



Analysis of Longmont Community Justice Partnership Database 2007-2009

Report of Results

May 2010



Table of Contents

Executive Summary 1

Analysis of LCJP Database 2

 Referrals to LCJP 2

 Characteristics of Program 6

 Characteristics of Offenders Participating in LCJP 7

 Characteristics of Agreements 9

Program Outcomes 10

 Case Disposition 10

 Victim Satisfaction 13

 Offender Satisfaction 16

 Community Member Satisfaction 19

 Client Recidivism Rate after LCJP 22

Tables

Table 1: Number of Offenders Referred by Time Period	2
Table 2: Number of Cases and Offenders 2007-2009	2
Table 3: Number of Offenders in Referred Cases	3
Table 4: Offender’s Age at Referral	3
Table 5: Ethnicity of Referred Offenders	3
Table 6: Gender of Referred Offenders	4
Table 7: Restorative Justice Processes	4
Table 8: Referring Agencies	4
Table 9: Referred Offender’s Type of Offense	5
Table 10: Process Participants	6
Table 11: Characteristics of Offenders	7
Table 12: Characteristics of Restorative Processes.....	8
Table 13: Language Translation Required.....	8
Table 14: Characteristics of Agreements.....	9
Table 15: Offender’s Contract Status.....	10
Table 16: Program Completion Rate by Offender Characteristics.....	11
Table 17: Program Completion Rate by Case Characteristics.....	12
Table 18: Average Victim Satisfaction Ratings	13
Table 19: Average Victim Satisfaction Ratings Compared by Offender Characteristics	14
Table 20: Average Victim Satisfaction Ratings Compared by Case Characteristics.....	15
Table 21: Average Offender Satisfaction Ratings	16
Table 22: Average Offender Satisfaction Ratings Compared by Offender Characteristics	17
Table 23: Average Offender Satisfaction Ratings Compared by Case Characteristics.....	18
Table 24: Average Community Member Satisfaction Ratings.....	19
Table 25: Average Community Member Satisfaction Ratings Compared by Offender Characteristics	20
Table 26: Average Community Member Satisfaction Ratings Compared by Case Characteristics	21
Table 27: Client was Re-Arrested after LCJP	22
Table 28: Rate of Recidivism by Offender Characteristics	23
Table 29: Rate of Recidivism by Case Characteristics.....	24

Figures

Figure 1: Victim Satisfaction (2007-2009)	13
Figure 2: Offender Satisfaction (2007-2009)	16
Figure 3: Community Member Satisfaction (2007-2009)	19

Executive Summary

The Longmont Community Justice Partnership (LCJP) began delivering restorative justice services as a part of the nonprofit, Teaching Peace, in October 1996, and has had National Research Center, Inc. evaluate their data over the last decade. This report represents an analysis of the data from 2007 through 2009. LCJP database was updated in 2008 to improve data collection administration and has led to more consistent documentation of case statistics. While much of the core analysis data continue to be collected, some previously analyzed variables are no longer available, and the format of some of the data changed so it is no longer comparable to historical data.

In the three years from 2007 through 2009, 301 cases involving 537 offenders were referred to LCJP.

Of the 301 cases referred 240 cases went through a restorative justice process in the 2007 to 2009 calendar years involved 442 offenders, 174 crime victims, 770 support persons, and 568 community members for a total of 1954 people served. The larger number of offenders than victims is primarily due to the fact that youth often commit crimes in groups, so it is not unusual to have multiple offenders involved in the same crime being held accountable to a single victim.

In the previous analysis by NRC, from 2001 to 2006 there was a steady increase in participation by Latinos in LCJP and this increased level was maintained from 2007-2009. Given that participation in LCJP is voluntary, it appears that the Latina community has become increasingly willing to accept a restorative option and/or it is being offered more to the Latina community by the referring agents.

The number of female offenders using the program also increased from 2001 to 2006, and in the last three years females have made up about 40% of offenders.

There had been a decline in the number of police officers attending the restorative processes from 2001 to 2006 (averaging about 40%), but this rebounded with police officers attending 52% of restorative processes in 2008-2009.

The vast majority of offenders in LCJP program complete their agreements. Throughout the years, completion rates have remained near 90%. The nature of the agreements has shifted with fewer cases requiring an educational component or cleanup. In the past few years more agreements required meaningful community service.

LCJP restorative justice interventions have been consistently successful through these years. Offender recidivism has been consistently low, averaging 10% from 2001 to 2008. The recidivism rates are tracked for one year post process so the rates for 2009 are not available at the time of this report. Satisfaction ratings of all participant groups have been consistently high. In each of these years, 2001 to 2009, over 95% of victims, offenders and community members who rated the program were satisfied or very satisfied with their experience.

