UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN MARCOS

Restorative Justice in Higher Education: A Case Study of Program Implementation and Sustainability

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of
the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education

in

Educational Leadership

by

Luke Leo LaCroix

Committee in charge:

University of California, San Diego

Carolyn Huie Hofstetter, Chair

California State University, San Marcos

Patricia Prado-Olmos

Sinem Siyahhan

2018

The dissertation of Luke Leo LaCroix is approved, and it is acceptable in quality and form for publication on microfilm and electronically:

_____

_____

_____
Chair

University of California, San Diego

California State University, San Marcos

2018

DEDICATION

This Prayer of Saint Francis is dedicated in loving memory of

Leo O. Proulx and Eva Yanonne Proulx, Eugene H. LaCroix and Eileen Flanagan LaCroix,

Robert P. LaCroix, and Kelly Anne Fenstemaker…

Lord, make me an instrument of your peace;

where there is hatred, let me sow love;

where there is injury, pardon;

where there is doubt, faith;

where there is despair, hope;

where there is darkness, light;

and where there is sadness, joy.

O Divine Master,

grant that I may not so much seek to be consoled as to console;

to be understood, as to understand;

to be loved, as to love;

for it is in giving that we receive,

it is in pardoning that we are pardoned,

and it is in dying that we are born to Eternal Life.

Amen.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is a pleasure to write this acknowledgement and celebrate those who supported me through this journey and in life. There is a special place in my soul for my trusted colleagues, mentors, friends, and family.

The JDP cohort model really served me well in earning a doctor of education. I want to specifically name my chair, Carolyn Hofstetter for her consistent support and advisement, Sinem for taking me under her wing, Patricia for her work in closing out the process, and all the JDP faculty for sharing their experience and regular encouragement. I also want to note cohort 11 for their accompaniment along the journey. In particular, I need to name Adriana Lepe-Ramirez and Brooke Judkins for their friendship, collaboration in all group work, and sharing their prospective. Also, I could not have made it through this journey without Theresa Meyerott. She is a generous, supportive, and present friend and classmate.

My academic and professional life would not be possible without the amazing participants who willingly participated in this case study and helped bring this descriptive narrative to empirical life. You all are truly "changemakers." I also want to note all the the faculty, administrators, mentors, colleagues, staff, classmates, students/residents, and campers who accompanied me throughout my formative, academic, and professional journeys thus far at the Elliott P. Joslin Camp for boys with diabetes, the Huntington School, Cardinal Spellman High School, Fordham University, The Ohio State University, New York University, the University of California San Diego, California State University San Marcos, The College of New Jersey, and the University of San Diego.

In completing this degree, I cannot cherish my family and friends (i.e.: my chosen family) enough for all their encouragement, motivation, their tough love in completing this

degree, and presence in my life in general. It is important to honor my Nana and Pepere Proulx and Grandma and Grandpa LaCroix for their unconditional love, support in attending Camp Joslin, and offsetting the cost with my first insulin pump. They are truly angels in my life. I also want to acknowledge my cousins and my aunts and uncles for their love and making themselves available when I am visiting home - and in particular my Aunt Tesie and Uncle Oakie O'Connor for their consistent interest in me as a person and Uncle Bob LaCroix for his humor, attention, and for role modeling what it is to be openly gay and Catholic.

I need to glow about my friend group for the gifts they bring to my life. I am compelled to gush over my most sacred A-list group - Mary Kate Blaine, Mike Puma, and Ty Crisman who are individuals that know my thoughts before I express them, comfort me when I am sad, angry and/or frustrated, debrief challenges without judgement, provide honest feedback when I need it most, and hold me accountable when I step out of line. It is also crucial to acknowledge Christopher and Mary LaCroix for their overwhelming support with my professional aspirations and Caitlin and Scott Luther for their hard work and audacious hospitality on the home front so I can be "California dreaming."

Lastly, but most importantly I want to dedicate this accomplishment to my Mom and Dad. Their perseverance afforded me the ability to read, showed me how to take care of my own health, inspired my interest in Catholic education and student formation, and role modeled an admirable work ethic. My parents' unconditional love, everlasting support, and acceptance are gifts from God that I could never truly dignify with the level of gratitude deserved.

VITA

EDUCATION

2018 Doctor of Education, Education Leadership, Joint Doctoral Program of University of California, San Diego and California State University, San Marcos

2008 Master of Science, Human Resource Management and Development,
New York University, New York, New York

2002 Master of Arts, Higher Education and Student Affairs Administration,
The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

2000 Bachelor of Arts, Communication and Media Studies and certificate in Peace and Justice Studies, Fordham University, Bronx, New York

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

2017 – present Director of Residential Administration, University of San Diego,
San Diego, California

2012 – 2017 Associate Director of Residential Life, University of San Diego,
San Diego, California

2008 – 2012 Assistant Director of Residential Education, The College of New Jersey, Ewing, New Jersey

2004 – 2008 Community Development Educator, New York University,
New York, New York

2002 – 2004 Residence Hall Director, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Restorative Justice in Higher Education:
A Case Study of Program Implementation and Sustainability

by

Luke Leo LaCroix

Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership

University of California, San Diego, 2018
California State University, San Marcos, 2018

Carolyn Huie Hofstetter, Chair

Restorative justice is an emerging topic related to college student behavioral issues and offers a personal behavior alternative strategy. It is used predominantly to address crime, misconduct, and injustices in criminal justice, K-12 education, and higher education arenas. Restorative justice addresses harm through dialogue with goals of repairing harm, rebuilding trust, and repairing relationships through a mutual decision-making process in order to determine outcomes with responsibilities for all participants. The literature demonstrates how restorative justice complimented student conduct processes, developed empathy, had a positive impact on school and campus culture, and the advancement of cultural and diverse competencies, and incurred great satisfaction by the participant.

Literature further states that restorative justice is supported by many professional groups in the Roman Catholic higher education setting as a personal behavior alternative strategy and reflects the spirit of Catholic Social Teachings.

This study examined how a Roman Catholic university implemented and sustained a restorative justice program at one site in southern California. Data included interviews and focus groups with leaders and facilitators working actively within the program. Emergent themes from the qualitative data includes: institutional need, shared belief system, university identity, Catholic Social Teachings, proactive use of restorative justice and restorative practices, reactive use of restorative justice and restorative practices, systematic training, collaboration, institutional support, institutionalizing the program, storytelling, reframing current work, frequent use of restorative justice practices impact of program sustainability on campus, impact of cultural experience, empathy, conflict management, local and national recognition, and student voice.

Key words: restorative justice, restorative practices, Roman Catholic, mission, empathy, conflict management, storytelling, collaboration, college, university, higher education

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

A sitting president of a prestigious college reported to work one morning and read reports of student misconduct that occurred over the weekend, capturing student drunkenness, physical altercations, and vandalism. Those of us today might believe these incidents reflect the challenging circumstances of higher education in our modern times, but this statement represents Harvard College in the 17th century. Since the Colonial college era, harms created by students and acts of student misconduct plague educational institutions (Karp & Frank, 2016; Jackson, 1995). Colonial colleges like Harvard were founded as seminaries and the presidents and the faculty supervised and disciplined the students with force in lieu of parental oversight, or *in loco parentis* (Schuh, Jones, & Harper, 2010). Now, four centuries later, colleges and universities continue to be challenged when it comes to developing processes and mechanisms to identify solutions to student misconduct, addressing concerns using varying punitive and educational outcomes, and strategizing plans for the development of a real campus community (Gehring, 2001; Grund, Brassler, & Fries, 2014; Janosik & Gehring, 2003; Hingson, Edwards, Heeren, & Rosenbloom, 2009; Taub et al, 2013; Thombs, Gonzalez, Osborn, Rossheim, & Suzuki, 2015; Thombs, Osborn, Rossheim, & Suzuki, 2014; Thombs, Osborn, Rossheim, & Suzuki, 2014).

Statement of Problem

A college or university campus form a small reflection of the larger society where hundreds to thousands of diverse students engage in a variety of activities together – studying, living, socializing, and sometimes working within close proximity to their peers. Interpersonal and violent conflicts occur within college or university communities like they do in many neighborhoods or densely populated areas. Conflicts among students creates stress for students in their ability to be comfortable, communicate, feel safe, study, and persist to graduation (Ross,

Fischer, Baker, & Buchholz, 1997; Gaarder & Hesselton, 2012; Sillars, 1980). Race, gender, sexual orientation, and concerns for many other types of social justice issues contributes to the conflicts on college campuses. The conflicts are due to the regular interactions between students from many different backgrounds and many of whom are experiencing difference for the first time (Bresnahan, Guan, Shearman, & Donohue, 2009; Gavrielides, 2014; Harper, Davis, Jones, McGowan, Ingram, & Platt, 2011; Payne & Welch, 2015; Pedreal & Lizeth, 2014).

The conflicts and challenges that exist on college campuses can impede student progress and student success. Student-on-student harms and acts of student misconduct could include incidents of sexual violence, physical altercations, underage alcohol consumption, illegal drug use, and instances of when a student or community member is a threat to him/herself or others on-campus (Grund, Brassler, Fries, 2014; Janosik & Gehring, 2003; Taub et al, 2013; Thombs, Gonzalez, Osborn, Rossheim, & Suzuki, 2015; Thombs, Osborn, Rossheim, & Suzuki, 2014). Many of the aforementioned incidents involve alcohol consumption and binge drinking that often lead to conflicts between students as a primary or secondary factor (Grund, Brassler, Fries, 2014; Hingson, Edwards, Heeren, & Rosenbloom, 2009; Janosik & Gehring, 2003; King, Borsari, Chen, 2010; Perskin, 2002).

The various circumstances that lead to student misconduct often include academic and social stress, poor decision making, use of alcohol and other drugs, and opportunities for exploration with newfound freedoms that may lead to unfortunate, detrimental ends. Residential colleges and universities are unique in that students live in close community with one another, often with individuals of similar age, and immersed with individuals different from themselves. Literature shows that similar to the larger world, conflicts exists in a micro-environment within

the college setting (Dusselier, Dunn, Wang, Shelley II, & Whalen, 2005; Grund, Brassler, Fries, 2014; Karp, 2013; Reed, Prado, Matsum, & Amaro, 2010; Ross, Niebling, & Heckert, 1999).

In response to student misconduct, colleges and universities in the United States developed systems that reflect broader judicial and legalistic processes due to varying court cases, subsequent case law, and federal mandates. A limitation of traditional student conduct programs is that the institutions do not prepare students for post-baccalaureate life in that individuals do not understand how to address conflicts with others, interact with one another without harm, and/or correct harms when they do occur. The traditional student conduct systems grew from an "era of accountability" fueled by political unrest within higher education in the 1960s. It includes policies listed in codes of conduct, due-process procedures, expanded levels of accountability for the students and the institution, and federal legislation protecting student conduct records. It mirrors what one may expect from a civil proceeding in a court with the student speaking with an administrator(s) or board members. The hearing includes a review of alleged infraction between a student and the institution, with little to no room for a potential student to participate. (Alexander, 2000; Gehring, 2001; Howell, 2005; Karp 2013). The evolution of such processes potentially moves the management of student misconduct away from student development, critical thinking skills, and advancing citizenship to systems more retributive in nature, potentially creating adversarial dynamics between the student and the institution when misconduct occurs, and therefore the ends do not demonstrate the purposes of educating cohorts of leaders (Gehring, 2001; Karp, 2013; Lowery & Dannells, 2004; Oles, 2004).

Recently, restorative justice practices emerged in an effort to educate students in regard to human interactions, including the campus community in resolving conflicts or acts of

misconduct, influencing how individuals make meaning of the world around them while helping them understand their responsibilities in it, and a potential to change campus culture toward one where individuals learn to interact with one another civilly. However, restorative justice programs at colleges and universities are not widespread. Approximately 70 institutions out of 4000 colleges and universities in the United States have implemented formal restorative justice programs within the past ten years. (Karp & Sacks, 2014; Latimer, Dowden, Muise, 2005; McMurtrie, 2015; Zehr, 2002). Although restorative justice serves as an initiative to curb and/or respond to the students engaging in misconduct and not just the "rule broken," the uses of restorative justice practices in higher education are beginning to emerge and more research is necessary in regard to implementation, sustainability, and program outcomes. Fortunately, restorative justice practices complement the due-process procedures of a traditional student conduct system, but also more productively address educational outcomes and student formation. The interest with the application of restorative justice in higher education expands and it will be purposeful to explore how such programs are implemented and sustained in a higher education setting (Fronius, Persson, Guckenburg, Hurley, & Petrosino, 2016; McMurtrie, 2015).

Overview of Restorative Justice Practices in Higher Education

The origins of restorative justice practices originate with Indigenous groups, adopted by Quaker and Mennonite religious groups, and most recently within the criminal justice and education systems of New Zealand, Australia, Canada, the United States, as well as in pockets of western European countries. The structures of restorative justice are broad and vary by groups and nations. The number of restorative justice programs in criminal justice systems, K-12, and higher education are not formally cataloged, but interest in restorative justice continues to expand. Programs and systems vary in how they are implemented, but all are restorative in

nature and aspire to address harms between individuals and within communities in a restorative manner (Eagle, 2001; Chiste, 2013; Goldstein, 2006; Haarala, 2004; Johnstone & Van Ness, 2007; Mbamboo & Skelton, 2003; Mirsky, 2004; Pranis, Stuart, & Wedge, 2003; Roujanavong, 2005; Wong, 2005).

Within the past ten years in college settings, the process of restorative justice was used to address harms, repair relationships, and rebuild trust between individuals in higher education settings and the community. For example, in 2014, a group of male dental students at a Dalhousie University in Halifax, Nova Scotia Canada used Facebook to make scathing and sexually explicit comments about female students. The institution used restorative justice practices to address the misconduct. Although the university faced backlash for what appeared to be a "soft" process, for five months the male students met with their classmates, administrators representing multiple areas of the institution, dental professionals in practice, restorative justice facilitators, and community members to discuss what occurred, the hurtful harm on impacted parties, and created solutions that the male students could do to restore trust, co-create resolution, and actively address personal and environmental factors that propelled their bias and misogyny. After the restorative justice experience, the men stated they grew as individuals through the experience, and accepted responsibility for their misconduct, the significant influence of facing the victims and seeing the impact their behavior had on them, and the significant preparation the experience had on their professional and personal lives (McMurtrie, 2015).

Similarly, Dustin, who was 19 years old and a first-year student at Colorado State University (CSU) in Fort Collins consumed copious amounts of alcohol, assaulted a resident of the town, cursed and sparred with the local police, and passed out on a neighbor's lawn.

Although Dustin served probation for two-years for the incident, enrolled in an alcohol management class, and completed 160 hours of community service hours, CSU's restorative justice program provided Dustin the opportunity to offer peace to those he impacted on a voluntary basis. Dustin met with the impacted family and police officers thereafter, listened to their accounts, apologized, and co-created an outcome where Dustin could rebuild trust with the community. Dustin agreed to drive the campus shuttle which provides students safe rides back to campus from off-campus locations on nights and weekends. Dustin stated, 'I definitely needed to take responsibility for this one, and learn from it. The way that you see how you affected people is very powerful' (Lipka, 2009).

In a final restorative justice example, the face-to-face meeting was important to the family of David Mueller after he died in a one-car accident. David was a passenger in the car of friend Dylan Salazar and died due to Salazar's decision to drive while intoxicated in the spring of 2010. David was 19 years old and David and Dylan were students at the University of Colorado, Colorado Springs. The traditional criminal justice system did not provide Mueller's family and Dylan the opportunity to discuss the incredible harm and loss. The courtroom was a proceeding between Salazar and the state, not the Mueller family. However, the restorative justice experience after the criminal proceedings allowed the responsible party and impacted parties to address the situation in a way that allowed regret to be discussed, emotions to be expressed, mutual healing to be explored, and created opportunity for healing that co-created change. Salazar and the Mueller family mutually embraced with emotion after the restorative conference (Hutton, 2011). Although the formation of restorative justice programs at institutions of higher education are young and emerging, restorative justice practices have a long and storied history within different cultures.

Purpose of Study

Restorative justice practices are increasing in use within correctional and educational settings. A small but growing body of empirical data exists to study restorative justice practices used in the criminal justice and K-12 systems, but less research is available regarding its use in higher education settings. The research on restorative justice practices in criminal justice, K-12, and higher education demonstrates a lack of formal evaluative measures and finite outcomes, represents relatively small sample sizes, and current research only addresses the outcomes of the specific restorative justice program. Also, there is a lack of understanding of how restorative justice programs are implemented (Fronius, Persson, Guckenburg, Hurley, & Petrosino, 2016).

Therefore, this study examines how a university implements a restorative justice program in order to cultivate a culture of community among students, faculty, staff, and administrators. The auspice of a restorative justice program is to create a system where individuals treat one another with care and concern, address harms when they occur, and respond to student misconduct in a restorative manner (Karp, 2013; Lowery & Dannells, 2004; Johnstone & Van Ness, 2007). More specifically, this study examines the conditions and decision points that motivates a university to implement a restorative justice practice and uncovers the best practices for implementing and sustaining a restorative justice program at a religiously affiliated, Roman Catholic institution in southern California. This dissertation reviews empirical and theoretical literature in regard to the frameworks and applications of restorative justice practices.

Research Questions

The research questions for the study are:

1. What factors motivate the institution to choose to implement a restorative justice program?

2. In what ways does a faith-based university tether the restorative justice program to its mission, vision, values, and identity?
3. By what methods, means, and strategies does a university use to implement a restorative justice program?
4. What are best practices for implementing a restorative justice program?
5. What are the effects of implementing a restorative justice program?

Overview of Methodology

The study included a qualitative investigation through a case study methodology at a religiously affiliated, Roman Catholic institution located in southern California. This study included 16 participants employed at the university. The participants included 11 trained facilitators of restorative justice practices and 5 individuals who constituted the restorative justice program's leadership team. The study included investigating one campus in order to provide insight into restorative justice in Catholic higher education, also described as "the issue" (Creswell, 2012). It is important to note that the researcher is employed at the site selected for the study and also serves as a leadership team member with the restorative justice program. The participant/observer experience is described in findings shared in chapter four and the researcher's positionality and precautions for bias therein are defined in chapter five.

The research design involved a number of recorded individual interviews and focus group interviews, transcription of those interviews, and a coding process by the investigator to identify the themes and findings of the study. The codes were grouped into categories in order to inform best practices for restorative justice practices and implementation on a college campus. With university permission, the researcher also reviewed and coded a large group of artifacts provided

by the institution, such as a manual, training materials, and publically available website information.

Significance of Study

As stated, little empirical work has been published about restorative justice practices in the higher education setting despite its growing use and study in the criminal justice and K-12 setting (Braithwaite, 2002; Lowery & Dannells, 2004; Umbreit, Coates, & Vos, 2004). Colleges and universities addressed student misconduct for nearly 400 years, but not always with emphasis on necessarily preventing the behaviors proactively (Dannells, 1997). Therefore, this study is important in regard to understanding the experience of the facilitator implementing restorative justice practices on a college campus and in conjunction with the institution's mission as a Roman Catholic religiously affiliated university. This study explores some of the best practices for implementing restorative justice practices on the university's campus, and understanding how best to utilize restorative justice practices in educating students for life after college.

Overview of the Dissertation

The dissertation consists of five chapters. The first chapter reviews the statement of the problem and introduction of restorative justice. The second chapter is an overview of literature related to student misconduct and the manner in which individuals treated one another, restorative justice practices and the solution therein, and the importance of quality facilitator training in implementing restorative justice practices, and the influence of restorative justice on school culture. The third chapter summarizes the theoretical framework and research methods for the study. The fourth chapter reports the themes and findings in addressing the five research questions. Lastly, chapter five provides a conclusion to the overall study.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to review literature pertaining to college and university campuses, data to inform the scope of the problem, and present an overview of literature in regard to the restorative justice continuum used in addressing conflicts and harms. It includes a synthesis of restorative justice practices within higher education settings, while drawing from lessons learned within criminal justice systems and K-12 districts. It also shows how restorative justice integrates with the Roman Catholic mission of a faith-based institution, and reviews the known challenges in implementing restorative justice programs. This chapter demonstrates how student misconduct is managed on a college or university campus and how restorative justice practices fit into process as a personal behavior alternative strategy. It concludes with an outline of the research questions that informs this study in how to implement and sustain a restorative justice program on a college campus.

Conflicts on College and University Campuses

Conflict and subsequent attempt at resolution persists in higher education. The problem negatively impacts campus life and student persistence. Conflict also impedes students in preparing for post-baccalaureate life in a way that helps individuals to understand others, interact without harm, and correct harms when they do occur. Despite significant investment in higher education, college graduates are increasingly ill-prepared to address the complexities of conflicts between one another, the consequences of personal behavior, and personal distress (Klibert, et al, 2014).

Colleges and universities serves as a cross-section of US populations. Campuses enroll students of all ages, religions, ethnic backgrounds, sexes, sexualities, gender identities, differing

abilities, socioeconomic statuses, and Veteran statuses. According to the Association of College and University Housing Officers – International (ACUHO-I, 2014), approximately 1.9 million college students in the United States live in college or university operated dormitories and campus apartments. Conflicts occur when individuals live and study within close proximity with their peers and individuals different from one another (ACUHO-I, 2014; Pezza & Bellotti, 1995; Roloff & Soule, 2002). Restorative practices address human interactions and the way individuals learn to interact.

Conflicts often derive from circumstances and instances without warning. Student health data indicates that stress influences conflict with peers. For example, conflicts with roommates and within residence hall environments also create varying levels of stress. Similarly, students worry about friends and family at home. Interestingly, stress is more common for United States citizens as compared to international students studying in the US, college women report higher levels of stress than college men, and conflict that exists between peers due to difference and physical proximity to one another are greater contributors to stress than that of financial concern or the academic rigor of an institution (Dusselier, Dunn, Wang, Shelley II, & Whalen, 2005; Rugge & Scott, 2009; Ross, Niebling, & Heckert, 1999).

Conflict and stress escalate between individuals of difference and close proximity to one another. To that end, college students of color and students of underrepresented groups experience more incidents of conflict, worry, and anxiety in comparison to the traditionally more privileged students (Dusselier, Dunn, Wang, Shelley II, Whalen, 2005; Literte, 2011; Ponsford, 2016; Porter & Williams, 2011) and similar for Muslim students (Arrigo, 2010; Rabrenovic, Levin, & Oliver, 2007). Conflict escalates into violence and therefore creates challenges for all, including responsible parties, impacted parties, and community members. Conflicts are a

catalyst for wrongdoing and violence on college and university campuses (Karp, 2013). Campus violence takes the form of physical and nonphysical acts. The physical consists of physical assault, sexual assault, relationship violence, and/or a campus-shooter. Non-physical violence is defined as verbal altercations, bullying, intentions to silence, intimidate or disempower another, and/or cause emotional harm without physical contact (Mayhew, Caldwell, & Goldman, 2011).

One significant form of violence on college campuses is bullying. More than one quarter of college students report being bullied on-campus (Chapell et al, 2004; Chapell, Hasselman, Kitchin, Lomon, MacIver, & Sarullo, 2006). Bullying is defined as violent and nonviolent and can be based on student identity(ies), ability, and/or faith in a world religion [Muslim, Jewish, etc.]. Bullying also intensifies by pre-college bullying (Ahmed & Braithwaite, 2011; Brock, Oikonomidoy, Wulfing, Pennington, & Obenchain, 2014; DeWitt & DeWitt, 2012; Holt et al., 2014; Lewis & Ericksen, 2016; Myers & Cowie, 2013). A newer form of college bullying includes cyber-bullying and results of student perceptions vary in how to define it, prevent it, and how an institution should monitor it, if at all (Paullet & Pinchot, 2014).

