ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL

Jeffrey Sprague & Tary Tobin

University of Oregon

Institute on Violence and Destructive Behavior

DRAFT 2/13/2017

Brief Table of Contents

Detailed Table of Contents: Overview of TFI-RP Items

Table of Contents

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **3** of **54**

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **4** of **54**

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **5** of **54**

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL

Acknowledgements

We are gratefully for ideas, support, and discussions with friends and colleagues, especially the Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports Technical Assistance Center team that meets in Educational and Community Supports at the University of Oregon.

Purpose and Background

The purpose of this manual is to assist educational decision-makers to implement with fidelity, and in a complementary way, Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) and Restorative Practices (RP). This manual can be used in several ways:

1. This manual can help educators understand and respond to TFI-RP questionnaire items (available online with a brief introduction and citation at https://oregon.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_a5H6RcBJD8p6VF3 and with just the questions at http://tinyurl.com/tfirp). The "Tiered Fidelity Inventory – Restorative Practices" (TFI-RP, Sprague & Tobin, 2016) was created to collect information directly from schools that are working to align PBIS and RP practices in order to reduce use of exclusionary disciplinary methods while improving school climate, engagement, and safety.

2. The TFI-RP primarily assesses alignment of Tier 1 (primary prevention as a universal intervention) practices. This manual provides additional information on Tier 2 and Tier 3 practices and may help with understanding how combining RP with multi-tiered PBIS can help students who need targeted or intensive support.

3. This manual provides information, references, and materials for those who want to know more about aligning positive behavior interventions and supports and restorative practices at all three tiers of support. A term that has been used for such a combination is School Wide Positive

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **6** of **54**

and Restorative Discipline (SWPRD, Vincent, Inglish, Girvan, Sprague, & McCabe, 2016).

What is PBIS?

"PBIS is a framework or approach for assisting school personnel in adopting and organizing evidence-based behavioral interventions into an integrated continuum that enhances academic and social outcomes for all students" (from https://www.pbis.org/school/swpbis-for-beginners/pbis-faqs). Agreement on this definition is widespread. Sometimes it is referred to as "School Wide Positive Behavior Support" (SWPBS). Examples from the literature base for PBIS include Algozzine et al., 2014; Lewis et al., 2016; Sailor, Dunlap, Sugai, & Horner, 2009; Sprague & Golly, 2004, 2013; and Tobin, Vincent, Horner, Rossetto Dickey, & May, 2012). A great deal of information and many more PBIS references can be found at www.pbis.org.

What is meant by "Restorative Practices (RP)?"

No commonly accepted definition exists (, in part because the movement to bring Restorative Justice (Van Ness & Strong, 2015) practices for adults into schools for children and youth is developing in different ways in different schools. We will provide a definition for "restorative justice" (RJ) and then two examples of ways the term "restorative practices" (RP) has been explained. RJ is "a process whereby all the parties with a stake in a particular offense come together to resolve collectively how to deal with the aftermath of the offense and its implications for the future" (Tony Marshall, cited in Van Ness & Strong, 2015, p. 24).

- "Restorative practices in schools are inspired by the philosophy and practices of restorative justice, which puts repairing harm done to relationships and people over and above the need for assigning blame and dispensing punishment" (Swain-Bradway & Mathews-Johnson, 2016, p. 13).

- "Restorative practices are processes that proactively build healthy relationships and a

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **7** of **54**

sense of community to prevent and address conflict and wrongdoing." (Restorative

Practices Working Group, retrieved from http://www.otlcampaign.org/restorative-

practices)

Basically, RJ is a reactive process occurring after a harmful incident. RP includes that but

adds proactive elements to try to prevent harmful incidents from occurring, primarily by

encouraging students and teachers to build supportive relationships by talking to each other

about their feelings and values and creating agreements that may help them avoid conflicts. Later

in this document we will come back to this matter. Examples of the growing literature base for

RP include Beckman, McMorris, & Gower, 2012; Costello, Wachtel, & Wachtel, 2009; Gregory,

2013; Kidde & Alfred, 2011; Restorative Practices Working Group, 2014; Riestenberg, 2012).

Why do people who are already using PBIS want to add RP?

Many expect that it will: (a) reduce out-of-school suspensions (even if PBIS has already

reduced them to some extent); (b) reduce racially or ethnically disproportionate suspensions; and

(c) improve school climate for students, staff members and families.

