

DRAFT: Not For Distribution Without Permission

Restorative Practices in a *Tiered Fidelity Inventory*¹ Framework (RP-TFI): An Evaluation Tool

Jeffrey Sprague & Tary Tobin

Restorative practices have a long history -- and a recent surge in popularity for use in schools -- in different cultures and places around the world. Ted Wachtel, president and founder of the International Institute for Restorative Practices (iirp.edu), explains that "Restorative practices are transcultural and are useful in bridging divisions between students of different cultures" (Wachtel, 2013, p. 41). He illustrates this with many examples:

- Inner-city Dutch schools with "a lot of nationalities. We have 95% of children whose parents were not born in the Netherlands. . . restorative practices gave me the opportunity and tools to deal with [group pressure] . . . in a very good way" (Wachtel, 2013, p. 41).
- In an "economically disadvantaged school district in Michigan, about one-fifth of its students speak Bengali as their primary language, one-fifth speak Arabic and others speak Bosnian, Polish and Albanian -- 27 languages in all . . . [and] has experienced a 75 percent decrease in bullying since . . . restorative practices were introduced" (Wachtel, 2013, pp. 41-42).
- "Restorative approaches such as "circles" (a particular practice that emerged from First Nation communities in Canada) [is] a way to work through, resolve, and transform conflicts" (Zehr, 2002, p. 4).
- "Indigenous traditions and current adaptations which draw upon those traditions [include] family group conferences adapted from Maori traditions in New Zealand . . . sentencing circles from aboriginal communities in the Canadian north; Navajo peacemaking courts; African customary law . . . Above all, restorative justice is an invitation to join in the conversation so that we may support and learn from each other. It is a reminder that all of us are indeed interconnected" (Zehr, 2002, p. 62).

The inspiration for this tool, RP-TFI, for evaluating restorative practices within a *Tiered Fidelity Inventory* (TFI) (Algozzine et al., 2014) framework came from the SWPBIS Cultural Responsiveness Companion (Levenson, Smith, & McIntosh, 2015). In the Part 1, definitions and common elements are discussed. In Part 2, for each item in the TFI, related aspects of restorative practices are listed, along with criteria for evaluation. Part 3 contains additional tools, further discussion, and references.

¹ Algozzine, B., Barrett, S., Eber, L., George, H., Lewis, T., Putnam, B., Swain-Bradway, J., McIntosh, K., & Sugai, G. (2014). *School-wide PBIS Tiered Fidelity Inventory*. OSEP Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports. Retrieved from [https://www.pbisapps.org/Resources/SWIS%20Publications/SWPBIS%20Tiered%20Fidelity%20Inventory%20\(TFI\).pdf](https://www.pbisapps.org/Resources/SWIS%20Publications/SWPBIS%20Tiered%20Fidelity%20Inventory%20(TFI).pdf)

Part 1

Definitions and Directions

Definitions

Culturally Responsive Teaching (CRT): The use of “cultural characteristics, experiences, and perspectives of ethnically diverse students as conduits for teaching them more effectively” (Gay, 2002, p. 106). Restorative circles provide an excellent way for a teacher to learn about and understand the cultural characteristics, experiences, and perspectives of his or her racially and ethnically diverse students in order to be able to use those characteristics, experiences, and perspectives in teaching.

Restorative Practices (RP): "Restorative practices are processes that proactively build healthy relationships and a sense of community to prevent and address conflict and wrongdoing. . . . Types of restorative practices [include] restorative justice . . . community conferencing . . . community service . . . peer juries . . . circle processes . . . preventive and post-conflict resolution programs . . . peer mediation . . . informal restorative practices . . . [such as] affective statements . . . affective questions . . . proactive engagement . . . [and] social-emotional skills" (Restorative Practices Working Group, 2014, pp. 2-4).

Schools that are successfully using a restorative approach select specific RP practices that fit with their needs, not all possible ones. Typically, they use (a) the circle process, including proactive and reactive circle discussions in classrooms; (b) informal conversations with affective statements and questions; and, for more serious problems, (c) formal conferences with school administrators and persons involved in, or concerned with resolving, a harmful incident. Restorative Practices can be used as an alternative, or to reduce the length of time a student may be excluded from the classroom or school.

"In a circle process, participants arrange themselves in a circle. They pass a 'talking piece' around the circle to assure that each person speaks, one at a time, in the order in which each is seated in the circle. A set of values . . . is often articulated as part of the process--values that emphasize respect, the value of each participant, integrity, the importance of speaking from the heart" (Zehr, 2002, p. 51). "While circles can be used as a response to wrongdoing, they are also very effective as a proactive process for building social capital and creating classroom norms" (Costello, Wachtel, & Wachtel, 2009, p. 23).

Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS): Contextual fit "is a core principle of SWPBIS [School Wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports], [and] SWPBIS is not fully implemented until it is culturally responsive" (Levenson, Smith, & McIntosh, 2015, p. 1). Contextual fit refers to the extent to which the intervention plan incorporates the values, skills, resources, and administrative support of those who implement the plan (Albin, Lucyshyn, Horner, & Flannery, 1996; Benazzi, Horner, & Good, 2006; O'Neill et al., 2015). The degree of contextual fit indicates the extent to which the intervention is implemented with cultural responsiveness and sensitivity. "Lucyshyn, Dunlap, & Albin (2002), in their work on parent training, emphasized the need to adapt to parents' values, schedules, and routines to be successful in teaching them how to implement PBS [positive behavior support] interventions. .

.. Culture, as an indispensable ecological context of human development, has a profound impact on human behavior . . . People determine a particular behavior as appropriate or inappropriate or even problematic on the basis of specific cultural values and beliefs" (Singer & Wang, 2009, p. 37).

