on activities in a given grant year. In terms of staffing, there are 11 core team members, plus additional collaborators and working partnerships.

Statutory: NCORJ was not established by statute.

Knowledge-based resource: NCORJ relies on local, regional, and national partnerships with experts within the RJ field to develop and implement resources for the system actors and the general public.

Clearinghouse: The training division at NCORJ generates resources and information for the BJA NTTAC database – mostly webinars and workshops that can be disseminated broadly. In an email follow-up several months later, the Assistant Director requested that the researcher mention NCORJ's new National Restorative Coaching Program (NRCP) which provides RJ

practitioners with individualized support in restorative skills, frameworks, and programmatic implementation.

Program developer and grant-maker & fundraiser and funder: NCORJ is in their planning phase for research subawards under the Restorative Justice Research Community (UVM).

Educator and capacity builder: This year, NCORJ is running a webinar series focused on RJ in the criminal legal system, specifically offering content for different system actors. They are all free, and accessible recordings are made available on their website.

Researcher: According to the Assistant Director of the Training Division, foundational research on RJ such as shared language, assessment and fidelity tools, outcome instruments, and implementation approaches are notably lacking. In response to these needs, in 2022 they launched the Restorative Justice Research Community (RJRC) as an independent, interdisciplinary academic community to provide a platform for connecting, advancing, and sustaining the field of RJ research. The RJRC prioritizes an approach to research that aims to empower community-based research partnerships and diverse voices.

With funding from NCORJ and BJA, the RJRC advances the following activities:

- 1) **Research communications:** The RJRC supports the dissemination of RJ research through conferences, events, and online resources. This includes the development of a website for advancing the field of RJ research, which launched in 2022
- 2) **Research publication series:** The RJRC advances research publications focused on RJ approaches and applications in the context of the U.S. criminal legal system. Projects address foundational issues, research frameworks, as well as investigations concerning the implementation and impact of restorative practices and approaches.
- 3) **Research fellows, roundtable events:** The RJRC will support a cohort of research fellows to engage in a series of 3-hour, facilitated discussions designed to examine RJ in the context of the U.S. criminal legal system and the opportunities for research. Each fellow will engage and support a local collaboration with community practitioners and/or those with lived experience to solicit feedback and input on all roundtable discussions. Discussions from these events will be summarized and used to contribute to the development of resources, including a Special Report - Research Agenda.
- 4) **Community gathering, working session events:** The RJRC will host a biennial community gathering with stakeholders, including community members, researchers, policy makers, practitioners, and OJP-BJA. During the working sessions participants will reflect on shared learnings from RJRC events and resources, as well as their own experiences, to identify key themes and priority areas for advancing research in the field. Discussions from the event will be summarized and shared broadly through a survey, inviting input and engagement from a broader community.
- 5) **Research agenda, special report:** The RJRC aims to develop a collaborative agenda to help guide and advance RJ research in the context of the U.S. criminal legal system. The research agenda will serve as a resource for informing funders, advocates, practitioners, researchers, and other stakeholders about actionable priority topics for research and for coordinating efforts among these groups. Information from RJRC events and activities will be used to

inform the development of the agenda. The agenda will be created as a living document that is adapted as new knowledge and shared learnings emerge.

Convener/leader: NCORJ offers free in-person events on a first-come, first-served basis. Partners vary depending on the project.

Victim-centered/offender accountable & compassionate: They are not a direct service-facing organization; They support others' work and efforts in this area.

Integrates/implements diversity, equity, and inclusion: They operate in a non-hierarchical structure with a commitment to DEI (plus justice) through their work and working relationships on the team and center the key principles of RJ.

7. The Scottish Government – Cabinet Secretary for Justice and Veterans

An employee from the Scottish Government provided the following written responses to the interview questions to the researcher:

State-sponsored: The Restorative Justice Action Plan was developed in partnership with the national agency Community Justice Scotland, and with input from stakeholders across the justice sector. Funding comes from their internal budget with the Scottish Government.