What difficulties have been reported?

Typical complaints, which may be related to failure to implement with fidelity, perhaps

due to inadequate training or being understaffed: (a) not enough time; (b) not reducing problem

behaviors; and (c) seems like those who misbehave are not being held accountable. When

restorative practices are implemented correctly, those who caused harm definitely ARE held

accountable. However, this involves having someone follow up after a restorative conference

(harm repair) where decisions were made about how the harm would be repaired and what

supports would be needed to make that possible. Who is going to follow up? Who has time to

follow up? Some schools have found that they need to hire someone whose main responsibility is

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION
FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **8** of **54**

to do this while other schools feel that teachers and administrators need to make time in their day to do this. When combined with PBIS, it makes sense to see if the PBIS Tier 2 and Tier 3 support strategies might fit in here. Sometimes they would and other times not but, so far, little research or intervention development has been published on this. We'll talk more about that later.

What seems to help?

It helps to have staff members who are well trained and experienced, even a few if they can lead the effort. It helps to give the process of aligning RP with PBIS more time – both in the short term (e.g., more training and energy put into initial efforts) and in the long term (having patience as the school gains experience and uses what it learns in doing formative evaluations).

How are the philosophies of RP and PBIS different?

PBIS builds on the strengths of Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA) and the study of school systems (Horner et al., 2012; Horner et al., 2014; Sugai & Horner, 2009; Wolery, Bailey, & Sugai, 1988). ABA is a scientific discipline that uses the principles of learning theory to change behaviors of social significance (Baer, Wolf, & Risley, 1968). The study of school systems, as a basis for PBIS, has extended the use of ABA principles with individuals to organizations (Sugai et al., 2000; Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, 2010).

RP builds on social control theory (Hirschi, 2002) and social-cultural theory (Shaffer, 2009; Vygotsky, 1978, 1986). 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, are bonded with peers, and have a stake in their wider community, they will voluntarily limit their propensity to commit deviant acts. Social-cultural theory includes an important concept called the zone of proximal development -- the distance

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **9** of **54**

between the actual development level . . . and the level of potential development . . . under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers. RP also builds on traditional ways of solving problems from many different cultures: "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 . . . " (Zehr, 2002, p. 62).

What do RP and PBIS have in common?

Both PBIS and RP teach expected behaviors. PBIS has advocated for using formal lesson plans (http://www.pbis.org/training/student) whereas RP would typically use classroom circles and morning "check-ins" to communicate and promote positive expectations. In addition to developing their own lessons designed for their own school (e.g., Fern Ridge Middle School's High Five – Taylor-Greene & Kartub, 2000), many PBIS schools use programs that help them teach and communicate expected behaviors, for example: (a) *Second Step* http://www.cfchildren.org/second-step/research; (b) character education programs (e.g., *Core Virtues*, http://www.corevirtues.net/; (c) other social skills, social-emotional learning (SEL) programs, such as *We Have Skills*, https://www.irised.com/pages/whs; (d) *Safe and Sound*, http://www.casel.org/s/safe-and-sound-il-edition.pdf. These character education and social-emotional learning programs generally cover more than the typical PBIS effort to teach the school rules or basic behavioral expectations at the school, although they are related. Likewise, teaching basic RP does not necessarily include, but may be enhanced by, character education and SEL programs. Schools with a focus on RP, some without PBIS, also sometimes use SEL programs to teach expected behavior. *Aggression Replacement Behavior®* (ART, Glick & Gibbs, 2011) was very effective when combined with restorative practices in an alternative

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **10** of **54**

school (Mirsky, 2014). The ART program helps "chronically aggressive children and adolescents ages 12-17 . . . [with] social skills training, anger-control training, and training in moral reasoning" (http://episcenter.psu.edu/ebp/art).

PBIS and RP both seek to give students a "voice." The term "voice" is used in discussions of (a) cultural responsiveness within in SWPBIS (Leverson et al., 2015) and (b) classroom circles in RP (http://www.safersanerschools.org/). "'Voice' refers to the ability 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'. . . voice is a source of empowerment. . .this fosters . . . peace" (Maiese, 2005).

