

## **A Case for Restorative Practices as Strategic Transformation Efforts in Higher Education**

Michelle Strange, Bellevue College, United States  
Consuelo Grier, Bellevue College, United States

The Asian Conference on the Social Sciences 2025  
Official Conference Proceedings

### **Abstract**

Bellevue College, a mid-size institution near Seattle, Washington, established restorative practices across the campus to advance equity, trust, healing, and accountability for its staff, faculty, and students through the Office of Community Care & Institutional Transformation (OCCIT). Responding to issues of institutional trauma, community harm, oppression, and mistrust, OCCIT created a Director of Restorative Practices position to support the college's efforts in shifting the campus culture and climate while re-defining and re-enforcing its values through a restorative lens. OCCIT strategically integrated restorative practices across the college through proactive, responsive, and education-based initiatives. Data collected from participants of the restorative initiatives showed greater cross-campus community engagement and increased knowledge of restorative tools to navigate harm and address conflict. With the persistence of oppressive dynamics nationally, interpersonally, and within higher education, restorative practices offer a strategic path for transforming campus culture and climate.

*Keywords:* higher education, restorative practices, equity, community, repairing harm, case study

**iafor**

The International Academic Forum  
[www.iafor.org](http://www.iafor.org)

## Introduction

Higher education has faced mounting pressure to reckon with institutional harm, systemic inequities, and eroding trust among students, staff, and faculty. As campuses confront histories of exclusion, toxic workplace cultures, and unresolved conflict, many are searching for approaches that move beyond punitive responses and performative equity work. Restorative practices—rooted in Indigenous knowledge and relational frameworks—offer a powerful alternative: a community-centered strategy that fosters trust, accountability, and healing while reimagining how institutions engage with harm and (re)build culture.

At Bellevue College, a mid-size public institution located near Seattle, Washington, these challenges catalyzed the creation of a comprehensive, campus-wide restorative practices initiative. Launched through the Office of Community Care & Institutional Transformation (OCCIT), formally known as the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (ODEI), this initiative recognized that fragmented or one-off interventions would be insufficient. Instead, OCCIT moved toward a systemic approach by establishing a Director of Restorative Practices and embedded restorative values across the college's policies, strategies, and teams.

This paper presents Bellevue College's integration of restorative practices as a strategic transformation effort—one that mobilized education-based offerings, proactive engagement, and responsive measures to address both historical and ongoing harm. Drawing on institutional data and community reflections, we explore how restorative practices have shifted the climate at Bellevue College and offer insights for higher education leaders seeking enduring, equity-driven cultural change.

## Context and Background

Bellevue College (BC) is the largest open-access institution in Washington, enrolling approximately 20,000 students annually with credit-bearing and continuing education programs. The college serves a diverse student body—over 57% identify as students of color, and nearly 1,300 are international students. Many students at BC are working adults, parents, or first-generation college students navigating multiple life responsibilities alongside their academic goals. The average age of credit-seeking students is 26, with a median age of 21, and approximately 65% of students work while attending college.

In recent years, Bellevue College has experienced critical challenges related to campus climate, including fractured relationships among faculty and staff, institutional harm, and a culture of mistrust exacerbated by systemic inequities and unresolved conflict. In response to feedback from stakeholders across the college, the Vice President of OCCIT established the Director of Restorative Practices position and committed to embedding restorative approaches as a strategy to center equity, healing, and accountability. This shift was guided by Kezar's (2007) theory of institutionalization, which underscores the importance of aligning change efforts with organizational culture, leadership, and structural support to ensure sustainability and impact over time. Cultural transformation reorients power and disrupts white institutional presence (Grier, 2021). Bellevue College's approach positions restorative practices not merely as a tool, but as a praxis for cultural transformation—anchored in collective accountability and care-centered engagement.

By approaching restorative practices not as isolated interventions but as integrated and systemic strategies, Bellevue College seeks to advance meaningful institutional change. This manuscript outlines OCCIT's strategies, grounded in the college's evolving needs.

### **Restorative Practices in Higher Education**

With origins from indigenous cultures worldwide, restorative practices encompass a framework for preventing and repairing harm through community building, trust restoration, active accountability, and inclusive decision-making (Karp, 2016). While some typically associate restorative practices with responsive interventions to harm, community building is the foremost restorative principle (Boyes-Watson et al., 2020), which focuses on proactive engagement, relationship building, and fostering authentic connections through storytelling and speaking one's truth beyond the surface. These proactive measures facilitate effectiveness and reduce the need for responsive measures to harm (Wachtel, 2016). It is not possible to restore trust where there was never any trust to begin with, so community building is a primary focus of restorative practices with an emphasis on proactive engagement before conflict surfaces. These relationship building efforts can also serve as a protocol that familiarizes the community with the depth of engagement that is called for in restoratively responding to harm.