The college experience in the United States provides students with independence from parents or legal guardians and with an increased access to alcohol and other drugs. These components create stress for students as they manage their experience and wrestle with the challenges and opportunities of living in this type of community (Dusselier, Dunn, Wang, Shelley II, Whalen, 2005; Reed, Prado, Matsum, & Amaro, 2010 Ross, Niebling, & Heckert, 1999). Community living encompasses harms and incidents of distress with the campus community. The Department of Education stated in the Campus Safety and Security Report from 2014 the following occurrences of conflict, violence, and student misconduct occurring

within the residence halls at the 2046 bachelor-degree granting public and not for profit institutions:

- Disciplinary actions/alcohol: 174,561
- Disciplinary actions/illegal substances: 47,162
- Criminal/assault: 620
- Criminal/rape: 3554
- Criminal/burglary: 6742
- Violence Against Women Act/domestic violence: 1238
- Violence Against Women Act/dating violence: 1871
- Violence Against Women Act/stalking: 1171

Government mandates require institutions to provide resources in regard to security measures, but colleges and universities are also called upon to address campus violence as an educational outcome surrounding good global citizenship and to better prepare students for the world after degree completion. Student safety, and an institutions' management of it, informs student success and students' ability to study (Banyard, 2014; Huitt, 2007; Grund, Brassler, Fries, 2014; Janosik & Gehring, 2003; Pezza & Belloti, 1995; Paludi, 2008; Taub et al, 2013; Thombs, Gonzalez, Osborn, Rossheim, & Suzuki, 2015; Thombs, Osborn, Rossheim, & Suzuki, 2014).

Institutions intervene with trained personnel to address concerns, conflicts, and provide a level of safety and welfare for students and prevent student challenges from going unnoticed or unaddressed (Elleven, Allen, & Wircenski, 2001; Hingson, Edwards, Heeren, & Rosenbloom, 2009; Janosik & Gehring, 2003; Kadison & DiGeronimo, 2004; King, Borsari, Chen, 2010; Kuh & Schuh, 1983; Perskin, 2002; Winston & Fitch, 1993). Many cases of student misconduct and

conflict involves the use of alcohol and binge drinking between students as a primary or a secondary factor (Grund, Brassler, Fries, 2014).

In addition, trained personnel also address interpersonal conflicts within the college or university community that are not violation of law, institutional policy, or student codes of conduct. The close proximity to peers in a campus setting provide challenges due to studying, working, and/or living in such close proximity to one another. These types of interpersonal conflicts create stress for students and impact their ability to be comfortable, communicate, feel safe, study, and persist (Ross, Fischer, Baker, & Buchholz, 1997; Sillars, 1980). Race, racial identity, and social justice disparities also contribute to conflicts managed on college and university campuses due to the regular interactions students have with individuals different from themselves (Bresnahan, Guan, Shearman, & Donohue, 2009; Harper, Davis, Jones, McGowan, Ingram, & Platt, 2011). Colleges and universities manage the educational enterprise in addition to addressing conflicts. Campus conflicts include violations of law, violations of campus policy and/or code of conduct, and interpersonal challenges that distract students from achieving their educational goals. The challenges cannot be ignored and strictly punitive measures are not sufficient in preventing student misconduct and campus conflict (Gehring, 2001; Howell, 2005; Karp 2013). A demand for resolution requires institutions to think differently about various personal behavior intervention strategies.

What is Restorative Justice?

As stated in chapter one, the origins of restorative justice practices are anchored in the practices of Indigenous groups and were later adopted by religious communities in the Western world and colonies. Programs and systems vary in how restorative justice practices are implemented, but the work seeks to address harms between individuals and within communities

in a restorative manner (Chiste, 2013; Johnstone & Van Ness, 2007; Palermo, 2013; Pranis, Stuart, & Wedge, 2003).

Restorative justice is defined as a cooperative decision-making process that involves many members of a community. An act or incident of thoughtlessness and hurtfulness can be addressed through restorative justice by including the offenders, the impacted, and general community members. The central principles of restorative justice include four beliefs: (a) inclusive decision-making where offenders and impacted parties mutually agree on the outcome of the restorative practice, (b) active accountability where offenders can take responsibility for his or her actions through active participation, (c) repair harm between the impacted parties and offender with an ambition to raise up all involved, and (d) rebuild trust so all parties can trust and feel safe again. The four principles are constant within a restorative practice regardless of where restorative justice was practiced: including a community at-large, as part of the criminal justice system, primary and secondary schools, and/or in higher education. The implementation of the four principles of restorative justice can strengthen the community, involve members who are part of the general educational enterprise, and assist institutions in graduating individuals with a stronger understanding of responsible citizenship (Karp, 2013; Zehr, 2003). The four principles build a framework for repairing wrongdoings through a restorative and alternate method in order to correct harms that is not strictly punitive and factor the experience of impacted parties.

Howard Zehr, 2002, the modern day champion of contemporary restorative justice, defines restorative justice as "a process to involve, to the extent possible, those who have a stake in a specific offense and to collectively identify and address harms, needs, and obligations, in order to heal and put things as right as possible" (p. 37). Restorative justice practices provide structure, roles, and techniques in order to actualize the goals and concepts to repair harms.

Participation in restorative justice practices are voluntary and require the investment of responsible parties, impacted parties, community members, and trained facilitators. Restorative justice addresses challenging harms, crimes, and injustices. It can be a time-consuming process to introduce to any community (Dominus, 2016; Karp, 2013; Wachtel, 2013).

The members of the community need to be open to the four principles of restorative justice and establish a commitment to the overall success of the principles in order to allow the principles to be actualized. However, a restorative justice dialogue, circle, or conference cannot take place if the responsible party and impacted party are not willing to participate and do not have an understanding of the goals of restorative justice (Dominus, 2016; Karp, 2013; Wachtel, 2013). Data and examples from the restorative justice community outside of higher education indicate how an orientation toward restorative justice can be developed, how communities of responsible and impacted parties take ownership and responsibility for the conflict in order to rebuild trust and repair harm, and how various community members are included in the restorative process in order to make the mutual decision-making process collaborative (Borton & Paul, 2013).

A school site, an institution of higher education, or a criminal justice system and its constituents need to prepare in order to implement restorative justice when addressing harms through a like-minded, restorative justice paradigm mindset. The preparation includes proper training for facilitators in restorative justice practices for addressing community harms. Preparation for restorative justice supports the four principles of restorative justice because it sets the framework. Restorative justice facilitators inform community members at-large about the overarching benefits of inclusive decision-making when restoring relationships and trust among community members when harms occur (Borton & Paul, 2013).

Restorative justice is a theory of faith unto itself, sustains as a norm for how individuals treat one another within a community, and actualizes through restorative practices in order to build healthy and just relationships, prevent and solve problems, and reconcile conflicts and social ills when they occur through a collaborative process (Karp, 2013; Karp & Clear, 2000; Lowery & Dannells, 2004; Johnstone & Van Ness, 2007; McCold 2000; McCold & Watchel, 2002). The goals of restorative justice are to allow impacted parties and other key stakeholders to have decision-making abilities in determining outcomes when restoring a harm or a crime, allow for justice to be more healing or restorative in nature, provide opportunity for justice to be transformative, rebuild relationships, and to reduce recidivism (Evans, Smokowski, Barbee, Bower, & Barefoot, 2016; Sharpe, 1998). These objectives are accomplished by maintaining a focus on the harm that occurred and the individuals involved, a consideration for the needs of all parties and the surrounding community, and attentiveness to the responsibilities and obligations therein (Pranis, Stuart, & Wedge, 2003; Zehr, 2002). The restorative justice processes should be transformative in the way that a person understands herself or himself and how an individual relates to others on a daily basis (Johnstone & Van Ness, 2007).

A restorative justice community come together through a continuum of practices. The continuum allows for facilitators to meet the goals of restorative justice with practices appropriate for the site and situation. Restorative justice practices include a group of forms and functions and act within a social context to include people, relationships, and contexts in addition to addressing a breach of expectations, laws, and/or student codes of conduct. Restorative justice practices are voluntary and community-based. Like traditional justice and student conduct systems, restorative justice practices focus on the responsible party, but *also* include the impacted parties and community members in addressing the harm and misconduct. The

community members and the responsible and impacted parties collaborate in determining the outcomes in an effort to push from punishment to restoration in order to address the pillars of restorative justice practices. The principles include: (a) rebuilding trust, (b) re-establishing relationships, (c) maintaining accountability, and (d) agreeing to solution/s and/or restitution/s in order to move forward as a stronger community (Karp, 2013; Latimer, Dowden, Muise, 2005; O'Brien, 2007; Zehr, 2002). Support for restorative justice and faith in it must be built within the community and established on college campuses as a shared value and philosophy in order to create a restorative culture (Armour 2013; Alarid & Montemayor, 2012; Borton & Paul, 2013; Fronius, Persson, Guckenburg, Hurley, & Petrosino, 2016).

The need for restorative justice in the criminal justice and educational systems comes from the inability for the criminal justice and student misconduct systems to address the opportunity to repair harms between a responsible party, impacted party, and the community and is borrowed from historical practices. The systems focus on what rule or law is broken and responsibility is assigned to the offender based on a punishment dictated by a court or administrator. Traditional disciplinary systems in our schools and criminal justice proceedings within our courts focus more on the incident and less on the individuals. These systems determine guilt and produce sanctions with little to no involvement from the responsible and impacted parties. The opportunities to repair harm, educate, and make it right are missed. The victim or impacted party do not have a voice – the system addresses the responsible party or defendant versus the state or institution in the criminal justice system or a traditional student conduct process. However, restorative justice addresses what happens and why, not just the what (Zehr, 2002; Pranis, Stuart, & Wedge, 2003).

Similar to the criminal justice and K-12 educational systems, institutions of higher education need to actualize restorative justice practices within codes of student conduct, in student conduct systems, and create a spirit of positive campus life on college campuses. Restorative justice practices are not necessarily meant to replace codes of student conduct and student conduct systems, but complement and inform those processes in order to better serve campus communities. Restorative justice practices better address harms and prepare students to consider themselves and their actions a part of something larger than themselves, learned through potential acts of thoughtlessness, and lead more just and socially responsible lives (Jonason & Rinker, 2014; Karp, 2013).

The Process of Restorative Justice Practices

The process of restorative justice comes together through a continuum of practices. As stated in chapter one, the restorative justice continuum consists of restorative dialogue, restorative conferences, and restorative circles. A criminal justice system, K-12 school district, and/or an institution of higher education can use all of the practices within the continuum simultaneously in building community norms, processes in responding to harms, and addressing culture in which humans treat each other (Bergseth & Bouffard, 2007; Karp, 2013; Gavrielides, 2012; Latimer, Dowden, Muise, 2005; McCluskey, Lloyd, Stead, Kane, Riddell, & Weedon, 2008; Mossison, 2002; O'Brien, 2007; Schiff, 2013; Saulnier, Lutchman, Sivasubramaniam, 2011; Van Ness & Strong, 2014; Wachtel, 2013; Zehr, 2002).

Restorative dialogue as a restorative justice practice. Literature states that a restorative dialogue is a communication and conversation style between individuals that seek to understand. The specific implication of dialogue notes about restorative practices defines "dialogue" as a process that flows between individuals where words and actions therein are

intentional (Umbreit & Armour, 2011; Umbreit, Lewis, & Burns, 2003; Umbreit, Vos, Coates, & Brown, 2006). The practical application of restorative dialogue can prevent conflicts/harms or inform how individuals address conflict with one another in an effort to understand multiple perspectives and create order collaboratively (Ahlin, Gibbs, Kavanaugh, Lee, 2015; Johnstone & Van Ness, 2007; Umbreit & Armour, 2011; Umbreit, Vos, Coates, & Brown, 2006).

Restorative dialogue can serve as an intervention or a preventative measure in regard to harm or conflict (Umbreit & Armour, 2011; Umbreit, Lewis, & Burns, 2003; Umbreit, Vos, Coates, & Brown, 2006). It works to create and enhance relationships in a process in order to form relationships of learning. A restorative dialogue may also rebuild a relationship after a harm or interpersonal conflict occurred. Relationship learning informs individuals in how to connect as community members and form a responsible association and/or friendship, be inclusive, accept accountability, and exhibit good citizenship through a restorative lens to inform people in how to treat and address one another with care. Restorative dialogue informs a sense of personal behavior and decision making in regard to others (Macready, 2009).

A positive impact of restorative dialogue includes the development of institutional culture within K-12 and higher education settings. Restorative dialogue influences student formation and contributes to school culture and student learning within K-12 schools. As restorative justice creates a mindset with how we understand ourselves and relate to neighbors in our day-to-day interaction, it also creates a culture within a school and influences practices and policies (Christle, Jolivette, & Nelson, 2005; Guckenburg, Hurley, Persson, Fronius, & Petrosino, 2015; Johnstone & Van Ness, 2007; Pavelka, 2013; Schiff, 2013; Olson, 2011). The policies and practices of the school reflects a restorative lens and philosophy if that is the value set of the school and/or district (Gonzalez, 2012). The educational enterprise is informed by the

restorative lens, it becomes a shared value set, and the restorative philosophy envelops the school community and creates the culture at the site (Karp & Breslin, 2001; Pavelka, 2013).

Newfound freedom, experiences with drugs and alcohol, student misconduct, and the educational experience through a student conduct process all inform the need for restorative dialogue in order to prevent harms on college campuses for traditional and nontraditional students alike. College students, faculty, and administrators often live, study, and experience campus-life together in community before, during, and after a harm occurs (ASCA, 2015; DiPaola, Roloff, & Peters, 2010; Kara & McAlister, 2010; Karp, 2013; Karp & Conrad, 2006; Lipka, 2009). The opportunity to create a campus culture through a restorative lens may prevent harms, prevent student misconduct from occurring, and consequently necessitates the purpose for this study.

Similar to K-12 systems as stated previously, the overall aims of restorative dialogue initiatives in higher education indicate that campus culture and college student learning may improve with the implementation of restorative justice practices and restorative dialogue despite the shallow amount of empirical research thus far (Kara & McAlister, 2010; Karp, 2013; Karp & Conrad, 2006; Knott, 2016; Lipka, 2009). Although research on the implementation of restorative practices is shallow within higher education settings and formal programs emerging over the past ten years, campus culture and faith in restorative justice continuum informs the opportunity for program implementation in order to prevent harms, address recidivism in the student conduct process, and advance student learning. Support for restorative justice and faith rely on a shared value and philosophy in order to create a restorative culture (Armour 2013; Alarid & Montemayor, 2012; Borton & Paul, 2013; McMurtrie, 2015; O'Brien, 2007). Research indicates that campus community members must be willing to participate and trained facilitators

must be committed to the work before the four principles of restorative justice can be actualized on a college campus. Restorative justice can be integrated in campus setting through many processes, programs, activities, services, and experiences (Cornelison, Crocker, Evett, & McDowell, 2014; Karp, 2013).

Restorative circles as a restorative justice practice. Restorative circles are a practice by where members of a community come together to discuss harms that may occur. One type of restorative circle involves individuals responsible for harms, conflicts, and/or crimes in the past. Another type of restorative circle involves members impacted by a harm in the community and without a responsible party. An example of these circles may include a robbery or a death in the community due to violence. A third type of restorative circle involves those who come together because of a connection to a societal ill in order to discuss in a restorative way. An example may include a restorative circle about Black Lives Matter, victims of sexual misconduct or relationship violence, or LGBTQA+ community members impacted by intolerances endorsed by case law (Bohmert, Duwe, & Hipple, 2016; Derajtys & McDowell, 2014; Hannem, 2013; Karp, 2013; Lehmann, Jordan, Bolton, Huynh, & Chigbu, 2012; Pedreal & Lizeth, 2014; Pranis, 2005; Umbreit & Armour, 2011; Zehr, 2002).

Restorative conferences as a restorative justice practice. As stated in chapter one, restorative conferences are the most formal and structured of all the restorative practices. A conference follows a harm, crime, or an act of student misconduct with a known responsible party and/or known impacted parties. Participation in restorative justice conference practices is voluntary and requires the investment of responsible parties, impacted parties, community members, and trained facilitators. Restorative justice addresses challenging harms, crimes, and injustices. Restorative justice conferences are a time-consuming process to introduce to any

community. The members of the community need to be open to the four principles of restorative justice and establish a commitment to their overall success in order to allow the four principles to be fully actualized. However, a restorative justice conference or circle cannot take place if the responsible party and impacted parties are not willing to participate with an understanding of the goals of the experience (Karp, 2013). Data and examples from the restorative justice community outside of higher education indicates how an orientation toward restorative justice can be developed, how communities of responsible and impacted parties can take ownership and responsibility for the conflict in order to rebuild trust and repair harm, and how various community members can be included in order to make the decision-making process collaborative (Borton & Paul, 2013; Rossner, 2011).

The restorative justice conference is a process based on three central concepts that include: the harm and needs, obligations, and engagement. The three concepts define the pillars of restorative justice. The first includes needs and harms to which the conference focuses on the victim(s), their needs, and the specific harm or harms that occurred. The conference is centered on the impacted party's needs and the harm that occurred. The needs and harms concept within the conference differs in that the US criminal justice proceeding is a hearing between the state and the defendant (Ross, 2006; Zehr, 2002). The second concept of a restorative justice conference includes the obligations of the parties involved in order to repair the harm, rebuild trust, and correct the harm. Obligations are also expected of all parties – including the impacted parties and the community.

The most significant findings in regard to the process and outcomes of restorative justice conferences are couched in the criminal justice system. Literature studying restorative justice programs within the criminal justice system show progress when it comes to advancing with the

aforementioned goals of restorative justice (Borton & Paul, 2013; Dzur, 2011; Gavrielides, 2012; Ross, 2006; Rossner, 2011; Toews, 2013; Zehr, 2002). More specifically, the literature states that responsible parties, impacted parties, and community members participating in restorative justice programs each are shown to build empathy and advance learning in a way that demonstrates that the individuals are able to make meaning of the harms that occurred (Roseman, Ritchie, & Laux, 2009). In addition, participants also indicate greater satisfaction with restorative justice when it comes to the overall healing process (Hayes, 2005; Umbreit, Vos, Coates, & Brown, 2003; Umbreit & Bradshaw, 1999), a decrease in recidivism among offenders (Bradshaw & Roseborough, 2005, Hayes, 2005; Kuo, Longmire, & Cuvelier, 2010), and a positive impact on the perception of law enforcement as a responsible and impacted party (Abramson, 2003; Alarid & Montemayor, 2012; Chatterjee & Elliott, 2003; McLeod, 2003; Young, Hoyle, Cooper, & Hill, 2005).

The needs of the community are met by using restorative justice programs to address harms. Restorative justice conferences provide offenders the opportunity to speak with impacted parties, an opportunity for parties to express how the incident impacted them, collaborate on how to rebuild a relationship, correct a wrong, and rebuild trust with benefits to those involved and society as a whole (Rossner, 2011; Zehr, 2002).

The responsible person's apology for the wrongdoing is positively influenced by a victim's presence. Literature indicates significant interpersonal growth between the responsible parties and the impacted parties through a restorative justice conference in comparison to a coerced apology more commonly seen in a traditional student conduct and/or disciplinary system. Empirical data states a consistent positive impact for responsible and impacted parties. Restorative justice conferences highlight regret and compliance with dispute resolution, while

indicating distinction for the restorative process for the apology over traditional justice system models with coercion and confession (Rossner, 2011; Saulnier & Sivasubramanian, 2015).

Outcomes of Restorative Justice Practices

As stated previously, restorative justice is understudied and current literature includes studies consisting of small sample sizes and without universal measures (Fronius, Persson, Guckenburg, Hurley, & Petrosino, 2016). However, the outcomes of restorative justice practices also indicate growth in empathy toward others, corrections to human behavior through decreasing recidivism, and great satisfaction in restorative practices among participants. However, the study of restorative justice practices is more representative of the criminal justice system and K-12 education than of the higher education setting.

Empathy development through restorative justice practices. Participation in restorative justice practices increases a person's capacity for empathy. Empathy is defined as an individual experiencing an emotional response in relation to another person based on that person's condition. The human conduction is informed by empathy and serves as an indicator of how individuals will treat one another (Skoe, 2010). It is important for a responsible party to possess or grow in his or her ability to empathize in order to assume responsibility for the harm that occurred. The development of empathy creates the opportunity for the harm to be addressed in a restorative manner. The responsible party learns by doing in the restorative justice practice because of the presence and dialogue with the impacted parties, community members, and the trained facilitators. The conference leads the responsible party through the sense of regret and guilt. The responsible individual can therefore apologize and express remorse with a true understanding of the impacts of the harm (Alarid & Montemayor, 2012; Braithwaite, 2002;

Borton & Paul, 2013; Oliner, 2005; Roseman, Ritchie, & Laux, 2009; Rossner, 2011; Saulnier & Sivasubramanian, 2015; Stokkom, 2002; Wachtel, 2013; Walters, 2015).

The restorative justice process develops empathy through the steps of moving from the initial harm, through pre-conference sessions, and later through the conference itself. It is important for the involved parties to possess or grow in their ability to empathize in order to assume responsibility for the harm that occurred and authentically take responsibility for their actions. The harm is addressed in the restorative justice conference dialogue, in the attempt to repair the relationships, in the trust between the responsible party and the impacted parties, and in the work to rebuild the community. The responsible party learns by doing in the restorative justice conference. The impacted parties and community members are mutually responsible for the outcome formation and each take some responsibility within it. The ability to empathize further the human connection, ability for individuals to name shame, guilt, genuinely take responsibility for the harm, authentically apologize, and collectively agree upon the outcomes of the conference (Borton & Paul, 2013; Oliner, 2005; Roseman, Ritchie, & Laux, 2009; Stokkom, 2002; Saulnier & Sivasubramanian, 2015; Walters, 2015; Zehr, 2002).

Satisfaction with restorative conferences. Responsible parties and impacted parties both report overall satisfaction with programs that integrate restorative justice principles. The data varies based on the program using restorative justice principles with convicted, responsible participants and the impacted participants. The data varies based on the types of crimes committed, states and provinces, and with some cultural groups (Hayes, 2005; Koss, 2014; Umbreit, Vos, Coates, & Brown, 2003; Umbreit & Bradshaw, 1999).

Youth agencies evaluate the level of satisfaction of youth participants in restorative justice conferencing (Lehmann, Jordan, Bolton, Huynh, & Chigbu, 2012; McGarrell, 2001). In

one study, the responsible parties are first-time juvenile offenders and convicted of nonviolent offenses. The data states the victims participating in the restorative justice conference group expressed higher level of satisfaction at 90% as compared to the control groups at 68%. Eighty – five percent of those in the treatment group state they would recommend the restorative justice program and only 38% in the control group recommend it (McGarrell, 2001).

Other studies with adult, convicted individuals participating in restorative justice programs involving violent crimes indicate satisfaction rates of over 90% with the programs as compared to the control groups in the 70 percentile. Similarly, participants willing to recommend the restorative justice programs to others also exceed 90% within this study (Kuo, Longmire, & Cuvelier, 2010). Similar to violent crimes involving adolescents and adults, responsible parties and impacted parties connected in crimes involving monetary damage also report satisfaction with restorative justice programs. The responsible parties in these crimes show greater willingness to comply with restitution outcomes than those in the control groups (Koss, 2014; Roy, 1993; Umbreit & Bradshaw, 1999).

