

Center for Restorative Justice & Peacemaking

RESEARCH & RESOURCES REVIEW

Volume 1, Issue 1

November, 1999

Welcome to the first addition of Research & Resources Review of the Center for Restorative Justice & Peacemaking at the University of Minnesota. We recently modified the name of the Center to include the term "peacemaking" rather than "mediation" in order to reflect a broader and more transformative framework for facilitating dialogue among crime victims, offenders, family members and other affected community folks. R&RR will offer brief reviews of current and upcoming research initiatives in restorative justice, as well as highlight important new written and video resources. Training opportunities offered by the Center will also be listed. Comprehensive charts that briefly describe all of the forty known victim offender mediation empirical studies (grounded in data, not just theory) and six known family group conferencing are presented in this issue. A bit more detailed description and key findings on selected more recent studies will be presented in future issues of R&RR. We hope this provides a helpful foundation, or "road map", to the rich 25 year history of VOM practice and research, representing the oldest, most empirically grounded, and most widely dispersed expression of restorative justice, as well as the more recent development of family group conferencing. Far more thorough monographs and articles related to these studies are available through the Center's web-site.

Mark Umbreit, Ph.D., Director
Center for Restorative Justice & Peacemaking

Table 1
VICTIM OFFENDER MEDIATION EMPIRICAL STUDIES
(Compiled by Mark S. Umbreit, Ph.D. and Robert B. Coates, Ph.D.)

AUTHOR, DATE, LOCATION	DESIGN	POPULATION SAMPLE	DATA	KEY FINDINGS
1. Davis, R. et. al. (1980). Location: New York City	Random assignment of those eligible for mediation. Post intervention measures.	Disputants known to each other; conflict resulted in felony arrest.		Participants believed had more opportunity to participate in mediation than in court. Believed outcome more fair. No evidence that mediation reduced levels of future conflict.
2. Collins, J.P. (1984). Location: Grand Prairie, Alberta, Canada.	Purposive sample Post intervention measures	About 30% of youth with charged offenses in jurisdiction referred to reconciliation project. Typical offender: 15, male, one offense, theft.	Interviews: Staff- 18 Victims-19 Offenders-22 Parents-16 Community Workers 6	Process perceived as working extremely well. Most participants had more positive view of justice system. Most believed agreements to be fair and reasonable. Program more costly than other diversion projects.
3. Coates, R. and J. Gehm, (1985). Location: three programs in Indiana and one in Ohio.	1983-- Matched sample of Vorp and non-Vorp cases from three programs. 1984-- Availability sample in four programs. Post-intervention	1983--73 Vorp Offenders: age- 16; 78% juvenile; 92%white; 93% male; 93% no prior incarceration post conviction; 54% convicted on burglary charges	1983 Sample - record data, 1984 Interviews, Vic- tim-37, Offender- 23, Staff-22 CJS-27, Victim refusal-26 Observations-9	1983 Sample -60% of eligible case resulted in meetings -98% meetings yielded contracts -87%contracts inc. restitution -Vorp offender less jail time 1984 Sample High levels of satisfaction were reported. Complaints regarding time delay.
4. Schneider, A. (1986). Location: Washington, D.C.	Random assignment. Post-intervention measures.	Typical offender: full time student, black, male, repeat offender, referred for felony, avg. age 15.4. VOM 143 Ref. but refused 131 Probation 137	Record Data	Forty percent referred to VOM refused on advice of lawyers. Offenders referred have statistically significant lower recidivism than those in probation group. Those participating in VOM have lower rates than those on probation.
AUTHOR,	DESIGN	POPULATION	DATA	KEY FINDINGS