### **Responding to Harm**

In responding to harm, restorative practices focus on the root cause of the issues, uplifting the people harmed versus simply punishing the people who caused harm (Karp, 2004). Punishment does not necessarily heal what has been broken or prevent harm from reoccurring. Restorative practices take a holistic account for different types of harm: communal and relational harm, systemic and structural harm, physical and material harm, and emotional and psychological harm (Karp, 2016). Communal and relational harm involves situations of interpersonal conflict. Systemic and structural harm encompasses institutional harm and oppression. Physical and material harm includes damage or destruction of people or property. Emotional and psychological harm entails issues that may cause distress.

### **Active Accountability**

Restorative practices call for people that cause harm to take active accountability for the various types of harm they cause. Active accountability requires people who caused harm to create plans to make things right, instead of waiting to be sanctioned or judged like in traditional notions of accountability (Karp, 2016). Punishment is central to dominant culture's notions of accountability that sanctions disciplinary action that is often unrelated to the harm or its cause and does not directly repair the harm (Mrowka, 2022). Active accountability, however, focuses on the issues and cause of the harm, centers those who are harmed, demonstrates an understanding of the harm and its significance, addresses the root cause of the harm, and draws attention to the framework that allowed for the harm to occur while working on rebuilding trust that is fractured through the harm (Karp, 2015). Focusing on the problem vs. the person who caused the harm is central to active accountability.

### **Restoring Trust**

When harm occurs, a primary issue is often not exclusively about the harm itself, instead a focal problem is the material consequences of the harm, which is a breach in trust, especially

concerning harm between parties with pre-existing relationships before the conflict like friends or colleagues. The trust issues can be exacerbated when the relationship involves power dynamics like supervisors, mentors, professors, etc. Restoring trust is central to restorative approaches to harm (LaCroix, 2018) which involves rebuilding relationships so that those who caused harm can be trusted again and those who were harmed can feel safe again (Karp, 2015). Restoring trust is an iterative process that requires multiple attempts over time.

### **Inclusive Decision-Making**

Finally, inclusive decision-making is a key restorative principle (LaCroix, 2018). Through careful facilitation, decisions are in the hands of those directly connected to the issues and harm. An inclusive decision-making process includes engagement from involved parties, asking what they believe is needed when there is an issue or before an issue arises. For example, a supervisor may consult with the team and community on access needs and equity issues before changing office hours. In response to harm, a trained facilitator would ask the person who caused the harm and the person who was harmed what they believe is needed to make things right. Outside of restorative spaces, the onus might be on those who were harmed to establish a task force or committee to call for change. In traditional notions of accountability, an external party, unrelated to the harm, may sanction the person who caused the harm (Wachtel, 2016).

### **Our Intervention**

Grounded in the restorative principles of community building, restoring trust, active accountability, and inclusive decision-making to prevent and repair harm, Bellevue College's OCCIT implemented a strategy of integrating restorative practices across the campus to transform its culture. A three-pronged approach ensued: education-based offerings, proactive engagement, and responsive measures.

### **Education-Based Offerings**

Drawing from Kezar's (2007) work on institutionalizing change, we utilized education-based offerings to mobilize the campus community around restorative practices. We started with informational interviews with campus leaders in key areas of conflict and community: staff and faculty affinity groups, Title IX, Dean of Students, Housing, Multicultural Services, Human Resources, Disability Resource Center, President's Office, Board of Trustees, and more. Each of these meetings highlighted the toxicity of the campus culture, which led to hosted workshops that introduced restorative practices across campus and provided restorative tools on navigating conflict. These tools demonstrate informal practices that do not require a trained facilitator, as these informal practices mitigate the need for and facilitate the effectiveness of formal restorative practices (Wachtel & McCold, 2001). The workshop: *Fostering Trust, Healing, & Accountability through Restorative Practices* was facilitated at several key events that required all faculty and staff to participate, like Campus Community Day and Equity Professional Development Day.