Recidivism post-conferences. The use of restorative justice process in criminal justice systems lead to a decrease in recidivism. Participants in restorative conferences do not repeat criminal activity or commit harms in comparison to their counterparts not participating in restorative justice. Multiple studies indicate decreases in recidivism among juvenile offenders (Bradshaw & Roseborough, 2005; Elis, 2005; Hayes, 2005; Kuo, Longmire, & Cuvelier, 2010; Toews, 2013). Each indicates success in positively influencing the responsible parties to take ownership for their behaviors, accept responsibility for the harms committed, and advance accountability for the restorative outcome of the conference through mutual accountability

(Bradshaw & Roseborough, 2005, Hayes, 2005; Dzur, 2011; Hayes & Daly, 2003; Kuo, Longmire, & Cuvelier, 2010).

Although data indicates that restorative justice conferences can reduce recidivism and the participants are satisfied with the process and goals of restorative justice, other studies showed that restorative justice programs do not reduce incarcerations. Restorative justice is cited as not reducing incarceration because the programs are micro in scope with each conference focusing on a single harm (Choi, Bazemore, & Gilbert, 2012; Kim & Gerber, 2012; Saulnier & Sivasubramaniam, 2015; Wood, 2015).

Some believe restorative justice may decrease recidivism, but that restorative justice conferences do not reduce incarceration because there is a dearth of such similar programs in schools or local municipalities. Restorative justice programs are still being developed in criminal justice and education settings. Many restorative justice programs exist where incarceration would not be a likely outcome of the harm and could be viewed in some areas as a potential alternative to prison; compelling political circumstances also surround prison growth and address crime in an aggressive manner (Wood, 2015).

There is a need for more restorative justice programs within schools and for youth in order to prevent harms, crime, and create a world where individuals understand how their actions impact others (Wood, 2015). Similar data was collected within K-12 systems in regard to the benefits of restorative justice conferences, although research in regard to restorative justice conferences is considerably shallow within higher education as formal programs began emerging ten years ago (Fronius, Persson, Guckenburg, Hurley, & Petrosino, 2016; McMurtrie, 2015).

Restorative conferences in K-12 systems. Student learning enhances and is informed by restorative justice practices. A research project took place with K-12 schools that adopted a

restorative lens and philosophy. A study assessed three case studies in Colorado, Minnesota, and Pennsylvania in order to determine if student learning occurred within the setting. The sites approached education from a restorative lens and created a restorative culture therein when addressing zero-tolerance disciplinary policies in regard to drug use. The case studies in the three locations indicated student learning and growth in the areas of communication skills, problem solving, decision-making, stress management, and development of self-control, although differences were noted in regard to language and implementation strategies for the restorative justice programs (Karp & Breslin, 2001). School leaders state that zero-tolerance policies are not conducive for students due to failure for school improvements, disciplinary disparities documented in regard to students of color in comparison to their majority counterparts, and an increase in concern with school culture and the school-to-prison pipeline (Guckenberg, Hurley, Persson, Fronius, & Petrosino, 2015). Similar to the research in the justice system, students in K-12 schools indicates learning as part of the restorative justice and its processes (Lehmann, Jordan, Bolton, Huynh, & Chigbu, 2012).

An additional benefit for schools that adopted a restorative lens is that it positively impacts school culture and student learning. Similar to the justice system, student misconduct diminishes and student behavior improves within the restorative setting. In addressing student behavior and harms within the K-12 setting, research reports participation satisfaction in restorative conferences and the benefits of the restorative approach to discipline. The research states the program's positive results related to recidivism, student perception of fairness, and compliance with conference outcomes (Calhoun & Pelech, 2010).

Districts implementing restorative justice experience a reduction in behavioral referrals and suspensions (Stinchcomb, Bazemore, & Riestenberg, 2006). More recently, the San Diego

Unified School District (SDUSD) instituted a restorative justice model into its student conduct processes during the 2014 – 2015 academic year. Education leaders engage the students in restorative processes in order to address student-on-student and student-on-faculty/staff conflicts. According to Vernon Moore, executive director of student services in SDUSD the number of expulsions dropped nearly 60% in a year after restorative justice was implemented (Bowler, 2015). That is an example of learning and changing school culture and connecting students to school resources. Students participating in restorative justice also grow in their ability to empathize with neighbors. Through restorative justice the students are able to dialogue in order to address the harm, repair relationships, and rebuild trust and expand their capacity to empathize with one another (Choi, Green, & Gilbert, 2011).

Evaluations of K-12 restorative justice conferences. The assessment of restorative justice conferences, although limited provide all educators with some optimism for positive change related to harm, some best practices, and pitfalls to avoid when implementing and sustaining restorative justice in an education setting. The analysis of restorative justice programs states there is a need for more research and assessment. Restorative justice is emerging in our school systems (Guckenberg, Hurley, Persson, Fronius, & Petrosino, 2015; Presser & Van Voorhis, 2002). In the study, interviews with 43 restorative justice professionals in K-12 settings provided an assessment of restorative justice programs in schools. The data from the schools that implemented restorative justice programs include benefits for campus culture and climate, overall satisfaction with the philosophical change in disciplinary processes post implementation of restorative justice, the opportunity to empower students in restorative justice and treat students fairly, and the improvement in student behaviors. The analysis of the interviews indicated restorative justice programs are most successful if implemented site-wide and not isolated in a

specific area. The data states that principals should champion restorative justice as a school-wide paradigm and with teacher and community wide support. Although restorative justice positively impacts discipline, it should also influence the way students and teachers interact and treat one another. However, challenges exist in sustaining and maintaining restorative justice within the school site, the time consuming process needed to implement and facilitate restorative justice conferences, and the difficulty in gaining momentum in changing campus culture with all stakeholders (Guckenberg, Hurley, Persson, Fronius, & Petrosino, 2015).

Restorative Justice in Higher Education

Studies of restorative justice in higher education lag behind those that have been done in criminal justice systems. Further, the needs of the students/participants vary substantially from those in criminal justice and K-12 settings. The overall aims of restorative justice practices and its documented uses on college campuses thus far indicate that campus culture and student learning will improve and advance with expanded implementation in higher education despite the limited research thus far. Newfound freedom, experience with drugs and alcohol, student misconduct, and an educational experience desired for student conduct processes all inform the need for restorative justice in addressing harms on college campuses for traditional and nontraditional students alike. College students, faculty, and administrators often live, study, and experience campus-life together in community during and after a harm occur and while it is being addressed through a student conduct process (ASCA, 2015; DiPaola, Roloff, & Peters, 2010; Kara & McAlister, 2010; Karp, 2013; Karp & Conrad, 2006; Lipka, 2009). Campus culture and faith in restorative justice practices informs the opportunity for implementation in order to address recidivism in the student conduct process and advance student learning (Fronius, Persson, Guckenburg, Hurley, & Petrosino, 2016).

Restorative justice conferences and the collegiate student conduct process. Colleges and universities are required by the Federal Government to have a defined student code of conduct, an office or designee to manage potential violations of student misconduct, an officer to investigate alleged Title IX and Civil Rights infractions, and a publication of processes. The role of a student conduct officer on college campuses is to advance student growth and development, protect the institution of higher education environment, support institutional and educational missions, and assist students in developing ethical decision making abilities. The conduct officers are professional staff, typically with advanced degrees and they determine findings of alleged violations, assess outcomes, and supervise the completion of sanctions (Association of Student Conduct Administration, 2015; Brenner, 2013; Gehring, 2001; Janosik & Gehring, 2003).

However, there is an emerging trend to incorporate restorative justice throughout student conduct programs to better address student misconduct effectively, code violations, and harms/policy infraction on college campuses in the United States. The goals of restorative justice complement traditional conduct processes in meeting the purposes of addressing misconduct within a higher education setting (Clark, 2014). The moral literacy serves as a learning process for some students. The experience participating in restorative justice also advances character development through student learning and expands the capacity for moral literacy (Hassinger & Shapiro, 2007).

As stated in chapter one, approximately 70 institutions sponsor formal restorative justice programs and have implemented their programs within the past ten years (McMurtrie, 2015). The uses of restorative justice within college student conduct reflects an interest to achieve restorative justice goals for greater learning, campus safety, and community formation (i.e.:

rebuild trust, rebuild relationships for the greater good, and advance the institutional and educational mission and objectives). Differences exist between restorative justice and traditional model code within student conduct programs. A model code program mimics a justice system in a court-like setting where the student's misconduct is addressed between the student, the alleged violation, and a sanction if found responsible. A typical code of conduct program operates like an administrative hearing, but does not necessarily address dialogue, repair relationships, and/or trust to be rebuilt (Karp, 2013; Koss, Wilgus, & Williamsen, 2014; Rossner, 2013).

Restorative justice utilized in student conduct procedures positively impacts student learning according to the STARR Project (Student Accountability and Restorative Justice Research Project). The indicators for student learning indicators defined in the STARR Project include: self-authorship and building a just community, active accountability, interpersonal competence, social ties to the institution, procedural fairness, and closure. The study assesses students participating in 659 student-conduct cases at 18 different colleges and universities across the United States according to the STARR Project instrument for student learning. The study includes conduct cases of various types of violations, types of conduct processes (restorative justice, model code, and hybrid programs), and various institutional types (Karp & Sacks, 2014).

Within the study, findings indicate greater student learning in cases using a restorative justice model or something similar. Responsible students report learning more according to the indicators defined in the STARR Project across all six indicators and across all 18 institutions. Student learning and student development expanded when a student authentically recognized his or her accountability. Student-learning advanced when restorative justice was part of the student conduct code. The research states that predictors existed within the student responsible for code

infractions. The predictors indicated if the student was prepared and ready to participate in a restorative conference. The student was willing to assume active accountability, possess interpersonal competence, hold social ties to the institution, demonstrate a greater sense of self-authorship, and be willing to participate in the process as part of a just community where restorative justice was part of the student conduct code. Also, students attending larger institutions indicated greater growth in learning as compared to their counterparts at smaller liberal arts colleges, especially according to social ties to the institution (Karp & Sacks, 2014).

Interestingly, there was a slight difference within race. Data shows that White students indicated greater learning after participating in a restorative justice conference than students of color. White students indicated greater learning in the areas of self-authorship and building a just community, active accountability, procedural fairness, and closure (Karp & Sacks, 2014).

Similar to the communities outside of higher education, individuals must bring a level of authenticity to the restorative justice on a college campus in order to achieve the principles of restorative justice because success is dependent on it. Another study was administered at a large, research I institution in the Midwest. The data shows that the student's own motivation and capacity to address the harm that occurred informs the individual's ability to participate in the restorative justice conference and learn from the experience. Students oriented themselves toward self, others, their change in attitude, and perception of community after participating in restorative justice as part of the student conduct code. Students motivated by restorative reasons also experienced greater satisfaction in the restorative justice than those students motivated by personal goals. However, all students showed some measurable benefit by participating in the restorative process, despite the level of motivation. Findings indicate the importance of motivation to participate in restorative justice, but there may also be an inherent benefit for all

students who participate in restorative justice regardless of motivation as a campus attempts to build a restorative campus culture and student learning could occur to some degree for all involved (Gallagher-Dahl, Meagher, & Vander Velde, 2014).

Restorative justice and classroom learning. Faculty members introduce students to restorative justice through real world assignments. Coursework includes restorative justice principles and justice to expose students to leadership skills and develop proficiency in the practice of restorative justice. The studies assess students through coursework in integrating restorative justice theory, purpose, strategies, and tactics and implementing restorative justice through application. Students are prepared in the classroom with their peers before the students start fieldwork. The instruction informs the way the students make meaning of harm through a social justice and restorative lens because they witness the restorative theory in practice within themselves and others. The experience, within a restorative justice framework, of being held accountable and holding others accountable is realized through group interactions. Research indicates that student learning is achieved when restorative justice principles are applied in instructional design. The restorative justice framework is a learning process (Armour, 2013; Karp & Clear, 2000; Roland, Ridout, Salinitri, & Frey, 2012).

Student learning and student development are an important impetus for using restorative justice on a college campus. The opportunities for college students to learn, develop critical thinking skills, and social consciousness support the desired outcomes of restorative justice principles, advance the campus culture surrounding restorative justice, and college students are generally open to the concepts of restorative justice when exposed to it (Ahlin, Gibbs, Kavanaugh, & Lee, 2015; Jonason & Rinker, 2014).

The opportunity to learn about restorative justice as a participant provides opportunity to create a culture for restorative justice on college campuses and for the careers students are preparing to enter. Intentional strategies are needed in order to educate students as leaders about restorative justice. Actively using restorative justice in fieldwork builds up an individual's leadership capacity so that the person can lead in a restorative manner (Armour, 2013).

Impact of Restorative Justice on College and University Campuses

Restorative justice requires communal intent and commitment toward student learning, development, and formation in order to advance student learning and campus culture (Karp, 2013). Restorative justice also contributes to school culture and student learning within K-12 schools. As restorative justice creates a mindset in how we understand ourselves and relate to neighbors in our day-to-day interaction, it also creates a culture within a school and influences practices and policies (Johnstone & Van Ness, 2007). The policies and practices of the school inevitably reflects a restorative lens and philosophy if that is the value set of the school district (Gonzalez, 2012). The educational enterprise is informed by the restorative lens, it becomes a shared value set, and the restorative philosophy envelops the school community and creates the culture at the site.

As stated previously, college and university campuses are microcosms of diverse interactions as students are encouraged to engage in meaningful, constructive dialogue about challenging topics, they live close together in residence halls, share campus resources, engage in leadership opportunities together, and often transition from secondary school to adulthood together through a transformational academic experience (Cornelison, Crocker, Evett, & McDowell, 2014; Jonason & Rinker, 2014; Karp & Allena, 2004). Physical proximity among different people creates many opportunities for learning in regard to capacity for empathy,

tolerance, perspective taking, and the celebration of various cultural traditions and values (Karp, 2013). Student learning, development, and formation can positively influence the contact of social justice as students make meaning of their college experience through moral development, inter-group relations, culture, social cognition, group identity, and hierarchical relationships. The tendency for harm to occur on a college campus is largely formed by student experiences: pre-college, upbringing, and behavioral norms learned at an early age. Openness to recognizing harm and discussing it on-campus requires the campus culture to engage students in the process of discernment within the classroom and through co-curricular programs, activities, services, and experiences (Cornelison, Crocker, Evett, & McDowell, 2014; Jonason & Rinker, 2014; Karp & Allena, 2004).

Campus culture evolves when restorative justice becomes part of the campus community. Student learning is observed among the impacted students, the students serving in community roles, and the students serving as conference facilitators. The collective experience from many of the participants provides evidence that the principles of restorative justice produce positive change within a specific restorative conference, but that an opportunity for the advancement of positive change emerges within the campus culture in developing a more restorative society as well. A student's capacity to exhibit leadership on campus expands as the individual's restorative lens positively impacts others and influences even more students (Cornelison, Crocker, Evett, & McDowell, 2014; Jonason & Rinker, 2014; Karp & Allena, 2004).

Restorative Justice through trained facilitators. An organization integrates restorative justice values and practices in order to create a change in culture through high quality training. The process of training restorative justice facilitators reflects the purpose of restorative justice practices of building responsible communities that work together in order to prevent and/or

correct harms (McCluskey, Lloyd, Stead, Kane, Riddell, & Weedon, 2008). Research shows connections with training to mediation skills.

For a community to value a restorative culture is dependent on the trained facilitator and community member(s) involvement. The success of restorative justice practices is dependent on a strong, trained facilitator capable to achieve the restorative justice goals with participating individuals. The trained facilitator provides the structure to conferences and restorative circles so responsible and impacted parties and community members are all prepared to participate. It is the facilitator's responsibility to ensure that the community members and impacted and responsible parties understand the purpose, process, and potential outcomes of restorative justice, and that restorative justice is a cooperative decision-making process. A trained facilitator is a key individual in ensuring a healthy restorative conference or circle can occur (Borton & Paul, 2013; Gerkin, 2012; Hannem, 2011; Karp, 2013; Olson & Dzur, 2003).

The facilitator's motivations can have a profound impact on the potential outcome of a restorative justice conference. For example, differences were identified in the facilitators' orientations toward the restorative conferences in a study of 29 facilitators inside two restorative justice organizations. The results of the study identified the following preferences: *advocate*, *counselor*, *healer*, and *community peacemaker*. All four preferences lead toward restorative outcomes, but objectivity and absence of perceived bias are necessary to successfully meet the goals of restorative justice. The orientation of the facilitator has an important influence on a conference to ensure that all members maintain active accountability as a restorative justice principle and that the inclusive decision-making piece is preserved in order to repair the harm and rebuild trust (Borton & Paul, 2013).

Restorative justice practices have impact when the community understands the goals of restorative justice and when community members are involved in the restorative conference or circle. The success of restorative conferences or circles are dependent on a strong understanding of and support from the community. The benefit is substantial because many members of the community can feel both ownership and responsibility for the harm. At times that may include the offender and others (Borton & Paul, 2013; Gerkin, 2012; Karp, 2013).

Responsible parties and impacted parties benefit from the presence and participation of community members in the restorative justice process. The community member's role in the conference is in addition to the facilitator, the impacted party, and the responsible party. Community impact demonstrates an ability to hold the impacted and responsible parties accountable in the restorative, inclusive decision making process. The presence of community members allows the facilitator to remain objective. The presence of community members can assist at arriving at a purposeful restorative conclusion to the conference, positively influence the outcomes of the conference, and possibly assist in the development of policy and practices. The active accountability strengthens and reinforces the decisions made at the restorative justice conferences in order to rebuild relationships and trust with all involved. Community member participation often provides support in creating a sense of forgiveness, provides an audience for participants to share their stories, and acknowledges the harm experienced by the victim. The community members' presence provides confirmation that the behavior of the offender was wrong, strengthens community values, and can result in a decrease in crime and supports the reintegration into the community for the responsible party (Borton & Paul, 2013; Hannem, 2011; Karp, 2013; Rossner, 2013; Zehr, 2002).

A school site, a college campus, and/or a justice system and its constituents need to be cognitively prepared in order to implement restorative justice practices when addressing harms through a likeminded, restorative justice paradigm mindset. The preparation includes training for facilitators in restorative conferences or circles for addressing community harms. The preparation for restorative justice supports the four principles of restorative justice because it sets the framework. Restorative justice practitioners need to inform community members at-large about the overarching benefits of an inclusive decision-making process when restoring relationships and trust among community members when a harm occurs (Borton & Paul, 2013; Karp, 2013; Hannem, 2011; Rossner, 2013; Zehr, 2002). Although college and university campuses with formal restorative justice programs have trained facilitators, it is a challenge to change campus culture where restorative justice is valued by those participating in the practices, but not embraced in a meaningful way by the campus community at-large.

Challenges with implementing a behavior intervention strategy. Literature states that restorative justice programs positively improves relationships between policy and law enforcement individuals with community members and helps individuals develop mutual understanding, formation of common values, management of constructive feedback, allows for harms to be addressed through restorative justice practices, advances learning through conflicts and harms, and expands empathy (Abramson, 2003; Alarid & Montemayor, 2012; Chatterjee & Elliott, 2003; McLeod, 2003; McCluskey, Lloyd, Stead, Kane, Riddell, & Weedon, 2008; Young, Hoyle, Cooper, & Hill, 2005). Research in the areas of restorative justice practices focuses on program outcomes, like responsible party and impacted party satisfaction, decreasing recidivism rates, etc. (Braithwaite, 2002; Christle, Jolivette, & Nelson, 2005; Evans, Smokowski, Barbee, Bower, & Barefoot, 2016; Fronius, Persson, Guckenburg, Hurley, & Petrosino, 2016;

Karp & Sacks, 2014; Latimer, Dowden, & Muise, 2005; McCluskey, Lloyd, Stead, Kane, Riddell, & Weedon, 2008; Rugge & Scott, 2009; Schiff, 2013; Walters, 2015).

The shift to a restorative justice model provides a proven benefit in regard to personal development and learning for all involved, but it is challenging and not easy to initiate. One of the challenges includes convincing college and university administrators and the campus community to include restorative justice practices as an outcome when a harm or conflict occurs. There is a need to educate campus-community members that a restorative justice outcome is not "soft," but purposeful for the educational process and tethered in mission. However, some members of the campus community may want severe consequences for student misconduct (Morris, 2006; Morris & Vaandering, 2012; Vaandering, 2014). A second challenge that impedes the implementation of restorative justice practices on-campus is the time consuming energy required in order to facilitate the practices. Colleges and universities have to weigh the benefits of restorative justice practices with the necessary resource required (i.e.: personnel and students' time). Another challenge includes educating the greater campus community (students, faculty, staff, administrators, boards/alumni, neighbors to campus, and parents) why restorative justice is important as a personal behavior intervention strategy, but also educating the community on what it was in the first place (Karp & Breslin, 2001). In addition, literature does not provide a standard measure in order to gather evidence and systematically evaluate a restorative justice program and the outcomes therein. The gap indicates a lack in research methods in order to provide educators and administrators with conclusive, reliable results in order to generalize from one site to another (Fronius, Persson, Guckenburg, Hurley, & Petrosino, 2016).

Restorative justice practices are mission driven. It is common practice of religiously affiliated institutions and within Catholic higher education for campus programs to be tethered in mission (Abelman & Dalessandro, 2009; Brendan, 2006; LaBelle & Kendall, 2016; Procario-Foley & Bean, 2002). Restorative justice is a theory of faith unto itself (Fronius, Persson, Guckenburg, Hurley, & Petrosino, 2016; Karp, 2013; Karp & Clear, 2000; Lowery & Dannells, 2004; Johnstone & Van Ness, 2007; McCold 2000; McCold & Wachtel, 2000) and the foundation of modern-day restorative justice practices derives from Indigenous societies and religious groups like Quakers and Mennonites and connect restorative justice practices directly to their value systems (Chiste, 2013; Karp, 2013; Palermo, 2013; Zehr, 2002). To that end, the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities affirms restorative justice and its practices as emblematic of Catholic Social Teachings outlined by the US Council of Catholic Bishops in valuing the life and dignity of the human person, community, solidarity, rights and responsibilities, options for the poor and vulnerable, and the care for all God's creation (ACCU, 2016; Estanek, Galligan-Stierle, Gilroy, & Kirkpatrick, 2017; Mikulich, 2012; USCCB, 1998). In addition to the endorsement provided by the USCCB, institutions of Roman Catholic higher education are encouraged to incorporate redemption, forgiveness, and accompaniment and justice in order to address student misconduct through discipline processes (Estanek, Galligan-Stierle, Gilroy, & Kirkpatrick, 2017).

Summary of Research

The literature review defines restorative justice for the reader and demonstrates the consistent and notable advances in conflict resolution through the use of restorative justice and the practices defined within the restorative justice spectrum. Although literature documents the success and opportunities available to the criminal justice and K-12 systems through the use of

restorative justice practices in documenting program outcomes, the empirical research is thin within higher education realm. A shallow amount of empirical research is published to document the processes and best practices in implementing a restorative justice program in higher education.

Data demonstrates the continued need for colleges and universities to address conflict on campuses and the literature eludes that restorative justice practices are viable personal behavior alternative strategies. The Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities affirms restorative justice. The available research with restorative justice in higher education settings is limited, and particularly in Roman Catholic university settings is limited (ACCU, 2016). The opportunity to assess how a Catholic campus implements and sustains a restorative justice program indicates an opportunity for an excelsior contribution to peace in the academic community, and subsequently literature.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter describes the methodology used to conduct a qualitative, case study designed to examine best practices in implementing and sustaining restorative justice practices at a religiously affiliated, Roman Catholic institution in southern California. It includes the research questions, the assumptions and rationale for a case study, qualitative study, a review of the setting and participant selection procedures, data collection procedures, data quality procedures, and the limitations of the study. In addition, this chapter provides detailed descriptions of the role of the researcher, individual interview and focus group protocols, and the credibility and dependability of study results.

Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to investigate how higher education administrators (leadership team and facilitators) implement restorative justice practices and a restorative justice program, what motivated the university to introduce restorative justice practices into campus life, what impact the program makes on the campus, and the connection the program has to the ecclesiastical mission at the university. Drawing from research about restorative justice programs in the K-12 and criminal justice systems (Huston, 2015; Karp, 2013; Parkinson & Roche, 2004; Schiff, 2013; Wenzel, Okimoto, Feather, & Platow, 2008; Witvliet, Worthington, Root, Sato, Ludwig, & Exline, 2008), the research questions for the study include:

1. What factors motivate the institution to choose to implement a restorative justice program?
2. In what ways does a faith-based university tether the restorative justice program to its mission, vision, values, and identity?

3. By what methods, means, and strategies does a university use to implement a restorative justice program?
4. What are best practices for implementing a restorative justice program?
5. What are the effects of implementing a restorative justice program?

Context of Research

A unique component of this study included how an institution's vision and mission are considered when implementing restorative justice practices on a religiously-affiliated, Roman Catholic campus. The researcher also included criterion sampling as a means to select the site. The measure contributed to sampling reliability within this case study method (Patton, 1990; Creswell, 2013). With that in mind, the site selected includes an independent Roman Catholic institution that uses restorative justice practices in addressing misconduct and uses restorative justice practices for conflict resolution and university community development. The institution's dean of students approved the research and two designees provided a letter of support, but the institution is not be named in this study.

The institution is a predominantly undergraduate serving, residential institution with an emphasis on the arts and sciences and professional studies. The university is a member of the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities and accredited by Western Association of Schools and Colleges – Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC). The institution is ranked in the top 100 of national universities by US News and World Report, participates in NCAA Division I athletics, considers itself a residential campus, and attracts 50% of its students from out-of-state. The campus is a predominately White serving institution with tuition, room, and board costs of approximately $62,418.00 per academic year.

The institution is an independent, Roman Catholic university in southern California that named restorative justice practices as a foundational approach when addressing harms and student misconduct on the campus as part of the student conduct code violations process and implements restorative practices into the student housing program on the campuses. The institution's mission surrounds ethical conduct and justice-based responsibilities in accordance with Roman Catholic doctrine for higher education (ACCU, 2016; JASPA, 2016; USCCB, 2016).

Research Design

A qualitative research design was selected to conduct a case study in how an independent, religiously affiliated, Roman Catholic university in southern California implements and sustains a restorative justice program at the institution. Qualitative research is an inquiry process of understanding based on methodological traditions of investigation that explores a social or human problem. Qualitative research is conducted in a natural setting and seeks to explore human behavior within the context of a bound program (Creswell, 2013). Through the case study method, the qualitative researcher answered the questions of *what* and *how* based on the experience of the participant. The how question investigated the effects of the study's focus on stakeholders within the bound system. The researcher investigated the contextual conditions of the site because the conditions were relevant to the phenomenon of the study. The limits were not clear between the experience and the context (Hatch, 2002; Yin, 2013). The case study method for this study allowed for the collection of data to allow the researcher to compare and contrast how the campus and the program leadership team members implemented and sustained restorative justice practices on the campus, and how the trained facilitators used restorative justice in their work. The purpose of this study determined the similarities in facilitation,

differences, and rationale to define the motivation to incorporate restorative justice practices, and how the restorative justice facilitators connected their work to the institution's mission (Baxter & Jack, 2008; Creswell, 2013).

A case study approach was selected based on its usefulness and appropriateness for this particular study. A case study is a special kind of qualitative work that investigates a contextualized, contemporary phenomenon within a specific boundary (Yin, 2013). Restorative justice is an example of a bounded phenomenon in education as it is a program (Merriam, 1988). The case study characteristics for this study included examining a particular program like restorative justice bound in time and space, providing a detailed description of contextual material about a particular setting, gathering material from multiple sources in order to provide a picture of the case, and using the researcher as an instrument of data collection (Creswell, 2013).

This qualitative study used theoretical assumptions of epistemology and case study methodology. The epistemology research paradigm examines the relationship of the researcher to the research. The goal of the researcher in this process was to get close to the subject being researched. The case study methodology design involved thorough descriptions of the case, the setting, and an imitative data analysis approach. The case study methodology used here also required the study be conducted within its context of the design. The researcher also followed this process in data collection and analysis (Creswell, 2013; Hatch, 2002).

The researcher selected the case study methodology because it provides the best research design in order to study how the university implements and sustains restorative justice practices in Roman Catholic higher education. The rationale includes the following reasons:

- the system studied was a bound system unique to the specific sites;

- the case study method allowed the researcher to serve as the data collection instrument when conducting interviews, facilitating focus groups, reviewing documents, and conducting observations at the site;
- the program under review is described in great detail by the researcher;
- the researcher organized and analyzed the data first according to general themes and then refined the themes thereafter;
- the results are presented to explain how a Roman Catholic institution in southern California implemented and sustained a restorative justice program.

Role of the Researcher

The role of the researcher was to build a complex, holistic picture of the topic, analyze the words shared during the individual interviews, focus groups, and those printed and posted online about the program, report the views of the participants in a detailed manner, and conduct the study in the natural setting (Creswell, 2013). The qualitative researcher is the data collection instrument (Hatch, 2002; Merriam, 1988; Patton, 1990; Yin, 2013). The data collected by the researcher in this study derived from multiple sources, including the site, individual interviews with the leadership team associated with the restorative justice program at that university, focus groups examining the experience of the restorative justice facilitators who worked with cases, but not serving in the leadership team, and a review of documents pertaining to restorative justice materials used onsite in establishing and sustaining the program. The researcher is a participant observer in the study, works at the site, and serves on the restorative justice leadership team. The description of the data analysis in chapter three and positionality in chapter five indicates the measures employed to curb bias. However, the researcher's position as a participant/observer at

the site may reflect a subconscious perspective in the qualitative focus group method (Creswell, 2013).

Research Plan

The researcher received permission to conduct the study and a commitment for the institution to participate. The university provided the researcher permission to review and code the data from institutional artifacts, individual interviews, and focus group interviews in order to answer the research questions. The institution provided a letter of support on institution letterhead provided the institution not be named in the study. The researcher received an IRB approval letter and shared the document with the appropriate parties at the university where the case study took place. After obtaining all required permissions from the university, Institutional Review Board (IRB) at California State University, San Marcos, and participants, the researcher began the study. The research plan occurred in three parts. First, the researcher coded artifacts (manuals, training materials, etc.) provided by the university. Second, the researcher collected the data from individual interviews and focus group interviews. Third, the researcher analyzed the data through the use of coding.

Participants

The participants for the study were designated as members of the restorative justice program by the institution as either a leadership team member or a trained facilitator. The university provided a roster of participants to the researcher that met the above criteria. The participants were asked to participate through email. A total of 16 individuals participated in this study through an individual interview or a focus group interview. The participants were informed that they were able to terminate the interview at any time and with no repercussions,

but that the researcher reserved the right to use the content of the interviews and focus groups once the session ended.

All of the individuals eligible to participate in the study were members of the restorative justice program at the university, 5 were members of the restorative justice leadership team, 11 were trained facilitators, and all 16 were trained to serve as a restorative justice facilitator. All 16 participants were full-time employees at the university with at least a bachelor's degree. All of the educational background was listed on the restorative justice roster of trained individuals. Two of the participants were graduate students in a higher education, student affairs, and leadership program, 10 had a master's degree, and four of the participants had a PhD or EdD. The waivers for the study did not elicit race, religion, age, socioeconomic status, sexuality, or sexual identity from the participants. This type of self-identifying information did not inform the research questions.

Table 1.0 below summarizes the participants to the researcher that participated in the study. The roster was provided by the university. The university listed the individuals by name, education, department, and role within the restorative justice program. The researcher edited the names and departments and replaced each with a pseudonym. The roles of the participants in the restorative justice program are defined below.

Table 1.0 Summary of Participants

Participants Number	Pseudonym Name	Department at the Site	Role in Restorative Justice Program
1	Freddie (GA)	Student housing	Trained Facilitator
2	Lynn	Student housing	Trained Facilitator
3	Stanley	Student housing	Trained Facilitator
4	Citrus	Student housing	Trained Facilitator
5	Shane	Student housing	Trained Facilitator
6	Terry	Student housing	Trained Facilitator
7	Elliott	Student housing	Trained Facilitator
8	Vivian (GA)	Student housing	Trained Facilitator
9	Jefferson	Student conduct	Trained Facilitator
10	John	Student activities	Trained Facilitator
11	Clara, EdD	Student services	Trained Facilitator
12	Mary, EdD	Student Conduct	Leadership Team Committee Member
13	Joan	Student conduct	Leadership Team Committee Member
14	Elizabeth, PhD	Student housing	Leadership Team Committee Member
15	Nicole	Student housing	Leadership Team Committee Member
16	Duncan, PhD	Student affairs training and development	Leadership Team Committee Member

Leadership team. The restorative justice leadership team includes five individuals and the researcher. The leadership team consists of unit leads in student housing and student conduct, another officer within student conduct, a coordinator of restorative justice, and officer from student housing, and a leader in student affairs training and development. The leadership team works with the campus to refer cases to restorative conferences and the activation of

restorative circles as reviewed in chapter two. The leadership team also directs all trainings, promotional materials, and meets monthly. The restorative justice leadership team at the university does not live in one unit or center, but members are all part of the division of student affairs.

Facilitators. The trained facilitators of restorative justice are trained to use restorative justice practices in their work at the university. The trained facilitators who participated in the study included 11 participants total; 8 staff from student housing, one from student conduct, one from student activities, and one from student services. The staff within student housing and student conduct are required to serve as restorative justice facilitators based on the expectation of their job responsibilities and documented in the job descriptions, and individuals were informed as part of the interview and onboarding processes. The trained facilitators from other units elected to serve as restorative justice facilitators. All restorative justice facilitators are trained by the leadership team.

Research Procedures

Artifacts. Artifacts in an education setting cannot be used as a primary source of data, unless it is a historical study (Arthur, Waring, Coe, & Hedges, 2012; Hatch, 2002). However, the assessment of documents and artifacts involved in this study serve as an assessment of the type of information and definitions of restorative justice practices shared online or through printed materials, training documents and/or presentation materials, and any records or site-specific assessment data and/or instruments.

The initial procedure of the three-part plan research included acquiring access to a set of artifacts for the restorative justice program from the university and receiving permission to analyze the materials. The artifacts included the restorative justice program's website, manual,

standard training document, and small sets of data collected by the program. The researcher reviewed and coded the artifacts. The artifacts were electronic and were secured on the researcher's password protected laptop.

This study also included an analysis of documents and materials associated with the restorative justice program in order to better understand the program built at the institution. The researcher's purpose in reviewing the materials (i.e.: manuals, training materials, and program assessments) served as a way to better understand the case site being studied, the purpose of the program, language used in the materials, and the overall messaging shared with constituents [internal and external] about the topic.

The second procedure included a set of individual interviews. The researcher emailed all participants and arranged for the interviews. All recordings and artifacts were secured in a password protected laptop. All written documentations and memorandums were locked in a drawer within the researcher's private home.

Individual Interviews. The interview method served as a good form to collect data. The interview provided an exchange of information through a dyad. Interviews are an applied instrument of gathering data (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990; Creswell, 2013). The interviews were helpful in gathering data around a topic [restorative justice] and unfolded the meaning of central themes in the participant's professional life (Valenzuela & Shrivastava, 2002). In this study, the interview questions were informed and adapted from interview protocols highlighting positive examples of restorative justice program implementation in the K-12 system (Huston, 2015; Karp, 2013; Parkinson & Roche, 2004; Schiff, 2013; Wenzel, Okimoto, Feather, & Platow, 2008; Witvliet, Worthington, Root, Sato, Ludwig, & Exline, 2008).

The interview protocol ensured consistency throughout the data gathering process. The same protocol was used for all the individual interviews with the restorative justice leadership team. The interview protocol required logistical work beforehand and included explaining the purpose of the study, reviewing the consent document, explaining and securing consent from participants, pre-scheduling the interview for approximately 60-minutes each, and securing a quiet and comfortable space with minimal to no distractions. At the time of the interview the researcher briefly described the project again and reviewed the consent form with the participant one-on-one. The researcher acquired permission from the participant to conduct the interview. The researcher documented the time, date, and location of the interview, numbered the interviewee in order to maintain confidentiality of the participant, noted the interviewer, and proceeded through the interview questions (Creswell, 2013).

The restorative justice leadership team participated in one on one interviews. The interviews followed the research protocol found in Appendix A. The interviews were recorded with permission and sent electronically to Rev.com for transcription. The transcripts were received from Rev.com electronically and stored for follow-up analysis. In total, 5 leadership team members participated in an individual interview.

The five face to face, individual interviews with the restorative justice leadership team members investigated the program implementation process, reports of best practices and lessons learned from experience, and recommendations for ongoing site sustainability of restorative justice program.

The researcher engaged with the participants through reflective interviewing with open ended questions during the actual interview. Reflective interviewing connected the researcher's theoretical concept of the interview, the researcher's topic and position in regard to the

participants and the topic, and the method used through questioning to dive deep through the human interaction between the researcher and participant in order to gather rich data. In short, the underlying method of reflective questions asked good questions with willing participants and sought data purposefully related to the research question(s) (Roulston, 2010).

Focus Group. The third set of data collection instrument in this study included focus group interviews. It was a research method involving a group interview in an attempt to gain multiple perspectives on the same subject from a relatively small group of people and within a short amount of time. The individuals asked to participate in the focus group were generally comprised of a homogenous group (Patton, 1990; Powell & Single, 1998; Sim, 1998). A focus group is an interview and requires the same diligence in procedures and protocols. The researcher documented the time, date, and location of the focus group, numbered the participants in order to maintain confidentiality of the participant, noted the interviewer, and proceeded through the interview questions (Creswell, 2013).

The researcher prepared for the focus groups by crafting a set of the open ended questions, planning for the sessions' logistics, facilitating the focus groups, and ending the session. The set of focus group interview questions were attached in Appendix B. The preparation for the focus groups included scheduling the session for approximately 90-minutes, reserving a comfortable location that allowed for individuals to share freely without distraction or concern, explaining the purpose for the study and the consent form agreement to participate, sharing the agenda in order to establish structure and preset participants to remain on topic, and reiterating that the individuals could excuse themselves at any time and for any reason without explanation (McNamara, 1999).

Two focus group interviews were scheduled and all of the trained facilitators from the restorative justice program were invited to participate. The focus group interviews were recorded and sent electronically to Rev.com for transcription. The transcripts were received from Rev.com electronically and stored for follow-up analysis. In total, 11 trained facilitators attended one of the two focus groups (5 in one and 6 in the other). As noted in Table 1.0, the individuals invited to the focus groups of this study were trained facilitators in restorative justice, but not part of the restorative justice leadership team.

The questions for the focus groups were also informed and adapted from interview protocols of restorative justice program implementation in the K-12 system (Huston, 2015; Karp, 2013; Parkinson & Roche, 2004; Schiff, 2013; Wenzel, Okimoto, Feather, & Platow, 2008; Witvliet, Worthington, Root, Sato, Ludwig, & Exline, 2008). The questions were nearly the same as the questions asked during the individual interview, but by design. The purpose of this allowed the researcher to compare and assess for deviation based on role [leadership team member and facilitator/non-leadership team personnel].

A total of 16 individuals participated in this study in either an individual interview or in the focus group interview.

Data Collection

The university provided the researcher with a group of artifacts pertaining to the restorative justice program at the institution with permission to analyze. The artifacts were securely stored on a password protected laptop. The artifacts included the restorative justice program manual and training materials (PowerPoint slides and instructor notes). The restorative justice program's publicly available website was also analyzed.

The program members were invited to participate in an individual interview or focus group interview as described in the research plan. Five individuals completed a face-to-face interview utilizing the interview protocols from Appendix A and for approximately 60-minutes. Eleven individuals participated in one of two focus group interviews (5 in one and 6 in the other), utilizing the interview protocols from Appendix B and for approximately 90-minutes.

Data collected through interviews and focus groups was electronically recorded and hand notes were taken by the researcher. The recordings were stored securely on a password protected laptop and memorandums were locked in a drawer in the researcher's private home.
The audio recordings were submitted to an outsourced company (Rev.com) for transcription. The transcriptions were received electrically and stored securely on a password protected laptop.

Data Analysis

The coding process was a funneling procedure beginning with many possible themes down to the most significant themes (Creswell, 2013; Weston, Gandell, Beauchamp, McAlpine, & Wiseman, 2001). The goal of qualitative research is to provide credible, accurate data true to the subject within the research questions. The researcher used the aforementioned instruments and protocols in this study of a university's restorative justice program. The researcher used triangulation to add validity to the study. Triangulation strengthened the study design. The combination of interviews, focus groups, and review of artifacts are recommended in educational research and coding processes (Creswell, 2012; Patton, 1990). The transcriptions from the five individual interviews with leadership team members and the two focus groups with the trained facilitators, a total of 7 transcriptions were reviewed a minimum of 4 times.

The researcher initially documented a memorandum after each individual interview and focus group interview. The researcher then reviewed each transcription while privately listening

to the audio recordings and corrected to ensure for accuracy. The individual interview and focus group transcriptions were coded by the researcher by hand. Site documents were reviewed and analyzed in order to provide additional context for the themes and findings. The second reading and review included the use of *initial coding* based on the research questions in order to breakdown the data into separate parts. *In vivo* coding was used during the third reading and review to highlight and respect the participants' voice with the restorative justice program and their perception of the program on the campus. Lastly, the fourth reading and review included *values coding* to assess the participants' values, attitudes, and beliefs about the restorative justice program at the university. The coding processes were based on the descriptions of techniques outlined in *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers* by Johnny Saldaña (2016). The exercises stated above served as the process in determining the major themes in what motivated a Roman Catholic university in southern California to implement and sustain a restorative justice program.

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

This study explored how a private, Roman Catholic university in southern California implements and sustains a restorative justice program. The research questions include:

1. What factors motivate the institution to choose to implement a restorative justice program?
2. In what ways does a faith-based university tether the restorative justice program to its mission, vision, values, and identity?
3. By what methods, means, and strategies does a university use to implement a restorative justice program?
4. What are best practices for implementing a restorative justice program?
5. What are the effects of implementing a restorative justice program?

This study used qualitative inquiry and included individual interviews with 5 members of the restorative justice leadership team and two focus group interviews with 11 trained restorative justice facilitators. The researcher reviewed the university's documents that pertain to the restorative justice program at a Roman Catholic university located in southern California. This chapter also includes a thorough review of the past and current documents/artifacts produced for and about the restorative justice program.

The findings from the study include sets of frequent salient themes and subthemes that emerged from the data. The themes and subthemes were synthesized through hand coding by the researcher for the individual interviews, focus group interviews, and the documents/artifacts in order to answer the research questions. The researcher is considered a participant/observer based on his positon at the site.

Introduction of Findings

The chapter reviews how the university implemented a restorative justice program and how the institution sustains the program. The themes synthesized from the data first informed what motivated the university to implement the restorative justice program. The data showed how the campus decided to use restorative justice and restorative justice practices.

First, the participants name that the restorative justice program was developed in order to respond to a need for the campus to implement a community-based, student development, and alternative personal behavior strategy. The results also reflect the participant observer perspective at points and therefore named (Creswell, 2013).

The data also defines how the restorative justice program and the restorative justice practices align with the Roman Catholic, faith-based mission of the institution. Similarly, the data demonstrates how restorative justice and restorative justice practices meet the standards outlined in the Catholic Social Teaching (USCCB, 1998).

Next, the data shows how the university uses restorative justice practices through integrated learning systems like trainings, activities, services, and experiences. The university uses formal restorative conferences, mediations, and circles with scripted, restorative questions as part of its restorative justice practices.

The next set of themes state how the university addressed how the university sustains the restorative justice program through good training, collaboration, consistent efforts to institutionalize the restorative justice practices throughout general campus awareness – students, faculty, administrators, and parents, the benefit of frequently using restorative justice practices in order to sustain the program across campus, and the need for the program to use different language with niche populations.

Lastly, the data indicates that the impact of the restorative justice program at the university results in themes of empathy development, conflict resolution, and recognition the program receives for its work. The data addresses the effect of implementing a restorative justice program on a college campus. The chapter concludes with participant data that assesses the impact of restorative justice practices on this university campus.

Theoretical Framework

Restorative justice itself is the theory that informed the research questions and data analysis in this study. As discussed in chapter two, restorative justice and its practices are a belief system and implemented as a standard for how individuals treat one another within a community. Restorative justice became a process and a program at the institution through a conscious decision to aspire to restorative ends and use restorative practices in community formation. Restorative justice practices activate community development, healthy and just relationships, demonstrate potential to prevent and solve conflicts, and address and/or resolve conflicts and social ills when they occur through a collaborative, community orientated process. The university uses the theoretical framework to inform the institution's restorative justice practices in order to address the aforementioned goals of a restorative justice program (Karp, 2013; Karp & Clear, 2000; Lowery & Dannells, 2004; Johnstone & Van Ness, 2007; McCold 2000; McCold & Watchel, 2002).

The goals of restorative justice are to allow impacted parties and other key stakeholders to have decision-making abilities in determining outcomes when restoring a harm, allowing for uprightness, healing, and reparative ends when challenges occur, providing opportunity for justice to be transformative for an individual and the community, rebuilding relationships, and reducing recidivism with poor conduct as defined by the community (Evans, Smokowski,

Barbee, Bower, & Barefoot, 2016; Sharpe, 1998). These objectives are accomplished by maintaining a focus on the harm that occurs, the individuals involved, allowing for the consideration for the needs of all parties and the surrounding community, and showing an enhanced attentiveness to the responsibilities and obligations of the participants therein (Zehr, 2002; Pranis, Stuart, & Wedge, 2003). Restorative justice processes are transformative in the way a person understands herself or himself, takes responsibilities for his or her actions, and how a person relates to others on a daily basis (Johnstone & Van Ness, 2007). The data analysis process for this study is informed by the theory of restorative justice to synthesize the themes in order to answer the research questions.

Factors Motivating the University to Implement a Restorative Justice Program

The first research question asked what factors motivate the institution to choose to implement a restorative justice program? The data collected for the study was analyzed with *initial*, *in vivo*, and *values* coding methods in order to address the research question here. The documents provided by the university were reviewed in order to understand components of the restorative justice program and how the program was described to the campus community. The motivation to establish the restorative justice program at the university was answered by the data collected from the leadership team who directed the program on the campus.

The needs on-campus, the professional interests of the personnel, and opportunity for advanced student learning initially led to the establishment of the restorative justice program at the university. Two themes emerged from the coding process related to research question one. The themes included the following: 1) the growing need for an alternative personal behavior strategy; 2) a shared belief system that supports restorative justice as a program at the university. Three of the restorative justice leadership team members interviewed were present for the

conception of the program and the initial implementation of restorative practices used on the university's campus. Those three individuals were Duncan, Elizabeth, and Joan. However, the same themes of institutional need and a shared belief system also emerged from the data collected from the other two individual interviews with those who were not present at the inception of the program and practices on the university's campus. Those two individuals were Nicole and Mary.

It is important to note that four of the five restorative justice leadership team members described that a "circumstance" was the process that lead to the decision to begin a restorative justice program at the university during academic year 2010 – 2011. For example, Duncan, a founding member of the restorative justice leadership team stated, "It was just lucky circumstance that a GA in housing and I were discussing over coffee and we were both contemplating in RJ in different ways." The three other leadership team members, Joan, Nicole, and Elizabeth noted the same circumstance that framed the work on the campus and what eventually grew into the restorative justice program at the university.

