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Restorative Justice is a values-based approach to building trust, strengthening relationships and resolving conflict.

This philosophy has deep roots in many indigenous cultures, and has been practiced successfully among diverse peoples across the world for generations. Restorative Justice addresses accountability while acknowledging trauma - not just between individual people, but between groups of people.

In our modern world, Restorative Justice can be employed in a variety of contexts - including within families, communities, schools, the justice system, even between communities and cultures - to foster understanding, responsibility, healing and safety. By prioritizing mutual concern and dignity for everyone involved, this approach can help all people impacted within the circle of harm, including those who cause the harm.
Restorative Justice in Our Education System

In the education context, Restorative Justice can help to build, strengthen and restore relationships between members of a school community. When we effectively use restorative practices in our schools, we encourage students to engage in collaborative problem solving and empower them with tools to communicate effectively. These skills are important both in, and beyond, the school setting.

As the foundation of school and classroom culture, Restorative Justice shifts the emphasis from managing misbehavior to building, strengthening and repairing relationships. Those who cause harm are empowered to take accountability, grow as individuals and reconnect with their community. Impacted individuals find ways to repair injury, while restoring damaged relationships and educating one another.

Restorative Justice emphasizes positive relationships as central to building a safe community. As such, this approach offers a substantive continuum of restorative justice-based practices, from proactive and preventative to responsive and restitutive.

Most restorative practices occur at the proactive and preventative end of this continuum, which can be imagined as the large and foundational base of a pyramid. They include very simple but powerful cultural practices, such as teachers intentionally greeting each student as they arrive to class, or taking time for a group check-in at the start of the school day. Such practices ensure that students and staff feel acknowledged, understood and respected. Supportive connections between members of the school community, when strengthened through restorative practices, can be a powerful remedy for the implicit biases that threaten both safety and equality in our schools.

When Restorative Justice is embraced with fidelity, there is less need to use practices at the responsive and restitutive end of the continuum. This can be imagined as the very small tip of a pyramid, when harmful situations, despite all preventative efforts, nonetheless occur in the school community. Once harm has been done, restorative practices can be implemented in lieu of punishment-focused approaches. Restorative Justice supports healing all impacted individuals, including students who may be causing harm because they themselves have experienced trauma, have unmet physical and emotional needs, or lack social support and connections.

When implemented with fidelity, Restorative Justice practices contribute to just and equitable learning environments. Restorative Justice can help to move our educational system away from ineffective cycles of punishment, retribution and repeated harm. This ineffective approach does not adequately contemplate
root causes of misbehavior; rather, it attempts to force “one-size-fits-all” punishments on unique and complicated situations.

By contrast, a Restorative Justice approach is individualized, relationship-centered and responsive to unique harms. This approach builds a culture of accountability, connection, educational engagement, and healing in our schools. Studies have shown that Restorative Justice in an educational setting can improve school climate, enhance the safety of students and staff, reduce disciplinary issues and reduce racial disparities in discipline, improve attendance, and bolster academic achievement.

**Restorative Justice in Our Juvenile Justice System**

Restorative Justice in the juvenile justice system emphasizes the way in which all individuals within the circle of harm are impacted, including those who most directly cause the harm. This approach supports our justice system’s foundational acknowledgement that the community, as represented by “the people,” is also harmed when individuals violate the rights and boundaries of their fellow community members.

Restorative Justice leads us away from the illusory categories of “victim” and “offender,” and toward a more expansive appreciation of shared harm and community restoration. This approach supports impacted community members as they collaborate together toward healing the different harms caused by misconduct. Restorative Justice promotes healing on all sides while also protecting the fundamental rights of youth in that system. When practiced with fidelity, restorative practices offer a deeper sense of acknowledgement, healing and justice for people who have been victimized.

Using Restorative Justice as the guiding framework for our juvenile justice system has the potential to reduce the disproportionate harm being caused in marginalized communities by our current punishment-and blame-focused approach. By providing opportunities for relationship building and deeper understanding between community members, Restorative Justice can mitigate the implicit biases that contribute to racial disparities and threaten the core value of equality before the law.

Restorative Justice in our juvenile justice system ensures accountability, community safety and personal growth. It considers the rights of people who have been harmed, and also the rights of people who have caused harm. In this model, the community plays a substantial role in the process of repairing harm, providing support to those who have been hurt and ensuring opportunities for people who cause hurt to make amends. The community is also charged with providing opportunities for youth to mature and develop skills that will steer them toward a more fulfilling and successful future.
Restorative practices should be used as early in the juvenile justice process as possible. This approach can and should be used across various levels of offense, including serious criminal conduct, with careful training and oversight of those involved. We believe that Restorative Justice should be a regular feature of juvenile justice system processes, rather than a unique exception in limited circumstances.

Using restorative practices in lieu of a punishment- and blame-focused process promotes shared values of respect, inclusion, collaboration, and accountability in our juvenile justice system. When modeling these values through a Restorative Justice approach, system actors and community members can be a powerful and positive example for our youth.

We support and affirm the definition of Restorative Justice in education as presented in House Resolution 1 (HR001), sponsored by Utah Representative Sandra Hollins, during the 2018 Utah Legislative Session. The language used here borrows from the work of Rep. Hollins and the Utah Restorative Justice Collaborative toward creating that legislation.

We support and partner with the Restorative Justice Collaborative of Utah, which we recommend as a local resource for community members, academics, parents, policymakers, educators, and all others who work with and care about youth.

We support and partner with the Utah State Board of Education as it works to bring training and technical support in restorative practices to our schools. While our language and approaches may differ at the margins, we share a core understanding of the importance and power of Restorative Justice.
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