Common Elements

The term "Voice" is used in discussions of (a) cultural responsiveness within in school wide positive behavioral interventions and supports (SWPBIS) (Levenson et al., 2015) and (b) circles in RP (<http://www.safersanerschools.org/>). According to Michelle Maiese (2005), "'Voice' refers to the ability to engage in meaningful conversation, to make a difference through what one says, and to have a say in key decisions. . . . When parties have a voice, their viewpoints, thoughts, and feelings receive a 'fair hearing' and are readily recognized by others. . . . For those who are marginalized, excluded, and/or disenfranchised, voice is a source of empowerment. . . . When all those most affected by the conflict have a voice in open and inclusive decision-making, this fosters . . . peace." (<http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/voice>)

Another common element is the importance of building community and relationships so that within the school and classrooms, a *culture of care* develops, even if a history of racial or ethnic conflict existed before (Cavanagh, Vigil, & Garcia, 2014). "With improved relationships, distrust, implicit bias and cultural misunderstanding may be reduced between teachers and students historically over-represented in school discipline" (Gregory, 2013, p. 15).

Sugai, O'Keefe, and Fallon (2012), after a study of culture and context from a SWPBIS perspective, reported that "Klingner et al., (2005) provide an excellent summary for our conclusions:

For these reasons, we take the stance that school wide PBS interventions should be proactive and promote a positive, culturally responsive climate that is conducive to learning by all. Teachers, administrators, and support staff should understand that perceptions of behavioral appropriateness are influenced by cultural expectations, that what is perceived as inappropriate varies across cultures, and that behaviors occur within larger socio-cultural contexts; connect with their students in ways that convey respect and caring; explicitly teach rules and expected behaviors within a culture of care; provide a continuum of support; and involve families and the community in positive, mutually supportive ways. (p. 19)" (Sugai et al., 2012, pp. 204-206, emphasis added).

Restorative practice circles, culturally responsive teaching, and positive behavioral interventions and supports have developed from different perspectives and each has its own literature base and network of advocates. However, recently, many schools are starting to combine these practices. This is expected to lead to new research to determine if blending these approaches will improve educational outcomes. The next section is a tool for evaluating fidelity of implementation of RP within SWPBIS.

Part 2

Restorative Practices within a TFI Framework (RP-TFI): An Evaluation Tool

Directions

1. Complete the SWPBIS Tiered Fidelity Inventory (TFI; available at <https://www.pbisapps.org/Pages/Default.aspx>) and the Action Plan that goes with it. Keep these handy to refer to as each of the related Restorative Practices (RP) elements (listed below) is evaluated.

2. Read the following list of elements² of Restorative Practices (RP) and evaluate how well each RP element is being implemented, using the following scale:

0 = Not implemented, 1 = Partially implemented, 2 = Fully implemented

3. Record any ideas for improving the implementation of RP elements that might be added to the Action Plan that was created based on the TFI.

Elements of Restorative Practices Organized by the TFI Features

TFI 1.1 Team Composition

RP 1.1a Someone with Restorative Practices (RP) expertise is on the school's Tier I team.

0 = No one on the school's Tier 1 team has any RP expertise.

1 = At least one person on the school's Tier 1 team has some level of RP expertise but could use more training or experience.

2 = One or more Tier 1 team members have a high level of RP expertise (professional training and experience).

TFI 1.2 Team Operating Procedures

RP 1.2a Team members are leading and influencing the whole school staff in the use of RP.

0 = No one on the school's Tier 1 team is doing anything related to leading or influencing any other school staff members in the use of RP.

1 = Some members of the school's Tier 1 team are doing something related to leading or influencing some other school staff members -- but not all -- in the use of RP.

2 = Team members are leading and influencing the whole school staff in the use of RP.

RP1.2b At least 80% of the school staff have indicated willingness to adopt and use RP.

0 = No attempt has been made to determine how many school staff members are interested in or willing to use RP.

1 = Some of the school staff have indicated interest in and/or willingness to use RP but not 80%.

2 = At least 80% of the school staff have indicated willingness to use RP.

² Sources for ideas for this list are marked with an asterisk in the reference list.

TFI 1.3 Behavioral Expectations

RP 1.3a Behavioral expectations are not just rules but "agreements" developed with input from students and staff members for all school and classroom environments.

0 = Rules or behavioral expectations are not developed as "agreements" with input from students and staff.

1 = Some of our school or classroom behavioral expectations were developed as agreements with some input from students or staff.

2 = Behavioral expectations are agreements that were developed with input from students and staff for school and classroom.

RP 1.3b Behavioral expectations include relationship language (e.g., we respect and support each other).

0 = Behavioral expectations for school and classrooms do not include any relationship language.

1 = Behavioral expectations for school or for classrooms include one items related to relationships.

2 = Behavioral expectations for school and for classrooms include topics about peer relationships and student-staff relationships.

TFI 1.4 Teaching Expectations

RP 1.4a Students have been taught (a) how to have informal RP conversations with affective statements and questions, (b) the RP circle process, and (c) what to expect and do if they are ever involved as a stakeholder in any role in a formal RP conference.

0 = None of that has been taught to any students.

1 = Some of that has been taught to some students.

2 = Students are taught all these things.

RP 1.4b In the classrooms³, RP circles and/or *Stop Everything and Dialogue* (SEAD) activities (Anderson, n.d.; Riestenberg, 2012) are among the methods used to teach behavior expectations.

0 = Neither RP classroom circles nor SEAD activities are used to teach behavioral expectations.

1 = RP classroom circles and/or SEAD activities are sometimes used by some teachers to teach behavioral expectations, but not on a systematic or school-wide basis.

2 = On a systematic, school-wide basis, RP classroom circles and/or SEAD activities are used to communicate and teach behavioral expectations.

³ This item also applies to Classroom Procedures.

TFI 1.5 Problem Behavior Definitions

RP 1.5a Problem behavior definitions are related to information for teachers indicating distinctions among types of behaviors that are considered (a) "serious" enough to warrant a formal RP conference that includes an administrator, (b) best handled in informal RP conversations with teachers, (c) likely to be resolved by a classroom RP circle, or (d) not appropriate for RP management. This could be shown in a flowchart illustrating if and when to use RP, which type (circle, conversation, or conference). Note that participation in a formal RP conference should be voluntary although preliminary individual talk with teacher or principal may lead to student deciding to participate.

0 = Problem behavior definitions have not been related to any information for teachers about when to use RP or what type of RP to use and no flowchart about this for our school exists.

1 = Problem behavior definitions have been related to some information (or a flowchart) for teachers about when to use RP and/or what type of RP to use although it is still not clear.