Statutory: Although the Restorative Justice Action Plan is a manifesto commitment for the government and is a key part of the Vision for Justice, it is not based in statute.

Knowledge-based resource: The Scottish Government manages "Restorative Justice Forum Scotland" a website that aims to bring together all those interested in the development of RJ in Scotland, such as practitioners and managers from the statutory and voluntary sectors (including children's services), academics and policymakers, to: (1) increase understanding of RJ (2) encourage improvements in the quality and availability of RJ in Scotland (3) promote the development of advice and support for potential participants and those referring to RJ and (4) disseminate relevant information. The website provides information general information on RJ and available conferences, seminars, and training related to RJ. There is also information specifically for practitioners and researchers.

Clearinghouse: So far, the Scottish Government has produced guidance on the delivery of RJ for service providers. This document is designed to ensure that, where RJ processes are available, these are delivered consistently in a trauma-informed way. Additionally, a code of practice for adults, children and young people was compiled and signed by the RJ stakeholder group and remains a live document for on-going consultation.

Program developer and grant-maker/fundraiser and funder: The Sheriffdom area, Lothian and Borders identified and agreed as the first initial test project. Community Justice Scotland (CJS) was funded to provide national oversight, monitoring, and evaluation of the initial test project. Thriving Survivors was also funded to provide the National Service for RJ in sexual harm. Additionally, Strathclyde University was funded to complete a Training Needs Analysis to inform a Scottish model for training development.

Educator and capacity builder: Under this action, “Public awareness and understanding of RJ in Scotland,” the Scottish Government commissioned the Children and Young People's Centre for Justice to conduct research with children, young people, and families to explore their awareness, understanding and attitudes to RJ in Scotland. Their report presents the findings of that research, including young people's understanding of harm, the awareness and acceptability of RJ, and key messages for the Scottish Government about the implementation and delivery of RJ in Scotland.

Researcher: As mentioned above, the Scottish Government has completed a national opinion survey on RJ to inform key messages and plan to accredit training and ensure its continuous monitoring and evaluation. Additionally, RJ academics are completing research into risk and mitigation strategies to inform risk and policy development.

Convener/leader: The Scottish Government and COSLA hosted a Violence Against Women and Girls and RJ roundtable event.

Victim-centered/offender accountable & compassionate: This function was not applicable to the Scottish Government.

Integrates/implements diversity, equity, and inclusion: This function was not applicable to the Scottish Government.

8. Kansas Institute for Peace and Conflict Resolution (KIPCOR) - Restorative Schools Initiative (RSI)

The researcher conducted a virtual interview with the Executive Director on May 16th, 2023. During the interview, the Executive Director shared the following:

State-sponsored: KIPCOR’s funding comes from various streams: regular donations, annual distributions from retirement, wills/trusts, organization donations, Department of Education grants due to their role as a service provider for restorative practices training, fee-for-services contracts, and more. In terms of staffing, they have a staff of five (three full-time, two part-time).

Statutory: KIPCOR is affiliated with Bethel College, a four-year liberal arts college associated with Mennonite Church USA. There is a statute around what they are doing with their divorce conflict resolution program but not in terms of the institute itself.

Knowledge-based resource: In conjunction with the Restorative Schools Initiative, the Kansas Restorative Schools Network supports collaboration, mutual learning communities, and resourcing for continued education and training for educational personnel implementing restorative approaches in their schools in Kansas. They share resources across the district and provide schools with access to free or reduced fee continuing education opportunities, participation in regional learning communities, and more. In terms of developing and implementing policies/standards, they have collaborated with partners to establish standards and student conduct standards in their districts. They cultivate and maintain their RJ expertise through continuous learning and finding resources that establish best practices/trends while also working with educators to learn what they need. They also contract trainers that help them administer their training and these trainers have expertise in working with k-12 grades.

Clearinghouse: KIPCOR is the service provider for RJ training in the state of Kansas. They have trained around 2500 school staff members. They train and support districts, schools, teachers, and educational personnel in restorative practices. They also provide interactive overviews of RJ and coaching to schools as professional development. Additionally, they offer victim-offender dialogue training for those working in the CJ system.