Infographics (Strange, 2025) on restorative responses to harm were introduced and made widely available to the campus as stand-alone reference and learning materials. Passive educational opportunities were important to increase access without requiring participants to have virtual or in-person time to train. The infographics include prompts that anyone can use,

not exclusively trained facilitators, to disrupt harm and cultivate accountability and repair. Another primary component of the education-based offerings includes consultations, spaces where students, staff, and faculty would meet with the Director to explore issues of power dynamics, trust building, accountability, classroom dynamics, community building, and other concerns in and outside of conflict. These consultations became a vital source of educating the campus community about restorative approaches to prepare them for the transformational changes ahead.

### **Proactive Engagement**

Following Kezar's (2007) framework for institutional change, the second phase after mobilization is implementation. At Bellevue College, this phase emphasized proactive engagement as a core strategy for embedding restorative practices. Proactive efforts are essential for building a restorative culture and preventing harm before it occurs (LaCroix, 2018), making community-building outside of conflict a key priority.

One such initiative was *Restorative Drop-In Hours* at the Social Justice Center—an informal space where students, staff, and faculty could connect, decompress, and engage with restorative materials and upcoming events. Over time, these sessions also became a trusted space for brief consultations and real-time problem-solving rooted in restorative approaches.

The team also facilitated restorative circles on topics such as belonging, navigating change, and accountability. These equity-centered spaces invite participants to reflect and listen deeply in community, using structured prompts to support relational connection (Wachtel & McCold, 2001). One particularly impactful offering was *Navigating Team Dynamics*, an interactive session developed in response to widespread concerns about power and workplace relationships. Participants explored their communication styles, conflict orientations, and shared needs. This activity has since been integrated into campus-wide training and division retreats to support healthier team dynamics.

Proactive engagement remains central to this work—not just to reduce harm, but to transform culture through intentional connection and sustained practice.

### **Responsive Measures**

The third component of our three-pronged approach to institutionalizing restorative practices at Bellevue College is responsive engagement. Designed to meet the campus' evolving needs, these measures provided support in moments of tension, conflict, and uncertainty.

In response to specific concerns from faculty, we launched *Restorative Hours for Faculty*—a weekly drop-in space for faculty to seek consultation on restorative approaches to classroom dynamics and department relationships.

During the 2024 presidential election season, the college experienced heightened stress, bias complaints, and an increase in CARE reports – online referral forms to document concerns about health, wellness, and other incidents. In anticipation of these impacts, OCCIT hosted *Post-Election Restorative Listening Circles*—one for students and one for faculty and staff. These optional, equity-centered spaces allowed participants to be in community while processing the election's emotional and social toll and reflect on their needs. The circles were

co-sponsored by the Associated Student Government and the Counseling Center and promoted in partnership with the Provost's Office to ensure visibility and structural support.

Following the circles, participants requested continued support through a *Post-Inauguration Healing Space*. In response, OCCIT offered drop-in decompression spaces centered on somatic healing. These included massage therapy, sound baths, and low-sensory environments hosted in the Social Justice Center, providing comfort and restoration during a period of widespread anxiety and fear.

Responsive engagement has been essential to our campus-wide strategy. These efforts addressed immediate needs while modeling restorative values of trust and care.

### **Partnerships**

This restorative work would not be effective or sustainable if it were done in isolation. In moving from implementation toward institutionalization (Kezar, 2007), we established restorative teams to support the cultural shifts across the college. We started by creating a restorative advisory board known as the Restorative Dream Team, staff and faculty from key areas across campus who help to (re)imagine restorative possibilities for the college. Then, we established a group of restorative staff, faculty, and community facilitators who would host restorative circles, trainings, and activities across the campus. The restorative facilitators participate in a three-day restorative circle training process where they learn the model and build the community amongst themselves that we aspire to see across the entire campus. Each year, we expand the restorative facilitator cohort, training new facilitators and hosting a monthly community of practice for facilitators to (re)connect with each other for mini training and modeling. Given unique concerns with faculty, in the second year after hiring the Director, we also hired Restorative Faculty Fellows to integrate restorative circles in academic affairs and support faculty with restorative approaches in their classroom and team dynamics. Establishing restorative teams across the college was not only central to the three-pronged strategy of integrating restorative practices across the college, our restorative teams helped to make restorative practices a part of the values, norms, and culture of the college.

“If systems are not inherently restorative, they cannot hope to affect change through an occasional restorative intervention. Restorative practices must be systemic, not simply situational” (Wachtel & McCold, 2001). Overall, our strategic approach to integrate restorative practices across the college centered systemic efforts that included key stakeholders throughout the campus for proactive, responsive, and education-based engagement.