2 = Problem behavior definitions have been related to information (or a flowchart) for teachers about when to use RP and/or what type of RP to use and it is clear so that decisions can be made quickly.

TFI 1.6 Discipline Policies

RP 1.6a District/School policies and procedures describe and emphasize preventive, instructive, and restorative (both proactive and reactive) approaches to student behavior (Algozzine et al., 2014, emphasis added).

0 = Discipline policy has information only on rules and reactive and punitive consequences if rules are broken.

1 = There is some information about some preventive, instructional, and/or RP approaches in the discipline policies and/or some indication of use of these approaches.

2 = RP, both proactive and reactive ones, are described in discipline policies and the school administrator reports consistent use.

RP 1.6b The school's Office Discipline Referral (ODR) form includes an RP option for a consequence / administrative decision.

0 = There is nothing about RP on the ODR form.

1 = RP is not listed on the ODR form as an option for a consequence / administrative decision but sometimes a comment is written in that mentions RP.

2 = The school's ODR form includes an RP option for a consequence / administrative decision.

RP 1.6c Discipline policies provide clear guidance (written protocols) in use of discipline procedures (e.g., office vs. classroom managed, out of school or alternative) and use of RP in connection with (or instead of) ODRs or out of school or alternative.

0 = The discipline policies do not provide clear guidance in these matters.

1 = The discipline policies provide some guidance on some of these matters but it is not clear for all of them.

2 = Discipline policies provide clear guidance (written protocols) in use of discipline procedures (e.g., office vs. classroom managed, out of school or alternative) and use of RP in connection with (or instead of) ODRs or out of school or alternative.

RP 1.6d The school administrator (or designee) plans for and facilitates restorative conferences as: interacting with students, teachers, and parents and asking questions like: What happened? Who was involved? What needs to happen to set things right?

0 = No records or verbal reports or interviews indicating that this happens.

1 = Some indication that some of this happens sometimes.

2 = Records and/or verbal reports or interviews clearly indicate that restorative conferences using these questions are planned and facilitated.

RP 1.6e When addressing harm, administrators will (Riestenberg, 2012):

- Assess the readiness of all parties in using a restorative response
- Use restorative questions in face-to-face meetings,
- If appropriate involve teachers or other staff affected by harm in face-to-face meetings with students
- Provide teachers with appropriate information on the agreements
- Keep track of data: office referrals, restorative meetings, agreements kept, and evaluation of the restorative process.
- Involve the community (staff, students, family, and community members) in reintegrating students into school and classroom.

0 = Administrators are not using RP to address harm.

1 = Administrators are not formally using RP to address harm; no formal system exists.

2 = Administrators are formally using RP to address harm.

RP 1.6f Restorative conferences, or other formal RP activities to repair harm, are co-facilitated by the professionally trained RP Coach or administrator as agreed upon by staff.

0 = Neither the RP Coach nor an administrator facilitates or there was no agreement about who does this.

1 = The RP Coach or an administrator does facilitate but this is not done in a way agreed upon by the staff.

2 = Restorative conferences, or other formal RP activities to repair harm, are co-facilitated by the professionally trained RP Coach or administrator as agreed upon by staff.

RP 1.6g Restorative conferences are documented and assessed using a checklist such as the one shown below. *

0 = No records or verbal reports or interviews indicating that this happens.

1 = Some indication that something like this happens sometimes.

2 = Records and/or verbal reports or interviews clearly indicate that restorative conferences are assessed using a checklist such as the one shown below:

****Checklist for Restorative Conferences***

- All relevant stakeholders (e.g., person(s) affected or harmed, person(s) who caused the harmful incident, school staff person with professional training in leading formal restorative conferences, advocate or support person(s) for the person(s) affected or harmed, advocate or support person(s) for the person(s) who caused the harmful incident) are invited to participate. ☐ Yes ☐ No
- Participation in a formal RP conference is voluntary although preliminary individual talks with teacher or principal may lead to all relevant stakeholders deciding to participate. ☐ Yes ☐ No
- RP conference is held as soon as reasonably possible after the harmful incident it concerns. ☐ Yes ☐ No
- Conference leader directs the following questions to the person who caused the harm (Costello et al., 2009):
What happened? ☐ Yes ☐ No
What were you thinking at the time? ☐ Yes ☐ No
What have you thought about since then? ☐ Yes ☐ No
Who has been affected by what you did? ☐ Yes ☐ No
In what way have they been affected? ☐ Yes ☐ No
What do you think you need to do to make things right? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- Conference leader directs the following questions to the person who was affected or harmed:
What did you think when you realized what happened? ☐ Yes ☐ No
What impact has this incident had on you and others? ☐ Yes ☐ No
What has been the hardest thing for you? ☐ Yes ☐ No
What do you think needs to happen to make things right? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- The RP conference results in consensus on a plan to repair the harm. ☐ Yes ☐ No
- The restorative plan includes measurable descriptions of:
How the harm will be repaired. ☐ Yes ☐ No
How the harm will be avoided in the future. ☐ Yes ☐ No
How the person(s) who caused the harmful incident will give back to the community. ☐ Yes ☐ No
Specific supports for the person(s) who was affected or harmed (see also RP 1.6g below). ☐ Yes ☐ No
Specific supports for the person(s) who caused the harmful incident. (See also RP 1.6g below). ☐ Yes ☐ No
Timeline for completion of responsibilities, including, if needed, follow-up meetings. ☐ Yes ☐ No

RP 1.6h RP support plans include consideration of possible use (or modification) of the school's PBIS Tier II and Tier III interventions and relevant follow-up activities for that.

0 = Restorative support plans do not include any consideration of possible use (or modification) of the school's PBIS Tier II and Tier III interventions.

1 = Restorative support plans include consideration of possible use (or modification) of the school's PBIS Tier II and Tier III interventions but no relevant follow-up activities.

2 = Restorative support plans include consideration of possible use (or modification) of the school's PBIS Tier II and Tier III interventions and relevant follow-up activities are scheduled.

RP 1.6i A process is described for follow-through on agreed-upon plans made as part of a restorative practice to track accountability for repairing harm and provision of any promised support.

0 = No such process about follow-through is described.