DATE, LOCATION		SAMPLE		
5. Perry, L., T. Lajeunesse, and A. Woods (1987). Location: Winnipeg, Manitoba	Post Intervention Measures 465 of the 1021 referred in 1984 & 1985 resulting in mediation. Purposive Sample: 45 respondents; 67 complainants.	Types of cases: community disputes 20%; diversion 65%; post plea 15%. First time offender; summary conviction type cases; identifiable victim; relationship between complainant and respondent.	Record data on those referred to mediation. Telephone interviews with 112 participants.	77% increase in cases referred between 84 and 85. 65% in both years were for diversion. 45% referrals reached mediation. In nearly 40% of cases, victims were not willing to meet. 88% of mediations reach agreements. Sub-sample: Good to excellent service: 84% offenders and 91% victims.
6. Umbreit, M. (1988). Location: Minneapolis & St. Paul, MN.	Availability sample: all referred to program in 85-86. Purposive sample: sub-sample of participants for interviewing. Post-intervention measures.	183 offenders & 179 victims referred to VOM in 1985 & 86. Most referred post-adjudication; some diversion. Typical offense: burglary.	Records Interviews: Victims -31 Offenders- 11	54% of victims and 64% of offenders went to mediation. 79% of restitution agreements were completed. Monetary: \$11,376 Personal service: 127 hrs Community service 489 hrs Client Satisfaction (Interviews): Restitution agreement fair-- 93% victims; 100% offenders
7. Umbreit, M. (1989). Location: Minneapolis, MN.	Purposive sample. Post-intervention measures.	50 victims of burglary; 62% in VOM.	Face-to-face interviews.	Attempting understand victim sense of fairness, three dimensions were discovered: rehabilitation, compensation, punishment. Victim participation regarded as critical across all types of victims. 80% VOM participants experience fairness compared with 38% of non-VOM.
8. Umbreit, M. (1989) *Location: Genesee County, New York and southern Wisconsin.	Purposive sample of four individual cases studies.	Cases: armed robbery, assault of a police officer, negligent homicide, sniper shooting	Interviews with victims, offenders, mediators and referral sources.	Victims of violent crimes have needs which, with considerable sensitive care, can be addressed through face to face mediation. The traditional VORP model developed for property kinds of crimes can be expanded as a framework for working the cases involving violent crime.
9. Galaway, B. (1989). Location: Minneapolis -St. Paul, MN.	Purposive sample. Post-intervention measures.	Eighty-seven persons who participated in VORP over a two year period.	Records High # agreements for participants!	54% of those referred participated 128 agreements were reached 44% monetary restitution 17% personal service 16% personal ser & monetary 10% community service 79% of agreements were fulfilled
10. Gehm, J. (1990). Location: six VORPs in Indiana, Wisconsin, Oregon	Availability sample. Post-intervention measures.	All individuals referred from July 1, 1985-Oct. 1, 1987 Eligible cases: 555	Records	Of 555 eligible, 250 meetings were held, 228 contracts agreed to and 203 successfully completed. 53% of victims unwilling to participate. More likely to meet if offender was white, offense was misdemeanor, and victim was representing an institution.
11. Marshal, T. (1990). Location: sites in Coventry, Leeds, North East Essex and Woverhampton--England.	Availability and purposive sample. Post-intervention measures.	Little descriptive sample information. Coventry-30% violent cases; Leeds-35% burglary; Wolverhampton most minor offense referrals and 55% corporate victims.	Records on all participants. Samples interviewed.	Police-based programs more perfunctory than court based. Corporate victims seemed less willing to meet and to reach agreement. Moderate influence on sentence. Majority of participating victims would do it again.
12. Dignan, J (1990). Location: Kettering, England	Availability and purposive samples. Matched sub-sample. Pre and post-intervention measures.	1987-89 — 291 referrals primarily from police. 74% accepted. Age-17+, no court record, admission of guilt, eligible for prosecution.	Record Sample interviewed: 50 offenders, 45 individual victims, 45 corporate victims	Comparing matched samples: -60% diversion -13% widening net -recidivism slightly lower for Kettering; 15.4% for face to face mediation vs. 21.6% for go between. Increase 32%-43% face to face mediations between year 1 & 3.
13. Hughes, S. and A. Schneider, (1990). Location: Restitution sites across the United States.	Purposive and random sampling. Post-intervention measures	Surveys sent to 342 organizations across the US. 240 responded. 79 of those had victim offender mediation programs.	Record Surveys	Mediation programs were found in counties from 3,000 to 2 million. Most often governed by private sector with referrals from courts. VOM regarded as functioning well with most respondents favorably disposed.
14. Umbreit, M. (1991) Location: Minneapolis/St. Paul	Availability sample for record data. Purposive sample for interview. Post-intervention measures.	379 cases referred CVOM in 1989. 228 victims 257 offenders (56% were misdemeanor offenses). Vandalism most frequent.	Record data. Interviews: 51 victims and 66 juvenile offenders.	50% of referred cases led to face to face meetings. These resulted in restitution agreement 96% of the time. 81% of agreements were completed. 86% of victims said it was helpful to meet the offender. 94% of offenders felt the same.
15. Umbreit, M. and R. Coates, (1992). Location: Albuquerque, NM; Minneapolis, MN; Oakland, CA; and Austin, TX.	Availability & Purposive samples Two comparison groups. Pre & post intervention measures	2,799 victims & 2,659 offenders referred; avg. age-15; gender-86% male; Caucasian-54%; most frequent offense-burglary	Records. Pre-interviews by telephone; post interviews in person. Observations.	High levels of client satisfaction: 79% offenders and 87% victims. VOM offenders more likely (81%) to complete agreements than similar youth in program without mediation (58%). Both offenders and victims expressed importance of meeting with the other sharing pain, hearing stories, etc.