Analysis of LCJP Database

This report summarizes the analysis of records for both offenders and victims who participated in Longmont Community Justice Partnership (LCJP) restorative processes from January 2007 to December 2009. The following pages describe the program, its clients, the services that were provided and the outcomes achieved in this three year period. As part of the analysis, outcomes are compared by characteristics of the case, the clients, the structure of the restorative process and the agreements reached.

Referrals to LCJP

Each year community partners refer cases to LCJP. These cases are vetted and either “referred back” (deemed not appropriate) or accepted, and a restorative process delivered. Cases may be referred in one year and processed in another if the referral comes at the end of a calendar year. Data in this section describe all the cases referred in the calendar year, whether or not they are brought into a restorative process in that year and whether or not they are ultimately ‘referred back’ (i.e., deemed not appropriate for LCJP).

Table 1: Number of Offenders Referred by Time Period

	N
January through December 2001	88
January through December 2002	64
January through December 2003	123
January through December 2004	98
January through December 2005	133
January through December 2006	144
January through December 2007	173
January through December 2008	199
January through December 2009	165
All offenders	1,187

Table 2: Number of Cases and Offenders 2007-2009

	2007	2008	2009	2007-2009
	N	N	N	N
Number of Cases	86	119	96	301
Number of Offenders Referred	173	199	165	537
Average Number of Offenders Per case	2.0	1.7	1.7	1.8

Table 3: Number of Offenders in Referred Cases

Number of offenders per case	2007	2008	2009	2007-2009
	N	N	N	N
1	43	79	57	179
2	26	20	24	70
3	6	10	7	23
4	5	7	5	17
5 or more	6	3	3	12
All cases	86	119	96	301

Table 4: Offender's Age at Referral

Age	2007		2008		2009		2007--2009	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
7-10	1	1%	11	6%	7	4%	19	4%
11-13	34	20%	39	20%	27	16%	100	19%
14-17	93	54%	82	41%	101	61%	276	51%
18-25	26	15%	40	20%	20	12%	86	16%
26+	8	5%	12	6%	9	5%	29	5%
unknown	11	6%	15	8%	1	1%	27	5%
All	173	100%	199	100%	165	100%	537	100%

Table 5: Ethnicity of Referred Offenders

Ethnicity	2007		2008		2009		2007-2009	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
White	112	65%	122	61%	102	62%	336	63%
Hispanic / Latino	55	32%	66	33%	60	36%	181	34%
Asian	4	2%	1	1%	0	0%	5	1%
Black / African American	1	1%	7	4%	2	1%	10	2%
American Indian / Alaskan Native	1	1%	1	1%	0	0%	2	0%
More than one Race	0	0%	2	1%	0	0%	2	0%
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	1	0%
All	173	100%	199	100%	165	100%	537	100%

Table 6: Gender of Referred Offenders

Gender	2007		2008		2009		2007-2009	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Male	114	66%	118	59%	109	66%	341	64%
Female	59	34%	81	41%	56	34%	196	36%
All	173	100%	199	100%	165	100%	537	100%

Table 7: Restorative Justice Processes

Process Types	2007		2008		2009		2007-2009	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CGC - Community Group Conference	95	55%	107	54%	98	59%	300	56%
SSW - Shoplifting Solution Workshop*	36	21%	40	20%	11	7%	87	16%
RC - Restorative Circle	20	12%	9	5%	26	16%	55	10%
CS - Circle of Support	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%
PC - Peace Circle	0	0%	14	7%	0	0%	14	3%
Not Applicable	21	12%	29	15%	30	18%	80	15%
All	173	100%	199	100%	165	100%	537	100%

*SSW - Shoplifting Solution Workshop was discontinued in July 2009

Table 8: Referring Agencies

Process Types	2007		2008		2009		2007-2009	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Longmont Police Department	158	91%	173	87%	147	89%	478	89%
Juvenile Diversion - Longmont	6	3%	0	0%	12	7%	18	3%
Probation Department - Boulder	0	0%	12	6%	1	1%	13	2%
Community Referral	2	1%	5	3%	1	1%	8	1%
Probation Department - Longmont	2	1%	2	1%	3	2%	7	1%
District Attorney - Boulder	5	3%	0	0%	0	0%	5	1%
St Vrain School District	0	0%	4	2%	0	0%	4	1%
City Prosecutor - Longmont	0	0%	1	1%	1	1%	2	0%
Police Department - Boulder	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	1	0%
Self-referred	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	1	0%
All	173	100%	199	100%	165	100%	537	100%