1 = Some mention is made of RP follow-up but it's not a clear description of a process for tracking accountability for repairing harm or providing any promised support.

2 = A process is clearly described for follow-through on agreed-upon plans made as part of a restorative practice to track accountability for repairing harm and provision of any promised support.

RP 1.6j A process is described for organizing use of a "peace room" or special place for RP activities (e.g., circles, conferences, Peer Juries) including (a) decision rules for use, (b) physical space, (c) staffing, and (d) invitations to attend.

0 = No such process about a special place for RP activities is described.

1 = Some mention is made of a special place for RP activities but the process for using that place is not spelled in detail.

2 = A process is clearly described, in detail, for use of a special place for RP activities.

TFI 1.7 Professional Development

RP 1.7a A written process is used for orienting all faculty/staff members on core Restorative practices⁴:

- Teaching school-wide expectations/group agreements
- Acknowledging valued behaviors
- Repairing harm/correcting errors
 - Affective statements, etc.
- Conducting class meetings and circles
- Requesting assistance for chronic harm/misbehavior
 - Are there scheduled annual training events for school team members?
 - Is there a faculty-wide orientation led by the full School Climate Leadership team?
 - Is there a scheduled annual orientation for new faculty members?

⁴ We will update this list based on final PBIS+RP content.

- o Are there documented strategies for orienting substitutes or volunteers?

0 = No process for teaching staff is in place.

1 = Process is informal/unwritten, not part of professional development calendar, and/or does not include all staff or all core Tier I PBIS + RP practices.

2 = Formal process for teaching all staff all aspects of Tier I system, including all core Tier I PBIS + RP practices.

RP 1.7b All teachers, support staff, and administrators receive ongoing professional development in the use of RP.

0 = No school staff have training in the use of RP.

1 = Some school staff have some training in the use of RP.

2 = All teachers, support staff, and administrators receive ongoing (initial training and annual boosters) professional development in the use of RP.

RP 1.7c Written orientation information on RP is available for all volunteers, substitute teachers, and guest who will be interacting with students, and clarified if they have questions.

0 = No such written information on RP is available.

1 = Some information on RP is available but not all volunteers, substitute teachers and guests are aware that it is available or have an chance to get any questions clarified.

2 = Written orientation information on RP is available for all volunteers, substitute teachers, and guest who will be interacting with students, and they are told about it and about how to get any questions they have about it answered.

TFI 1.8 Classroom Procedures⁵

RP 1.8a Classroom behavior expectations

- o Are positively stated
- o Are publicly posted in all classrooms
- o Are co-developed with students using “group agreements”
- o Are regularly reviewed and taught using a variety of formats (at least once per month), such as class meetings and SEAD activities (Anderson, n.d; Riestenberg, 2012)

0 = Classroom teachers are not communicating or teaching school wide expectations.

1 = Classroom teachers are informally communicating and/or teaching school wide expectations but no formal system exists.

⁵ See also RP 1.4b.

2 = Classrooms are formally communicating and teaching school wide expectations, using a variety of formats (at least once per month), such as class meetings and SEAD activities (Anderson, n.d; Riestenberg, 2012)

RP 1.8b At least once a week, at least 15-20 minute RP circles or class meetings occur school wide according to an agreed upon schedule.⁶

0 = Classroom teachers are not formally implementing RP circles or class meetings

1 = Classroom teachers are informally implementing RP circles or class meetings but no school wide or scheduled system exists or it is not at least once a week for at least 15 minutes.

2 = Classrooms teachers are formally conducting RP circles or class meetings according to school wide, agreed upon schedule for at least once a week for at least 15 minutes.

[Part 3 of this document includes more information on recommendations for RP Circles in the classroom, a checklist for assessing quality of RP circles, and examples of frequency and duration from schools and teachers reporting successful use of circles.]

RP 1.8c Quality and fidelity of use of RP circles in the classroom is assessed and documented using the Checklist for RP Circles in Part 3 of this document, or a similar tool.

0 = Classroom RP circles are not being assessed or documented.

1 = Classroom RP circles are informally assessed or documented but not using any kind of checklist or tool.

2 = Classroom RP circles are formally assessed and documented using the checklist in Part 3 of this document (or a similar tool

: _____)

[Reference for the similar tool, if one is used.]

RP 1.8d At least once per week, a talking piece⁷ is used to share or teach or for an RP circle.

0 = Classroom teachers never use a talking piece.

1 = Classroom teachers sometimes use a talking piece but not often, not every week.

2 = Classrooms teachers use a talking piece at least once a week.

RP 1.8e Classrooms reflect a "culture of care" (Cavanagh, n.d.; 2014; Sugai, O'Keeffe, & Fallon, 2012) as indicated by the following qualitative and quantitative features:

Qualitative Features:

- o Focus is on relationships and interactions.
- o Students treated as co-creators.

⁶ Rita Alfred has suggested (a) Monday morning circle and check in, (b) Wednesday circle at lunch (student run), and (c) Friday afternoon circle and check out. For other examples, see Part 3 of this document and/or the following authors: Amstutz & Mullet (2005); Costello, Wachtel, & Wachtel (2009); Riestenberg (2012); Wachtel & Mirsky (2008).

⁷ See *Using Talking Circles in the Classroom* by A. Winters, for information on the "talking piece" at <http://pbisnetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/talkingCircleClassroom.pdf>

- o Power and responsibility are shared.
- o Wrongdoing and conflict are learning opportunities.
- o Capacity of students and teachers is built to solve problems nonviolently.
- o Healing harm to relationships is a focus.

Quantitative Features Observed:

- o Students are asked a question pertaining to empathy; empathy is the "ability to identify with and feel another person's concerns" (Riestenberg, 2012, p. 34).
- o The teachers use an "I" statement to express feelings or model the process of adult thinking.
- o The teacher models active listening when seeking input from students (Costello et al., 2009).
- o The teacher uses affective language when talking to students and responding to minor problem behavior (reframing, offering support, giving choices; expressing feelings).

0 = Classrooms do not reflect a "culture of care" as indicated by any of these features.

1 = Classrooms have a few of the features of a "culture of care."

2 = Classrooms have many of the features of a "culture of care."