16. Warner, S. (1992). Location: Glasgow and Edinburgh, Scotland.	Availability sample. Randomly assigned comparison group. Post-intervention measures.	175 referrals from Oct. 89-Feb.90. 87% accepted; 174 victims & 185 accused; 77% individual victims; 2/3 violence or criminal damage; avg. age of accused: 30.2	Record data Interview or questionnaires with 1/3 of victims and 22% of offenders. Observations of decision-making process.	33% of cases accepted sent back primarily because of victim. Out of 103 cases, 84 reached agreement. Respondents highly satisfied. Few victims met face-to-face with accused and most did not want to. Mediation fair and just alternative to prosecution for minor offenders.
17. Clarke, S., E. Valente, Jr., and R. Mace (1992). Location: three counties in North Carolina	Availability & purposive sampling. Comparison counties. Post-intervention measures.	Court record data: sample of eligible 1,421 clusters. Mediation program data set: 544 clusters sent to the three mediation programs. Related party misdemeanor cases.	Record data Telephone interviews: 354 complainants randomly selected, 32 defendants.	58% of clusters received for mediation were mediated. Agreements were arrived at in over 90% of mediated cases. None of those reaching agreement went to trial. In one county, Henderson, number of trials resulting from these was reduced by 2/3. Length of process increased in two of the three counties.
18. Roy, S. (1993). Location: Elkhart, IN and Kalamazoo, MI.	Random sample of participants in each program. Post-measures.	Youth in face-to-face VOM compared to youth in court-based restitution program. Over half involved felonies.	Record data: 218 youth representing 50% of those participating in both programs.	No difference in rate of completion of restitution contracts. No difference in rate of recidivism.
19. Galaway, B. (1995). Location: New Zealand	Availability sample of six sites.	1,455 offenders, 1,672 cases involving monetary penalties, 22 district court judges, 341 probation officers	Record data, interviews, survey questionnaires	Reparation appropriate as sole sentence for offenders with minor or no prior criminal history who committed minor property offenses.
20. Nugent, W. and J. Paddock (1995). Location: Anderson County, TN.	Random sample of participants. Matched sample of time period preceding. Post-measures.	125 VORP & 150 matched from prior time period; all pled guilty to property offenses.	Records	VORP offenders less likely to offend than non-VORP: 19.8 vs.33.1; VORP offenders reoffenses were less severe than youth processed through traditional approaches.
21. Roberts, T. (1995). Location: Langley, British Columbia.	Availability sample. Pre & post-intervention measures.	130 referrals; 39 total cases accepted Violent offenders: 46% sexual assault; 18% murder; 23% armed robbery Avg. time from sentence to referral--3.7 years.	Personal or telephone interviews: 22 offenders; 24 victims; 23 CJS. Videos of some interviews and 15 mediations Record data	Involved showing victim and offender interviews to victim/offender counterparts before meeting. 56% cases had met face-to-face by end of study. Two VOM staff present & mediations last 3-5 hours. Unanimous support of program from all participants.
22. Umbreit, M. (1995). Location: Langley, British Columbia; Calgary, Alberta; Winnipeg, Manitoba; Ottawa, Ontario.	Purposive samples: mediation & non-mediation. Post-intervention measures.	4,445 referred to mediation. 39% met face to face. Offenders: 59% male, avg. age - 33, 86% Caucasian	Records Phone Interviews: 323 victims & 287 offenders. Observation: 24 sessions Interviews with staff & officials	93% of face-to-face mediations led to agreements. Victims participating in mediation were significantly more likely to be satisfied (78%) than those who did not (48%). Offenders in mediation also significantly more satisfied (74%) than those not in mediation (53%). Mediation contributes to an enhanced sense of justice.
23. Umbreit, M. and A. Roberts (1996). Location: Coventry and Leeds, England.	Availability sample Post-intervention measures.	70 victims and 53 offenders. Groups: direct mediation; indirect mediation; referred but did not participate.	Record data Phone and in person interviews System officials also interviewed	Majority of mediations were indirect — not face-to-face. Those participating in mediation more likely to express satisfaction and sense of fairness than those not. More benefits with face-to-face.
24. Flaten, C. (1996). Location: Anchorage, Alaska	Purposive sample. Post-intervention measures.	In-depth study of seven serious offense mediations including manslaughter.	Interviews with offenders, victims, victims advocates, offender counselors and mediators.	Mediation can be helpful with very serious cases. Six of seven victims believed mediation was successful. Offender felt meeting victim personalized the crime event. Preparation key to success.
25. Wynne, J. (1996). Location: Leeds, Eng.	Availability and purposive samples. Post-intervention measures.	For cases closed 1988-92: Most offender male and 21 or younger. Most frequent offenses: burglary & theft.	Record data	48% of referred cases result in direct or indirect mediation. Two cohorts followed for reconviction: 85-87 75% no conviction after one year; 89 78% no conviction after one year.
26. Niemeyer, M. and D. Shichor (1996). Location: Orange County, CA.	Availability sample and systematic random sample for recidivism comparisons. Post-intervention measures.	35% of juvenile cases referred graffiti/tagging; 24% serious personal; 16% serious property	Record data. Questionnaire	Over seventy percent of all victims and offenders chose face-to-face mediation. Victims refusing — not important enough to warrant participation. Agreements reached in 99% of mediated cases. Recidivism results: mixed
27. Winnimaki, L (1997) Location: Anderson, Putnam, Cum-berland Counties, TN.	Random sample of participants. Matched sample of time period preceding. Post-measures.	203 VORP & 217 matched sample from prior time period; all pled guilty to property offenses.	Records	VORP offenders less likely to offend than non-VORP: 38.4% reduction associated with VORP participation..
28. Umbreit, M. and	Purposive sample.	Minneapolis: 89 victims in	Record data.	Victims in juvenile program more likely to feel