Duncan and Joan, founding members of the restorative justice program and members of the leadership team each described how restorative justice was recently introduced in the student conduct setting within the higher education and student affairs areas at colleges and universities. The leadership team members described that restorative justice was popping-up as a "buzzword," webinars and conference presentations were beginning to pop-up in order to explain restorative justice theory and how it can apply at institutions of higher education. Similarly, a graduate student staff member in residential life learned about restorative practices in a course and referenced it over coffee with one of the student conduct administrators interviewed for this study – leading the conversation to some coalition building and the initiative began between

residential life and student conduct at the university. Duncan, a member of the restorative justice leadership team stated that the idea to implement a restorative justice program evolved quickly through the work of like-minded individuals. A description of the two themes are described below.

Institutional need. The data collected during individual interviews indicated that incidents of student misconduct were escalating at the university. The data collected was analyzed with *initial* and *in vivo* coding methods in synthesizing this theme. According to the student conduct administrators who sit on the restorative justice leadership team, the university was seeking alternative behavior modification strategies in order to address the need for more student learning and enhanced college student development.

According to one of the restorative justice leadership team members Duncan, a founding member of the restorative justice leadership team stated,

> An incident occurred where a student was just cruel to her RA. Like man. Belittling and berating her. I knew we needed to do something as a means of making the relationship right again. This was the beginning of what lead us to explore restorative justice as it emerged in the field. The incident was an example of the need occurring on our campus and around the nation.

He noted more and more situations like this were occurring on various levels of severity and the routine "court like" processes for managing student conduct were not working.

Similarly, Duncan, Elizabeth, and Joan stated that the university was considering ways to make the student conduct process more learning centered and serve more like a retention tool in order to assist students in making better decisions with their behavior. Restorative justice offers a strategy to address student learning and college student development. There was a need to move from a traditional student conduct model to a student conduct process more aligned with student learning and to encourage persistence, but in a just manner.

Restorative justice was emerging in the field of higher education and the climate was calling for student conduct processes to be more developmental. As stated in chapter two, restorative justice began to emerge in higher education and the "buzz" began to pervade professional organizations, discussion of the theory at conferences, et cetera (McMurtrie, 2015). Three members of the restorative justice leadership team in this study, Duncan, Elizabeth, and Joan stated that the merger of the need at the university and the introduction of restorative justice was organic and opportune. The new restorative justice strategy and the demand for something new in regard to responding to student misconduct were rising within a similar timeframe. The timing seemed opportunistic and evident in the data collected for this study.

Mary, was a student conduct administrator who also sat on the restorative justice leadership team and works in student conduct and referred cases for restorative conferences. Mary stated,

> Based on my working with the [RJ] committee and kind of overseeing RJ the last two years, working with people who were a part of that initial developmental process, I think everyone at the core feels that, sees the value of RJ, sees the powerful impact that it can have on student learning and development and community healing.

Similarly, Joan also works in student conduct and referred cases for restorative conferences and sat on the program leadership team echoed Mary's statement. Joan stated,

> Our administrative hearings were fully framed on developmental practice and really looking at students as developmental beings, and how do we help them develop? What RJ did is it also then gave us the additional 'you're not developing in isolation.' You're developing in community. With community being one of our core values, it makes total sense for us to make sure that we're having conversations not just about their personal growth and development but ... how that impacts their interaction with the people that they live near, go to school with, interact with as well as the people who maybe are further away like family or friends who care about them. It gives the conduct process I think a much fuller and, ironically, developmental experience, but it becomes more than just about the student.

Lastly, Duncan a founding member of the restorative justice program and a former professional staff member in student conduct. He stated that current college student populations,

> We need to begin to be more educational. We are educators. Yes, we have a role in protecting the campus and protecting students. Upholding policy. But that needs to be done in a way that's consistent with our educational institution and development mission.

The restorative justice process provided a tool in order to restore students, and therefore retain them. Duncan, Mary, and Joan stated that restorative justice supported the overall purpose of student conduct in supporting the mission of the university by serving students and addressing harms when students' misconduct were at play.

Shared belief system. The data shows that the decision for the university to select restorative justice as a means to address student misconduct and a method in forming community reflects the faith-based, mission of the institution. The data collected from the individual interviews reflected the literature. The literature states how restorative justice integrates the Roman Catholic mission of a faith-based institution. Restorative justice developed as a common practice of religiously affiliated institutions and within Catholic higher education setting (Abelman & Dalessandro, 2009; Brendan, 2006; LaBelle & Kendall, 2016; Procario-Foley & Bean, 2002). The data collected was analyzed with *values* coding method in order to group this theme.

The restorative justice coordinator in student housing noted how well the program reflected the mission of the university. Nicole works in housing and serves as a coordinator for restorative justice practices on the campus. Nicole stated,

> I think because of our alignment from a religious standpoint, and our mission, restorative practices was an ... I wouldn't say easy, but an exciting opportunity for the institution to take up. I would definitely say it took some important individuals to advocate for restorative justice to be integrated into the community, and with those advocates who were clearly explaining restorative justice, and

> articulating the parallel alignment with our values in that work. It was an easy transition for the institution to take up.

In addition, Elizabeth serves as the the unit head in housing and echoed Nicole's account. When asked why the university decided to implement restorative justice practices on the campus Elizabeth stated,

> Because it's so aligned with our mission and our school of peace and justice. So I mean, restorative justice is so aligned with the Catholic mission of just building peace, I mean, you even think about what's happening in our country right now and you either have people who are reacting in these hate, go after, every single person of this characteristic who did the act, or you have a leader who's like, "Wait. We can be loving and restorative. Let's not do more harm, let's repair the harm that was done in order to build up our community. And I think that's so aligned with, you see the way that Pope Francis is even tweeting right now about the environment, and so it's so aligned with the Catholic Church's mission and then our mission as a values based institution, but then also it was so aligned with the timing of the peace and justice center opening up. And their work and dialogue and restorative practices.

Duncan, a founding member of the restorative justice leadership team made a similar statement connecting the purpose, form, and function of restorative justice and restorative practices to the shared belief system at the university and in conjunction with the Catholic mission at the institution. Duncan stated,

> We see the link between restorative justice and our identity as a Catholic institution. Looking at the dignity of the individual. Care for community and almost sort of a forgive the sinner kind of approach. Find a way to reintegrate people into our community in a way that's appropriate, helpful and developmentally responsible.

The shared belief system theme reflects how the restorative justice leadership team connected the program to the mission of the institution in preparing students to address urgent challenges. The data reflects the literature in chapter two. Namely, the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities affirms restorative justice and its practices as representative of Catholic Social Teachings as outlined by the US Council of Catholic Bishops in valuing the life

and dignity of the human person, the community, solidarity in the overarching good, individual rights and responsibilities, providing options for the poor and the vulnerable, and caring for all God's creation (ACCU, 2016; Mikulich, 2012; USCCB, 1998). The connection made by the university between restorative justice and the faith-based, mission of the institution is explained through the data presented in the chapter. The restorative justice program addresses how the theoretical framework and restorative justice practices align with the university's values.

How a Restorative Justice Program Reflects Mission at a Roman Catholic Institution?

Research question two asks in what ways the university tethers the restorative justice program to the institution's Roman Catholic vision, mission, values, and identity. Although the decision to implement the restorative justice program at the university grew from the administrators' common belief system in order to answer a need on-campus, this question asks the researcher "the how" when connecting restorative justice to the university's vision, mission, values, and identity. The data demonstrates two themes in addressing this research question. The themes include: 1) the university's moral identity; 2) the aspiration for the individuals affiliated with the restorative justice program to fulfill the Catholic Social Teachings. The data supports how the university's restorative justice program connects with some of the principles outlined in the Catholic Social Teachings.

University identity. The participants name the university's vision and mission statements, core values, and the changemaker distinction bestowed upon the university in how they describe the manner in which the restorative justice program activates the aforementioned institutional identity in the work within the program.

The participants repeatedly named how obvious the goals of the restorative justice program align with the university's mission and the overall purpose of student formation at the

institution. More specifically, the university's mission is to graduate holistic people with a greater knowledge, committed to ethical conduct, and provide compassionate service to humanity by creating diverse and inclusive communities in order to address the world's urgent challenges. The data collected for the study was analyzed with *values* coding method in order to analyze this theme.

Nicole, who works in housing and serves as the restorative justice coordinator offered a perspective sharing the restorative justice program reflects the university's identity. She stated,

> As a Catholic institution we look at restorative justice as a mechanism that's aligned with all of our values, and pillars as an institution. So to put in terms, restorative justice is a way to be with people, elevate community, strengthen relationships, repair harm, and work towards change. Restorative justice allows the processes to talk about global issues, contentious challenges, things that aren't black and white answers for. That's what [institution] is. We're educating our students with a liberal arts education, a holistic experience. Restorative justice is a great tool to aid in that holistic education.

The participants shared that the restorative justice program reflects the university's purpose in developing students who are aware of others and a level of responsibility to prevent harm and take responsibility for it when appropriate, during and after college. The restorative justice program frames how individuals should act in the world, how people should interact with others and with a good level of cultural competency, respect human dignity, and to act ethically. The participants also named how the restorative justice program and the university's restorative practices encouraged students and staff to consider how they impact others and how actions inform leadership.

Catholic social teachings. The participants stated that restorative justice provides tools that help the institution strive to meet the mission of the institution and meet standards outlined in the Catholic Social Teaching (USCCB, 1998). Namely, the participants from the restorative justice leadership team all (all five) stated that the restorative justice program was anchored in

the vision of the university. Similarly, the five participants who are part of the restorative justice leadership team also stated that the purposes of the restorative justice program aligns with the themes outlined in the Catholic Social Teachings. As stated in chapter two, the teachings were published by the United States Council of Catholic Bishops (USCCB, 1998) and the university aligns itself with the themes outlined in Catholic Social Teachings. The data demonstrates that the themes Catholic Social Teachings correlate with the information shared by the participants related to the restorative justice program at the university.

The data collected through the interviews, focus groups, and documents demonstrate how the mission of the institution and the standards outlined in the Catholic Social Teachings pairs with the goals of restorative justice theory. The coding methods used here was *in vivo* and *values coding*. The coding method reflects the participants' perceptions of the restorative justice program and their beliefs in the system using restorative justice practices (Saldaña, 2016). The data collected in this study reflects how the restorative justice program at the university connects to the mission of the institution.

The Catholic Social Teachings provide the institution with a list of standards related to form and function as to how the community should be formed and how individuals should be treated as part of the community. The university uses the Catholic Social Teachings to provide an overarching context for the work at the institution. The university is a unique, independent Roman Catholic institution and does not operate under a specific charism of Catholicism (like a Jesuit or Franciscan college or university, for example).

The data shows that the goals of the restorative justice program reflect the themes of Catholic Social Teachings. As published in the university's restorative justice manual and presented in training materials, restorative justice is a belief system in which members of a

community repair harms, rebuild trust, and repair relationships through a mutual decision making process in order to determine outcomes with responsibilities for all participants. The restorative justice program at the university complements the Catholic Social Teachings in which individuals should respect the dignity of the human person, call one another to live in active communities, that communities reflect the rights and responsibilities of all members, students proactively provide options for the marginalized and disenfranchised, respect the work of others, advocate for human solidarity as one universal community, and proactively care for all God's creation.

The Catholic Social Teachings are organized into like-groups here in order to demonstrate where the participants in the study articulated how the restorative justice programs reflected the themes.

Call one another to live in active communities; advocate for human solidarity as one universal community. The restorative justice program at the university lives within student conduct, residential life, and the professional development arm of the division of student affairs. The program does not have one center by design. As collected from the interviews, the goals of restorative justice are meant to permeate the core of how community is developed at the institution.

Elizabeth, a founding member of the restorative justice program and member of the leadership team stated,

> Restorative justice is so aligned with the Catholic mission of just building peace from a social teachings perspective, I mean, you even think about what's happening in our country right now and you either have people who are reacting in these hate, go after, every single person of this characteristic who did the act, or you have a leader who's like, "*Wait. We can be loving and restorative. Let's not do more harm, let's repair the harm that was done in order to build up our community*.

The restorative justice leadership team echoed Elizabeth's statement. The program informed the presentation of materials at new student orientation, bystander intervention practices, first floor meetings coordinated by resident assistants, and the process in which roommate agreements were conducted within the residence halls. The leadership team all shared examples of restorative circles used to proactively prevent harms and react to harms in order to restore the community. For example, Joan a founding member of the restorative justice leadership team stated, "I definitely am asking what you did with the student, but, more importantly, I'm asking and really trying to get in more deeply to what was the impact of what you did on other members of the community." The nature of the restorative justice practices named here are proactive in the manner community develops at the university and is tethered in the university's contemporary Roman Catholic mission. The documents/artifacts provided by the university reflects the leadership team members' accounts.

In addition, the restorative justice program works to address student misconduct and restore relationships and harms when incidents occurred for the student's benefit and the community. Lynn, one of the trained facilitators who participated in focus group one described how the restorative justice program cares for the responsible individual and the campus community at-large when a harm occurs. Lynn stated,

> Our desire to care for the whole person and our desire to ensure the students leave the university with skills to be better citizens of this world. I think putting them in spaces where they dialogue with one another, that may be uncomfortable, but instead of dismissing a harm with simple action of a punitive sanction. We desire to know more. To repair relationships.

The other trained restorative justice facilitators nodded in agreement as Lynn spoke during the focus group. It is the manner communities are formed at the institution. The students' development also reflects their responsibility to those around them in addition to themselves.

Respect the dignity of the human person; respect the work of others; communities reflect the rights and responsibilities of and by members. The restorative justice leadership team stated the restorative justice program started as a collaboration between residential life and student conduct. The program was formed to address student misconduct and the harms therein. The need for the program is to bring voice to those impacted by harms and provide an opportunity for impacted parties to activate their voice in creating resolution from a restorative perspective. The restorative justice program provides a unique additional sanction to address student misconduct in order to hold responsible parties accountable by design. The restorative justice program also distributes the responsibilities for rebuilding trust and repairing harm on the responsible parties and the impacted parties – as a significant component of the restorative justice program and the university's contemporary Roman Catholic mission.

For example, Mary one of the restorative justice leadership team members stated during the individual interview,

> We see restorative justice as the opportunity or the pathway to reconcile and help bring students together and make that right, in both an impacted party playing a role in that process as well as a responsible party.

Restorative justice in itself is a form of reconciliation at the university and provides opportunity for redemption and healing.

Similarly, Vivian one of the restorative justice trained facilitators echoed Mary's statement during a focus group when referring to mission and the process of respect and responsibility. Vivian stated, "As a Catholic institution we encourage students to truly see the other person, like their whole self, and then provide forgiveness to others and of self."

The data collected during the individual interviews and focus group interviews reflects literature in regard to harms and student misconduct. As stated in chapter two, a Roman Catholic

institution incorporates redemption, forgiveness, and accompaniment as important as justice in addressing student misconduct through discipline processes (Estanek, Galligan-Stierle, Gilroy, & Kirkpatrick, 2017). The participants named how the university addresses harms and repairs relationships in a manner to restore challenges and people.

Provide options for the marginalized and disenfranchised; proactively care for all God's creation. According to data collected from the restorative justice leadership team and the trained facilitators who participated in the focus groups, the restorative justice program is used to address challenges observed on-campus, in the nation, and in the world. To list some examples shared by multiple participants in the individual interviews and the focus groups, restorative circles were held during the formation of the Black Lives Matters movement, annually during the university's sexual assault awareness week, in response to the United States election in November 2016, in response to harms that occurred between groups of students (with an incident that occurred between an athletic team and a group of resident assistants and an incident between a predominantly white sorority and the Black student union), when swastikas were found within a residence hall community bathroom on-campus, and in regard to challenges with immigration reform. Terry, a trained restorative justice facilitator and member of the housing staff stated during a focus group, "I use the circles to address harms, but also to engage the community in the conversation and the solutions." The circles listed here also reflect the dignity of the person, but also provide opportunity and voice to underrepresented populations at the university.

Strategies Used to Implement a Restorative Justice Program

The third research question asked by what methods, means, and strategies does the campus use to implement a restorative justice program. The data collected during the individual interviews with the restorative justice leadership team, the trained facilitator participants who

attended the focus groups, and the documents and artifacts provided by the university answered this research question. The themes emerged from the transcriptions by using the *in vivo* and *initial* coding methods. The documents and artifacts were reviewed for the content shared on the institution's website. The two themes included how the collective restorative justice team and the materials shared about the program proactively and reactively attempt to prevent, address, and/or respond to campus climate and student needs.

The proactive and reactive restorative practices include the various restorative learning strategies synthesized from the literature and presented in chapters one and two. The differentiation between the proactive use and the reactive use of restorative justice theory and practices are evident in the data based on the experience of the participants offered during the individual interviews and the focus group interviews.

Appropriate staffing was named as a means for advancing the restorative justice theory at the university. All of the restorative justice leadership team named that restorative justice work is listed in their job descriptions. One of the leadership team members was once required to assist with directing restorative justice practices, but since assumed a new role on campus but was permitted to persist with the group based on significant interest. Also, all but one of the trained facilitators described how restorative justice work is listed in their job descriptions and attending required trainings in order to stay current. The one trained facilitator who participated in the research study shared that she elected to attend an open restorative justice facilitator training based on interest and despite it not being required for her position. It was important to note that two of the leadership team members, Mary and Nicole each shared that questions about their interest in restorative justice were asked when they interviewed for their position; the other

three leadership team members, Duncan, Joan, and Elizabeth were part of the initial program planning group and participated in implementing the program at the university.

Proactive use of restorative justice and restorative practices. The first theme from the data names that the campus uses a variety of integrated learning systems like trainings, activities, services, and experiences to implement a restorative justice program as a part of campus life at the university.

The data shows how the university uses restorative practices to proactively empower the campus to be restorative. For example, the leadership team and trained facilitators named recurrent trainings, storytelling, and the structure used to facilitate roommate agreements in the residence halls. John, a trained restorative justice facilitator stated during a focus group how restorative questions are used at student activities in order to enhance the student experiences and engage students in conversation about their leadership style. Restorative justice practices are also used to create a sense of responsibility for today's urgent challenges, and actualize the university's Roman Catholic, faith-based mission, and institution's changemaker identity. The participants described various methods in using restorative justice in their work as mentioned above. In addition, the list of restorative justice training and workshop opportunities are also listed on the university's website.

Reactive use of restorative justice and restorative practices. The reactive restorative practices listed on the university's website include a menu of opportunities in order to restore relationships and rebuild trust compromised by student misconduct, larger campus issues, and potentially tragic world events. The menu lists and defines each opportunity, which includes restorative circles, restorative mediation, and restorative justice conferences. The site describes each resource and names the trained professional staff as facilitators.

The website reflects the data collected in the individual interviews and focus groups. The sources were consistent with one another. The leadership team members shared how they use restorative practices in their work with students and by the function of their role, but all the members named how they use restorative justice theory in managing conflict or disagreements with colleagues and through all sorts of supervision work as well. The university uses restorative justice theory and implements it on the campus through restorative justice practices in order to help frame and inform dialogue and encourage productive outcomes when constructive and challenging conversations ensue. For example, Duncan, one of the initial restorative justice leadership team members stated,

> My experience through conferences and processes has been that a lot of times the impacted parties whether they know it or not, have isolated themselves or differentiated themselves from the community, potentially due to shame as a result of a conflict.

The natural response of a responsible party to remove themselves after a conflict can be addressed through restorative practices. The process of healing the situation and making it right reflects the mission of the institution in order to reconcile the challenges there as noted by the participants in this study.

The trained facilitators also stated during the focus groups that they follow the restorative conference process when assigned an incident, but often use restorative language when working with students individually and through the activities and events in their respective areas of student life. For example, the trained facilitators stated how they use restorative justice circles with students to address world, national, and campus challenges and ills. Facilitators from residential life named how they use restorative justice practices in supervision of student leaders, resident assistants, and with addressing roommate conflicts.

Recommended Best Practices in Implementing a Restorative Justice Program

Research question four asks what are best practices for implementing a restorative justice program. The recommendations provided by the participants and documents were grouped into themes from the transcriptions by using the *initial* and *in vivo* coding methods. The themes that emerged include collaboration in implementing and building the restorative justice program. The participants in the study stated the program was sustained on the campus through consistent efforts to institutionalize the program and the restorative practices therein through coordinating activities, services, and experiences that reflected the student learning according to the restorative justice theoretical framework.

The participants also stated that spreading awareness about the restorative justice program through strategic storytelling about the restorative justice program with community members at the university – students, faculty, administrators, and parents helped institutionalize and sustain the program. The participants noted the benefit of using restorative justice practices to influence the formation of the community and some of the limitations of the restorative justice program in how it may be perceived by underrepresented populations.

Systematic training. The restorative justice trainings and workshops are coordinated by the leadership team and defined on the university's website. The restorative justice training documents provided by the university for this study include: defining restorative justice, a spectrum of restorative practices as described above as proactive and reactive practices, an explanation of how a harm can result in a formal restorative conference depending on student readiness, an explanation, demonstration, and review of various formal restorative conferences, and a lot of role play exercises. It was important to note from the documents provided by the institution (i.e.: manual and training materials) that the restorative training sessions also ask

those in attendance to consider their own professional practices and what adaptations they could make to their own work with students and colleagues in order to make it more restorative (to prevent harm or respond to it). As noted in chapters one and two, restorative justice practices should reflect current work and not creating new work.

The trained restorative justice facilitators described their experience twofold, the importance of onboarding with restorative justice and the importance of and need for some recurrent training. The sentiments are consistent in both focus groups. As an example, Shane, a trained restorative justice facilitator stated,

> It was very detailed. They walk you through the entire process and there's lots of opportunity to practice, demonstrate, and walk through it together. It is probably one of the more in-depth trainings we do. It's part of the job. It's almost two days…and we apply it in our day to day work.

The trained facilitators also described in the two focus groups the importance of ongoing training in order to keep the content and goals of the restorative justice program at the forefront of their professional practice. For example, Citrus, a trained facilitator who participated in focus group two described how he was completely unaware of restorative justice and the potential application in higher education until he began his work at the university and attended a training. Citrus stated, "Before the training I was like 'What is this RJ stuff? What's going on?' I learned it is a process and I was 'Okay, I get the feel of it.'" The introduction to restorative justice, content with the training related to proactive and reactive restorative practices, and application of those practices to the professional staffs' daily work are all incredibly important to the onboarding of trained facilitators, who do the work regularly, and therefore important advocates in sustaining the restorative justice program at the institution in order to impact campus culture and advance the mission of the university.

Collaboration. As stated above, the restorative justice program at the university did not live in one center, but is a shared program led by members from across student affairs – mainly residential life and student conduct. Duncan, a founding member of the restorative justice leadership team stated, "Don't do it alone [implement restorative justice]. We found a great collaboration with residential life. They think it is important and found a liaison to help with it." The collaborations and connections across campus with restorative justice are important in order to make it part of the culture. In addition, Duncan also stated that "it was a mess whenever we went off track from our plans as a group." Duncan continued that the directions of the restorative practices were important in order to provide an infrastructure and system to ensure the restorative work was action oriented, time bound, and realistic.

The restorative justice leadership team each shared that the group meets regularly. The group meets to discuss the progress of the program and ongoing opportunities to advance restorative justice with students and at the university. Four of the restorative justice leadership team members, Duncan, Nicole, Mary, and Joan named the importance of identifying cases for formal conferences after an incident of student misconduct occurs and that the case be appropriate for a restorative justice conference. Mary, a conduct officer who refers cases for restorative conferences noted the importance of timely referrals when responding to campus, national, and world challenges in order to activate a restorative practice to reactively address the harm. The information gathered with the leadership team members' stated that coordinating the work quickly when needed and activating the trained facilitators maintains the relevancy of the program at the university.