Table 9: Referred Offender's Type of Offense

Offense	2007		2008		2009		2007-2009	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Theft (Misdemeanor)	46	27%	70	35%	54	33%	170	32%
Criminal Mischief	22	13%	8	4%	12	7%	42	8%
Harassment	15	9%	19	10%	5	3%	39	7%
Trespassing (Criminal Mischief)	14	8%	1	1%	15	9%	30	6%
Theft (Felony)	5	3%	17	9%	5	3%	27	5%
Possession (Misdemeanor)	12	7%	12	6%	1	1%	25	5%
Arson	7	4%	5	3%	11	7%	23	4%
Vandalism (Criminal Mischief)	4	2%	7	4%	10	6%	21	4%
Burglary	8	5%	9	5%	2	1%	19	4%
Curfew (Criminal Mischief)	0	0%	9	5%	10	6%	19	4%
Fighting in Public	6	3%	3	2%	8	5%	17	3%
Assault (Misdemeanor)	4	2%	3	2%	4	2%	11	2%
Consumption	0	0%	4	2%	5	3%	9	2%
Menacing (Felony - with weapon)	3	2%	0	0%	5	3%	8	1%
Minor in Possession	8	5%	0	0%	0	0%	8	1%
Unreasonable noise	3	2%	4	2%	0	0%	7	1%
Graffiti (Criminal Mischief)	0	0%	5	3%	1	1%	6	1%
Missile throwing	5	3%	0	0%	0	0%	5	1%
Unlawful Sexual Conduct	1	1%	3	2%	1	1%	5	1%
Bullying	0	0%	4	2%	0	0%	4	1%
Fireworks, illegal	0	0%	0	0%	4	2%	4	1%
Littering	0	0%	3	2%	1	1%	4	1%
Criminal Tampering	2	1%	1	1%	0	0%	3	1%
False reporting	2	1%	0	0%	1	1%	3	1%
Identity Theft	1	1%	0	0%	2	1%	3	1%
Throwing Missiles (Criminal Mischief)	0	0%	3	2%	0	0%	3	1%
Defacing Property	0	0%	2	1%	0	0%	2	0%
Disorderly Conduct	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%	2	0%
Fraud	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%	2	0%
Reckless Driving	0	0%	2	1%	0	0%	2	0%
Recreational use of a vehicle	0	0%	2	1%	0	0%	2	0%
Unlawful Acts	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%	2	0%
Other	5	3%	3	2%	2	1%	10	2%
All	173	100%	199	100%	165	100%	537	100%

Characteristics of Program

Once a case is deemed appropriate and is accepted by LCJP, a restorative process is coordinated. The data discussed in this section are for cases that were accepted. Data in this section are organized by the calendar year the case was actually processed, although the case may have been referred to the program in a previous calendar year. Therefore the total numbers of cases and offenders will not match the previous section which discussed referrals in a calendar year.

From 2007 to 2009, LCJP held 240 restorative processes. Services were provided to 442 offenders, 558 offender support persons, 174 victims and 212 victim support persons. Additionally in these 3 years, 1,950 volunteer community members and facilitators participated in restorative processes through LCJP.

Table 10: Process Participants

	2007	2008	2009	2007-2009
	N	N	N	N
Number of offenders	149	170	123	442
Number of adult victims	33	73	24	130
Number of juvenile victims	9	22	13	44
Number of offender support persons	199	204	155	558
Number of victim support persons	56	63	93	212
Number of police officers present	29	52	48	129
Number of volunteer community members	231	241	233	705
Number of volunteer facilitators present	408	428	409	1245
Total number of participants (including facilitators)	1114	1253	1098	3465
Number of restorative processes	67	95	78	240

Characteristics of Offenders Participating in LCJP

A number of offender socio-demographic characteristics were stored in the database. The typical offender using LCJP services was a white male, 14 to 17 years of age. While most offenders were male, the number of females in the program increased in 2005/2006 and has remained at near 40%. The proportion of offenders who are Latino remains at about one-third.

Table 11: Characteristics of Offenders

Characteristics	2007		2008		2009		2007-2009	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Age								
7-10	1	1%	11	7%	1	1%	13	3%
11-13	31	22%	33	21%	18	15%	82	20%
14-17	81	58%	66	42%	77	63%	224	54%
18-24	22	16%	33	21%	18	15%	73	18%
25+	4	3%	13	8%	8	7%	25	6%
Total	139	100%	156	100%	122	100%	417	100%
Gender								
Male	95	64%	96	56%	78	63%	269	61%
Female	54	36%	74	44%	45	37%	173	39%
Total	149	100%	170	100%	123	100%	442	100%
Ethnicity/Race								
White	99	66%	105	62%	78	63%	282	64%
Latino	47	32%	52	31%	44	36%	143	32%
Other	3	2%	13	8%	1	1%	17	4%
Total	149	100%	170	100%	123	100%	442	100%

Characteristics of Restorative Processes

Characteristics of the restorative processes, many of which related to the numbers and ages of attendees, were logged in the database. A large majority of the processes (67%-78%) had at least 20% youth attendees. Police officer participation decreased from 2001-2007, but increased in 2008 and 2009. About one-quarter of restorative processes require language translation.