TFI 1.9 Feedback and Acknowledgment⁸

RP 1.9a Students and staff receive feedback on their participation in RP and acknowledgement for following agreements and cooperating with the school's efforts to create a culture of care using RP.

0 = The school has no systematic plan that involves providing students or staff with feedback or acknowledgement related to participation in RP.

1 = Some school staff sometimes provide some feedback or acknowledgement related to participation in RP to some students or to some other staff members, but it is sporadic and not guided by any school plan.

2 = The school has developed a systematic plan that coordinates RP with PBIS and assures that students and staff receive feedback on their participation in RP and acknowledgement for following agreements and cooperating with the school's efforts to create a culture of care using RP.

TFI 1.10 Faculty Involvement

⁸ Feedback and acknowledgement, sometimes spoken of as including "rewards" and "positive reinforcement" are key elements of PBIS. However, these have not often been addressed directly in literature on RP, although it is obvious that social attention is a key part of RP and that can function positively or negatively. Indeed, RP is used with the intention of affecting behavior by way of social attention. See Part 3 of this document for more information on this topic.

RP 1.10a All school staff participate cooperatively in RP activities as needed.

0 = School staff are not participating cooperatively in RP activities at all.

1 = Some school staff sometimes participate in RP activities but this may or may not be in a cooperative way or when needed.

2 = All school staff are participating cooperatively in RP activities when needed.

RP 1.10b The school leadership team reports the exclusionary discipline outcomes and related RP data to key stakeholder groups, including faculty, monthly. The data are disaggregated by race/ethnicity, gender and disability.

0 = This is not happening at all.

1 = Faculty receive some information on disciplinary outcomes and related RP data sometimes but not often, not monthly.

2 = Faculty receive monthly reports on exclusionary disciplinary outcomes and related RP data and the data are disaggregated by race/ethnicity, gender and disability.

TFI 1.11 Student/Family/Community Involvement

RP 1.11a RP has been explained to students/family/community and they participate in RP circles/chats/conferences as needed.

0 = This is not happening at all.

1 = Some explanation of RP has been given to students/family/community and sometimes some of them participate in some RP activities when needed but either the explanations or the participation, or both, need to be improved.

2 = RP has been explained to students/family/community and when needed, with very few exceptions, they participate in RP activities.

RP 1.11b The school leadership team reports the exclusionary discipline outcomes and related RP data to key stakeholder groups, including students/family/community, monthly. The data are disaggregated by race/ethnicity, gender and disability.

0 = This is not happening at all.

1 = Students/family/community receive some information on disciplinary outcomes and related RP data sometimes but not often, not monthly.

2 = Students/family/community receive monthly reports on exclusionary disciplinary outcomes and related RP data and the data are disaggregated by race/ethnicity, gender and disability.

TFI 1.12 Discipline Data

RP 1.12a The school staff, including teachers and administrator(s), have agreed on a process for documenting RP, including teachers' and administrators' activities, responsibilities, ways of following up on how well restorative plans are carried out, and if harmful incidents are occurring repeatedly in spite of restorative efforts or not.

0 = Nothing like this is happening.

- 1 = We are starting to do this but it is not all worked out yet.
- 2 = We have agreed on a process for documenting RP, as described above.

RP 1.12b School staff are using the process we agreed upon to document RP activities.

- 0 = Nothing like this is happening.
- 1 = Some school staff are sometimes using the process we agreed upon for documenting RP but not consistently.
- 2 = School staff are consistently using the process we agreed upon for documenting RP.

RP 1.12c in addition to the discipline data that is collected and graphed, as described in the TFI, the school is collecting data on RP, analyzing that data, and relating the RP data to discipline data.

- 0 = We have no data on RP.
- 1 = RP data are collected sometimes but not consistently and/or not analyzing or relating it to discipline data.
- 2 = RP data are collected, analyzed, and related to discipline data.

RP 1.12d The school has a system for consistently documenting use of RP in connection with (or instead of) an office discipline referral (ODR), in-school suspension (ISS), or out-of-school suspension (OSS).

- 0 = Nothing like this is happening.
- 1 = We are starting to do this but it is not all worked out yet or it is not being consistently used yet.
- 2 = The school has a system for consistently documenting use of RP in connection with (or instead of) an ODR, ISS, or OSS.

TFI 1.13 Data-based Decision Making

RP 1.13a The school leadership team reviews the exclusionary discipline outcomes and related RP data monthly.

- 0 = Nothing like this is happening.
- 1 = This happens but not monthly.
- 2 = The school leadership team reviews the exclusionary discipline outcomes and related RP data monthly.

RP 1.13b At least one goal in the data-based action plan of the School Climate Leadership [Tier 1] team is focused on RP.

- 0 = There is no data-based action plan developed by a Tier 1 team.
- 1 = There is a Tier 1 team data-based action plan but it does not include an RP goal.
- 2 = The Tier 1 team has a data-based action plan that includes at least one RP goal.

TFI 1.14 Fidelity Data

RP 1.14a The Tier 1 team reviews and uses data on the fidelity of implementation of RP practices, using tools such as this document, at least annually.

0 = No data on fidelity of implementation of RP collected.

1 = RP fidelity information is collected informally and/or reviewed or used less than annually.

2 = RP fidelity of implementation data are collected systematically, and reviewed and used annually in school improvement planning.

TFI 1.15 Annual Evaluation

RP 1.15a Tier I team documents fidelity of implementation of RP and evidence related to its effect on student outcomes and school climate, at least annually (including year-by-year comparisons), shares the evaluation with stakeholders (staff, families, community, district), and makes decisions regarding future processes related to RP based on the evaluation.

0 = No evaluation of fidelity of RP implementation takes place or evaluation occurs without data.

1 = Evaluation of fidelity of RP implementation conducted, but not annually, or outcomes are not used, or not shared with stakeholders.

2 = Evaluation of fidelity of RP implementation is conducted annually, shared with stakeholders, and used to make relevant decisions.