Program developer and grant-maker & fundraiser and funder: This function was not applicable to KIPCOR.

Educator and capacity builder: In April 2018, KIPCOR hosted the inaugural Restorative Kansas Conference, the first ever statewide conference on RJ. They also provide an interactive introduction to RJ. Additionally, they are also hosting it this year with a variety of other stakeholders (mediation centers, courts, community-based organizations, etc.), including indigenous based institutions. Similarly, they teach college courses on RJ.

Researcher: This function was not applicable to KIPCOR.

Convener/leader: KIPCOR has a brick-and-mortar structure where people who are connected to this work can connect with one another. They provide a space for people who are in like fields to have a safe space to have conversations around restorative practices and conflict resolution in general. In the past the Executive Director has led circles for school board members and done intervention work for the school district. They also host several meetings to allow people to connect with one another.

Victim-centered/offender accountable & compassionate: KIPCOR is currently working towards being as trauma-informed as they can be.

Integrates/implements diversity, equity, and inclusion: KIPCOR is working to establish a whole school approach where everyone must go through their RJ trainings to change the culture of the school and therefore establish a more equitable environment.

9. Minnesota – Office of Restorative Practices

The researcher was referred to this recent public safety bill by a Subcommittee member. Here is what the researcher found upon investigation:

State-sponsored: Minnesota Governor Tim Walz signed a public safety bill that includes funding for establishing an Office of Restorative Practices (\$500k/year) and for Restorative Practices Initiatives Grants (\$4 million/year). In terms of staffing, the commissioner of public safety will appoint a Director of the Office of Restorative Practices. The Director will then hire additional staff to perform the duties of the Office of Restorative Practices.

Statutory: On May 19th, 2023, Governor Tim Walz signed a public safety bill (SF 2909) that includes funding for establishing and maintaining an Office of Restorative Practices and for grants to establish and support restorative practices initiatives pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, section 299A.95, subdivision 6. The Office of Restorative Practices will be established within the Department of Public Safety.

Knowledge-based resource: The Office of Restorative Practices will provide information to local restorative practices advisory committees, or restorative practices initiatives in Tribal communities and governments, counties, multicounty agencies, other state agencies, and other jurisdictions about best practices that are developmentally tailored to youth, trauma-informed, and healing-centered, and provide technical support. Providing information includes but is not limited to sharing data on successful practices in other jurisdictions, sending notification about available training opportunities, and sharing known resources for financial support. The Office of Restorative Practices will also provide training and technical support to local restorative practices advisory committees. Training includes but is not limited to the use and scope of restorative practices, victim-centered restorative practices, and trauma-informed care. Additionally, the Office of Restorative Practices will oversee the coordination and establishment of local restorative practices advisory committees. The restorative practices advisory committees will utilize restorative practices in their decision-making process and come to consensus when developing, expanding, and maintaining restorative practices criteria and referral processes for their communities.

Clearinghouse: The Office of Restorative Practices will collaborate with Tribal communities, counties, multicounty agencies, other state agencies, nonprofit agencies, and other jurisdictions, and with existing restorative practices initiatives in those jurisdictions to establish new restorative practices initiatives, support existing restorative practices initiatives, and identify effective restorative practices initiatives.

Program developer and grant-maker/fundraiser and funder: Within available appropriations, the director will award grants to establish and support restorative practices initiatives. An approved applicant will receive a grant of up to \$500,000 each year.

Educator and capacity builder: The Office of Restorative Practices will create a statewide directory of restorative practices initiatives. The office will make this directory available to all restorative practice initiatives, counties, multicounty agencies, nonprofit agencies, and Tribes to facilitate referrals to restorative practices initiatives and programs.

Researcher: The Office of Restorative Practices will engage restorative practitioners in discerning ways to measure the effectiveness of restorative efforts throughout the state. Additionally, by February 15 of each year, the director will report to the chairs and ranking minority members of the legislative committees and divisions with jurisdiction over public safety, human services, and education, on the work of the Office of Restorative Practices, any grants issued pursuant to this section, and the status of local restorative practices initiatives in the state that were reviewed in the previous year.