Table 12: Characteristics of Restorative Processes

	2007		2008		2009		2007-2009	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
At least 20% of attendees were youth	67	78%	95	75%	73	67%	235	73%
Police officer present	67	39%	95	55%	78	59%	240	52%

Table 13: Language Translation Required

Language	2007		2008		2009		2007-2009	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	50	75%	75	79%	55	71%	180	75%
Spanish	16	24%	19	20%	22	28%	57	24%
Chinese	1	1%	1	1%	0	0%	2	1%
American Sign Language	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	1	0%
All	67	100%	95	100%	78	100%	239	100%

Characteristics of Agreements

Almost all (96%) offenders who went to process completed their agreements.

Fewer agreements required an educational component in 2007-2009 than in prior years, but more cases required meaningful community service. Continuing a declining trend, few of the cases required a clean-up component.

Table 14: Characteristics of Agreements

	2007	2008	2009	2007-2009
Community service component	66%	64%	75%	67%
<i>Total hours assigned</i>	<i>1821</i>	<i>1377</i>	<i>1415</i>	<i>4613</i>
<i>Mean hours assigned</i>	<i>18.6</i>	<i>12.8</i>	<i>15.4</i>	<i>15.5</i>
<i>Median hours assigned</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>10</i>
Education component	54%	55%	56%	55%
Clean up required	7%	10%	15%	11%
Behavioral component	44%	62%	46%	51%
Restitution required	24%	13%	15%	17%
Apology letter(s) required	77%	63%	74%	71%

Program Outcomes

We identified four variables in the database to represent outcomes of LCJP program: completion, offender satisfaction, victim satisfaction, and recidivism. For all of these outcomes we present the rate of overall outcome attainment followed by a comparison of outcomes by offender and case characteristics. (Note that many of the numbers in these tables are based on small numbers of offenders so caution must be exercised when making interpretations.)

Case Disposition

The offender completion rate for 2007 to 2009 is 86% for all cases that were not referred back at intake or had a contract pending at the time of this report. Completion is defined by the offender completing all of the items in their agreement by the due date.

Table 15: Offender's Contract Status

Contract Status	2007		2008		2009		2007-2009	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Completed	127	88%	138	84%	91	86%	356	86%
Did Not Complete	17	12%	26	16%	15	14%	58	14%

Cases that were referred back, were pending a contract or were still in intake, were not included in this table. In past reports those with pending contracts were included.

The completion rate for all cases is compared by case and offender characteristics in the tables on the following pages. For the most part case completion rates are high and do not vary widely by case characteristic. Some differences to note:

- when restitution was required 73% of offenders (2007-2009) completed their contract compared to 89% of the offenders in cases not requiring restitution.
- when clean up was required 76% of offenders (2007-2009) completed their contract compared to 87% of the offenders in cases not requiring cleanup.
- when an apology letter was required 89% of offenders (2007-2009) completed their contract compared to 78% of the offenders in cases not requiring an apology letter.

Table 16: Program Completion Rate by Offender Characteristics

Total number of offenders in category and percent of offenders in the category who completed all items in their agreement by the due date¹

Characteristics	2007		2008		2009		2007-2009	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Age								
7-10	1	100%	10	80%	1	100%	12	83%
11-13	31	84%	32	81%	16	81%	79	82%
14-17	76	91%	64	86%	66	88%	206	88%
18-24	22	91%	32	78%	14	71%	68	81%
25+	4	100%	12	83%	8	100%	24	92%
Gender								
Female	51	86%	72	90%	37	92%	160	89%
Male	93	89%	92	79%	69	83%	254	84%
Ethnicity/Race								
American Indian / Alaskan Native	1	100%	1	100%	0	0%	2	100%
Asian	2	100%	3	100%	0	0%	5	100%
Black / African American	0	0%	7	57%	1	100%	8	63%
Hispanic / Latino	46	87%	50	78%	38	84%	134	83%
More than one Race	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	2	100%
White	95	88%	101	88%	67	87%	263	88%
Type of Offense								
Theft	47	85%	46	89%	45	87%	138	87%
Criminal mischief	22	82%	15	93%	12	75%	49	84%
Harassment	9	78%	18	72%	2	100%	29	76%
Possession of alcohol	10	90%	11	100%	1	100%	22	95%
Theft - motor vehicle	5	80%	16	81%	2	100%	23	83%
Arson	6	100%	5	100%	7	100%	18	100%
Criminal trespass	11	100%	1	100%	6	50%	18	83%
Vandalism	5	60%	6	67%	9	67%	20	65%
Burglary	2	100%	10	80%	2	100%	14	86%
Assault	2	100%	2	100%	1	100%	5	100%
Defacing property	0	.	3	100%	0	0%	3	100%
Felony menacing	0	.	3	67%	0	.	3	67%
Other	25	100%	28	75%	19	100%	72	90%