The three leadership team members who were present when the restorative justice program was created (Joan, Elizabeth, and Duncan) described how the initial design of the

program changed when they lost a partner in academic affairs at the university. The three individuals stated that the dean of the peace school was a formative partner in driving the program, but this person moved-on and it was not a priority within the peace school by the successor. Duncan stated specifically,

> The partnership with the peace school gave it some credibility right away. It got the Dean involved. It got the vice president stating "*Ah this is great. Let's do this.*" But that initial year was really important to find success with some initial cases right off the bat that involved staff members; Public Safety Officers, a faculty member who could then sing the praises of restorative justice and say "*Hey, this was really powerful and very different. We should do more of this*."

The three noted how the program persisted with the current collaboration within student affairs, but noted the importance of institutionalizing the program as noted in the upcoming theme.

Institutional support. The participants named the importance of institutionalizing the program in order to create program longevity. It expands the theme of *collaboration* into three complementary points from the individual interviews and focus groups under this theme. The three themes include institutional support, finding opportunities to work the restorative justice program into people's daily work, and restorative practices into existing structures, and storytelling.

Institutionalize the program. The leadership team named that gathering institutional support as the next step after collaboration. The leadership team described creating credibility from university leaders for the program in order to support the process of implementing a restorative justice program. The support is crucial to gain momentum for the program. The aforementioned quote from Duncan demonstrated how collaboration can institutionalize a program on a college campus. Duncan shared a story of a prominent faculty member that came-up to Duncan and gave him a high five after hearing about how well a restorative conference went. Duncan described the faculty member praising the process, enthusiasm about the goals of

restorative justice, and excitement about the direction at the university. Duncan, Joan, and Elizabeth also shared how the credibility built through *collaboration* and *institutional support* to provide support to the program in order to persist despite losing the academic affairs partner in the school of peace as previously mentioned. Similar to the momentum experiences, the data also showed that the energy for the program continued through the storytelling process in order to maintain institutional support.

Storytelling. As stated above, sharing success is pivotal in gaining support and creating keenness in establishing a restorative justice program – specially to create a collaborative effort on a university campus without a specific center. Four of the five leadership team members named how they use storytelling to regularly and outwardly share the success of restorative practices in order to gain momentum for the program, but also to recruit new facilitators not required by their role on-campus or the requirements of their position. The participants shared the term *storytelling* as a program implantation mechanism. The researcher created a theme from the language expressed in the interviews.

Nicole, who works in residential life and served as the restorative justice coordinator shared a good description of storytelling in a restorative justice context. Her statement reflected the overall sentiment of the participants,

> I think storytelling is huge. I think some tangibles and discrete anecdotal data about how our students are benefiting. Folks are wowed when I share some of our work. I think lack of awareness gets in the way; people do not know what RJ is. They do not know how it can be successful.

Duncan, Nicole, and Joan from the leadership team shared that the small, interpersonal networking opportunities and intentional storytelling amongst colleagues advanced the restorative work and with students alike. The small interactions between trusted colleagues supports the outreach in the program publications and website.

Reframing Work. The final theme for best practices for implementing a restorative justice program includes reframing existing work so members of the university do not perceive restorative justice as additional work. As stated in chapter two, restorative justice is a way of being and a way to address harms (Karp, 2013; Karp & Clear, 2000; Lowery & Dannells, 2004; Johnstone & Van Ness, 2007; McCold 2000; McCold & Watchel, 2002). The restorative work reflects overall core values of the institution. It directly connects with what is already happening on the campus and creates structure so that the restorative work can live. The data collected from the individual interviews, the focus group interviews, and the documents provided by the university all support the theme here and the themes emerged from the use of *initial* and *in vivo* coding methods.

Reframing current work. The program leadership team stated that many individuals already work restoratively within their daily responsibilities. Four of the five leadership team members (Duncan, Mary, Joan, and Nicole) stated that they do not encounter opposition when discussing restorative justice theory because it is so aligned with the university's mission. However, it is important to frame restorative practices as not more work, but an enhancement to existing work with students and the campus community.

The entire restorative justice leadership team (Mary, Nicole, Duncan, Joan, and Elizabeth) named the importance of collaboration and human resource talent necessary to advance the work on-campus. More specifically, housing and student conduct added restorative justice work into professional and student staff job descriptions, annual trainings, and the professional development work in order to advance the restorative justice program in a substantive way.

Similarly, the trained facilitators who participated in the focus groups stated how the restorative justice responsibilities further peaked their interest in the position and the university during the interview process, motivating people to learn more about the program when interviewing, and how they were impressed by the quality training and purposeful connection to work once in the role.

Frequent use of restorative justice practices impacts program sustainability on campus. A best-practice theme that emerged for sustaining a restorative justice program on a college campus is frequent use of restorative justice practices. The theme emerged from the individual interviews with the restorative justice leadership team and the two focus groups, but from different perspectives. The perspectives discussed below stated that the frequent use of restorative justice practices creates familiarity with members of the campus and therefore supports the norms for the type of community the university wants.

The theme identified in the individual interview with the restorative justice leadership team reflected the need for storytelling and momentum (as stated previously), but also the regular use of restorative circles, restorative justice conference referrals, and impact on a department's portfolio and program as with student housing on the campus.

To that end, Nicole, the restorative justice coordinator stated "We try to use it as a way of being. In building community, with programs and activities, to address challenges, and a way to be whole as a campus." The frequent use of restorative justice practices implies that the restorative justice work is not a new task or responsibility. It is a way of doing current work differently as the campus community evolves to addressing challenges through a restorative model.

Another component of the frequent use method is the impact on personnel. For example, Duncan, a seasoned member of the restorative justice leadership team stated that, "Growing the program through our community assists in maintaining it when people resign or move-on." The familiarity the campus has with restorative justice practices – aside from the trained facilitators and the leadership team assists the program's sustainability on the campus when key members of the leadership team resign, assume new roles, and/or move-on from the university.

As stated above, the trained facilitators also named the importance of using restorative justice practices frequently as it assists them with their skill development. More specifically, restorative justice talking points at meetings, use of restorative practices at meetings with professional staff, periodic touch-base trainings, and facilitating circles and restorative justice conferences assists with keeping the work fresh in their practice and reminds them of the restorative justice model when working individually with students and student leaders. For example, Stanley, a trained facilitator stated, "I seek help from Nicole [restorative justice coordinator] when I am referred a case for a conference or when something odd comes-up in my community." Similarly, the trained facilitators also stated during the focus groups that they benefit from resources like the training documents and restorative justice manual, the ability to ask leadership team members for support, and/or to process questions.

Impact of cultural experiences. An interesting trend developed in one focus group of trained restorative justice facilitators. Clara, a trained facilitator who works predominantly with underrepresented students made a comment about the cultural perspective of underrepresented students in managing conflict. More specifically, Clara stated,

> I think in a higher education setting it's another strategy for handling conflict that can be useful depending on the population that you're working with. In some ways, having the more strict sort of strategy is helpful. It works for some people. That's the only if they understand negative behavior but for other people I think

> there's that sort of a need for more delicate ways to handle conflict and since I don't really come from sort of that delicate way of handling conflict.

There were other trained facilitators in the same focus group who were visually diverse. Three of the participants echoed Clara's statement. The context reveals that the sustainability of the restorative justice program and the impact on the social justice work can only be enhanced if restorative justice opportunities are framed from a cultural perspective. It is important to note that the participants named that the university continues to use restorative circles with harms that target underrepresented groups. For example, the campus should continue to hold restorative circles to support the Black Lives Matter movement, incidents like the Pulse/Orlando tragedy, and partner with students active in the impacted communities.

Although participant identities are not a consideration in this study, the data is too rich to not share. The theme from the focus groups significantly struck the researcher. As a program participant, the researcher understands the purpose of restorative justice to address injustices and correct disenfranchisement. The data states that more work needs to be done in order to better include underrepresented groups in the program in order to enhance the campus culture for all. The feedback reinforces the purpose of restorative justices as noted in chapter two; to address harms in our world, nation, and campus, to build or rebuild trust between campus community members, strengthen relationships, and partner to come to agreements for restitution.

Impact of a Restorative Justice Program on a College Campus

The fifth research question investigates the effects of implementing a restorative justice program. The data collected indicates an impact on campus culture based on the perceptions of the participants in the study. The qualitative strategy used by the researcher to arrive at the findings were *in vivo* and *initial* coding methods. The data analyzed in this study to assess the

impact of the restorative justice program reflects the perceptions on the program based on participant involvement.

The themes that emerged from the individual interviews reflects the impact of the restorative justice program on the campus. The themes include empathy development in those who take part in the restorative justice program and restorative practices, the role of restorative justice in addressing conflict at the university, and program recognition. The data reflects the participants' perception at the time of data collection.

Empathy. As stated in the literature presented in chapter two, restorative justice and restorative practices develops empathy among participants – by those who created harms and those impacted by a harm as well (Alarid & Montemayor, 2012; Braithwaite, 2002; Borton & Paul, 2013; Oliner, 2005; Roseman, Ritchie, & Laux, 2009; Rossner, 2011; Saulnier & Sivasubramanian, 2015; Stokkom, 2002; Wachtel, 2013; Walters, 2015; Zehr, 2002). The restorative justice program at the university seeks to develop empathy with the participants in an effort to inspire individuals to exhibit ethical conduct, act in a compassionate manner toward humanity, and create diverse and inclusive communities that reflect those values.

One of the leadership team members noted the explicit empathy observed after a restorative conference. Mary, who works in student conduct and referred cases for restorative justice conferences stated,

> I hear as they process through the situation or the incident and obviously I hear a lot of like, identification with everybody involved. I also hear them put themselves in the shoes of a responsible person, in terms of thinking about what is the best way to work with this person? In hearing words and phrases that allow me to think that they are just as concerned about that person's dignity and their learning and their development and their hopes and fears from that process and what they might experience, so I hear them placing themselves in the shoes of responsible people as well as they think about how we're going to go about approaching, facilitating a conference or dialogue. That comes from a lot of the, I

> think the training we do around the empathy development. I think there is a lot of empathy development there.

The statement above reflects the powerful impact the restorative justice program has on the trained facilitators specifically. However, the data point also reflects the call to the work and the shared value set demonstrated emerging from the individual interviews with the restorative justice leadership team and the focus groups with the trained facilitators.

The most salient example of empathy development comes from student learning through challenging experiences. The trained facilitators and leadership team members described a version of shame when explaining the competency for empathic growth. Nicole, a person employed in housing and serving as the restorative justice coordinator names a challenging interaction with a student who not only sought reconciliation, but also became an advocate for restorative justice as a theory and the practices therein. Nicole stated,

> Students speak from a very vulnerable place, and understanding of the harm that they had caused. The brokenness within themselves that led to some poor decision making, and demonstrated commitment to be more, to be better, to be a positive contributing member of our community. So seeing an individual who had gone to detox, who had made some mistakes, who impacted fellow sorority members to then have that person come along the way, and then partner in the restorative justice program, and then become a student facilitator.

Similar to Nicole, Joan, who works in student conduct and refers cases for restorative justice conferences shared similar regard with empathy developed among students at the university as a result of restorative justice. To paraphrase Joan's comments, the program resonates with so many people who work at the university because of the manner it assists students with their learning to interact with peers in a mature way, personally prevent conflict, or how to respond to conflict when it occurs. Joan stated that restorative justice addresses the developmental needs of students when there are a lack of skills there, when students do not have an ability to actually see another person's perspective, or the students do not see how their actions could impact someone,

and/or how important it is to care about that when living in community. Joan stated, "That's the empathy piece." It provides an opportunity to take up someone else's perspective, to acknowledge it as true for the other person, and to take steps to address what the other individuals' are saying.

Conflict management. The role of the restorative justice program in addressing conflict at the university reflects the evidence synthesized in relation to empathy development with participants. From the participants' perspective in the study, the restorative justice program works with students through a restorative process. Duncan, a founding member of the restorative justice leadership team stated the students involved can better understand the nature of a conflict, the harm that is created, the needs that are because of the conflict, and how the restorative justice program can support students in repairing the harms and meet the needs of all the parties involved. Conflict prevention and conflict resolution are pillars of the program. As stated in chapter 2 and by participants, it is a way of being in the world. The restorative approach at the university uses a lens based in how to engage people after a harm or conflict occurs, not how to act upon them.

The participants in the study also named readiness as an opportunity and challenge in using restorative justice to address a conflict. A restorative practice can have a great impact in resolving conflict, but only if the parties are ready to engage in the conversation. The restorative justice program's effectiveness can vary to whether or not people are open to it. The leadership team participants in the study named that a strength of the program in resolving conflict is participation in the restorative practices is voluntary for students in order to prevent more harm.

Local and national recognition. The restorative justice program at the university received local and national recognition in the advancement of student development and

alternative personal behavior strategies. The restorative justice program provides consultation and training in southern California to local K-12 charter schools and colleges. One of the leadership team members is a board member at one of the nearby charter schools and is primarily on the board to assist the school with its restorative justice practices.

The restorative justice program received national recognition in two forms. One includes the program being featured in a resource book in regard to restorative justice programs and practices at colleges and universities. The second includes a grant from an international organization to serve as a co-sponsor for the newly formed restorative justice network of Catholic college and university campuses.

Student voice. The institution provided a sample set of survey responses from students who participated in a restorative justice conference. The data was collected a year or two after the program was established. Although the data collected is a small set of students (N = 16), the anecdotal data reflects some of the impact the restorative justice program has on the students participating in restorative practice.

One student who participated in a restorative justice conference as a responsible party wrote,

> I am very thankful that [institution] has such a process. It definitely helped me to understand the repercussions of my actions and gave me a safe space to work through all my thoughts and feelings. [Name] was wonderful in helping to come up with ideas on how to move forward from this and was very understanding. I definitely hope students who are in similar situations have the opportunity to participate in this program.

Similarly, another student who participated in a restorative justice conference as an impacted party wrote,

> I am very impressed with the process and [student's name] which, is also a tribute to the pre-work done by [trained facilitator]. Looking forward to watching [student's name] progress.

Although anecdotal, Joan and Duncan believe the statements reflect the student experience and satisfaction with the outcome of the restorative practice. The purpose of including these statements was not to reflect change in the students, but note the potential impact the restorative justice program can have on the human experience at the university as a result of participating in a restorative practice. Table 2.0 summarizes the results of the completed research for this study.

Table 2.0 Summary of Results

Research Question	**Themes**
Q1. What factors motivate the institution to choose to implement a restorative justice program?	1. Institutional need 2. Shared belief system
Q2. In what ways does a faith-based university tether the restorative justice program to its mission, vision, values, and identity?	1. University identity 2. Catholic Social Teachings
Q3. By what methods, means, and strategies does a university use to implement a restorative justice program?	1. Proactive use of restorative justice and restorative practices 2. Reactive use of restorative justice and restorative practices
Q4. What are best practices for implementing a restorative justice program?	1. Systematic training 2. Collaboration 3. Institutional support 4. Institutionalize the program 5. Storytelling 6. Reframing current work 7. Frequent use of restorative justice practices impacts program sustainability on campus 8. Impact of cultural experience
Q5. What are the effects of implementing a restorative justice program?	1. Empathy 2. Conflict management 3. Local and national recognition 4. Student voice

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

Overview of Problem and Chapter

Student misconduct continues as a pervasive challenge in higher education. World, national, and campus harms impact the students' experience and campus culture. Restorative justice offers a behavioral intervention alternative to address harms, an opportunity to rebuild trust among responsible and impacted people in order to restore the community, engage the entire community, and involve the responsible and impacted parties through inclusive decision making and shared responsibilities for outcomes. Restorative justice can also prevent harms from occurring in the first place with proactive work in the formation of campus culture and through a restorative justice mindset. This study focused on the implementation of a restorative justice program at a faith-based, Roman Catholic university in southern California.

This chapter offers a summary of the findings from the case study and how the themes connect the findings with the literature cited in chapter two. The chapter includes a summary of the findings, connection to the scholarly literature, the limitations of the study, and the implications of the research for policy and social justice. The researcher works at the site and serves as a member of the restorative justice leadership team. Positionality is explained as part of the limitations of the study. The researcher proposes suggestions for further research in relation to implementing a restorative justice program on a Roman Catholic university campus and institutions of higher education in general.

Summary of Findings

The outcomes from this study formed from the data collected in a case study at one Roman Catholic university in southern California. The data reflects multiple themes to address the components identified in implementing and sustaining a restorative justice program at a

Roman Catholic, faith-based university. The themes include: *institutional need*, *shared belief system*, *university identity*, *Catholic Social Teachings*, *proactive use of restorative justice and restorative practices*, *reactive use of restorative justice and restorative practices*, *systematic training*, *collaboration*, *institutional support*, *institutionalize the program*, *storytelling*, *reframing current work*, *frequent use of restorative justice practices impacts program sustainability on campus*, *impact of cultural experience*, *empathy, conflict management*, *local and national recognition*, and *student voice*. The themes emerge from the data in how the university implemented and sustained the restorative justice program on the campus.

As an active participant in the restorative justice work and an employee at the site, the researcher notes the following themes as unforeseen before this study: (a) shared belief system, (b) use of Catholic Social Teachings, (c) storytelling as a marketing strategy, and (d) the impact of cultural experiences. The themes were significant in which the number of times they were discussed and served as moments for personal learning. The themes reflect how the institutional mission is tethered in the restorative justice program and how important the program's outreach impacts successful sustainability on the campus.

Factors Motivating the University to Implement a Restorative Justice Program

This summary answers research question one in this study, "What factors motivate the institution to choose to implement a restorative justice program?" The immersion of restorative justice work used in the functional areas of student conduct and the study of restorative justice within the university's school of peace emerged at relatively the same time. The conduct officers noted the rise of restorative justice at professional conferences, webinars, and journals. Student affairs staff members discussed restorative justice spontaneously and organically. The program started soon thereafter. Restorative justice was also part of the coursework and curriculum in the

university's school of peace. The data collected during the restorative justice leadership team reflects the organic nature that started the program. The data emphasized a shared belief system rooted in the university's mission as one of the motivating factors for implementing a restorative justice program. It surprised the researcher that the participants emphasized a shared beliefs system and that the theme was so significant throughout the interviews. The amount of interview and focus group time related to institutional need in terms of harms and student misconduct was extensive.

The factors that contributed to the program include institutional need in order to enhance the student conduct process. The need called the student conduct process to be more student centered and address the needs of the campus community for healing after a harm occurs. The restorative justice leadership team members stated that the theory of restorative justice and practices therein create a structure to meet the needs of the community. The theory of restorative justice also reflects the shared belief system at the university, the program is tethered in the mission of the institution, and therefore gained support from the school of peace and the division of student affairs to establish the program.

In literature, Gonzalez, 2012 stated that K-12 school climates are positively impacted when the school or district implement restorative justice theory. The use of restorative justice and restorative practices emerges and expands to multiple parts of the schools. Similarly, the data in this study reflects the literature in regard to the theory restorative justice and goals of restorative justice (Eagle, 2001; Chiste, 2013; Goldstein, 2006; Haarala, 2004; Karp, 2013; Karp & Frank, 2016; Jackson, 1995; Johnstone & Van Ness, 2007; Mbamboo & Skelton, 2003; Mirsky, 2004; Pranis, Stuart, & Wedge, 2003; Roujanavong, 2005; Wong, 2005; Zehr, 2002). The data collected through this study relate to motive challenges campus leaders at other

institutions of higher education - faith-based, private nonsectarian, and public colleges and universities can explore restorative practices if factors emerge on the campus.

A Reflection of the Restorative Justice Program at a Roman Catholic University

This summary answers research question two in how a faith-based university tethers a restorative justice program to its mission, vision, values, and identity. The ability to connect restorative justice theory to the institution's mission makes it possible to anchor the program to the university's core values and educational standards based in Catholic Social Teachings. The restorative justice program reflects the university's identity as an educational institution. The participant responses about Catholic Social Teaching surprised the researcher in how the individuals could name it so clearly when responding to interview questions. The Catholic Social Teaching standards are straightforward. The standards served as a reference for the participants when making their points.

As stated by Morris, 2006, Morris & Vaandering, 2012, and Vaandering, 2014, restorative justice programs and practices do not become mainstream at the school if not tethered in the institution's mission. The success of the program at the site in this study demonstrates how the restorative justice program reflects the mission of the university. The study demonstrates how the university advances the restorative justice program because of mission and need on the campus. Therefore, all institutions of higher education can consider a restorative justice program if the college or university wants to enjoy restorative outcomes in the student conduct process. Any institution with an educational purpose and mission can consider creating a restorative justice program to address campus climate and how individuals treat one another as part of the community.

The goals of restorative justice align with the Catholic Social Teachings and inform the institution's work within this study. The restorative justice program reflects the call to a just community, human solidarity, respect for human dignity, respect for work of others, address harms for those disenfranchised, and responsibility to care for creation as outlined in the Catholic Social Teachings (USCCB, 1998). The date shows that the restorative justice program reflects Catholic Social Teachings by valuing each community member, integrating the community members into the process in addressing harms, and providing opportunity for all members of the community to be part of the solution in addressing harms and community norm formation. The data collected from the participants and the documents provided by the university reflect the literature in how restorative justice could be tethered in Roman Catholic teachings (ACCU, 2016; Estanek, Galligan-Stierle, Gilroy, & Kirkpatrick, 2017; Mikulich, 2012; USCCB, 1998).

Strategies Used in Implementing a Restorative Justice Program

This summary answers research question three in regard to what methods, means, and strategies does a university use to implement a restorative justice program. The strategies that emerged from the data include multiple perspectives of the restorative justice continuum. The themes include using restorative justice practices to proactively form the community and community norms and the use of reactive restorative justice practices when harms occur on the campus, but also when challenges occur in the nation or world. This important theme is not commonly published in empirical studies and therefore informs a college or university's ability to implement a restorative justice program.

Best Practices Implementing a Restorative Justice Program

This summary answers research question four in describing the best practices for implementing a restorative justice program. The recommended best practices for implementing

a restorative justice program emerged from the individual interviews with the restorative justice leadership team, the focus groups with trained restorative justice facilitators, and the documents provided by the university. The themes that emerged include: systematic training, collaboration, institutional support, and process of institutionalizing the restorative justice program through storytelling and reframing existing work - not creating new work in restorative justice. The researcher was surprised by the recommendation to purposefully market and share the good news about the restorative justice program as a mechanism to further implement and institutionalize the program. However, it was not a consideration before the study.

Other best practices for implementing a restorative justice program include frequent use of restorative practices in order to enlighten the campus and impact culture. The campus needs to reframe the use of restorative justice practices in order to appeal to communities with other cultural ideas and ways to make meaning. This important theme served somewhat as a surprise to the researcher and informs a college or university's ability to implement a restorative justice program.

The Impact of a Restorative Justice Program on the University Campus

This summary answers research question five in projecting the effects of implementing a restorative justice program on a college campus. The data collected during the individual interviews and focus group interviews demonstrates the impact of the restorative justice program at the university and informs many themes. The themes include empathy development with the community members who participate in restorative practices, the alternative behaviors outcomes that restorative justice can provide informs conflict management, and past participants inform the success of the program on-campus. The program also enjoys local and national recognition.