### **Outcomes and Impact**

After applying our three-pronged approach to transforming the campus climate with restorative practices, we found great quantitative and qualitative impact from our restorative approaches. Below, we describe the outcomes and impact of each of the three prongs of our intervention.

#### **Educational Impact**

We conducted over 137 hours of training across 1,265 participants which included 13 campus-wide trainings, 11 internal facilitator trainings, and 8 multi-day external trainings.

Specifically, our introduction to restorative practices workshop, *Fostering Trust, Healing, & Accountability through Restorative Practices* reached over 150 participants and 98% of participants agreed that as result of the training, they learned at least one tool they can use to respond to harm. As an extension of our training and its own standalone resource, faculty and staff display our restorative infographics in their spaces across the college, including the President's Office highlighting its restorative tools to respond to harm and uplifting positive impact. In a restorative gathering, a staff member in Human Resources remarked, "I use the infographics in my intake meetings and they are very helpful!" With the pervasiveness of harm between faculty and staff, it was vital to structurally integrate restorative practices into the ways Human Resources respond to conflict. The aforementioned restorative infographic, *Restorative Response Cards*, provide tools for cultivating active accountability amongst those who cause harm and empathy for those who were harmed, all while demonstrating restorative responses that support positive impact for proactive engagement. Regarding consultations, OCCIT found that they were particularly useful for faculty and team leaders that needed support navigating classroom dynamics involving oppressive comments and power dynamics within their academic teams. Leaders across campus sought restorative consultation to educate themselves on restorative strategies to prevent and repair conflict in their spheres of influence. Given the pervasiveness of perceived mistrust and toxicity on campus; educational engagement was transformational.

### **Proactive Impact**

While continuing to advance our education-based offerings, the restorative impact of proactive engagement was also notable. With quarterly Restorative Drop-In Hours, participants were able to casually learn about and experience our restorative efforts. More formally, we hosted a variety of restorative circles to bring the campus community together in more authentic ways, resulting in participants saying "it felt like the community I needed." Another participant remarked, "you can feel the energy shift after a circle." As one participant simply stated, our restorative circles are "transformative." Breaking silos across the campus and building a culture of trust, these proactive interventions established restorative values as a new norm throughout the college. Alongside circles, OCCIT hosted restorative activities for various teams and divisions across campus, especially during faculty retreats. Specifically, after the *Navigating Team Dynamics* activity, one participant raved, "people are now talking to each other who were not on speaking terms!" Another participant responded that because of the activity, "[our academic division] learned better ways to work together... our meetings look and feel different." Cultural change is difficult to measure, but the feedback from these restorative activities demonstrates the transformational power of this proactive engagement.

### **Responsive Impact**

The impact of our responsive measures was also striking. Most notably, 100% of participants of the campus-wide Post-Election Restorative Listening Circles indicated that the model was an effective strategy to listen and be heard on important issues and would recommend a restorative listening circle to others. In another restorative listening circle, a participant reported, "I felt seen and safe, heard and supported." The restorative listening circle is a strategically responsive model that OCCIT utilizes to reinforce restorative values of trust, empathy, and active accountability in giving campus communities a space to share, grieve, and process generalized harms.

## Overall Impact

While transformation can be difficult to measure and trace its exact roots, participants of our restorative initiatives have provided astounding reflections on the impact of the work. The transformation was expressed by a campus leader's remarks on our restorative efforts to address the toxicity of the climate, "the campus feels different." A faculty member vulnerably shared, "before participating in restorative programs, honestly, I was going to leave the college." Finally, a campus administrator who was originally skeptical of restorative work admitted, "to be honest, the main benefit was healing. I had felt so discouraged and disconnected with the college before this [process]. This experience has allowed me to feel welcomed again and like I do belong. It was great spending time with such wonderful people." Beyond any individual restorative program assessment results, our restorative approaches overall have transformed many aspects of the campus, supported employee retention, and cultivated a culture of profound community connection for those who have participated.

## Analysis and Reflections

We learned a lot over three years of integrating restorative practices across the college. Our three-pronged approach of education-based, proactive, and responsive initiatives has been vital to making the restorative efforts sustainable and systemic. While much of the campus wanted to focus exclusively on responsive measures, the focus on proactive engagement proved to establish community building values that were necessary for effective responsive measures. Developing restorative teams and stakeholders was also critical to making the work sustainable. Early on, we found that a focus on staff and faculty was necessary, given the pervasiveness of the toxic culture they were seeking to address amongst themselves. In the third year, after our restorative approaches were more established, we expanded our focus to include direct student support. Moving forward, we plan to establish a restorative peer facilitator cohort for affinity group student leaders to learn restorative circle processes for their cultural organizations and constituents.