¹ For example, in 2007, a total of 51 offenders were female and of these 51 female offenders, 86% (or 44 female offenders) completed all items in their agreement by the due date. In 2008, a total of 101 offenders were white and of these 101 white offenders, 88% (or 89 white offenders) completed all items in their agreement by the due date

Table 17: Program Completion Rate by Case Characteristics


Total number of offenders in category and percent of offenders in the category who completed all items in their agreement by the due date

Characteristics	2007		2008		2009		2007-2009	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Referred by Longmont Police Department								
No	12	83%	21	100%	15	67%	48	85%
Yes	132	89%	143	82%	91	89%	366	86%
Police officer present at restorative process								
No	89	87%	70	86%	46	93%	205	88%
Yes	55	91%	94	83%	60	80%	209	84%
More than 20% of attendees were youth								
No	19	95%	38	84%	29	86%	86	87%
Yes	125	87%	126	84%	72	85%	323	85%
Language translation required								
No	120	88%	136	85%	80	89%	336	87%
Spanish	22	91%	24	80%	17	80%	63	82%
Apology letter stipulated in contract								
No	29	90%	57	72%	24	79%	110	78%
Yes	115	88%	107	91%	82	88%	304	89%
Restitution stipulated in contract								
No	108	92%	142	87%	89	88%	339	89%
Yes	36	78%	22	64%	17	76%	75	73%
Community service stipulated in contract								
No	46	91%	56	82%	22	82%	124	85%
Yes	98	87%	108	85%	84	87%	290	86%
Education component stipulated in contract								
No	64	86%	71	87%	43	88%	178	87%
Yes	80	90%	93	82%	63	84%	236	85%
Clean up stipulated in contract								
No	133	89%	147	85%	88	89%	368	87%
Yes	11	82%	17	76%	18	72%	46	76%
Behavioral component stipulated in contract								
No	78	92%	59	85%	53	92%	190	90%
Yes	66	83%	105	84%	53	79%	224	83%

Victim Satisfaction

Victim satisfaction ratings collected at the end of restorative processes were logged by 118 of the victims who participated in LCJP in 2007-2009. Almost all victims (98%) reported being satisfied or very satisfied with the process. Only 2% reported being very dissatisfied.

Figure 1: Victim Satisfaction (2007-2009)



Unlike the pie graph above, the ratings given below are not percentages of satisfaction. Victim satisfaction ratings were converted to a 100-point scale to ease comparison where 0 means “very dissatisfied” and 100 means “very satisfied”.

Table 18: Average Victim Satisfaction Ratings

Average satisfaction rating for all victims in the case who completed a satisfaction survey, where 0=very dissatisfied, 25=dissatisfied, 50= neither satisfied nor dissatisfied 75=satisfied, 100=very satisfied

2007		2008		2009		2007-2009	
N	Rating	N	Rating	N	Rating	N	Rating
22	95	42	92	54	89	118	91

Table 19: Average Victim Satisfaction Ratings Compared by Offender Characteristics

Average satisfaction rating for all victims in the case who completed a satisfaction survey, where 0=very dissatisfied, 25=dissatisfied, 50= neither satisfied nor dissatisfied 75=satisfied, 100=very satisfied

Characteristics	2007		2008		2009		2007-2009	
	N	Rating	N	Rating	N	Rating	N	Rating
Age								
7-10	0		2	100	0		2	100
11-13	5	100	13	94	7	96	25	96
14-17	11	100	15	90	34	88	60	91
18-24	2	100	5	90	10	87	17	89
25+	0		6	96	3	100	9	97
Gender								
Female	11	91	20	90	12	94	43	91
Male	11	100	22	94	22	88	75	92
Ethnicity/Race								
White	17	97	24	97	40	88	81	93
Hispanic / Latino	4	88	13	83	14	92	31	88
Asian	0		2	100	0		2	100
Black / African American	0		1	100	0		1	100
Type of Offense								
Theft	12	92	9	92	19	89	40	91
Criminal mischief	3	100	2	100	10	77	15	84
Harassment	4	100	0		0		4	100
Theft - motor vehicle	0		7	89	2	100	9	92
Possession of alcohol	3	100	0		0		3	100
Vandalism	0		5	90	7	98	12	95
Criminal trespass	0		1	100	0		1	100
Arson	0		4	81	4	94	8	88
Burglary	0		4	100	2	100	6	100
Assault	0		1	75	0		1	75
Defacing property	0		2	100	0		2	100
Felony menacing	0		0		0		0	
Other	0		7	96	10	90	17	93