The impact of the restorative justice program reflects literature related to empathy development and conflict management. Borton & Paul, 2013 stated that restorative justice advances empathy between all participants. The interpersonal relationship can heal and trust can be restored through restorative processes. The work reflects upon a strong community. The positive impact of a restorative justice program on a college or university campus can assist any institution in managing conflict within its community. The restorative justice program can inform campus climate and therefore encourage institutions to continue restorative justice practices in the programs, activities, services, and experiences for students. Conflicts can be prevented if the community is aware of the principles of restorative justice.

Significance of Study

This study addresses the process of implementing a restorative justice program on a university campus and the best practices in how to sustain a program. As stated in chapter one, the interest in restorative justice in higher education continues to expand and it will be purposeful to explore how such programs are implemented and sustained in a higher education setting.

The outcomes of this study provides campuses four significant factors to consider when determining to implement a restorative justice program. The key factors to consider from this study include: (a) addresses a campus need, (b) reflects the collaborative interests of administrators and students, (c) reflects the current values, mission, and vision of the institution, and (d) reframes current work at the university with different effort.

This study informs a pressing need in addressing how a restorative justice program is implemented and sustained. It is important to note the pre-existing, empirical data evaluates program outcomes with small sample sets without an explicit ability to generalize to other sites

(Fronius, Persson, Guckenburg, Hurley, & Petrosino, 2016; McMurtrie, 2015). The outcomes in this case study may not be transferrable to other sites, but the study offers data that can inform and serve as a reference to other Roman Catholic and faith-based institutions when implementing a restorative justice program.

Implications

The implications from this study inform theory and practice for restorative justice. Restorative justice programs and practices are important because they inform campus culture, address behavior for community members at the university, inform the student conduct process in order to address student misconduct in a developmental manner, provide guidance in ways to seek understanding through difference and social justice topics. Restorative justice and its practices can positively impact the student conduct process as an intervention or prevention strategy related to misconduct and citizenship formation. The value in implementing a restorative justice program engages the community in an inclusive conduct process and addresses the "why something happened" in addition to "what happened" (Pranis, Stuart, & Wedge, 2003; Zehr, 2002). The information provided by the university through the artifacts compliments the literature shared in chapter two in relation to the formation of campus culture and student behavior through conflict management, empathy, and the manner in which individuals treat one another in order to form a healthy community (Christie, Jolivette, & Nelson, 2005; Guckenburg, Hurley, Persson, Fronius, & Petrosino, 2015; Johnson & Van Ness, 2007; Macready, 2009; Pavelka, 2013; Schiff, 2013; Olson, 2011; Umbreit & Armour, 2011; Umbreit, Lewis, & Burns, 2003; Umbreit, Vos, Coates, & Brown, 2006). Restorative justice practices support the formation of a healthy college or university community. The students have the potential to

address urgent challenges in our larger society upon commencement and become leaders in their chosen professions and in our global society.

The literature states that restorative justice and its outcomes are meant to advance peace, strengthen community, and address societal harms that negatively impact the disenfranchised. Restorative justice attempts to engage community through inclusive decision making after harm occurs and develop shared responsibility in addressing a harm. Restorative justice theory states that such practices as conferences and circles provide a framework for underrepresented groups to be heard, create community, and address institutionalized harms (Karp, 2013; Zehr, 2003). However, the data collected during the focus group interviews from the trained restorative justice facilitators demonstrates significant challenges in the aforementioned goals listed for the restorative justice program. The literature states that the challenges associated with conflict on a college campus more negatively impact underrepresented students than the dominant student populations (Arrigo, 2010; Dusselier, Dunn, Wang, Shelley II, Whalen, 2005; Literte, 2011; Ponsford, 2016; Porter & Williams, 201; Rabrenovic, Levin, & Oliver, 2007). The restorative justice program's language may be misaligned with differing cultural perspectives according to the focus group participants. Therefore, the data reveals an opportunity to further engage marginalized students with the restorative justice program.

In regard to practices, the restorative justice program and its continuum of strategies positively impact the campus in building community. The restorative circles and restorative conferences include multiple members of the community to address harms in order to try to make it better and strengthen the campus culture. The data collected from participants shows that the impact of a restorative justice program on a college campus positively influences the campus culture and educates others about restorative outcomes. The responses from the

participants further support the literature presented in chapter two (Karp, 2013; Latimer, Dowden, Muise, 2005; O'Brien, 2017; Zehr, 2002). The impact at the university in this study also addresses how regularly using restorative practices builds momentum when implementing the program and informs the campus community about restorative justice. As Lowery & Dannells, 2004 stated, the full integration of restorative justice on a university campus impacts how individuals treat one another and it is a manner *to be* in the world.

Currently there are some like institutions to the university in this case study that also use restorative justice in the conduct process. A standard does not exist for restorative justice program implementation. More specifically, the Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) in Higher Education does not list standards for restorative justice programs or centers. There is a need for a list of best practices in order to implement policies related to restorative justice program development. A standard can advance an enhanced community participation to correct harms and to develop a restorative justice climate on a university campus. CAS may want to consider what may be the standards for a restorative justice program, which will in turn impact the strategies used on campuses choosing to implement a formal program.

This study highlights a series of philosophical and practical application of restorative justice practices on a college campus. Table 3.0 below serves as a heuristic chart to inform senior level higher education administrators considering a restorative justice program for their campus. The tool defines what is needed beforehand based on the site, the desired outcomes, and best practices and uses.

Table 3.0 Program Implementation Tool

Site Characteristics	Desired Outcomes/Goals	Approaches and Practices

• Mutual understanding of mission
• Institutional need
• Sense of campus identity
	• Campus culture
	• Empathy development
	• Conflict management
		• Systematic training
		• Campus collaboration
		• Institutional support
		• Marketing; storytelling
		  ○ Consider cultural experiences and perspectives
		• Reframing current work
		• Frequent use of restorative justice practices
		  ○ Proactive and reactive uses

Limitations of the Study

A group of limitations impacted this study. The study pertained to one site and at a Roman Catholic university in southern California. The study produced little comparative information because there was little data in regard to the implementation of restorative justice programs within Roman Catholic higher education. This study was not intended to assess or evaluate the program.

Positionality. The researcher works for the site selected for the study and also serves as a leadership team member with the restorative justice program. The researcher considered the theories of reflexivity and *epoche* in order to minimize bias and positionality as defined by Hatch and Moustakas. The theory of reflexivity attempted to maintain the integrity of the study by controlling for influence, biases, and emotion (Hatch, 2002). The technique of *epoche* was defined as acknowledging personal biases and control bias in order to gain clarity and neutralize presumptions (Moustakas, 1994). The researcher used three coding methods in three cycles to prevent positionality and it was imperative for the researcher to name his positive experience with restorative justice programs and experiences therein in order to prevent bias. This study did not evaluate the restorative justice program at the site, but rather shared the experience of those

leading, implementing, and sustaining the restorative justice program at one Roman Catholic university in southern California.

Recommendations for Further Research

The limited availability of research in how a university implements a restorative justice program demonstrated that there was a need for more research and assessment. The estimated number of established restorative justice programs at higher education institutions hovers around 70 among nearly 2000 institutions (McMurtrie, 2015). The current research largely evaluates the outcomes of programs, with small sample sets, and without data to inform best practices for implementation (Braithwaite, 2002; Fronius, Persson, Guckenburg, Hurley, & Petrosino, 2016). To that end, the process in changing campus culture to one considered "restorative" has been a challenge for sites implementing a restorative justice program (Karp & Breslin, 2001; Morris, 2006; Morris & Vaandering, 2012; Vaandering, 2014).

There is an opportunity for campus leaders to consider critical questions pertaining to student learning, conflict management, and campus culture. In addressing campus challenges, leaders can assess institutional needs in such areas through a restorative justice lens. The potential research relates to developing a high caliber restorative justice plan, leadership development, campus accountability, and overcoming potential resistance to the program.

In addition, there may be economic opportunities for the institution after sponsoring a restorative justice program. One research opportunity includes if graduates maintain any competitive advantage in the workplace and/or when enrolled in competitive graduate school programs. More specifically, will interpersonal skills (i.e.: communication, treating others with dignity, seeking to understand through difference, conflict management, etc.) learned through restorative justice practices advance career success for alumni.

Another opportunity for further research is the use of restorative justice and sexual and relationship violence work (also found in Title IX legislation). The Department of Education prohibits the use of mediation in sexual and relationship violence work, but restorative justice is not considered mediation. The two are different. The proactive use of restorative justice with encouraging bystander intervention, educating the campus how to avoid problematic behavior, how to manage differences, and be aware of responsibilities before a problem occurs in the first place. Preventing crimes from the onset may positively inform campus climate, encourage academic persistence, and may reduce costs for the institution.

This case study informs how restorative justice practitioners can implement a restorative justice program and sustain practices through campus life. Also, it is important to note that restorative justice programs and restorative practices are endorsed by governing groups for Roman Catholic institutions of higher education, tethered in mission, and therefore the findings and outcomes of the study are timely (ACCU, 2016; Estanek, Galligan-Stierle, Gilroy, & Kirkpatrick, 2017; Mikulich, 2012; USCCB, 1998). Therefore, Roman Catholic institutions of higher education should assess the process of implementing a restorative justice program on their campus, evaluate the program in regard to sustainability, and the data thereafter should be utilized in the creation of standards for implementing and sustaining restorative justice programs. In addition, Roman Catholic institutions of higher education could serve as research sites for researchers exploring restorative justice paradigms in a university setting.

Conclusion of the Study

This study occurred at one Roman Catholic university in southern California through a case study methodology. The restorative justice framework and its practices were a belief system and implemented as a standard for how individuals treat one another within a community.

The framework served as a lens to research how a Roman Catholic university in southern California implemented and sustained a restorative justice program on their campus. The themes that emerged from the data include: factors motivating the university to implement a restorative justice program, a reflection of the restorative justice program at a Roman Catholic university, strategies used in implementing a restorative justice program, reframing existing work, best practices implementing a restorative justice program, and the impact of a restorative justice program on the university campus.

College campuses are a microcosm of our larger society. Conflicts and challenges occur that could lead to student misconduct. Restorative justice offers a purposeful mindset to develop community in a just manner, provide tools to address conflict in a healthy way, and most importantly reflects the Roman Catholic values of the university in a way that brings the mission to life in a substantive way when managing conflict. Restorative justice engages the community in the student conduct process in order to reestablish trust, make amends when harm occurs, integrate ideas from many in forming restitution, and strengthens the community in the process. Restorative justice makes participants whole in small groups and with impact that could inform a lifetime of decision making and how individuals treat one another. The research provided evidence to support restorative justice program implementation and sustainability at a Roman Catholic university.

APPENDIX A

Individual Interview Protocol for Restorative Justice in Higher Education

Individual Interview Protocol: Restorative Justice

Time of Individual Interview:

Date:

Place:

Interviewer:

Introduction to the interview: The purpose of this study is to understand the experience of implementing and sustaining restorative justice practices on a Roman Catholic campus. I am interviewing you and other individuals within your program in order to understand better the experience of implementing and sustaining restorative justice practices in higher education. The location of the study and all participants will be made anonymous in the writing of the report and all data collected, including this interview, will be maintained in a locked file and in password protected computer files. This interview will take approximately 60 – 90 minutes. You will have an opportunity to review all the information gathered through this review to assess if the information has been noted correctly.

[Have the interviewee read and sign the consent form]

[Turn on and test recording device]

Proceed with questions:

1. How do you think the campus defines restorative justice?
2. What are the restorative justice practices you use most regularly? Please explain.
3. Why did the campus choose to implement a restorative justice practices?
4. What is your personal experience with the restorative justice program on the campus?
5. How do you think the campus uses restorative justice practices?
6. Please describe the timeline and process of implementation on the campus as you understand it?
7. How do you think the program evolved over time?

8. Do you think the current program reflect the initial design? How and how not?
9. How do you coordinate training on your campus?
10. How effective do you think restorative justice practices are in raising empathy with those involved in the program?
11. How effective do you think restorative justice practices in addressing conflict?
12. In your opinion, what could the campus do better to advance the restorative justice program on-campus?
13. What do you believe are the barriers and supports in implementing a restorative justice program?
14. How do the restorative justice practices align with the mission of your institution?
15. What suggestions or best practices would you share with a colleague beginning a restorative justice program?
16. What impact, if any do you believe restorative justice practices have or will have in higher education?

Thank you for your participation in this interview.

APPENDIX B

Focus Group Interview Protocol for Restorative Justice in Higher Education

Interview Protocol: Restorative Justice

Time of Focus Group Interview:

Date:

Place:

Interviewer:

Introduction to the interview: The purpose of this study is to understand the experience of implementing and sustaining restorative justice practices on a Roman Catholic campus. I am interviewing you and other individuals within your program in order to understand better the experience of implementing and sustaining restorative justice practices in higher education. The location of the study and all participants will be made anonymous in the writing of the report and all data collected, including this interview, will be maintained in a locked file and in password protected computer files. This interview will take approximately 60 – 90 minutes. You will have an opportunity to review all the information gathered through this review to assess if the information has been noted correctly.

[Have the interviewee read and sign the consent form]

[Turn on and test recording device]

Proceed with questions:

1. Why did you become involved in the restorative justice program?
2. How do you use restorative justice practices?
3. What were some strengths and challenges of the restorative justice program on campus?
4. In your opinion, what is your perception of the restorative justice program on the campus [by students, faculty/administrators, parents/other constituents and stakeholders]?
5. What are your experiences with restorative justice training?

6. What suggestions or best practices would you share with a colleague beginning a restorative justice program on another campus?
7. What do you believe are the barriers and supports in implementing a restorative justice program?
8. How do you see the restorative justice practices aligning with the mission of the university?
9. What impact do you believe restorative justice practices have or will have in higher education?

Thank you for your participation in this interview.

REFERENCES

Abelman, R., & Dalessandro, A. (2009). Institutional vision in Christian higher education: A comparison of ACCU, ELCA, and CCCU institutions. *Journal of Research on Christian Education*, *18*(1), 84-119.

Abramson, A. (2003). Sustaining relationships and competing values: Restorative justice initiatives and the police – a case study. *Police Practice and Research, 4* (4), 391–398 DOI: 10.1080/15614260310001631280

Ahlin, E., Gibbs, J., Kavanaugh, P., Lee, J. (2015). Support for restorative justice in a sample of U.S. university students. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 1* (17).
DOI: 10.1177/0306624X15596386

Ahmed, E., & Braithwaite, V. (2012). Learning to manage shame in school bullying: Lessons for restorative justice interventions. *Critical criminology*, *20*(1), 79-97.

Alexander, F. K. (2000). The changing face of accountability: Monitoring and assessing institutional performance in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *71*(4), 411-431.

Alarid, L., & Montemayor, C. (2012). Implementing restorative justice in police departments. *Police Practice and Research, 13* (5), 450-463.
DOI: 10.1080/15614263.2011.607654

American Psychological Association. (2010). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Armour, M. (2013). Real-world assignments for restorative justice education. *Contemporary Justice Review*, *16*(1), 115-136.

Arrigo, B. A. (2010). Identity, international terrorism and negotiating peace: Hamas and ethics-based considerations from critical restorative justice. *British Journal of Criminology, 50*, 772 – 790.

Armour, M. (2013). Real-world assignments for restorative justice education. *Contemporary Justice Review, 16* (1), 115-136.
DOI: 10.1080/10282580.2013.769300

Arthur, J., Waring, M., Coe, R., & Hedges, L. (2012). Research methods and methodologies in education. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities (2016). Catholic Higher Education. Retrieved on November 29, 2016 from http://www.accunet.org/i4a/pages/index.cfm?pageid=3789

Association of College and University Housing Officers – International (2014). About us. Retrieved on June 30, 2016 from: http://www.acuho-i.org/about

Association of Student Conduct Administration (2015). About ASCA. Retrieved on November 30, 2015 from: http://www.theasca.org/

Banyard, V. L. (2014). Improving college campus–based prevention of violence against women: A strategic plan for research built on multipronged practices and policies. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, *15*(4), 339-351.

Bergseth, K. J., & Bouffard, J. A. (2007). The long-term impact of restorative justice programming for juvenile offenders. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *35*(4), 433-451.

Braithwaite, J. (2002). *Restorative justice & responsive regulation*. Oxford University Press on Demand.

Braithwaite, J. (2002). Setting standards for restorative justice. *British Journal of Criminology*, *42*(3), 563-577.

Bradshaw, W., & Roseborough, D. (2005). Restorative justice dialogue: The impact of mediation and conferencing on juvenile recidivism. *Federal Probation, 69*, 15−21.

Brenner, A. (2013). Transforming campus culture to prevent rape: the possibility and promise of restorative justice as a response to campus sexual violence. *Harvard Journal of Law & Gender*, *10*.

Bresnahan, M., Guan, X., Shearman, S., & Donohue, W. (2009). Roommate conflict: Does race matter? *The Howard Journal of Communications*, *20*(4), 394-412.

Brock, C. H., Oikonomidoy, E. M., Wulfing, K., Pennington, J. L., & Obenchain, K. M. (2014). "Mean girls" go to college: Exploring female–female relational bullying in an undergraduate literacy methods course. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, *20*(4), 516.

Bohmert, M, Duwe, G., & Hipple, N. (2016). Evaluating restorative justice circles of support and accountability: can social support overcome structural barriers? *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 1*(20), 2 – 20. DOI: 0306624X16652627

Borton, I., & Paul, G. (2013). Exploring communities of facilitators: Orientations toward restorative justice. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly, 31* (2), 189-218. DOI: 10.1002/crq.21073

Bowler, M. (2015, Jul. 28). Students ask San Diego Unified for more structure in discipline program [video file]. Retrieved from: http://www.kpbs.org/news/2015/jul/28/students-ask-san-diego-unified-more-structure-disc/

Calhoun, A., & Pelech, W. (2010). Responding to young people responsible for harm: a comparative study of restorative and conventional approaches. *Contemporary Justice Review, 13* (3), 287–306. doi:10.1080/10282580.2010.498238

Chapell, M., Casey, D., De la Cruz, C, & Ferrell, J. (2004). "Bullying in college by students and teachers." *Adolescence, 39*(153): 53.

Chapell, M. S., Hasselman, S. L., Kitchin, T., Lomon, S. N., MacIver, K. W., & Sarullo, P. L. (2006). Bullying in elementary school, high school, and college. Adolescence, 41, 633 – 648.

Chatterjee, J., & Elliott, L. (2003). Restorative justice policing in Canada: The Royal Canadian Mounted Police, community justice forums, and the youth criminal justice act. *Police Practice and Research, 4* (4), 347–359.

Chiste, K. (2013). The origins of modern restorative justice: Five examples from the English-speaking world. *University of British Columbia Law Review, 46*, 33–80.

Chen, J. (2009, Feb. 27). Father forgives son's killer [video file]. Retrieved from: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zuulHN213ys

Choi, J. J., Bazemore, G., & Gilbert, M. J. (2012). Review of research on victims' experiences in restorative justice: Implications for youth justice. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *34*(1), 35-42.

Choi, J., Green, D., & Gilbert, M (2001). Putting a human face on crimes: A qualitative study on restorative justice processes for youths. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal, 28*, 335–355. DOI 10.1007/s10560-011-0238-9

Christle, C. A., Jolivette, K., & Nelson, C. M. (2005). Breaking the School to Prison Pipeline: Identifying School Risk and Protective Factors for Youth Delinquency. *Exceptionality*, *13*(2), 69-88. doi:10.1207/s15327035ex1302_2

Clark, K (2014). A call for restorative justice in higher education judicial affairs. *College Student Journal, 48*: 4

Connelly, F., & Clandinin, D. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher*, *19*(5), 2-14.

Cornelison, D., Crocker, V., Evett, E., & McDowell, L. (2014). Perceptions of restorative justice concepts: an evaluation of university housing residents. *Contemporary Justice Review, 17* (3), 346-361. DOI: 10.1080/10282580.2014.944799

Creswell, J. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, ad Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. (2013). *Qualitative Inquiry & Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*. Sage Publications. Thousand Oaks, CA.

Dannells, M. (1997). *From discipline to development: Rethinking student conduct in higher education. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, Vol. 25, No. 2*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports, The George Washington University, One Dupont Circle, Suite 630, Washington, DC 20036-1183.

Derajtys, K. J., & McDowell, L. A. (2014). Restorative Student Judicial Circles: A Way to Strengthen Traditional Student Judicial Board Practices. *Journal of Theoretical & Philosophical Criminology*, *6*(3), 213.

DeWitt, D. M., & DeWitt, L. J. (2012). A case of high school hazing: Applying restorative justice to promote organizational learning. *NASSP Bulletin*, *96*(3), 228-242.

DiPaola, B. M., Roloff, M. E., & Peters, K. M. (2010). College students' expectations of conflict intensity: A self-fulfilling prophecy. *Communication Quarterly*, *58*(1), 59-76.

Dominus, S. (2016, September). *An effective but exhausting alternative to high school suspensions*. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/11/magazine/an-effective-ut-exhausting-alternative-to-high-school-suspensions.html?_r=0

Dusselier, L., Dunn, B., Wang, Y., Shelley II, M., & Whalen, D. (2005). Personal, health, academic, and environmental predictors of stress for residence hall students. *Journal of American college health*, *54*(1), 15-24.

Dzur, A. W. (2011), 'Restorative Justice and Democracy: Fostering Public Accountability for Criminal Justice, *Contemporary Justice Review*, 14: 367–81.

Eagle, H. (2001, November). Restorative justice in native cultures. *State of Justice* 3. A periodic publication of Friends Committee on Restorative Justice.

Elleven, R. K., Allen, J. M., & Sarkees-Wircenski, M. (2001). Resident assistant training: A southwestern perspective. *College Student Journal*, *35*(4), 609-615.

Elis, L. (2005). Restorative justice programs, gender, and recidivism. *Public Organization Review: A Global Journal, 5*, 375–389.

Estanek, S., Galligen-Stierle, M., Gilroy, M, Kirkpatrick, L. (2017). *Student life in Catholic higher education: Advancing good practice*. Washington, DC: Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities.

Evans, C. R., Smokowski, P. R., Barbee, J., Bower, M., & Barefoot, S. (2016). Restorative justice programming in teen court: A path to improved interpersonal relationships and psychological functioning for high-risk rural youth. *Journal of Rural Mental Health*,

40(1), 15-30. doi:10.1037/rmh0000042

Fronius, T., Persson, H., Guckenburg, S., Hurley, N., & Petrosino, A. (2016). Restorative justice in U.S. schools: A research review. *WestEd Justice & Prevention Research Center*, San Francisco, CA.

Gallagher-Dahl, M., Meagher, P., & Vander Velde, S. (2014). Motivation and outcomes for university students in a restorative justice program. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, 51* (4), 364–379. DOI: 10.1515/jsarp-2014-0038

Gaarder, E., & Hesselton, D. (2012). Connecting restorative justice with gender-responsive programming. *Contemporary Justice Review*, *15*(3), 239-264.

Gavrielides, T. (2014). Bringing race Relations into the restorative justice debate: An alternative and personalized vision of "the Other." *Journal of Black Studies*, *45*(3), 216-246. DOI: 10.1177/0021934714526042

Gavrielides, T. (2014). Reconciling the notions of restorative justice and imprisonment. *The Prison Journal*, *94*(4), 479-505.

Gehring, D. (2001). The objectives of student discipline and the process that's due: Are they compatible? *NASPA Journal, 38*, 466-481. Retrieved from http://www.naspa.org/pubs/journals/naspajournal.cfm

Gerkin, P. (2012). Who owns this conflict? The challenge of community involvement in restorative justice. *Contemporary Justice Review, 15* (3), 291. DOI: 10.1080.10282580.2012.707423

Goldstein, A. (2006, October). *Restorative practices in Israel: The state of the the field*. Paper presented at the Eighth International Conference on Conferencing, Circles and other Restorative Practices, Bethlehem, PA, USA. Retrieved from http://thaichristianfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/Defining-Restorative.pdf

Gonzalez, T. (2012). Keeping kids in schools: Restorative justice, punitive discipline, and the school to prison pipeline. *JL & Educ.*, *41*, 281.