Both RP and PBIS seek to create a positive school climate. They seek to build 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, no date; 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'Keeffe, 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 schoolwide 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

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **11** of **54**

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).

Both RP and PBIS seek to reduce office discipline referrals, suspensions, and expulsions.

How can these punitive events be reduced? One way recommended by PBIS is through the use of a multi-tiered support system where, at Tier 1, all students are taught and recognized for following school rules; at Tier 2, students at risk for breaking these rules, or who have broken a few rules, are provided with additional support, such as the *Behavior Education Program* (also known as "Check In Check Out") and at Tier 3, students with serious problems are given an intensive support, following a positive "Behavior Intervention Plan" that is based on a functional behavioral assessment (Crone, Hawken, & Horner, 2010).

RP recommends (a) that adults do things *with,* rather than *to* or *for* students, such as working together to develop agreements about behavior, rather than having adults make up rules and impose and enforce them; (b) adults and students improve their relationships by talking about their feelings, especially when conflicts arise and they are trying to problem-solve; and (c) when agreements or rules are broken, or when conflicts arise, restorative chats, circles, conferences, or mediation are used instead of exclusionary punishments (Thorsborne & Blood, 2013).

Even though in this discussion we are focusing on RP and PBIS, we should keep in mind the broader picture that includes other views of ways to prevent or reduce use of punishment because other strategies also have been effective and might well be part of the solution. Given that all approaches cost money and take time and energy (all in limited supply), we have a

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **12** of **54**

responsibility to be open to learning about different ways that have worked for others. Improving instruction, so that it is more engaging because students are involved in higher order thinking and finding success in responding to inquiries, may prevent acting out and problem behaviors that function to escape boring or difficult lessons when leading to being sent out of the classroom. Gregory et al., (2016), conducted a randomized controlled trial, the only one we know of finding an intervention to successfully reduce racially disproportionate disciplinary referrals, to learn what might reduce discipline referrals equally for both African American and White students. This study found that improving instruction, so that is was more engaging and increased use of inquiry-based learning and higher order thinking, was significant, even more than emotional support.

Office Discipline Referrals, Suspensions, and Expulsions

During the past 15 years, the use of "consequences" for disruptive behavior in schools—office referrals, in-school and out-of-school suspensions, and expulsions—has skyrocketed. Paradoxically, these practices have been shown to actually increase aggressive behavior, truancy, vandalism, and school dropout and disengagement. These practices are also disproportionately used with students of color, with a disability, and from lower income families. It makes sense to remove students from the classroom or school if their disruptive behavior does not quickly improve. It also makes sense for students to experience the consequences of their behavior and for school staff to alert parents and to protect other students and staff members. Office behavioral referrals, in-school and out-of-school suspensions, and expulsions serve to accomplish all of these things. Yet any temporary "relief" that settles in when a student is removed from a school or classroom just as quickly vanishes when the student returns with the same challenging behaviors. In fact, these kinds of consequences to inappropriate behavior come with their own

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **13** of **54**

unintended consequences, because referrals, suspensions, and expulsions fail to teach students appropriate ways to behave. As detrimentally, they cause students to miss out on instruction so that they typically fall further behind academically and become increasingly marginalized. When students are given no educational alternative in the wake of disruptive behavior, schools may actually be contributing to serious short and long term negative outcomes: alienation, school failure, delinquency, mental health problems, and substance abuse.

A general interest in restorative justice in society at large has contributed to the adoption of restorative justice practices in schools and the ways that these practices might address ongoing concerns about exclusionary discipline. When applied to schools, restorative practice emphasizes repairing any harm caused by destructive behavior. This restitution and repair in the process of administering school discipline includes sanctions, but the approach does not focus on punishment as the sole solution. Some view RP as a "way of life" with implementation explained in qualitative terms (Brown, 2013; Deaton, 2014). Another perspective views RP as a discrete set of practices that may be useful in reducing problem behavior and improving school climate; quantitative ways of describing implementation are of interest (Gregory, Clawson, Davis, & Gerewitz, 2015; Swain-Bradway et al., 2015; Vincent et al., 2016). Our approach is in line with the latter perspective when the focus is on ongoing assessment of fidelity of implementation, which is essential if desired outcomes are to be realized, as previous research has shown. Improvement occurs during an iterative process as specific components needing change are identified (Fixsen et al., 2005).

