



Adapted from: Gregory, A. (2017). *RP-Assess: Quality, Quantity, and Equity in Restorative Practices Implementation*, v. 2. Unpublished Compilation of Measures. Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

## Using an Equity Lens to Assess Restorative Practice Implementation in Schools

Please circle the degree to which you have seen each RP indicator implemented with equity:

<b>Indicator 1: Administrative Support for RP, SEL &amp; Equity</b>		
No consideration of equity	Somewhat equity aware	Equity focused
<b>Indicator 2: Schoolwide RP, SEL, &amp; Equity Buy-in and Leadership</b>		
No consideration of equity	Somewhat equity aware	Equity focused
<b>Indicator 3: RP, SEL, &amp; Equity Professional Development</b>		
No consideration of equity	Somewhat equity aware	Equity focused
<b>Indicator 4: “Re-thinking discipline” – Discipline Policy Reform</b>		
No consideration of equity	Somewhat equity aware	Equity focused
<b>Indicator 5: Data-based Decision-Making to Guide Change</b>		
No consideration of equity	Somewhat equity aware	Equity focused
<b>Indicator 6: Explicit and differentiated SEL skill-building</b>		
No consideration of equity	Somewhat equity aware	Equity focused
<b>Indicator 7: Community-building and Skill-building Circles in Classrooms</b>		
No consideration of equity	Somewhat equity aware	Equity focused
<b>Indicator 8: Repairing “less serious” harm and restoring community in classrooms</b>		
No consideration of equity	Somewhat equity aware	Equity focused
<b>Indicator 9: Repairing “more serious” harm and restorative conferences</b>		
No consideration of equity	Somewhat equity aware	Equity focused
<b>Indicator 10: RP Student Leadership</b>		
No consideration of equity	Somewhat equity aware	Equity focused
<b>Indicator 11: RP Family/Community Involvement</b>		
No consideration of equity	Somewhat equity aware	Equity focused
<b>Indicator 12: Addressing Equity and Social Justice</b>		
No consideration of equity	Somewhat equity aware	Equity focused
<b>Other implementation indicator(s)? Write in: _____</b>		
No consideration of equity	Somewhat equity aware	Equity focused

### **12 INDICATORS OF RESTORATIVE PRACTICE (RP) IMPLEMENTATION**

1. **Administrative Support for RP, SEL & Equity.**

Administrators are consistently demonstrating (through actions and words) that RP, SEL, And Equity is a priority. They help facilitate implementation through concrete actions. They might participate/demonstrate RP, create time in the schedule for community- and SEL skill-building circles, designate a space in the building for RP, and reduce the ratio of students to teachers during advisory or circles.

2. **Schoolwide RP, SEL, & Equity Buy-in and Leadership.**

A vast majority of staff is open and willing to implement RP, SEL and Equity efforts. RP leadership includes numerous team members sharing the responsibility to consistently lead and influence the whole school staff in the use of RP. There is a collective investment in developing an RP, SEL, and Equity mindset amongst staff. An RP, SEL, and Equity mindset is demonstrated through policy and the application of that policy through everyday practice; stakeholders “walk the talk,” including using restorative language and offering supports throughout the building and school day.

3. **RP, SEL, & Equity Professional Development.**

Teachers, support staff, and administrators receive ongoing professional development (PD) in the use of RP, SEL and equitable practices. When possible, safety agents also receive PD. Training can take many forms: multi-day training, brief but consistent workshops, one-on-one consultation, and classroom-based coaching.

4. **“Re-thinking discipline” – Discipline Policy Reform.**

Written school policies and procedures highlight approaches that prevent behaviors from occurring, teach behavioral expectations and skills, and repair harm or relationships consistently. Additionally, discipline policies provide clear guidance in use of discipline procedures (e.g., office vs. classroom managed, out of school or alternative) and use of RP/SEL in connection with (or instead of) office discipline referrals or out of school suspension.

5. **Data-based Decision-Making to Guide Change.**

In addition to the discipline data that is collected, the school collects data on RP and analyzes it in relation to exclusionary discipline sanctions. The school has a system for consistently documenting the use of RP in connection with, or instead of, an office discipline referral, in-school suspension, or out-of-school suspension. Finally, the school leadership team reviews the exclusionary discipline outcomes and related RP data monthly.

6. **Explicit and differentiated SEL skill-building.**

All students receive explicit instruction in SEL skill-building. In addition, all students have access to additional SEL supports when they need it. Supports are tailored to individual needs. Supports may be formal (skill groups, counseling) or informal (check-ins, regular skill-oriented dialogues). Adults are proactive in identifying student needs for extra support (instead of reactive after a more serious negative interaction). Staff also reflect on their own SEL skills and challenges, including identifying what triggers them during aversive exchanges with students.

### **12 INDICATORS OF RESTORATIVE PRACTICE (RP) IMPLEMENTATION**

**7. Community-building and Skill-building Circles in Classrooms.**

According to an agreed upon schedule, classroom teachers formally conduct community-building and skill-building circles in classrooms at least once a week for at least 15-20 minutes schoolwide. A high percentage of staff and students participate in community-building circles. Additionally, circles address highly relevant subjects to youth and subjects related to power, privilege, and equity (e.g. exploring feelings about race, privilege, discussing issues of equity, oppression, “isms,” addressing LGBTQI issues).

**8. Repairing “less serious” harm and restoring community in classrooms.**

Repairing less serious harm and restoring community in classrooms indicates that circles are used when low level incidents occur. Additionally, school staff should have agreed which classroom behaviors are addressed through classroom-based RP strategies and which behaviors are addressed by the RP coordinators and/or office. This indicator takes into account the number of responsive/reactive circles facilitated by trained RP staff for lower level issues. There is a policy around repairing low-level harm before sending a student out of the learning environment that is being consistently applied in practice.

**9. Repairing “more serious” harm and restorative conferences.**

Repairing “more serious” harm involves the use of formal Restorative Conferences in response to behavioral infractions, specific restorative questions directed toward the students who had the infraction and the student that was affected, and (when appropriate) follow up meetings for Restorative Conferences involving all relevant individuals within one week. The follow up plans likely include consequences that are: logically linked to the infraction of classroom/school guidelines, determined by consensus, facilitate activities to repair harm, and indicate how school staff can support the student. There is a policy around repairing higher-level harm that is being consistently applied in practice.

**10. RP Student Leadership.**

Students participate in RP leadership training through intensive or regular training events. Additionally, student leaders have regular opportunities to lead RP through a range of forums, such as an advisory council, leading circles, or a class devoted to RP.

**11. RP Family/Community Involvement.**

Family/Community involvement includes clear explanations of RP to students, their families, and the community at large. At times, families participate in 2-4 RP activities a school year such as families engaging in RP circles and/or student led, student-driven topical sessions/performances.

**12. Addressing Equity and Social Justice.**

On a regular basis, school staff engage in courageous conversations around race, equity, identity, cultural awareness, implicit bias, and/or systemic injustices. Conversations are not an end point in and of themselves. They are part of a continuous cycle of reflection and action that lead to proactive steps to increase equity in school policy and practices. Steps may include increasing student agency, changing policies/practices that have an unfair impact on some student groups, and engaging students and adults in open dialogue about marginalizing institutional practices.