Grbich, C. (2012). *Qualitative data analysis: An introduction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Grund, A., Brassler, N., & Fries, S. (2014). Torn between study and leisure: How motivational conflicts relate to students' academic and social adaptation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 106* (1), 242-257. DOI: 10.1037/a0034400

Gonzalez, T. (2012). Keeping kids in schools: Restorative justice, punitive discipline and the school to prison pipeline. *Journal of Law and Education, 41* (2), 281-235.

Guckenburg, S., Hurley, N., Persson, H., Fronius, T., & Petrosino, A. (2015, Oct.). Restorative

justice in U.S. schools: Summary findings from interviews with experts. Retrieved from: http://www.wested.org/wpcontent/files_mf/1447101213resourcerestorativejusticeinusschoolssummaryfindingsfrominterviewswithexperts.pdf

Haarala, L. (2004). A community within. In *Restorative justice week: Engaging us all in the dialogue*. Ottawa, ON, Canada: Correctional Service of Canada.

Hannem, S. (2013). Experiences in reconciling risk management and restorative justice: How circles of support and accountability work restoratively in the risk society. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *57*(3), 269-288.

Harper, S., Davis, R., Jones, D., McGowan, B., Ingram, T., & Platt, C. (2011). Race and racism in the experiences of Black male resident assistants at predominantly White universities. *Journal of College Student Development*, *52*(2), 180-200.

Hassinger, R., & Shapiro, J. (2007). Using case students of ethical dilemmas for the development of moral literacy: Towards educating for social justice. *Journal of Educational Administration, 45* (4), 451 – 470. DOI: 10.1108/09578230762454

Hatch, J. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in education settings.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Hayes, H. (2005). Assessing reoffending in restorative justice conferences. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology, 38*, 77−101.

Hayes, H., & Daly, K. (2003). Youth justice conferencing and reoffending. *Justice Quarterly, 20*, 725−760.

Holt, M. K., Greif Green, J., Reid, G., DiMeo, A., Espelage, D. L., Felix, E. D., Furlong, M., Poteat, V., & Sharkey, J. D. (2014). Associations between past bullying experiences and psychosocial and academic functioning among college students. *Journal of American College Health*, *62*(8), 552-560.

Hingson, W., Edwards, M., Heeren, T., & Rosenbloom, D. (2009), Age of drinking onset and injuries, motor vehicle crashes, and physical fights after drinking and when not drinking. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research*, 33, 783–790. doi:10.1111/j.1530-0277.2009.00896.x

Howell, M. T. (2005). Students' perceived learning and anticipated future behaviors as a result of participation in the student judicial process. *Journal of College Student Development*, *46*(4), 374-392.

Huitt, W. (2007). *Success in the Conceptual Age: Another paradigm shift.* Paper delivered at the 32nd Annual Meeting of the Georgia Educational Research Association, Savannah, GA, October 26. Retrieved from

http://chiron.valdosta.edu/whuitt/papers/conceptual_age_s.doc

Huston, C. M. (2015). Restorative justice: A comparative analysis of campus implementation. Retrieved from DigitalCommoms@UMaine.

Hutton, T. (2011, Feb 10). Star student-athlete remembered in video [video file]. Retrieved from: http://communique.uccs.edu/?p=2945

Jackson, L. (1995). The rights of man and rites of youth: Fraternity and riot at eighteenth century Harvard. *History of Higher Education Annual*, *15*, 5-49.

Janosik, S., & Gehring, D. (2003). The impact of the Clery campus crime disclosure act on student behavior. *Journal of College Student Development, 44*(1), 81-91. DOI: 10.1353/csd.2003.0005

Jesuit Association of Student Affairs Professionals (2016). About JASPA. Retrieved on October 29, 2016 from http://jaspa.orgsync.com/About

Johnstone, G., & Van Ness, D. (2007). *The meaning of restorative justice*. In G. Johnstone & D. W. Van Ness (Eds.), Handbook of restorative justice (pp. 5−23). Portland, OR: Willan Publishing.

Jonason, C., & Rinker, J. (2014). Restorative justice as reflective practice and applied pedagogy on college campuses. *Journal of Peace Education, 11* (2), 162-180. DOI: 10.1080/17400201.2014.898628

Kadison, R., & DiGeronimo, T. F. (2004). *College of the overwhelmed: The campus mental health crisis and what to do about it*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kara, F., & MacAlister, D. (2010). Responding to academic dishonesty in universities: A restorative justice approach. Contemporary Justice Review, 13(4), 443-453. DOI: 10.1080/10282580.2010.517981

Karp, D. (2013). *The little book of restorative justice for colleges and universities: Repairing harm and rebuilding trust in response to student misconduct*. Intercourse, PA: Good Books.

Karp, D., & Allena, T. (2004). *Restorative justice on the college campus: Promoting student growth and responsibility, and reawakening the spirit of campus community*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.

Karp, D., & Breslin, B. (2001). Restorative justice in school communities. *Youth & Society, 33* (2), 249-72.

Karp, D. R., & Clear, T. R. (2000). Community justice: A conceptual framework. *Boundaries changes in criminal justice organizations*, *2*, 323-368.

Karp, D., & Conrad, S. (2006). Restorative justice and college student misconduct. *Public Organization Review: A Global Journal, 5*, 315–333.

Karp, D., & Frank, O. (2016). *Offenders no more: An interdisciplinary restorative justice dialogue*. New York: Nova Science Publishers.

Karp, D., & Sacks, C. (2014). Student conduct, restorative justice, and student development: Findings from the STARR project: A student accountability and restorative research project. *Contemporary Justice Review, 17* (2), 1-19. DOI: 10.1080/10282580.2014.915140

Kim, H. J., & Gerber, J. (2012). The effectiveness of reintegrative shaming and restorative justice conferences: Focusing on juvenile offenders' perceptions in Australian reintegrative shaming experiments. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *56*(7), 1063-1079.

King, J., Borsari, B., & Chen, J. (2010). Resident assistant and college students' perceptions of alcohol use. *Addictive behaviors*, *35*(6), 640-643.

Killen, M., & Smetana, J. (2010). Future directions: Social development in the context of social justice. *Social Development, 19* (3), 642–657. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9507.2009.00548.x

Klibert, J., Lamis, D. A., Collins, W., Smalley, K. B., Warren, J. C., Yancey, C. T., & Winterowd, C. (2014). Resilience mediates the relations between perfectionism and college student distress. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *92*(1), 75-82.

Knott, K. (2016). How one university when all-in on restorative justice. The Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved from https://www.chronicle.com/article/How-One-University-Went-All-In/238093.

Koss, M. (2014). The RESTORE program of restorative justice for sex crimes: Vision, process, and outcomes. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 29* (9), 1623 – 1660. DOI: 10.1177/0886260513511537

Koss, M., Wilgus, J., & Williamsen, K. (2014). Campus sexual misconduct: Restorative justice approaches to enhance compliance with Title IX guidance. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse Review Journal, 15* (3), 242-257. DOI: 10.1177/1524838014520635

Kuh, G. D., & Schuh, J. H. (1983). Perceptions of the RA Role: Does a Year Make a Difference?. *Journal of College and University Student Housing*, *13*(2), 3-7.

Kuo, S., Longmire, D., & Cuvelier, S. (2010). An empirical assessment of restorative justice. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 38*, 318–328. DOI: 10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2010.03.006

LaBelle, J., & Kendall, D. (2016). Characteristics of Jesuit colleges and universities in the United States: A reciprocal interdependence analysis. *Journal of Catholic Education*,

19(3), 264.

Latimer, J., Dowden, C., & Muise, D. (2005). The effectiveness of restorative justice practices: A meta-analysis. *The prison journal*, *85*(2), 127-144.

Lehmann, P., Jordan, C., Bolton, K. W., Huynh, L., & Chigbu, K. (2012). Solution-focused brief therapy and criminal offending: A family conference tool for work in restorative justice. *Journal of Systemic Therapies*, *31*(4), 49-62.

Lewis, M. W., & Ericksen, K. S. (2016). Improving the climate for LGBTQ students at an historically Black university. *Journal of LGBT youth*, *13*(3), 249-269.

Lipka, S. (2009). With restorative justice, colleges strive to educate student offenders. *The Education Digest*, *75*(2), 36.

Literte, P. E. (2011). Competition, conflict, and coalitions: Black-Latino/a relations within institutions of higher education. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 477-490.

Losen, D., & Skiba, R. (2010). *Suspended education: Urban middle schools in crisis*. Montgomery, AL: Southern Poverty Law Center.

Lowery, J., & Dannells, M. (2004). Contemporary practices in student judicial affairs: Strengths and weaknesses. *Restorative justice on the college campus: Promoting student growth and responsibility and reawakening the spirit of campus community*, 16-26.

Macready, T. (2009). Learning social responsibility in schools: A restorative practice. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, *25*(3), 211-220.

Mayhew, M. J., Caldwell, R. J., & Goldman, E. G. (2011). Defining campus violence: A phenomenological analysis of community stakeholder perspectives. *Journal of College Student Development*, *52*(3), 253-269.

Mbambo, B., & Skelton, A. (2003). Prepar- ing the South African community for implementing a new restorative child justice system. In L. Walgrave, (Ed.), *Repositioning Restorative Justice* (pp. 271-283). Devon, UK: Willan Publishing.

McCluskey, G., Lloyd, G., Stead, J., Kane, J., Riddell, S., & Weedon, E. (2008). 'I was dead restorative today': From restorative justice to restorative approaches in school. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *38*(2), 199-216. doi:10.1080/03057640802063262

McCold, P. (2000). Toward a mid-range theory of restorative criminal justice: A reply to the Maximalist model. *Contemporary Justice Review*, *3*(4), 357-414.

McCold, P., & Wachtel, T. (2002). Restorative justice theory validation. *Restorative justice: Theoretical foundations*, 110-142.

McMurtrie, B. (2015, June). *With restorative justice, students learn how to make amends*. Retrieved from http://www.chronicle.com/article/With-Restorative-Justice/230575?cid=rclink

McNamara, C. (1999). *Basics of conducting focus groups.* Retrieved January 21, 2017, from http://www.managementhelp.org/evaluatn/focusgrp.html.

McGarrell, E. (2001, Aug.). Restorative justice conferences as an early response to young offenders (NCJ 187769, pp. 1—11). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs.

McLeod, C. (2003). Toward a restorative organization: Transforming police bureaucracies. *Police Practice and Research*, 4 (4), 361–377. DOI: 10.1080/15614260310001631262

Merriam, S. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mikulich, A. (2012). Catholic social thought (CST) and restorative justice. *JustSouth Quarterly Social Justice Research Institute, (3)*, 3.

Mirsky, L. (2004, April & May). Restorative justice practices of Native American, First Nation and other indigenous people of North America: Parts One & Two. *Restorative Practices eForum*. Retrieved from http://www.iirp.edu/article_detail. php?article_id=NDA1

Morrison, B. (2006). Restorative justice and school violence: Building theory and practice. *International Institute for Restorative Practices, a Graduate School*, Bethlehem, PA. Retrieved from http://www.iirp.edu/article_detail.php?article_id=NDQx

Morrison, B., & Vaandering, D. (2012). Restorative justice: Pedagogy, praxis, and discipline. *Journal of School Violence, 11*(2), 138–155.

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research studies.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Myers, C. A., & Cowie, H. (2013). University students' views on bullying from the perspective of different participant roles. *Pastoral Care in Education*, *31*(3), 251-267.

O'Brien, S. (2007). Restorative justice: principles, practices, and application. *The Prevention Researcher*, *14*(5), 16-18.

Oles, P. (2004). Restorative justice: An institutional view. In D. R. Karp & T. Allena (Eds.), *Restorative justice on the college campus: Promoting student growth and responsibility, and reawakening the spirit of campus community* (pp. 259-267). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Oliner, S. (2005). Altruism, intergroup apology and forgiveness: Antidote for a divided world. *Humboldt Journal of Social Relations, 29* (2), 8-39.

Olson, C. (2011). The deep roots of the fairness committee in Kohlberg's moral development theory. *Schools*, *8*(1), 125-135.

Olson, S., & Dzur, A. (2003). Reconstructing professional roles in restorative justice programs. *Utah Law Review, 1*, 5 –89.

Palermo, G. B. (2013). Restorative justice: A more understanding and humane approach to offenders. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *57*(9), 1051-1053. doi:10.1177/0306624X13495009

Paludi, M. A. (2008). *Understanding and preventing campus violence*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers/Greenwood Publishing Group.

Parkinson, J., & Roche, D. (2004). Restorative justice: deliberative democracy in action? *Australian Journal of Political Science*, *39*(3), 505-518.

Patton, M. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods.* (2nd ed.) Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Paullet, K., & Pinchot, J. (2014). Behind the screen where today's bully plays: perceptions of college students on cyberbullying. *Journal of information systems education*, *25*(1), 63.

Pavelka, S. (2013). Practices and policies for implementing restorative justice within schools. *The prevention researcher*, *20*(1), 15-18.

Payne, A. & Welch, K. (2015). Restorative justice in schools: The influence of race on restorative discipline. *Youth and Society, 47* (4). 539–564, DOI: 10.1177/0044118X12473125

Pedreal, B., & Lizeth, M. (2014). Restorative Justice Programs in Higher Education. *The Vermont Connection*, *35*(1), 5.

Perkins, W. (2002). Social norms and the prevention of alcohol misuse in collegiate contexts. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol Supplement*, *14*, 164−172.

Perkins, W. (2002). Surveying the damage: A review of research on consequences of alcohol misuse in college populations. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol Supplement*, *14*, 91−100.

Pezza, P. E., & Bellotti, A. (1995). College campus violence: Origins, impacts, and responses. *Educational Psychology Review*, *7*(1), 105-123.

Powell, R., & Single, H. (1996). Focus groups. *International Journal of Quality in Health Care, 8*(5), 499-504.

Ponsford, L. R. (2016). Assessing mental health and violence on college campuses using the vulnerability model. *Journal of the American Association of Nurse Practitioners*, *28*(4),

212-217.

Porter, J., & Williams, L. M. (2011). Intimate violence among underrepresented groups on a college campus. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *26*(16), 3210-3224.

Pranis, K. (2015). *Little book of circle processes: A new/old approach to peacemaking*. Skyhorse Publishing, Inc.

Pranis, K., Stuart, B., & Wedge, M. (2003). *Peacemaking circles*. St. Paul, MN: Living Justice Press.

Presser, L., & Van Voorhis, P. (2002). Values and evaluation: Assessing processes and outcomes of restorative justice programs. *Criminology and Delinquency, 48* (1), 162–188.

Procario-Foley, E. G., & Bean, D. F. (2002). Institutions of higher education: Cornerstones in building ethical organizations. *Teaching Business Ethics*, *6*(1), 101-116.

Rabrenovic, G., Levin, J., & Oliver, N. M. (2007). Promoting respect for difference on the college campus the role of interdependence. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *51*(2), 294-301.

Reed, E., Prado, G., Matsumoto, A., & Amaro, H. (2010). Alcohol and drug use and related consequences among gay, lesbian and bisexual college students: Role of experiencing violence, feeling safe on campus, and perceived stress. *Addictive behaviors*, *35*(2), 168-171.

Roland, K., Ridout, G., Salinitri, G., & Frey, M. (2012). Development and use of a restorative justice ideology instrument: Assessing beliefs. *Contemporary Justice Review, 15* (4), 435–447. DOI: 10.1080.10282580.2012.734574

Roloff, M., & Soule, K. (2002). Interpersonal conflict. *Handbook of interpersonal communication*, *3*, 475-528.

Roseman, C., Ritchie, M., & Laux, J. (2009). A restorative justice approach to empathy development in sex offenders: An empathy study. *Journal of Addictions & Offender Counseling*, 29, 96 – 109.

Ross, W., Fischer, D., Baker, C., & Buchholz, K. (1997). University residence hall assistants as mediators: An investigation of the effects of disputant and mediator relationships on intervention preferences. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *27*(8), 664-707.

Ross, S., Niebling, B., & Heckert, T. (1999). Sources of stress among college students. *Social psychology*, *61*(5), 841-846.

Ross, R. (2006). *Returning to the Teachings*. Toronto: Penguin Books.

Rossner, M. (2013). *Just emotions: Rituals of restorative justice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rossner, M. (2011). Emotions and interaction rituals: A micro analysis of restorative justice. *British Journal of Criminology* 51 (1): 95–119.

Roujanavong, W. (2005, November). Restorative justice: Family and community group conferencing (FCGC) in Thailand. In *Seventh International Conference on Conferencing, Circles and other Restorative Practices, Manchester, UK*.

Roulston, K. (2010). *Reflective interviewing: A guide to theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Roy, S. (1993). Two types of juvenile restitution programs in two midwestern counties: A comparative study. *Federal Probation, 57*, 48−53.

Rugge, T., & Scott, T. Y. (2009). Restorative justice's impact on participants' psychological and physical health. *Public Safety Canada*. Retrieved from https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrcs/pblctns/2009-03-rjp/index-en.aspx.

Saldaña, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Saulnier, A., Lutchman, K., & Sivasubramaniam, D. (2012). Laboratory experiments: A meaningful contribution to restorative justice research? *Critical Criminology*, *20*(1), 99-115.

Saulnier, A., & Sivasubramaniam, D. (2015). Effects of victim presence and coercion in restorative justice: An experimental paradigm. *Law and Human Behavior, 39* (4), 378–387. DOI: 10.1037/lhb0000103

Schiff, M. (2013, January). Dignity, disparity and desistance: Effective restorative justice strategies to plug the "school-to-prison pipeline." In *Center for Civil Rights Remedies National Conference. Closing the School to Research Gap: Research to Remedies Conference. Washington, DC*.

Schuh, J., Jones, S., & Harper, S. (Eds.). (2010). *Student services: A handbook for the profession*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Sillars, A. L. (1980). Attributions and communication in roommate conflicts. *Communications Monographs*, *47*(3), 180-200.

Sim, J. (1998). Collecting and analyzing qualitative data: issues raised by the focus group. *Journal of advanced nursing*, *28*(2), 345-352.

Sharpe, S. (1998). *Restorative justice: A vision for healing and change*. Edmonton, AB: Edmonton Victim Offender Mediation Society.

Skiba, R., Horner, R., Chung, C., Rausch, M., May, S., & Tobin, T. (2011). Race is not neutral: A national investigation of African American and Latino disproportionality in school discipline. *School Psychology Review, 40*, 85-107.

Skoe, E. (2010). The relationship between empathy-related constructs and care-based moral development in young adults. *Journal of Moral Education*, *39* (2), 191 – 211. DOI: 10.1080/03057241003754930

Stinchcomb, J., Bazemore, G., & Riestenberg, N. (2006). Beyond zero tolerance: Restoring justice in secondary schools. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 4* (2): 123 -147.

Stokkom, B. (2002). Moral emotions in restorative justice conferences: Managing shame, designing empathy. *Theoretical Criminology, 6* (3), 339 – 360.

Taub, D., Servaty-Seib, H., Miles, N., Lee, J., Morris, C., Prieto-Welch, S., & Werden, D. (2013). The impact of gatekeeper training for suicide prevention on university resident assistants. *Journal of College Counseling, 6*, 64 – 78. DOI: 10.1002/j.2161-1882.2013.00027.x.

Thombs, D. L., Gonzalez, J. M. R., Osborn, C. J., Rossheim, M. E., & Suzuki, S. (2015). Resident assistant training program for increasing alcohol, other drug, and mental health first-aid efforts. *Prevention Science*, *16*(4), 508-517.

Thombs, D. L., Osborn, C. J., Rossheim, M. E., & Suzuki, S. (2014). Attitudes Associated with Alcohol and Marijuana Referral Actions by Resident Assistants. *The journal of primary prevention*, *35*(6), 429-437.

Toews, B. (2013). Toward a restorative justice pedagogy: reflections on teaching restorative justice in correctional facilities. *Contemporary Justice Review*, *16*(1), 6-27.

Umbreit, M., & Armour, M. (2011). Restorative justice dialogue: An essential guide for research and practice. New York: Springer Publishing Company.

Umbreit, M., Coates, R., & Vos, B. (2004). Victim-offender mediation: Three decades of practice and research. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, *22*(1-2), 279-303.

Umbreit, M., Lewis, T., & Burns, H. (2003). A community response to a 9/11 hate crime: Restorative justice through dialogue. *Contemporary Justice Review*, *6*(4), 383-391.

Umbreit, M., Vos, B., Coates, R., & Brown, K. (2003). *Facing violence: The path of restorative justice and dialogue*. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.

Umbreit, M., & Bradshaw, W. (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, 9*, 35−51.

United States Department of Education. (2014). Campus Safety and Security Report 2014. Retrieved from https://ope.ed.gov/campussafety/#/

United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (1998). Criminal Justice – Restorative Justice. Retrieved on November 28, 2016 from http://www.usccb.org/issues-and-action/human-life-and-dignity/criminal-justice-restorative-justice/index.cfm

Valenzuela, D., & Shrivastava, P. (2002). Interview as a method for qualitative research. *Southern Cross University and the Southern Cross Institute of Action Research (SCIAR)*.

Vaandering, D. (2014). Implementing restorative justice practice in schools: what pedagogy reveals. *Journal of Peace Education*, *11*(1), 64-80.

Van Ness, D., & Strong, K. (2014). *Restoring justice: An introduction to restorative justice*. London: Routledge.

Wachtel, T. (2013). *Dreaming of a new reality: How restorative practices re- duce crime and violence, improve relationships and strengthen civil society.* Bethlehem, PA: The Piper's Press.

Walters, M. A. (2015). 'I thought 'he's a monster'... [but] he was just... normal: Examining the therapeutic benefits of restorative justice for homicide. *British Journal of Criminology*, *55*(6), 1207-1225. doi:10.1093/bjc/azv026.

Winston Jr, R. B., & Fitch, R. T. (1993). Paraprofessional staffing. *Student housing and residential life*, 315-343.

Wenzel, M., Okimoto, T. G., Feather, N. T., & Platow, M. J. (2008). Retributive and restorative justice. *Law and human behavior*, *32*(5), 375-389.

Weston, C., Gandell, T., Beauchamp, J., McAlpine, L., Wiseman, C., & Beauchamp, C. (2001). Analyzing interview data: The development and evolution of a coding system. *Qualitative sociology*, *24*(3), 381-400.

Witvliet, C. V., Worthington, E. L., Root, L. M., Sato, A. F., Ludwig, T. E., & Exline, J. J. (2008). Retributive justice, restorative justice, and forgiveness: An experimental psychophysiology analysis. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *44*(1), 10-25.\

Wong, D. (2005) Restorative justice for juveniles in Hong Kong: Reactions of a practitioner. Paper presented at the Sixth International Conference on Conferencing, Circles and other Restorative Practices, Penrith, NSW, Australia.

Wood, W. (2015). Why restorative justice will not reduce incarceration. *British Journal of*

Criminology, 55 (5), 883-900. DOI: 10.1093/bjc/azu108

Yin, R. (2013). *Case study research: Design and methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Young, R., Hoyle, C., Cooper, K., & Hill, R. (2005). Informal resolutions of complaints against police. *Criminal Justice, 5* (3), 279–317. DOI: 10.1177/1466802505055837

Zehr, H. (2002). *The little book of restorative justice: A bestselling book by one of the founders of the movement*. Intercourse, PA: Good Books.