Tiered Fidelity Inventory-Restorative Practices

We developed the TFI-RP (Sprague & Tobin, 2016) to assist schools to assess fidelity of implementation in tandem with evidence-based PBIS practices. This assessment is important

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **14** of **54**

because while hopes initially may be high, if efforts to combine PBIS and RP are not well done, disappointing results may lead to cynicism and discouragement. That is why assessing fidelity is so important! It makes data-based decision-making and creating action plans with a realistic chance of success possible. Schools have limited budgets and, although information on the costs of introducing new interventions may be hard to obtain[1], when such investments are made, people who pay taxes and other stakeholders should expect valid data to be collected on how well the interventions were implemented.

The inspiration for our tool, the TFI-RP, for evaluating restorative practices within a *Tiered Fidelity Inventory (TFI)* (Algozzine et al., 2014) framework, came from the SWPBIS Cultural Responsiveness Companion (TFI-CR, Leverson et al., 2015).[2] Both the TFI-CR, on cultural responsiveness, and the TFI-RP, on restorative practices, are intended to be used after completing the TFI questionnaire[3] which addresses key elements of multi-tiered School Wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (SWPBIS). According to Horner et al., (2012), basic assumptions of SWPBIS are that is (a) is a framework for establishing and supporting a multi-tiered continuum of behavior support for all students; (b) gives priority to evidence-based practices and strategies; (c) emphasizes a prevention approach in which teaching, monitoring, and rewarding social behaviors is done to establish a positive, school-wide, social culture; (d) implementation decisions are guided by implementation phases: exploration, installation, initial and full implementation, and continuous regeneration; (e) is grounded in behavioral theory and applied behavior analysis; (f) invests in data and information systems that

---

[1] Some exceptions: Allen et al. (2011) and Horner et al. (2012).
[2] This has since been revised into the PBIS Cultural Responsiveness Field Guide: Resources for Trainers and Coaches. (Leverson, M., Smith, K., McIntosh, K., Rose, J., & Pinkelmean, S., 2016). Available online at: http://www.pbis.org/Common/Cms/files/pbisresources/PBIS%20Cultural%20Responsiveness%20Field%20Guide.pdf
[3] https://www.pbisapps.org/Applications/Pages/PBIS-Assessment-Surveys.aspx#tfi

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **15** of **54**

enable effective, efficient, and relevant decision making, especially related to fidelity of implementation and student outcomes.

In addition to explaining and giving examples related to items in the first version of the TFI-RP (available online with a brief introduction and citation at https://oregon.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_a5H6RcBJD8p6VF3 and with just the questions at http://tinyurl.com/tfirp), the current document will provide ideas on what it means to combine PBIS and RP at Tier 2 (targeted interventions for secondary prevention efforts) and Tier 3 (intensive and individualized interventions for tertiary prevention efforts).[4] What this means, of course, will depend on perspectives and local context, as will be discussed in more detail later.

Specific Examples of Restorative Practices

Although the TFI-RP is based on a careful study of the literature for both PBIS and RP, and on experience working with schools, those who are using it to assess their own efforts should keep in mind that for RP, no consensus exists as to what those practices must be. The various PBIS assessment tools have cut-off scores and criteria (see https://www.pbisapps.org/Applications/Pages/PBIS-Assessment.aspx). This is not the case for RP, at least, not yet, although some research projects currently are being conducted, as explained in Fronius, Persson, Guckenburg, Hurley, and Petrosino (2016) and González (2015, 2016). We do find reports with opinions about how well RP was implemented (or not) but not agreement on necessary practices or established standards (e.g., Wadhwa, 2016; Zulfa, 2015). However, Table 1 compares three representative examples of recommendations for various aspects of RP.