Convener/leader: The Office of Restorative Practices will encourage collaboration between jurisdictions by creating a statewide network, led by restorative practitioners, to share effective methods and practices.

Victim-centered/offender accountable & compassionate: This function was not applicable to the Office of Restorative Practices.

Integrates/implements diversity, equity, and inclusion: This function was not applicable to the Office of Restorative Practices.

Bibliography

- An Act Regarding the Maine School Safety Center, H.P 1380 – L.D. 1870. (2022).
<https://legislature.maine.gov/legis/bills/getPDF.asp?paper=HP1380&item=3&snum=130>
- A Bill For An Act Concerning Restorative Justice Programs, H.B. 07-1129, 66th General Assembly. (2007). www.statebillinfo.com/bills/bills/07/1129_01.pdf
- Brewster, L.G. (1980). Cost Effectiveness in Victim-Witness Advocate Programs – A Case Study. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 8(2), pp. 97-109. <https://ojp.gov/ncjrs/virtual-library/abstracts/cost-effectiveness-victim-witness-advocate-programs-case-study>
- Dispute Resolution Act, 25-2904, (1991).
<https://nebraskalegislature.gov/laws/statutes.php?statute=25-2904>
- Haas, G. (2022). MA DOC Expenditures and Staffing Levels for Fiscal 2022. *Lifer's Group Inc.*
<http://www.realcostofprisons.org/writing/haas-expenditures-and-staffing-levels-for-2022.pdf>
- Hull, C. & Harvell, S. (2020, August). Justice Reinvestment Initiative (JRI): Oregon. *Urban Institute*.
https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/2020/08/19/justice_reinvestment_initiative_oregon.pdf
- Jones, F.G. & Harris, L. (2022). An Economic Evaluation of Restorative Justice. *Whyme?*
<https://why-me.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/Why-Me-RJ-Economic-Evaluation-Technical-report-2022-v3.pdf>
- Khalid, A. & Harvell, S. (2020, July). Justice Reinvestment Initiative (JRI): Massachusetts. *Urban Institute*.
www.urban.org/sites/default/files/2020/07/27/justice_reinvestment_initiative_massachusetts.pdf
- Massachusetts Office of Public Collaboration. (2013). Massachusetts Community Mediation Center Grant Program: Program Design.¹⁸
- Mass. Gen. Laws Ch. 75, § 46 (1990).
- Mass. Gen. Laws Ch. 75, § 47 (2013).
- Mass. Gen. Laws Ch. 94G § 14A (2023).
- Mass. Gen. Laws Ch. 94G § 14B (2023).
- Nebraska Office of Dispute Resolution. (2023). Budget Overview – Fiscal Year 2023.¹⁹
- Omnibus Judiciary and Public Safety Appropriations, S.F. 2909, 93rd Legislature. (2023).
<https://www.house.mn.gov/ccj/journals/2023-24/J0520075.htm#9979>

¹⁸ Provided by the Executive Director of MOPC.

¹⁹ Provided by the Director.

- Sakala, L. & Harvell, S. (2020, August). Justice Reinvestment Initiative (JRI): Pennsylvania. *Urban Institute*.
https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/2020/08/12/justice_reinvestment_initiative_pennsylvania.pdf
- The Colorado Restorative Justice Coordinating Council. (2023). FY24 Budget.²⁰
- The Restorative Justice Advisory Committee. (2021). 2021 Annual Report.
<https://archives.lib.state.ma.us/bitstream/handle/2452/856259/on1245425058-2021.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- The Restorative Justice Advisory Committee. (2022). 2022 Annual Report.
<https://www.mass.gov/doc/2022-restorative-justice-advisory-committee-annual-report/download>
- U.S. Department of Justice. (2021, May). The Justice Reinvestment Initiative: A Guide for States. <https://bja.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh186/files/media/document/JRI-Guide-for-States.pdf>

²⁰ Provided by the State RJ Council Coordinator.