Table 20: Average Victim Satisfaction Ratings Compared by Case Characteristics


Average satisfaction rating for all victims in the case who completed a satisfaction survey, where 0=very dissatisfied, 25=dissatisfied, 50= neither satisfied nor dissatisfied 75=satisfied, 100=very satisfied

Characteristics	2007		2008		2009		2007-2009	
	N	Rating	N	Rating	N	Rating	N	Rating
Referred by Longmont Police Department								
No	0		5	95	2	75	7	89
Yes	22	95	37	92	52	90	111	92
Police officer present at restorative process								
No	17	94	14	91	18	86	49	90
Yes	5	100	28	93	36	91	69	93
More than 20% of attendees were youth								
No	3	100	10	95	18	93	31	94
Yes	19	95	32	91	34	87	85	90
Language translation required								
No	22	95	37	93	44	91	103	93
Spanish	0		5	81	10	84	15	85
Apology stipulated in contract								
No	0		14	93	14	83	28	88
Yes	22	95	28	92	40	92	90	93
Restitution stipulated in contract								
No	19	96	36	92	41	90	96	92
Yes	3	92	6	92	13	86	22	88
Community service stipulated in contract								
No	7	100	16	92	9	72	32	88
Yes	15	93	26	92	45	93	86	93
Education component stipulated in contract								
No	9	94	20	91	27	86	56	89
Yes	13	96	22	93	27	93	62	94
Clean up stipulated in contract								
No	22	95	34	92	42	87	98	90
Yes	0		8	94	12	99	20	97
Behavioral component stipulated in contract								
No	14	95	16	92	29	92	59	93
Yes	8	97	26	92	25	87	59	91

Offender Satisfaction

Almost all of the offenders (97%) whose concern went to a restorative process reported being satisfied or very satisfied with the process.

Figure 2: Offender Satisfaction (2007-2009)



Similar to victim satisfaction, offender satisfaction ratings were converted to a 100-point scale to ease comparison where 0 means “very dissatisfied” and 100 means “very satisfied”. The ratings are compared in the table below.

Table 21: Average Offender Satisfaction Ratings

Average satisfaction rating for offenders who completed a satisfaction survey, where 0=very dissatisfied, 25=dissatisfied, 50= neither satisfied nor dissatisfied 75=satisfied, 100=very satisfied

2007		2008		2009		2007-2009	
N	Rating	N	Rating	N	Rating	N	Rating
38	81	68	88	96	89	202	87

Table 22: Average Offender Satisfaction Ratings Compared by Offender Characteristics

Average satisfaction rating for offenders who completed a satisfaction survey, where 0=very dissatisfied, 25=dissatisfied, 50= neither satisfied nor dissatisfied 75=satisfied, 100=very satisfied

Characteristics	2007		2008		2009		2007-2009	
	N	Rating	N	Rating	N	Rating	N	Rating
Age								
7-10	0		2	75	1	100	3	83
11-13	5	80	15	89	15	90	35	88
14-17	24	84	26	86	57	85	107	85
18-24	3	61	14	91	16	96	33	91
25+	2	75	9	89	7	100	18	92
Gender								
Male	13	82	28	85	27	90	68	86
Female	25	81	40	90	69	89	134	87
Ethnicity/Race								
White	33	81	42	90	64	87	139	87
Hispanic / Latino	4	86	20	84	31	92	55	89
Asian	0		1	88	1	88	2	88
Black / African American	0		2	75	0		2	75
American Indian	1	83	1	75	0		2	79
More than one Race	0		2	81	0		2	81
Type of Offense								
Theft	1	90	9	81	2	93	12	90
Criminal mischief	16	84	11	91	16	87	43	87
Harassment	4	75	1	75	2	75	7	75
Theft - motor vehicle	1	100	9	89	2	100	12	92
Possession of alcohol	3	42	1	100	1	75	5	60
Vandalism	0		6	83	9	97	15	92
Criminal trespass	0		1	75	7	90	8	88
Arson	0		5	85	7	88	12	86
Burglary	0		7	82	2	100	9	86
Assault	0		2	88	1	75	3	83
Defacing property	0		3	100	0		3	100
Felony menacing	0		3	92	0		3	92
Other	2	75	10	93	21	82	33	85

Table 23: Average Offender Satisfaction Ratings Compared by Case Characteristics


Average satisfaction rating for offenders who completed a satisfaction survey, where 0=very dissatisfied, 25=dissatisfied, 50= neither satisfied nor dissatisfied 75=satisfied, 100=very satisfied