Table 1. Types and Elements of Restorative Practices

---

[4] For a public health explanation of the three prevention levels, see http://www.iwh.on.ca/wrmb/primary-secondary-and-tertiary-prevention

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **16** of **54**

Types and Elements of Restorative Practices	IIRP[5]	RPWG[6]	AG[7]
1. Affective statements	x	x	x
2. Restorative questions	x	x	x
3. Small impromptu conference	x		x
4. Proactive circles	x	x	x
5. Responsive circles	x	x	x
6. Restorative conferences (and pre-conference meetings)	x	x	x
7. Fair process[8]	x		x
8. Reintegrative management of shame[9]	x		
9. Restorative staff community	x		x
10. Restorative approach with families	x		x
11. Fundamental hypothesis understandings[10]	x		
12. Preventive and post-conflict resolution activities (teach problem solving and self-control or provide conflict coaching to understand & manage conflict)		x	x
13. Restorative justice (righting a wrong and repairing harm done)	*[11]	x	*
14. Peer juries (with trained student jurors)		x	
15. Peer mediation (train students to help other students resolve differences)		x	
16. Community service (to restore a harm by providing a meaningful service)	*	x	*
17. Social-emotional learning (managing emotions, developing caring and concern for others, establishing positive relationships, etc.)	*	x	*

These items represent different concepts in that some are activities school staff should do, others are actions that persons who caused harm might take to repair the harm, others seem to be

---

[5] Institute of International Restorative Practices (IIRP). (2011). "The 11 Essential Elements" in an online program overview *of SaferSanerSchools™ Whole-School Change through Restorative Practices* (http://www.iirp.edu/pdf/WSC-Overview.pdf). Also cited on page 5 in Gregory, A. (2015).

[6] Restorative Practices Working Group. (2014). *Restorative practices: Fostering healthy relationships & promoting positive discipline in schools.* http://www.otlcampaign.org/sites/default/files/restorative-practices-guide.pdf

[7] Gregory, A. (2016, October). *Schoolwide RJ Practices.* A list provided on page 8 of an initial, unpublished draft for an implementation survey. (Personal communication).

[8] "Means people are treated respectfully throughout a decision-making process and they perceive that process to be fair, regardless of the outcome" (IIRP, 2011, p. 15); "adults engage youth in decision-making and clarify rationale behind rules" (Gregory, 2016, p. 8).

[9] "Anticipates the shame response in every situation where people are confronted with the consequences of misbehavior. Helps people transform and move beyond shame" (IIRP, 2011, p.16).

[10] "Human beings are the happiest, healthiest and most likely to make positive change in their behavior when those in authority do things *with* them rather than *to* or *for* them" (IIRP, 2011, p. 19).

[11] "*" indicates that it is implied or might be expected (as an outcome of circles, conferences, and other RP activities).

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **17** of **54**

ideals or goals (which may or may not be realized[12]), and still others are interventions that some schools implement even when they are not trying to implement RP. Two important RP concepts not clearly articulated in Table 1, but found in the literature, are (a) mediation where a trained facilitator meets with a victim and an offender to structure a restorative dialogue and (b) reintegration, which involves helping the person who caused harm, and has tried to repair that harm, to be able to return to classes and normal socialization with feeling stigmatized. While all of these items may be desirable and worthwhile, the ones that stand out as particularly important for any school that intends to justify itself as a school that implements RP with fidelity are listed and explained below:

1.   Affective Statements "Personal expressions of feeling in response to specific positive or negative behaviors of others" (IIRP, 2011, p. 6).

2.   Restorative Questions "are central to all of the more formal restorative practices; are responses to negative behavior and conflict; are selected or adapted from two sets of standard questions[13] designed to challenge the negative behavior of the wrongdoer and to engage those who were harmed" (IIRP, 2011, p. 7).

3.   Proactive Circles "One of the essential RP elements is the "Proactive Circle" in which teachers use a structured group discussion and meaningful exchanges while sitting in a circle" (Gregory et al., 2015, p. 4).

4.   Responsive Circles "Are a vehicle for using peer pressure to get positive change in behavior . . . Engage students in the management of conflict and tension by repairing harm and restoring relationships in response to moderately severe incident or pattern of behavior affecting

---

[12] González (2016) reports a study in Oregon in which 75% (not 100%) of the students involved in RP felt the harm had been repaired. Of course, when suspension is the only option, we do not expect any harm to be repaired.
[13] These two standard sets of restorative questions are provided in Appendix A of the current document.

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **18** of **54**

a group of students or an entire class . . . Address who has been harmed and what needs to happen to make things right" (IIRP, 2011, p. 11).

5.   Restorative Conferences (with pre-conference meeting first): "Participation of each person affected by the behavior; allows all stakeholders to contribute to the resolution process" (Restorative Practices Working Group, 2014, p. 3). Pre-conference meetings are held separately with the person harmed and the person who caused the harm to determine if such a conference would be appropriate (e.g., will the person who caused the harm accepts responsibility?) and if they are willing to be involved with an RP conference.