Part 3

Restorative Circles Checklist⁹

1. Circles are used for community building / welcoming. ____Yes ____No
2. Purpose of circle is clearly stated before the circle begins. ____Yes ____No
3. Students have contributed to establishment of circle values. ____Yes ____No
4. Circle keeper is identified for each circle event (can be staff or student). ____Yes ____No
5. Circle keeper consistently states circle guidelines. ____Yes ____No
6. Circle keeper initiates dialogue using a talking piece. ____Yes ____No
7. Circle keeper provides the opportunity for all participants to speak in turn. ____Yes ____No
8. Does the teacher keeps a log about circles? ____Yes ____No

The log should show dates, times, topics, outcomes (Were agreements kept?), fidelity (How well did we follow circle guidelines?), and other comments, including reflection suggestions from Pranis (2005): (a) For Peacemaking Circles: "Are the key parties willing to participate? Are trained facilitators available? Will the situation allow the time required to use the circle process? Can physical and emotional safety be maintained?" (Pranis, 2005, p. 44). (b) For Talking Circles: "Are there people who are willing to participate--does the topic matter to anyone? If not, then a Circle is *not* appropriate. Am I (the organizer) hoping to convince others of a particular point of view or change others? If the answer is yes, the Circle is *not* the appropriate forum. Am I open to hearing and respecting perspectives very different from mine? If not, then a Circle is *not* appropriate. Is the intent respectful of all participants? If not, then a Circle is *not* appropriate." (Pranis, 2005, p. 50)

Other dimensions to consider when reflecting on RP circle processes have been suggested by Gregory, Gerewitz, Clawson, Davis, & Korth (2013) and more recently, in a talk given by Anne Gregory (2015), for the National Network of Restorative School Research:

- Safety: Are circle agreements kept? If broken, can they be restored? ____Yes ____No
- Is there positive rapport (friendly tone) between teacher and student? ____Yes ____No
- Do students listen to each other and show empathy? ____Yes ____No
- Do students have a voice in circle topics and process? ____Yes ____No
- Do students share personal experiences appropriately? ____Yes ____No
- If the circle involves problem-solving, is the problem clearly identified and are possible solutions considered in a respectful way? ____Yes ____No

⁹ See Pranis, 2005, pp. 44-45 for 4 key stages: (a) determining suitability, (b) preparation, (c) convening all parties, (d) follow-up.

- Do students have a positive attitude and stay focused? ____Yes ____No

Restorative Practice Implementation Questions for School Staff

When asked to respond to the following questions about implementation, most school staff who are asked will answer at least 5 of the 7 questions well and in accord with the PBIS + RP training provided:

1. Briefly, what is the general concept of restorative justice in a school context?
2. Have you used affective questions and statements to resolve conflict and manage student behavior?
3. Could you demonstrate the use of affective questions and statements to resolve conflict and manage student behavior?
 - Please provide an example of an affective statement.
4. Do you model and use active listening as a conflict resolution and behavior management strategy?
 - Please provide an example of active listening.
5. I model and use reframing as a conflict resolution and behavior management strategy
 - Please provide an example of reframing.
6. Have you used restorative circles in the past week to reinforce expected behavior and foster positive school climate?
 - Please provide an example of using circles in your classroom.
7. Have you used restorative circles in the past week to responsively address harm and wrongdoing?
 - Please provide an example of conducting a circle in your classroom in response to inappropriate behavior.

Frequency and Duration of Circles: Examples from Successful Use of Circles

How often for circles?

"Circles at the beginning of each day can help develop common understandings of guidelines, expectations, and values . . . address tensions or problems that may have arisen the day before" (Amstutz & Mullet, 2005, p. 55, emphasis added).

"A fifth grade class began holding circle meetings every morning . . . [Students became] more respectful of each other." (Costello, Wachtel, & Wachtel, 2009, p. 23, emphasis added).

"At the beginning of each class, you may do a go-around in which each student responds to a question or statement like, 'How are you feeling today?'" (Costello, Wachtel, & Wachtel, 2009, p. 24, emphasis added).

"Once circles have been established as a normal part of the classroom routine, at the beginning of each class, at the beginning and ending of each week, or perhaps every Wednesday, students will become very comfortable with the process" (Costello, Wachtel, & Wachtel, 2009, pp. 27-28, emphasis added).

CSF [Community Service Foundation] Buxmont School has "morning circle meetings" (Wachtel & Mirsky, 2008, p. 11, emphasis added).

At the "Academy" [a project-based program for students "struggling with behavior or academic performance" at Palisades High School] 'check-in' and 'check-out' circles [occur] at the beginning and end of each 90-minute class period -- an opportunity for students to set goals and expectations together Wachtel & Mirsky, 2008, pp. 37-38, emphasis added).

"Souderton High Spanish teacher Tammy Caccova does check-in and check-out circles at the beginning and end of class periods, which has helped build community in her classes (Wachtel & Mirsky, 2008, p. 78, emphasis added).

"Indian Crest learning-support teacher Doug Henning (whose students have learning, emotional or behavioral issues) . . . has regular check-in and check-out circles. Monday is "good and new day," when student share one good or new thing. Friday is "smiles and cries day," when they share something happy or sad" (Wachtel & Mirsky, 2008, p. 79, emphasis added).

At a residential special school for boys with emotional and behavioral difficulties, ages 11 to 16, "circle meetings [are held] at the end of every school day . . . we ask questions about the last 24 hours . . . 'What had gone well? . . . What has not gone so well? . . . [Later] we changed the school timetable to hold classroom circles each morning in addition to the unit-based evening circles" (Wachtel & Mirsky, 2008, pp. 109-111, emphasis added).

Pranis (2005): Does not address this at all but see her directions for deciding if a Circle is appropriate for a situation.