Characteristics	2007		2008		2009		2007-2009	
	N	Rating	N	Rating	N	Rating	N	Rating
Referred by Longmont Police Department								
No	0		5	90	10	88	15	89
Yes	38	81	63	87	86	89	187	87
Police officer present at restorative process								
No	19	81	18	88	26	92	63	87
Yes	19	82	50	88	70	88	139	87
More than 20% of attendees were youth								
No	7	68	21	90	30	96	58	91
Yes	31	85	47	86	64	85	142	85
Language translation required								
No	38	81	56	87	76	88	170	86
Spanish	0		9	87	19	93	28	90
Apology letter stipulated in contract								
No	1	83	25	84	23	83	49	84
Yes	37	81	43	89	73	91	153	88
Restitution stipulated in contract								
No	20	78	57	87	80	87	157	86
Yes	18	86	11	89	16	97	45	90
Community service stipulated in contract								
No	21	75	28	90	24	85	73	84
Yes	17	89	40	86	72	90	129	89
Education component stipulated in contract								
No	18	88	34	89	41	92	93	90
Yes	20	75	34	86	55	87	109	84
Clean up stipulated in contract								
No	29	81	60	87	83	88	172	87
Yes	9	83	8	91	13	91	30	89
Behavioral component stipulated in contract								
No	22	77	30	87	50	89	102	86
Yes	16	88	38	88	46	89	100	89

Community Member Satisfaction

From 2007-2009, 295 community members evaluated their experience participating in LCJP restorative processes and 99% were satisfied or very satisfied.

Figure 3: Community Member Satisfaction (2007-2009)



Community satisfaction ratings were converted to a 100-point scale to ease comparison where 0 means “very dissatisfied” and 100 means “very satisfied”. The ratings are compared in the table below.

Table 24: Average Community Member Satisfaction Ratings

Average satisfaction rating for all community members in the case who completed a satisfaction survey, where 0=very dissatisfied, 25=dissatisfied, 50= neither satisfied nor dissatisfied 75=satisfied, 100=very satisfied

2007		2008		2009		2007-2009	
N	Rating	N	Rating	N	Rating	N	Rating
26	88	69	94	96	94	191	93

Table 25: Average Community Member Satisfaction Ratings Compared by Offender Characteristics

Average satisfaction rating for all community members in the case who completed a satisfaction survey, where 0=very dissatisfied, 25=dissatisfied, 50= neither satisfied nor dissatisfied 75=satisfied, 100=very satisfied

Characteristics	2007		2008		2009		2007-2009	
	N	Rating	N	Rating	N	Rating	N	Rating
Age								
7-10	0		2	88	1	75	3	83
11-13	5	88	17	98	18	90	40	93
14-17	12	88	26	93	53	94	91	93
18-24	3	100	14	90	17	96	34	94
25+	2	100	9	97	7	96	18	97
Gender								
Male	13	87	28	94	27	95	68	93
Female	13	89	41	94	69	93	123	93
Ethnicity/Race								
White	21	89	42	93	62	96	125	94
Hispanic / Latino	4	80	20	97	33	91	57	92
Asian	0		2	100	0		2	100
Black / African American	0		2	94	1	100	3	96
American Indian	1	100	1	88	0		2	94
More than one Race	0		2	88	0		2	88
Type of Offense								
Theft	12	81	9	97	31	93	52	91
Criminal mischief	4	98	11	88	16	93	31	92
Harassment	4	83	1	100	2	100	7	90
Theft - motor vehicle	1	100	9	94	3	88	13	93
Possession of alcohol	3	100	1	88	1	100	5	98
Vandalism	0		7	94	9	94	16	94
Criminal trespass	0		1	100	7	100	8	100
Arson	0		5	89	7	99	12	95
Burglary	0		7	95	2	83	9	92
Assault	0		2	100	1	75	3	92
Defacing property	0		3	94	0		3	94
Felony menacing	0		3	100	1		4	100
Other	2	100	10	98	17	94	29	96

Table 26: Average Community Member Satisfaction Ratings Compared by Case Characteristics

Average satisfaction rating for all community members in the case who completed a satisfaction survey, where 0=very dissatisfied, 25=dissatisfied, 50= neither satisfied nor dissatisfied 75=satisfied, 100=very satisfied

Characteristics	2007		2008		2009		2007-2009	
	N	Rating	N	Rating	N	Rating	N	Rating
Referred by Longmont Police Department								
No	0		5	98	10	98	15	98
Yes	26	88	64	94	86	94	176	93
Police officer present at restorative process								
No	19	89	17	93	26	90	62	90
Yes	7	88	52	94	70	95	129	95
More than 20% of attendees were youth								
No	7	99	21	93	31	96	59	95
Yes	19	84	48	95	63	93	130	92
Language translation required								
No	26	88	57	94	74	95	157	93
Spanish	0		9	100	21	90	30	94
Apology letter stipulated in contract								
No	0		25	97	25	92	50	95
Yes	26	88	44	92	71	95	141	93
Restitution stipulated in contract								
No	20	88	57	94	80	93	157	93
Yes	6	89	12	95	16	96	34	95
Community service stipulated in contract								
No	10	93	29	90	26	92	65	92
Yes	16	85	40	97	70	94	126	94
Education component stipulated in contract								
No	12	87	33	95	43	93	88	93
Yes	14	90	36	93	53	94	103	93
Clean up stipulated in contract								
No	26	88	61	94	81	94	168	93
Yes	0		8	93	15	93	23	93
Behavioral component stipulated in contract								
No	15	89	31	94	50	95	96	94
Yes	11	87	38	94	46	93	95	93