W. Bradshaw (1997). Location: Minneapolis, MN and Winnipeg, Manitoba.	Post-intervention measures.	juvenile VOM program. Winnipeg: 92 victims in adult VOM program.	Face-to-face interviews.	that mediation helped them participate in the justice system than victims in adult programs. Both groups very satisfied with mediation. Victims of adults more fearful that offender will reoffend.
29. Carr, C. (1998). Location: Los Angeles County, CA.	Availability and purposive samples. Post-intervention measures.	632 juvenile referrals; 279 mediations from July of 1997 to July of 1998.	Record data Post- medn. interv: off-138; parent- 135; vic-133.3 month follow up interv: 51 youth; 49 parents/guardians	Offenders, parents and victims highly satisfied with mediation results and felt mediators were fair. Nearly all were pleased they chose to take part and would recommend the program to others. A minimum six month follow-up indicated 89% had not recidivated.
30. Roberts, L. (1998). Location: Tucson, AZ.	Availability sample. Post-intervention measures.	483 juvenile referrals FY 96 & 97. Mediations: 196. Agreements: 189.	Record data Phone interviews: 53 offenders ??victims	Nearly 90% of offenders and victims felt it was helpful to meet the other party. Nearly all participants felt the mediator was fair to all parties. 79% did not recidivate within year following mediation.
31. Umbreit, M. and Greenwood, J.(1999). Location: United States	Nationwide survey, Availability sample	289 VOM programs 116 interviewed 43% private 23% church-based 16% probation	Phone interviews	Who refers? 29% probation; 23% judges; 15% prosecutors. Offense frequency: vandalism, minor assaults, thefts, burglaries. Mediation occurs: 34% as diversion, 56% post-adjudication. 81% of programs work with juvenile cases.
32. Stone, S., W. Helms, and P. Edgeworth (1998). Location: Cobb County Juvenile Court, Georgia	Availability sample; matched comparison sample. Post-intervention measures.	799 court based mediated cases 93-96; comparison 1,045 from 90-92. Mediation sample: Avg. age - 13.9; 71% male, 72% white; avg. prior court contact .16.	Court record data.	No difference in return to court rates between mediated and non-mediated youth. Mediated cases required 1/3 the time to process. 75% of the returns to court involved violation of conditions of mediated agreements. More experienced mediators tended to get better results.
33. Bradshaw, W. and Umbreit, M. (1998). Location: Minnesota, California, New Mexico, Texas.	See # 15 for design and sample descriptions.		Secondary analysis.	Stepwise multiple regressions shows feeling good about mediator, believing restitution agreement fair, and having a strong desire to meet offender explains much of victim satisfaction.
34. Umbreit, M., R. Coates and A. Roberts (1998). Location: US, Canada, England.	See #s 15,22,and 23 for design and samples.		Secondary analysis.	Comparing victim-offender satisfaction rates across countries shows high levels of satisfaction. Lowest level were found in England where the majority of case are processed with indirect mediation.
35. Nugent, W., M. Umbreit, L. Wiinamaki, and J. Paddock (1999). Location:US	Reanalysis of recidivism data from three studies.	Samples of juveniles VOM & non-VOM in four Tennessee counties, Minneapolis, Albuquerque, Austin and Oakland. Total sample of 1,298 juveniles.	Record Data	Youth participating in VOM are significantly less likely to recidivate than non-VOM youth: a 32% reduction. VOM youth who recidivate do so at significantly less serious level than do comparable non-VOM youth.
36. Fercello, C. and Umbreit, M. (1999).	Availability sample. Post-intervention measures.	33 juvenile offenders 37 crime victims	Phone interviews	High level of satisfaction with the victim offender meeting process and outcomes.
37. Umbreit, M. and W. Bradshaw (1999). Location: Winnipeg, Manitoba.	See # 22 for design and samples.		Secondary analysis.	Regression analysis suggests that feeling good about mediator, sense of fairness of restitution agreement, and desire to meet offender explain much of victim satisfaction.
38. Umbreit, M., W. Bradshaw, and R. Coates (1999). Location: US	Purposive selection. Post intervention data.	2 case studies resulting from mediation with survivors of vio-lent crime & offender/inmate.	In person interviews; video tapes of meetings.	Description of process of mediation/dialogue with participants in two murder cases. Participants expressed various reasons for being very satisfied with process.
39. Umbreit, M. and K. Brown (1999). Location: Ohio.	Purposive selection. Post intervention data.	2 case studies resulting from mediation with survivors of vio-lent crime & offender/inmate.	In person interviews.	Description of process of mediation/dialogue with participants in violent cases. Participants expressed reasons for being very satisfied with process.
40. Umbreit, M. and Vos, Betty (2000) Location: Texas	Purposive selection. Post intervention data.	2 case studies resulting from mediation with survivors of capiital muder & inmate.	In person interviews.	Description of process of mediation/dialogue with participants in two death row cases. Participants ex-pressed reasons for being very satisfied with process