Riestedberg (2012) provides information on different answers to this in different schools -- all with good results:

- "A group of multi-cultural, multi-political high school students gathered once a week for a one-credit semester course in Circle after the September 11 (2001) attacks" (Riestedberg, 2012, p. 106, emphasis added).
- "One alternative learning program asks the students at the Wednesday weekly Circle to share a high and a low of the week so far" (Riestedberg, 2012, p. 102-103, emphasis added).
- "Elementary school teachers in Minneapolis public schools used the 'Magic Circle' to start or end the day. Magic Circle was a self-esteem and drug abuse prevention programs" (p. 118).
- "When I learned about restorative measures and the Circle process . . . It resonated with . . . the morning meeting from Responsive Classroom, Olweus's class circle, the old Magic Circle" (p. 118, emphasis added).
- "A 'recovery school' is an alternative learning center where the students have all been in treatment for chemical dependency . . . The school started using Circles for students to 'check in' at the beginning of the week and to 'check out' at the end of the week. The school also began using circles to repair harm" (pp. 125-126).
- "We implemented a daily 'check in' circle" (p. 129).
- A music teacher starts each class with a 3-minute circle. First, one minute of silence. Then each student says his or her name and one word about how they are feeling. (p. 146)
- "The staff [in a K-8 school] was trained by Cordelia Anderson and was encouraged to use it in their classrooms on a daily basis . . . In reality, teachers were not always able to conduct their morning meetings in Circle; other demands sometimes disrupted their regular routine" (p. 150)
- At a charter school, Circles were held "once a week" (p. 213).
- "Setting aside time--even once a week in a high school or daily in an elementary classroom--for students to talk, discuss, and debate with each other, to listen, confer, and problem solve with each other seems a small investment, when the results are a safer school" (p. 215, emphasis added).

How much time should be allocated for a Circle¹⁰?

¹⁰ For a formal "conference" -- not a classroom Circle but a conference for a serious disciplinary infraction, Thorsbourne & Vinegrad (2009) state: "Preparation time will depend on the circumstances and complexity of the incident, the number of people involved and how willing they are to participate. Facilitating the conference will take on average one and a half to two hours. Conferences are usually held within one to five days of the incident occurring. Sometimes the process is used as the 'ceremony of reintegration' to terminate a fixed term exclusion (suspension) before the pupil is back in class" (p. 88).

There should be enough time for this guideline: "Everyone gets a chance to talk without interruption" (Riestenberg, 2012, p. 91). To estimate how much time would be needed, consider:

- (a) the number of people involved and likely to be willing to speak and start by estimating at least 1 or 2 minutes or more per person for each time the talking piece will be passed around;
- (b) the topic to be discussed and type of circle;
- (c) how long opening ("Invite the students to sit in silence for a minute or to participate in simple yoga breathing . . . [then] a reading or a story . . . [to] establish its focus" (Riestenberg, 2012, pp. 99-101) and closing ceremonies ("Closings can be formal with a reading of another quote or story, or they can be a summary of the discussion . . . time for the keeper to highlight one idea" (Riestenberg, 2012, p. 101) will take;
- (d) if chairs & center piece need to be set up (and then put back afterwards), how long that usually takes; (e) whether or not decisions (based on consensus, of course) need to be made; and
- (f) how many times you expect to need to go around the circle -- "Circles usually involve a number of rounds" (Amstutz & Mullet, 2005, p. 53). Consider these two guidelines from Riestenberg (2012): (1) "Ali Anfinson, a Circle keeper and trainer, speaks of the 'rule of three' for passing around the talking piece. 'Passing the talking piece around three times on a topic or question usually elicits a response or comment from everyone' (p. 111) and (2) "Most circles close with one final pass of the talking piece, so that everyone can essentially 'check out.' The Circle keeper may solicit final thoughts by asking, 'In one word, how was this Circle for you?' or 'Is there anything else anyone has to say?' (p. 101).

Various Amounts of Time Reported

Alternatively, Riestenberg (2012) reports that "Another teacher holds fifteen-minute Circles with the students as they stand circling the classroom" (p. 113). Costello, Wachtel, and Wachtel (2009) describe a longer one: "What was intended as a brief circle to introduce new students and begin the new school year turned into a lengthy discussion . . . talked about their fears and frustrations. The circle went on for three hours" (p. 31).

At Springfield Township High School, "Eighth grade teacher Michele Mazurek uses check-ins on Mondays and check-outs on Fridays . . . Just doing it twice a week has cut down on the number of incidents of teaching . . . Social studies teacher Dave Gerber . . . [says] 'You don't have to spend 40 minutes doing a circle. You can spend five minutes and it is effective'" (Wachtel & Mirsky, 2008, pp. 53-54). [No explanation is provided about how to do an effective circle in 5 minutes -- but see below for someone else's explanation of a 3-minute circle.]

A music teacher starts each class with a 3-minute circle. First, one minute of silence. Then each student says his or her name and one word about how they are feeling.
(Riestenberg, 2012, p. 146)

Different Backgrounds, Common Goals

PBIS and RP have different backgrounds yet can be blended because of common goals: better outcomes for students, teachers, and schools. PBIS builds on the strengths of Applied Behavior Analysis and the study of school systems.

RP builds on two theories, social control theory and social-cultural theory. Social control theory is concerned with people's relationships, commitments, values, norms, and beliefs that affect decisions to get along well with others. If individuals accept peer norms and are bonded with, and have a stake in their wider community, they will voluntarily limit their propensity to commit deviant acts¹¹.

Social-cultural theory¹² includes an important concept called the *zone of proximal development* -- the distance between the actual development level . . . and the level of **potential** development . . . under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers [e.g., in a circle]. (See <http://psychology.about.com/od/developmentcourse/f/sociocultural-theory.htm>)

¹¹ Hirschi, T. (2002). *Causes of delinquency*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers.

¹² Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Vygotsky, L. (1986). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