Schools working to implement RP in alignment with PBIS should make an effort to systematically implement the five restorative practices listed above, at a minimum, and document their efforts. Of course, ideally, more than the minimum would be done. If they also use any of the other types or elements of restorative practices, that would be a benefit and should also be documented. We need to know more about which types and elements of RP are being used, in what combinations with each other and with other strategies. Even more, we need to know how it is possible to find the time, money, energy, and patience to carry out each element. One of the biggest controversies in the field is around who will be responsible for tasks related to adding RP to the school's agenda. Some schools hire someone to be in charge of their RP program, even if it means cutting "art and music" to have funds to do that (Anyon, 1916, p. 4). In other schools, no one new is hired for this because the staff the school already have hired (teachers, administrators, counselors) been trained to implement RP, perhaps with the help of district staff, PBIS coaches, SWIS facilitators, or volunteers from community mediation nonprofit agencies or universities.

TFI-RP, the Online Questionnaire Items Explained

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **19** of **54**

Directions
1. Complete the SWPBIS Tiered Fidelity Inventory (TFI; available at https://www.pbisapps.org/Applications/Pages/PBIS-Assessment-Surveys.aspx#tfi 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 elements 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 (Examples of what these mean for each element are given below.)
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 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.

TFI 1.3 Behavioral Expectations
RP 1.3a Behavioral expectations are not just rules but "agreements" developed with input from students and staff for school and for classroom.
    0 = Rules or behavioral expectations are not developed as "agreements" with input from

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **20** of **54**

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

     1 = Behavioral expectations for school or for classrooms include one relationship topic.

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

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 for if and when to use RP, which type (circle, conversation, 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.

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **21** of **54**

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 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?

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **22** of **54**

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 use RP to address harm, using a formal process such as the one recommended by Riestenberg (2012), **shown in Appendix D**.
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 in Appendix C*)
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 in Appendix C).

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

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **23** of **54**

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 School Wide Positive and Restorative Discipline (SWPRD) practices (*shown in Appendix E*)
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 SWPRD practices.

2 = Formal process for teaching all staff all aspects of Tier I system, including all core Tier I SWPRD practices (as shown in Appendix E).

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 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 a 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 Procedures

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **24** of **54**

RP 1.8a Classroom behavior expectations help teach school wide expectations, are positively stated, publicly posted in all classrooms, are co-developed with students using "group agreements," and 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.

2 = Classrooms are formally communicating and teaching school wide expectations.

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.

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 *Appendix C*) 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 Appendix C (or a similar tool: _____) [We would appreciate it if you would send us[14] the reference for the similar tool, if one is used.]

The next question is about a "talking piece." A "talking piece" could be a feather or a teddy bear or anything that is used to show who "has the floor" or the right to speak. It is passed around so that only one person speaks at a time. As a restorative strategy, specific customs have meaning in the circle process. A "talking piece" such as a feather or anything is used to show who "has the floor" or the right to speak. When the stick is passed to you, you are expected to speak, on the topic being discussed. If you prefer to remain silent, you may just pass the talking piece on to the next person. Teachers are encouraged to try to motivate all, by speaking to them in advance as a group or perhaps privately with key individuals, so that few will choose to remain silent and all will say what they think. Of course, all are also to be taught and encouraged to "honor the talking stick" by listening to the speaker attentively and NOT having side conversations or fooling around with something else.

RP 1.8d At least once per week, a talking piece 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.

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **26** of **54**

RP 1.8e Classrooms reflect a "culture of care" (Cavanagh, n.d.; 2014; Sugai, O'Keeffe, & Fallon, 2012) as indicated by the qualitative and quantitative features listed below.
 (These also are *shown in Appendix F*).

Qualitative Features

o   Focus is on relationships and interactions.

o   Students treated as co-creators.

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

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 uses 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 Acknowledgment

RP 1.9a Students and staff receive feedback on their participation in RP and acknowledgement for following agreements and cooperating 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

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **27** of **54**

culture of care using RP.

TFI 1.10 Faculty Involvement

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.

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.

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.

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.

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **28** of **54**

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.

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **29** of **54**

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.