Client Recidivism Rate after LCJP

In 2007-2008, less than 10% of offenders were re-arrested by the Longmont Police Department within one year of completing LCJP restorative processes. For 2009, only 24% of the cases had known outcomes as most cases were not yet one year old.

This rate of recidivism, for cases with a known outcome, is compared by case and offender characteristics below.

Table 27: Client was Re-Arrested after LCJP

	2007		2008		2009		2007-2009	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	127	85%	129	76%	24	20%	280	63%
Yes	14	9%	14	8%	8	7%	36	8%
Not checked	8	5%	27	16%	91	74%	126	29%
All	149	100%	170	100%	123	100%	442	100%

**For all cases where outcome is known*

Table 28: Rate of Recidivism by Offender Characteristics

Total number of offenders in category and percent of offenders in the category who were re-arrested, for all cases where outcome is known

Characteristics	2007		2008		2009		2007-2009	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Age								
7-10	1	0%	8	0%	1	0%	10	0%
11-13	30	10%	28	11%	5	40%	63	13%
14-17	78	13%	57	12%	18	33%	153	15%
18-24	21	5%	26	15%	5	0%	52	10%
25+	4	0%	10	0%	3	0%	17	0%
Gender								
Male	49	4%	66	9%	9	22%	124	8%
Female	92	13%	77	10%	23	26%	192	14%
Ethnicity/Race								
White	94	6%	92	8%	19	16%	205	8%
Hispanic / Latino	44	14%	39	10%	13	38%	96	16%
Asian	2	50%	3	33%	0		5	40%
Black / African American	0		6	33%	0		6	33%
American Indian	1	100%	1	0%	0		2	50%
More than one Race	0		2	0%	0		2	0%
Type of Offense								
Theft	41	7%	43	9%	11	18%	95	9%
Criminal mischief	22	14%	14	7%	3	67%	39	15%
Vandalism	5	40%	5	20%	4	25%	14	29%
Arson	6	17%	5	40%	2	50%	13	31%
Harassment	11	9%	14	14%	0		25	12%
Criminal trespass	12	8%	1	0%	1	100%	14	14%
Theft - motor vehicle	5	0%	13	8%	1	0%	19	5%
Felony menacing	0		3	33%	0		3	33%
Assault	2	50%	2	0%	0		4	25%
Defacing property	0		3	0%	0		3	0%
Possession of alcohol	10	0%	11	0%	0		21	0%
Burglary	2	0%	8	0%	2	0%	12	0%
Other	25	8%	21	10%	8	13%	54	9%

Table 29: Rate of Recidivism by Case Characteristics

Total number of offenders in category and percent of offenders in the category who were re-arrested, for all cases where outcome is known								
Characteristics	2007		2008		2009		2007-2009	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Referred by Longmont Police Department								
No	10	10%	21	0%	1	100%	32	6%
Yes	131	10%	122	11%	31	23%	284	12%
Police officer present at restorative process								
No	84	11%	62	6%	14	7%	160	9%
Yes	57	9%	81	12%	18	39%	156	14%
More than 20% of attendees were youth								
No	19	5%	32	6%	9	22%	60	8%
Yes	122	11%	111	11%	23	26%	256	12%
Language translation required								
No	119	10%	120	10%	24	21%	263	11%
Spanish	20	5%	20	11%	8	38%	48	13%
Apology letter stipulated in contract								
No	31	10%	44	11%	6	33%	81	12%
Yes	110	10%	99	9%	26	23%	235	11%
Restitution stipulated in contract								
No	109	11%	128	10%	25	24%	262	12%
Yes	32	6%	15	7%	7	29%	54	9%
Community service stipulated in contract								
No	48	8%	48	6%	7	57%	103	11%
Yes	93	11%	95	12%	25	16%	213	12%
Education component stipulated in contract								
No	63	8%	65	6%	18	6%	146	7%
Yes	78	12%	78	13%	14	50%	170	15%
Clean up stipulated in contract								
No	130	11%	129	9%	27	19%	286	11%
Yes	11	0%	14	14%	5	60%	30	17%
Behavioral component stipulated in contract								
No	79	8%	50	2%	19	32%	148	9%
Yes	62	13%	93	14%	13	15%	168	14%