References

- Albin, R. W., Lucyshyn, J. M., Horner, R. H., & Flannery, B. K. (1996). Contextual fit for behavioral support plans: A model for "goodness of fit." In L. Koegel, R. Koegel, & G. Dunlap (Eds.), *Positive behavioral support: Including people with difficult behavior in the community* (pp. 81-98). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
- *Algozzine, B., Barrett, S., Eber, L., George, H., Lewis, T., Putnam, B., Swain-Bradway, J., McIntosh, K., & Sugai, G. (2014). *School-wide PBIS Tiered Fidelity Inventory*. OSEP Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports. Retrieved from [https://www.pbisapps.org/Resources/SWIS%20Publications/SWPBIS%20Tiered%20Fidelity%20Inventory%20\(TFI\).pdf](https://www.pbisapps.org/Resources/SWIS%20Publications/SWPBIS%20Tiered%20Fidelity%20Inventory%20(TFI).pdf)
- *Amstutz, L. S., & Mullet, J. H. (2005). *The little book of restorative discipline for schools*. Intercourse, PA: Good Books.
- *Anderson, C. (no date). *Restorative justice and circles*. Sensibilities Prevention Services. Retrieved from <http://www.cordeliaanderson.com/SEAD&CircleTools>
- Benazzi, L., Horner, R. H., & Good, R. H. (2006). Effects of behavior support team composition on the technical adequacy and contextual fit of behavior support plans. *Journal of Special Education, 40*, 160-170.
- *Cavanagh, T. (no date). *Culture of Care Observation Tool*. Appendix C of Professional Development Training Proposal in Cavanagh's "RJ Education Vision." Unpublished tool. Fort Collins, Colorado: Restorative Justice Education.
- *Cavanagh, T., Vigil, P., & Garcia, E. (2014). A story legitimating the voices of Latino/Hispanic students and their parents: Creating a restorative justice response to wrongdoing and conflict in schools. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 47*(4), 565-579. [See also <http://americanindigenousresearchassociation.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/Cavanagh-et-al.-Restorative-Justice.pdf>]
- *Costello, B., Wachtel, J., & Wachtel, T. (2009). *The restorative practices handbook for teachers, disciplinarians and administrators*. Bethlehem, PA: International Institute for Restorative Practice.
- Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*, 106-116. Retrieved from <https://www.uwec.edu/COEHS/upload/Pattee-Article.pdf>
- *Gregory, A., (2013). *The promise of restorative practices for reducing racial disparities in school discipline*. Collaborative on racial and gender disparities. Chicago, IL. Retrieved from <http://gsappweb.rutgers.edu/rtsequityrsch/equitypdfs/Equity%20and%20Restorative%20Practices.pdf>
- *Gregory, A. (November 19, 2015). *Restorative practices and fidelity of implementation*. Paper presented for the National Network of Restorative School Research. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers.
- *Gregory, A., Gerewitz, J., Clawson, K., Davis, A., Korth, J. (2013). *RP-Observe Manual*. Short excerpt posted: <http://www.iirp.edu/pdf/pa13-handout-gregory-davis.pdf>
- *Kidde, J., & Alfred, R. R. (2011). *Restorative justice: A working guide for our schools*. San Leandro, CA: Alameda County Health Care Services Agency, School Health Services Coalition. Retrieved from <http://acschoolhealth.org/Docs/Restorative-Justice-Paper.pdf> but also see for citation: <http://reclaimingfutures.org/juvenile-justice-system-school-to-prison-pipeline-restorative-justice-guide-for-schools>
- Klingner, J. K., Artiles, A. J., Kozleski, E., Harry, B., Zion, S., Tate, W., Riley, D. (2005). Addressing the disproportionate representation of culturally and linguistically diverse students in

- special education through culturally responsive educational systems. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 13(38). Retrieved from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v13n38/>.
- *Lewis, S. (2009). *Improving school climate: Findings from schools implementing restorative practices*. Bethlehem, PA: International Institute on Restorative Practices. A link to a PDF of the report retrieved from <http://www.iirp.edu/pdf/ImprovingSchoolClimate.pdf>
- *Levenson, M., Smith, K., & McIntosh, K. (2015). *PBIS CR companion guide*. Unpublished working draft. Eugene, University of Oregon, College of Education.
- Lucyshyn, J. M., Dunlap, G., & Albin, R. W. (Eds.). (2002). *Families and positive behavior support: Addressing problem behaviors in family contexts*. Baltimore: Brookes.
- Maiese, M. (2005). *Voice. Beyond Intractability*. Retrieved from <http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/voice>
- O'Neill, R. E., Albin, R. H., Storey, K., Horner, R. H., & Sprague, J. R. (2015). *Functional assessment and program development for problem behavior: A practical handbook*, 3rd ed. Independence, KY: Cengage Learning.
- *Pranis, K. (2005). *The little book of circle process: A new/old approach to peacemaking*. Intercourse, PA: Good Books.
- *Restorative Practices Working Group. (2014). *Restorative practices: Fostering healthy relationships and promoting positive discipline in schools: A guide for educators*. Opportunity to Learn Campaign. Retrieved from <http://www.otlcampaign.org/restorative-practices>
- *Riestenberg, N. (2012). *Circle in the square: Building community and repairing harm in school*. St. Paul, MN Living Justice Press.
- Singer, G. H. S., & Wang, M. (2009). The intellectual roots of positive behavior support and their implications for its development. In W. Sailor, G., Dunlap, Sugai, & R. Horner (Eds.), *Handbook of positive behavior support* (pp. 17-46), a volume in the *Issues in Clinical Child Psychology* series. New York: Springer.
- *Sprague, J. (2015). *PBIS + RP Fidelity Alpha Table 1.2*. Unpublished draft. Eugene, University of Oregon, College of Education.
- *Sugai, G., O'Keeffe, B. V., & Fallon, L. M. (2012). A contextual consideration of culture and school-wide positive behavior support. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 14, 197-208.
- *Swain-Bradway, J., Eber, L., Johnson, E., Balgoyen, S., Maggin, D., & Hearn, A. (2015, April 9). Restorative practices implementation checklist. Unpublished draft. Chicago: Midwest PBIS Network.
- *Tobin, T. J., Tobin, J. C., & Vincent, C. G. (2015, November 10). *Circling up for culturally responsive teaching and positive, restorative discipline*. Presentation at the Northwest Positive Behavior Support (NWPBIS) Conference, Seattle, WA.
- *Wachtel, T. (2013). *Dreaming of a new reality: How restorative practices reduce crime and violence, improve relationships and strengthen civil society*. Pipersville, PA: The Piper's Press.
- *Wachtel, T. (2013). *Defining restorative*. Bethlehem, PA: International Institute for Restorative Practices. Retrieved from <http://www.iirp.edu/pdf/Defining-Restorative.pdf>
- *Wachtel, T., & Mirsky, L. (2008). *Safer saner schools: Restorative practices in education*. Bethlehem, PA: International Institute for Restorative Practices.
- *Zehr, H. (2002). *The little book of restorative justice*. Intercourse, PA: Good Books.