With our proactive engagement, Restorative Drop-In Hours were primarily successful in the first year, then over time, attendance began to decline. We also found that drop-in hours require a cultural shift around time. With multiple competing priorities, people at the college struggle with prioritizing rest and restoration. Given the decline in participation, we transitioned our restorative programs to be offered by request or emergent need. One of the most consistent restorative requests was *Navigating Team Dynamics* for faculty retreats for each of the academic divisions across the college. Participants across academic affairs continue to remark on the transformative power of the session. A major component of the success of this activity was that it serves as an accessible way to bring restorative practices to large groups of the campus community who are already together. People who were not necessarily invested in restorative practices before the session would comment that they are deeply connected and invigorated by the end of the session.

The education-based offerings proved to mobilize the campus around restorative practices and train the community on restorative tools to navigate harm. Hosting the introductory workshop during campus-wide professional development opportunities was most effective for engagement and like Restorative Drop-in Hours, hosting the workshop on its own did not draw many participants after the first year. We found that once the campus was initially exposed to restorative practices in the original year, formal introductory training was no



longer necessary. On the other hand, the infographics were widely successful and took on a life of their own with much of the campus highlighting and utilizing its restorative tools. Next, we will post video clips on our website explaining the infographics to provide more context for those who have not attended the trainings. So far, restorative consultations have been by request, and OCCIT is planning to establish a process that allows restorative teams to come to departments and team meetings instead of relying on those units to come to us. Given the newness of restorative practices across the college, we recognize there can be access and knowledge barriers that prevent departments from reaching out to us.

Our responsive measures were the newest to evolve. For the first two years, the primary focus was building the proactive and education-based initiatives to mobilize the campus around restorative practices in an effort to make responsive measures more effective. While we have successful responsive models like Restorative Listening Circles, our next step is to establish a restorative justice conference process across the college's Human Resources, Title IX, Conduct, and bias report processes. A restorative justice conference is a model to repair harm that unites all parties involved to process the harm, impact, and collectively decide what is needed to move forward (Karp, 2016). While a restorative justice conference is an option in intake forms across the college, participants opt for other options, likely because they are unfamiliar with this restorative approach. Moving forward, we will create educational campaigns about restorative practices while advancing proactive and responsive interventions.

### **Conclusion and Implications for Practice**

For other college campuses seeking to transform their culture and climate utilizing restorative practices, we recommend educating the entire campus community on restorative practices and its benefits. This can help to debunk myths and process any resistance. Mobilizing efforts are most effective before hiring and implementing any changes because they prepare the campus for what is ahead and includes them in the transition. Mobilizing campus leaders including the Office of the President and Board of Trustees is strategic for budget needs and structural support, which allowed us to grow our programs and expand our reach because they understood the stakes, potential, and what is needed for the shared goal of cultural transformation. Overall, before implementing any restorative interventions, we recommend the campus community have an adequate understanding of restorative practices and potential.

The importance of beginning with and continuing to reinforce proactive restorative practices outside of conflict cannot be overstated. With a hostile campus climate, there may be pressure to directly start with exclusively responsive measures to address the pervasiveness of harm. Unfortunately, this pressure could lead higher education professionals into serving as restorative police, re-inventing harmful systems that are antithetical to restorative values. While it takes more time, as true culture-changing initiatives do, focusing on proactive and community building efforts is the most effective and sustainable strategy that will actually make future responsive measures more successful. Similarly, an overreliance on formal restorative practices like circles and conferences can also be limiting. In essence, restorative practices is a relationship-building framework centering empathy, it can be isolating for the campus community to feel like only trained facilitators utilizing structured and scripted processes can be restorative. Informal restorative practices can include affective questions and dialogue that cultivate shared vulnerability that is often utilized in formal restorative practices. Additionally, culture transformation requires expansive thinking on programmatic offerings beyond restorative circles. We found such transformative impacts in our healing

spaces that included somatic processing, sound baths, massage therapy, and quiet reflection. Culture change requires going against the status quo of traditional higher education program design.