LIST OF VICTIM OFFENDER MEDIATION REFERENCES KEYED TO TABLE 1 NUMBERS

1. Davis, R. et. al. (1980). Mediation and Arbitration as Alternative to Prosecution in Felony Arrest Cases. An Evaluation of the Brooklyn Dispute Resolution Center. New York, NY: VERA Institute of Justice.
2. Collins, J.P. (1984). Final Evaluation Report on the Grande Prairie Community Reconciliation Project For Young Offenders.
3. Coates, R. and J. Gehm, (1985). Victim Meets Offender: An Evaluation of Victim-Offender Reconciliation Programs. Valparaiso, IN: PACT Institute of Justice; Coates, R. and J. Gehm (1989) "An Empirical Assessment" in M. Wright and B. Galaway (eds.) Mediation and Criminal Justice. London: Sage, pp. 251-263.
4. Schneider, A. (1986). "Restitution and Recidivism Rates of Juvenile Offenders: Results from Four Experimental Studies," Criminology Vol. 24, pp. 533-552.
5. Perry, L., Lajeunesse, T. and Woods, A. (1987). Mediation Services: An Evaluation. Manitoba Attorney General: Research, Planning and Evaluation.
6. Umbreit, M. S. (1988). "Mediation of Victim Offender Conflict," Journal of Dispute Resolution, pp. 85-105.
7. Umbreit, M., (1989). "Crime Victims Seeking Fairness, Not Revenge: Toward Restorative Justice," Federal Probation (September 1989) pp. 52-57.
8. Umbreit, M., (1989). "Violent Offenders and Their Victims," In M. Wright and B. Galaway (eds.) Mediation and Criminal Justice. London: Sage, pp. 99-112.
9. Galaway, B. (1989). "Informal Justice: Mediation between Offenders and Victims." In: P. Albrecht and O. Backes (eds.), Crime Prevention and Intervention: Legal and Ethical Problems. NY,NY: Walter de Gruyter, pp. 103-116.
10. Gehm, J. (1990). "Mediated Victim-Offender Restitution Agreements: An Exploratory Analysis of Factors Related to Victim Participation." In B. Galaway and J. Judson (eds.), Criminal Justice. Restitution, and Reconciliation. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press, pp. 177-182.
11. Marshall, T. (1990). "Results of Research from British Experiments in Restorative Justice." In B. Galaway and J. Hudson (eds.), Criminal Justice, Restitution, and Reconciliation. London: Sage, pp. 83-107.
12. Dignan, (1990). Repairing the Damage: An Evaluation of an Experimental Adult Reparation Scheme in Kettering, Northamptonshire. Sheffield: Centre for Criminological Legal Research, Faculty of Law, University of Sheffield.
13. Hughes, S. and A. Schneider, (1990). Victim-Offender Mediation in the Juvenile Justice System. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
14. Umbreit, M. (1991). "Minnesota Mediation Center Produces Positive Results," Corrections Today (August) pp. 194-197.
15. Umbreit, M. and R. Coates, (1992). Victim Offender Mediation: An Analysis of Programs in Four States of the US. St. Paul, MN: Center for Restorative Justice and Mediation. Other publications related to this study include: Umbreit, M. & R. Coates, "The Impact of Mediating Victim Offender Conflict: An Analysis of Programs in Three States," Juvenile & Family Court Journal (1992), pp. 1-8; Umbreit, M. & R. Coates, "Cross-Site Analysis of Victim-Offender Mediation in Four States," Crime & Delinquency Vol. 39, (Oct. 1993), pp 565-585; Umbreit, M. "Juvenile Offenders Meet Their Victims: The Impact of Mediation in Albuquerque, New Mexico," Family and Conciliation Courts Review Vol. 31, (Jan. 1993), pp.90-100; Umbreit, M. Victim Meets Offender. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press, 1994; Umbreit, M. "Crime Victims Confront Their Offenders: The Impact of a Minneapolis Mediation Program," Research On Social Work Practice Vol. 4 (Oct. 1994), pp. 436-447; Umbreit, M. "Restorative Justice through Mediation: The Impact of Offenders Facing Their Victims in Oakland," Journal of Law and Social Work Vol. 5 (Spring 1995) pp. 1-13; Umbreit, M. "Restorative Justice Through Victim-Offender Mediation: A Multi-Site Assessment," Western Criminology Review Vol.1 (1998).
16. Warner, S. (1992) Making Amends: Justice for Victims and Offenders. Aldershot: Avebury.
17. Clarke, S., E. Valente, Jr., and R. Mace (1992). Mediation of Interpersonal Disputes: An Evaluation of North Carolina's Programs. Chapel Hill: Institute of Government, University of North Carolina.
18. Roy, S. (1993) "Two Types of Juvenile Restitution Programs in Two Midwestern Counties: A Comparative Study," Federal Probation Vol. 57, pp. 48-53.

