**Evidence-Based Research Analysis on the Effectiveness of Restorative Justice**

# Numerous empirical studies and meta-analyses of restorative justice approaches from across the nation and the globe have shown significant benefits of the restorative justice approach to dealing with criminal behavior. Further, restorative justice conferencing is “one of the most rigorously-tested innovations in sentencing and corrections,” in the world, both by the number of empirical studies on effectiveness and scientific rigor.[i](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CDMa3%5CDownloads%5CCRC_Web_Site_Information_2-19-21_Revised_RC.docx#_bookmark0)

As the Dane Co. CRC approach is a novel one, there are no studies specifically on point to the identical method and population at issue, but general trends and analogous population groups have been examined. These observable and measurable benefits include:

* Reduces Recidivism
	+ Meta-analysis studies show a reduction in recidivism rates for offenders who participated in different types of restorative processes can range from approximately 20% - 38% reduction in recidivism[ii](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CDMa3%5CDownloads%5CCRC_Web_Site_Information_2-19-21_Revised_RC.docx#_bookmark1)
	+ Other smaller and internal self-studies have yielded even more dramatic results of up to 50-80% or greater reductions in recidivism[iii](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CDMa3%5CDownloads%5CCRC_Web_Site_Information_2-19-21_Revised_RC.docx#_bookmark2)
		- This includes successes in Wisconsin[iv](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CDMa3%5CDownloads%5CCRC_Web_Site_Information_2-19-21_Revised_RC.docx#_bookmark3) [v](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CDMa3%5CDownloads%5CCRC_Web_Site_Information_2-19-21_Revised_RC.docx#_bookmark4)
		- Baltimore’s Community Conferencing Program notes a Maryland Department of Juvenile Services study showing 60% reduction in recidivism for youth who have gone through a community conferencing program.[vi](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CDMa3%5CDownloads%5CCRC_Web_Site_Information_2-19-21_Revised_RC.docx#_bookmark5)
		- Grafton County Juvenile Restorative Justice Program (in New Hampshire) notes recidivism rates between 4-7% for restorative justice participants vs. a 45% recidivism rate for the traditional juvenile justice system.[vii](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CDMa3%5CDownloads%5CCRC_Web_Site_Information_2-19-21_Revised_RC.docx#_bookmark6)
	+ Another important note is that those who do reoffend tended to commit less serious offenses[viii](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CDMa3%5CDownloads%5CCRC_Web_Site_Information_2-19-21_Revised_RC.docx#_bookmark7) and it took them longer to recidivate than those who did not participate in a restorative justice process.
* Higher Percentage of Offenders Making Full Restitution Payments
	+ Offenders are 25-50% more likely to pay full restitution relative to those who do not go through a restorative process[ix](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CDMa3%5CDownloads%5CCRC_Web_Site_Information_2-19-21_Revised_RC.docx#_bookmark8)
	+ Higher rates of restitution paid overall. In addition to the greater likelihood of full restitution paid, collect significantly more restitution – some studies 100-200% or more on collected restitution (assessed amount isn’t different, individuals just satisfy more of the obligation)
* Cost Savings, Timeliness, & Efficient Case Resolution
	+ Cost estimate comparisons show significant per case savings: $1,500-$3,500 cost per case for restorative justice process vs. $12,000-$13,500 cost per case for traditional court processing.[x](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CDMa3%5CDownloads%5CCRC_Web_Site_Information_2-19-21_Revised_RC.docx#_bookmark9)
	+ In Henderson County, North Carolina, researchers found a two-thirds reduction in the number of trials due to the operation of a restorative process, leaving a substantial impact at the county level[xi](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CDMa3%5CDownloads%5CCRC_Web_Site_Information_2-19-21_Revised_RC.docx#_bookmark10)
	+ Chilliwack, British Columbia (roughly 1/3 the size of Madison): Restorative justice program handles an average of 100 youth and adult referrals per year, saving the local criminal justice system approximately $260,000 per year.[xii](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CDMa3%5CDownloads%5CCRC_Web_Site_Information_2-19-21_Revised_RC.docx#_bookmark11)
	+ Cases resolved in approximately 1/3 the amount of time.[xiii](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CDMa3%5CDownloads%5CCRC_Web_Site_Information_2-19-21_Revised_RC.docx#_bookmark12)
* Increased Satisfaction vs. Traditional Criminal Justice System
	+ Multiple meta-analysis studies show greater levels of satisfaction with a restorative process when compared to the traditional criminal justice process[xiv](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CDMa3%5CDownloads%5CCRC_Web_Site_Information_2-19-21_Revised_RC.docx#_bookmark13)
	+ A meta-analysis of seven evaluation studies found that, when compared to those who went through the traditional court process, BOTH victims and offenders who participated in a restorative justice process: 1. were more satisfied with the handling and outcome of the case; 2. perceived the process and outcome as having greater fairness; and 3. had greater feelings that the offender had been held accountable.[xv](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CDMa3%5CDownloads%5CCRC_Web_Site_Information_2-19-21_Revised_RC.docx#_bookmark14)
	+ This meta-analysis also found that victims who participate in a restorative justice process are 1/3 less likely to still be upset about the crime and are ½ less likely to fear re-victimization when compared to those who went through the traditional court process.[xvi](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CDMa3%5CDownloads%5CCRC_Web_Site_Information_2-19-21_Revised_RC.docx#_bookmark15)
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