In designing restorative initiatives, we recommend higher education professionals consider the structure of programs over time. We found drop-in hours to be more productive in the first year, scheduled programs were successful in the second year, and transitioning to primarily offer requested support and respond to emergent needs was effective in the third year. It is vital that higher education professionals consider the unique needs of the campus given its culture and growing relationship to restorative practices. Similarly, it is helpful to consider the accessibility of in-person vs. virtual offerings and synchronous vs. asynchronous offerings while maintaining the integrity of the work. We found that in-person is the best option for restorative circles while select educational offerings are most accessible as a virtual or even asynchronous option. For example, displaying our restorative infographics on our website has proven to attract engagement and use across campus, supplementing the infographics with brief video clip explanations and suggestions for consideration might be even more effective.

Building restorative teams is crucial to making the work more sustainable and establishing restorative practices across the campus so that it is not exclusively dependent on one person or office. Restorative teams can spread the impact of the work in subtle ways that we found attracts more engagement. Building teams to implement the work leads to restorative practices becoming a part of the culture rather than it exclusively being known as a part of the office that houses it. We recommend establishing restorative teams with representation in departments with high impact, community building areas with potential to advance restorative practices. Restorative teams may serve different functions. We found an advisory board was central to consulting on which restorative practices were best to implement given campus needs. We found restorative facilitators were essential to implementing restorative practices across the college. To meet the unique needs of faculty academic departments, we found that establishing a restorative faculty fellowship was necessary. While each restorative team may serve a distinct purpose, to maintain the integrity of the work, it is important that the teams are built around restorative values and not rigidly prescriptive about their role. For example, while the primary function of the restorative facilitators is to implement restorative practices across the college, we found in their creation of the community of practice, the restorative facilitator cohorts took on a life of their own, a community building network with and for each other. In its first year, staff and faculty were desperate to be invited despite the overwhelming campus work culture of burnout and silos. Building teams that are restorative by nature creates its own transformative potential.

Transformation is an iterative process that unfolds over time. To be effective, it must be approached with strategic planning—avoiding the temptation to implement everything all at once. In our first year, we focused on building restorative foundations and cultivating restorative teams. The second year emphasized the integration of sustainable restorative models into the fabric of the college. By the third year, our efforts expanded to include deeper engagement with students and collaboration with other colleges. Much like the trust required in early relationship building, culture change also evolves in stages. When thoughtfully planned, the integration of restorative practices across a college campus can lead to lasting, systemic impact.

## References

- Boyes-Watson, C., Pranis, K., & Riestenberg, N. (2020). *Circle forward: Building a restorative school community*. Living Justice Press.
- Grier, C. A. (2021). *Leadership code-switching: Navigating white institutional presence to advance equity and inclusion* (Publication No. 28645564) [Doctoral dissertation, Northcentral University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Karp, D. R. (2004). Introducing restorative justice to the campus community. In T. Allena & D. Karp (Eds.), *Restorative justice on the college campus: Promoting student growth and responsibility, and reawakening the spirit of Campus Community* (pp. 5–15). Charles C Thomas Publisher, Ltd.
- Karp, D. R. (2015). *The little book of restorative justice for colleges and universities: repairing harm and rebuilding trust in response to student misconduct* (Revised & Updated.). Good Books, an imprint of Skyhorse Publishing.
- Kezar, A. (2007). Tools for a time and place: Phased leadership strategies to institutionalize a diversity agenda. *Review of Higher Education: Journal of the Association for the Study of Higher Education*, 30(4), 413–439.
- LaCroix, L. L. (2018). *Restorative justice in higher education: A case study of program implementation and sustainability* (Doctoral dissertation). University of California, San Diego. Retrieved from <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/78972339>
- Mrowka, K. A. (2022). *Restorative justice practices as a framework for change in higher education* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Maryland, Baltimore County. Retrieved from <https://mdsoar.org/items/c6517eb1-aaf7-4956-8513-cc45a838beaf>
- Strange, M. (2025, April 16). *Restorative practices: Office of Community Care & Institutional Transformation @ bellevue college*. Restorative Practices. <https://www.bellevuecollege.edu/diversity/restorative-practices/>
- Wachtel, T. (2016). Defining restorative - IIRP. [https://www.iirp.edu/images/pdf/Defining-Restorative\\_Nov-2016.pdf](https://www.iirp.edu/images/pdf/Defining-Restorative_Nov-2016.pdf)
- Wachtel, T., & McCold, P. (2001). Restorative justice in everyday life. In J. Braithwaite and H. Strang (Eds.), *Restorative Justice and Civil Society*. Cambridge University Press.

**Contact emails:** [m.strange@bellevuecollege.edu](mailto:m.strange@bellevuecollege.edu)  
[consuelo.grier@bellevuecollege.edu](mailto:consuelo.grier@bellevuecollege.edu)