19. Galaway, B. (1995). "Victim-Offender Mediation by New Zealand Probation Officers: The Possibilities and the Reality." Mediation Quarterly Vol. 12, pp. 249-262.
20. Nugent, W. and J. Paddock (1995) "The Effect of Victim-Offender Mediation on Severity of Reoffense," Mediation Quarterly Vol. 12, Summer, pp.353-367.
21. Roberts, T. (1995). Evaluation of the Victim Offender Mediation Project, Langely, BC: Final Report Victoria, BC: Focus Consultants.
22. Umbreit, M. (1995). "Mediation of Criminal Conflict: An Assessment of Programs in Four Canadian Provinces." St. Paul, MN: Center for Restorative Justice and Mediation; Umbreit, M. (1996) "Restorative Justice Through Mediation: The Impact of Programs in Four Canadian Provinces," in B. Galaway and J. Hudson, (eds.) Restorative Justice: International Perspectives. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press; Umbreit, M. (1999) "Victim Offender Mediation in Canada: The Impact of an Emerging Social Work Intervention," International Social Work.
23. Umbreit, M and A. Roberts (1996). Mediation of Criminal Conflict in England: An Assessment of Services In Coventry And Leeds. St. Paul, MN: Center for Restorative Justice and Mediation; and, Roberts, A. and M. Umbreit (1996). "Victim Offender Mediation: The English Experience," MEDIATION UK Vol 12, Summer.
24. Flaten, C. (1996). "Victim Offender Mediation: Application with Serious Offences Committed by Juveniles." In: B. Galaway and J. Hudson (eds.), Restorative Justice: International Perspectives. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press, pp. 387-401.
25. Wynne, J. (1996). "Leeds Mediation and Reparation Service: Ten Years Experience of Victim-Offender Mediation." In: B. Galaway and J. Hudson (eds.), Restorative Justice: International Perspectives. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press, pp. 443-461.
26. Niemeyer, M. and D. Shichor (1996). "A Preliminary Study of a Large Victim/Offender Reconciliation Program," Federal Probation Vol. 60 (September) pp. 30-34.
27. Winnimaki, K. (1997). Doctoral dissertation. School of Social Work, University of Tennessee.
28. Umbreit, M. and W. Bradshaw (1997). "Victim Experience of Meeting Adult vs. Juvenile Offenders: A Cross-National Comparison," Federal Probation Vol. 61, (December) pp. 33-39.
29. C. Carr (1998). VORS Program Evaluation Report.
30. Roberts, L. (1998). Victim Offender Mediation: An Evaluation of the Pima County Juvenile Court Center's Victim Offender Mediation Program (VOMP). Available from Frasier Area Community Justice Initiatives in Langley, British Columbia.
31. Umbreit, M. and Greenwood, J. (1999). "National Survey of Victim Offender Mediation Programs in the US," Mediation Quarterly 16(3), pp. 235-251
32. Stone, S., W. Helms, and P. Edgeworth (1998). Cobb County Juvenile Court Mediation Program Evaluation..
33. Bradshaw, W. and Umbreit, M. "Crime Victims Meet Juvenile Offenders: Contributing Factors to Victim Satisfaction with Mediated Dialogue," Juvenile and Family Court Journal Vol 49 (Summer 1998) pp. 17-25.
34. Umbreit, M., R. Coates, and A. Roberts, "Impact of Victim-Offender Mediation in Canada, England and the United States," The Crime Victims Report (January/February 1998) pp.20-92.
35. Nugent, W., M. Umbreit, L. Wiinamaki, and J. Paddock (2000, in press). "Participation in Victim-Offender Mediation and Severity of Subsequent Delinquent Behavior: Successful Replicatons?" Journal of Research in Social Work Practice.
36. Fercello, C. and Umbreit, M. (1999). St. Paul, MN: Center for Restorative Justice & Mediation.
37. Umbreit, M. and W. Bradshaw (1999). "Factors that Contribute to Victim Satisfaction with Mediated Offender Dialogue in Winnipeg: An Emerging Area of Social Work Practice," Journal of Law and Social Work.
38. Umbreit, M., W. Bradshaw, and R. Coates (2000, in press). "Victims of Severe Violence Meet the Offender: Restorative Justice Through Dialogue." International Journal of Victimology.
39. Umbreit, M. and K. Brown (1999). "Victims of Severe Violence Meet the Offender in Ohio", The Crime Victim Report. Vol. 3 (3).
40. Umbreit, M. And Vos, Betty (2000, in press). "Homicide /survivors Meet the Offender Prior to Execution: Restorative Justice Through Dialogue." Homicide Studies.

Table 2
FAMILY GROUP CONFERENCING EMPIRICAL STUDIES
 (Compiled by Mark S. Umbreit, Ph.D. and Robert B. Coates, Ph.D.)

AUTHOR, DATE, LOCATION	DESIGN	SAMPLE	DATA	FINDINGS
1. Maxwell, G. and A. Morris (1993). Location: New Zealand	Post-intervention measures. Six month recidivism follow-up.	All cases involving children and youth for 3 mo. period referred to FGC. Data gathered on five sites; four metro and one provincial. Youth referred older, history of previous offenses, and committed more serious offenses than those typically diverted.	Observation of 162 conferences; Interviews: Parents -176; Youth -157; Victims -81. Records.	86% resolved matter in one meeting. 70% of cases resulted in apology 55% work in the community Avg. number of people attending--9 In only five percent of the cases was there no evid accountability. 48% of those referred to FGC had reoffended with There were numerous differences across sites. Large numbers of children and youth were diverted courts.
2. Moore, D and L. Fosythe (no date, est. 1995) Location: Wagga Wagga, Australia.	Pre and post time periods for nine month recidivism checks. Post intervention measures.	Cases for 19 mos. before FGC is implemented and cases for 27 mos. after. Most frequent offenses: shoplifting	14 case studies Interviews with conference participants. Records.	Increased number of youth cautioned by police. Did not result in net widening. Increased diversion from court. Reprehension rates for court youth higher than Ft Rates for the latter about the same as other diverted
3. <u>Rise Working Papers 1-4: A Series of Reports on Research in Progress on the Reintegrative Shaming Experiments (RISE) for Restorative Community Policing.</u> (1997). Location: Australia	Post intervention measures with a control group.	Eligible offenders randomly assigned to court or FGC. 111 young offenders up to age 29; 437 "drink" drivers. Young offenders offenses range from shoplifting to sexual assault. In most instances "drink" drivers had no specific "victim."	Observation of cases. Interviews with offenders. Interviews with sub-sample of victims.	Avg. length of FCG was 71 minutes. FGC yielded more reintegrative shaming than court more expressions of remorse and forgiveness. Victims participating in conferences were ten time to receive "repair" than court counterparts. 74% of FCG offenders felt outcome was fair compared 54% processed in courts. 77% of FCG offenders felt they expressed their views with 54% in the courts.
4. Umbreit, M and C. Fercello, (1998). Location: Woodbury, MN.	Post intervention measures.	Availability sample : offenders and victims participating in Woodbury, Minnesota Police Dept. community conferencing programs for juveniles. 27 offenders; 20 parents of offenders and 11 victims.	Self-administered seven item questionnaires at close of conference.	Offenders, parents and victims reported high level satisfaction with the process. On a ten point scale: the mean level of satisfaction participants was 7.96. 82% of victims preferred conference to court--over offenders and parents agreed.
5. McCord, P and B. Wachtel, (1998). Location: Bethlehem, PA.	Random assignment of eligibles control or treatment. Refusals comprised another control or comparison group. Post-intervention measures. One year recidivism checks.	Eligibility: youth who had not been through probation system; no felony level crimes; no drugs or alcohol, or sex offenses; include simple assaults (no weapons or serious injury) and thefts and property crimes of a misdemeanor summary violation level.	Surveys Observations Records	Typical police officers can be trained to coordinate consistent with due process and restorative justice 92% of participating offenders, victims and police would recommend conferencing to others. Overall case processing of juvenile offenders was unaffected." Preliminary recidivism checks: Control: "property" 21%; "violent" 35% Treatment Part. "property" 32%; "violent" 20% Treatment Not part. "property" 35%; "violent" 48%
6. Fercello, C. and M. Umbreit (1998). Location: 1 st Judicial District of Minnesota.	Post intervention measures. (Pre intervention measures were planned but were obtained on about half of the sample).	Availability sample of eligibles. Eligibility: all cases between 5-97 and 9-98 referred to FGCs with at least one offender and one victim - 193. Offenders were juveniles; most common offense was shoplifting -62%.	Post-conference telephone interviews: offenders-103 victims-105 support persons-130	High levels of satisfaction were reported. 93% of 94% of support persons and offenders were satisfied. Nearly all participants would recommend FGC to 100 support persons were present to "support" the contrasted with 30 for victims.

LIST OF FAMILY GROUP CONFERENCING REFERENCES KEYED TO TABLE 2 NUMBERS

1. Maxwell, G. and A. Morris, (1993). Family, Victims and Culture: Youth Justice in New Zealand. Wellington, New Zealand: Social Policy Agency and Institute of Criminology, Victoria University of Wellington.
2. Moore, D. and L. Forsythe, (no date, est. 1995). A New Approach To Juvenile Justice: An Evaluation of Family Conferencing in Wagga Wagga. Wagga Wagga, Australia: Centre for Rural Social Research.
3. Rise Working Papers 1-4: A Series of Reports on Research in Progress on the Reintegrative Shaming Experiments (RISE) for Restorative Community Policing, (1997). Institute of Advanced Studies, Australian National University.
4. Umbreit, M. and C. Fercello, (1998). "Family Group Conferencing Program Results in Client Satisfaction," Juvenile Justice Update, (December/January).
5. McCord, P. and B. Wachtel, (1998). Restorative Policing Experiment: The Bethlehem Pennsylvania Police Family Group Conferencing Project. Pipersville, PA: Community Service Foundation.

6. Fercello, C. and M. Umbreit, (1998). Client Evaluation of Family Group Conferencing in 12 Sites in 1st Judicial District of Minnesota. St. Paul, MN: Center for Restorative Justice & Mediation.

National Restorative Justice Training Institute

Center for Restorative Justice & Peacemaking

University of Minnesota Victims of Severe Violence Meet the Offender: *A Journey Toward Healing and Strength* - Mark Umbreit & Mary Sam

Offered Twice: March 22-25 or July 12-15, Wed - Saturday, 9 am - 5 pm, \$500 (application required, ASAP)

Peacemaking & Spirituality: *Touching the Soul of Restorative Justice* - Mark Umbreit & Mary Sam, with panel of representatives from Jewish, Christian, Buddhist, Muslim, Native American, and atheist traditions.

Offered Twice: April 14 or May 5, Friday, 9 am- 4 pm, \$50

Victim Offender Conferencing: *A Multi-Method Approach* - Carolyn McLeod & Mark Umbreit

May 31-June 3, Wednesday-Saturday, 9am - 5pm, \$400

Center for Restorative Justice & Peacemaking, School of Social Work, University of Minnesota, 105 Peters Hall, St. Paul, Minnesota 55108, Phone: (612) 624-4923, Fax: (612) 625-8244 , E-Mail: rjp@tlcmail.che.umn.edu, Web Site: <http://ssw.che.umn.edu/rjp>

VOMA Connections

VOMA Connections is published by the International Victim Offender Mediation Association. VOMA's mission is to provide inspiration, leadership and information-sharing in the development and support of various models of justice which create opportunities for dialogue between victims, offenders and their communities for the purpose of healing and restoration.

VOMA welcomes contributions, including short articles, literature reviews, case studies, program news and other interesting info. Photos and graphics are also needed. Views expressed within the VOMA Connections are those of the authors and not necessarily those of VOMA.

Publishing Schedule for VOMA Connections

Issue	Submissions Deadline
Summer 99	June 1
Fall 99	September 1
Winter 99	December 1
Spring 00	March 1

Send submissions to either co-editor:

Beverly Moore

Restorative Justice Program
Community Mediation Services
44 West Broadway, Suite 202
Eugene, OR 97401
541/344-5366; fax 541/687-8392
e-mail: mediate@efn.org

or

Annie Roberts

Center for Restorative Justice and Mediation
University of Minnesota, School of Social Work
Dakota Co. Community Corrections
1406 Palace Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55105
tel/fax: 651/699-4532
e-mail: annwarneroberts@compuserve.com

.....

Victim Offender Mediation Association
4624 Van Kleeck Drive
New Smyrna Beach, FL 32169
tel: 904/424-6129 or 904/424-1591
fax: 904/423-8099
e-mail: voma@voma.org
on-line @ www.voma.org

1998-1999 VOMA Board of Directors

Lorraine Stutzman Amstutz, Co-Chair Region III/VII

MCC Office on Crime and Justice
2501 Allentown Road
Quakertown, PA 18951
215/536-2733; fax 215/536-2783
e-mail: amstutz@fast.net

Jan Bellard Region IV

Mediation Network of North Carolina
P.O. Box 705, Brevard, NC 28712
828/877-3728; fax 828/877-5060
e-mail: janbellard@citcom.net

George Dash Region I

87 Mackenzie Way
Regina, Saskatchewan S495M8
306/693-0780; fax 306/787-0088
e-mail: gdash@justice.gov.sk.ca

Dave Doerfler Region V

Texas Dept. of Criminal Justice
Victim Services Division
P.O. Box 13401, Capitol Station
Austin, TX 78711
512/406-5441 or 800/848-4284;
fax 512/452-0825
e-mail: david.doerfler@tdcj.state.tx.us

Kathy Elton Region IV

Mediation Programs Coordinator
Administration Office of the Court
P.O. Box 140241
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-0241
801/578-3984; fax 801/578-3843
e-mail: kathye@email.utcourts.gov

Kathy Hall, Secretary Region II

Iowa Mediation Service
1025 Ashworth Road, Suite 202
West Des Moines, IA 50265
515/223-2318; fax 515/223-2321
e-mail: amh335@aol.com

Bruce Kittle, Co-Chair Region II

The Restorative Justice Project
University of Wisconsin Law School
975 Bascom Mall
Madison, WI 53706
608/262-4013; fax 608/263-3380
e-mail: bakittle@facstaff.wisc.edu

Mike Llado Region IV

2072 Mistletoe Court
Tallahassee, FL 32311
850/656-3379
e-mail: Peaceworks@planetdirect.com

Doris Luther Region III

P.O. Box 335
Cumberland, ME 04021
207/829-5775; fax 207/829-6894
e-mail: dluther@igc.org

Carolyn McLeod Region I

Community Justice Prog., Washington Co. Court Serv.
P.O. Box 6
Stillwater, MN 55082-0006
651/430-6948; fax 651/430-6947
e-mail: mcLeod@co.washington.mn.us

Beverly Moore Region VI

Restorative Justice Program/Community Mediation Services
44 W. Broadway, Suite 202
Eugene, OR 97401
541/344-5366; fax 541/687-8392
e-mail: mediate@efn.org

Marty Price Region VI

VORP Information and Resource Center
19813 N.E. 13th Street
Camas, WA 98607
360/260-1551; fax 360/260-1563
e-mail: martyprice@vorp.com

Ann Warner Roberts Region I

Center for Restorative Justice & Mediation
University of Minnesota, School of Social Work
Dakota Co. Community Corrections
1406 Palace Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55105.
Tel/fax: 651/699-4532
e-mail: annwarneroberts@compuserve.com

Barbara Schmidt Region V

KINnections Program
Kansas Children's Service League
1365 N. Custer
Wichita, KS 67203
316/942-4261; fax 316/943-9995
e-mail: bschmidt@kcsl.org

Sue Wiese, Treasurer Region II

Mediation Services - Fransiscan Skemp
LaCrosse County Administration Center
400 N. St., Suite B01
LaCrosse, WI 54601
608/784-7322; fax 608/784-5910
e-mail: wiese.susan@mayo.edu

VOMA Administrators

Bill & Wendy Preston

46224 Van Kleeck Drive
New Smyrna Beach, FL 32169
904/424-6129 or 904/424-1591; fax 904/423-8099
e-mail: voma@voma.org