Advanced Tier 2 and Tier 3 Concepts

PBIS and RP have different concepts of advanced tiers and even within each approach, schools will differ. For schools using RP primarily as an alternative to suspension after a discipline referral, "circles, mediations, and conferences are considered targeted (Tier 2) and intensive (Tier 3) interventions, as opposed to Tier 1 universal supports" (Anyon et al., 2017, p. 10). A specific distinction is not made between Tier 2 and Tier 3 but the higher "tier" would be more serious offences with more formal responses, probably involving administrators. When

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **30** of **54**

schools focus on use of RP as an alternative to suspension, it may not have widespread use throughout the school and, perhaps, not even to any great extent with students who receive office discipline referrals as in many cases, they are simply offered a choice of a suspension or a restorative practice. If students have not learned to appreciate the value of restorative practices, and are not willing to admit that they may have caused harm which they should repair, a suspension might actually be more appealing, especially if the student likes being away from school, either to relax at home or to seek adventure downtown. It also is possible that those who have been harmed would not agree to participate in a formal restorative conference if they had seldom participated in successful informal restorative procedures, not having built up the "social capital" (Thorsborne & Blood, p. 31) with those around them. In essence, some students have "nothing to lose" by being sent from the school or classroom in the name of discipline.

The view point of many who emphasize the proactive aspects of RP, for building a "culture of care" in the whole school, definitely see RP this as an important universal Tier 1 intervention involving all students, not primarily just as an alternative to suspension for students who were referred to the office for discipline. Many RP advocates recommend that all students learn about restorative practices and learn to use of restorative questions and affective statements in many informal chats, conversations, and circles, to prevent major conflicts, to improve relationships and school culture, and to resolve minor conflicts. Even if most students are not expected to cause serious harm that would lead to them being involved as an offender in a formal restorative conference attempting to avoid a suspension, any student might be a person who is harmed (directly or indirectly) and should have some idea of how to respond if asked to participate in a restorative conference. Therefore, those concerned about whole school transformation focus on RP as a universal intervention. Thorsborne and Blood (2013) speak

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **31** of **54**

eloquently about this: "If transformational change is sought, then capturing of hearts and minds in the vision statement becomes a central focus of this part of the process. . . 'If we were a perfect example of a school operating on an RP platform, what would the culture of the school look like, sound like, feel like in three years' time?" (p. 152).

In PBIS, secondary (Tier 2) and tertiary (Tier 3) prevention efforts are concerned with ongoing characteristics, disabilities, or learning needs of an <u>individual</u> <u>student</u> who needs more support than Tier 1 provides in order to be successful in school. All students receive Tier 1 support, even if also receiving support from advanced tiers. The tiers are about how much support some individuals need. Typically, this support will be provided for some time.

In RP, the focus is on a <u>specific incident and all the people involved</u>. It is not just about the individual who caused the harm. Rather, it is about all who were involved in the incident – the person(s) who were harmed as well as the person(s) causing the harm. In RP, tiers, when they are considered at all, are about how formal or informal the response to an incident will be. RP puts more emphasis on a continuum of support and practices, from informal conversations to formal conferences than on "tiers." RP does not have rigid tiers but it does have a range of responses about what needs to happen to repair the harm caused by an incident. Typically, these RP responses to specific incidents, whether very informal, moderately informal, or very formal, will occur and be finished in a relatively short period of time, the length of time it takes to decide how the harm should be repaired. However, most of the literature on RP does (usually briefly) indicate that the decision should include not just what must be done by the person who caused the harm (e.g., return stolen property with an apology and a promise not to steal again), but also some ideas for how the school community could provide support to those who were involved in the incident – both offender and victim – to help prevent any future incidents. However, the RP

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **32** of **54**

literature does not have much specific information on possible supports and seems to assume that whoever is involved in the chat, circle, or conference will be able to come up with some ideas and carry through. Howard Zehr has given this more attention than many other RP experts, saying, "Putting right requires that we address harms and causes. Offenders have an obligation to address the causes of their behavior but they usually cannot do this alone. There may be larger obligations beyond those of offenders: for example, the social injustices and other conditions that cause crime or create unsafe conditions. Many times, others in addition to the offenders have responsibilities as well: families, the larger community, society as a whole. . . We must explore the harms that offenders themselves have experienced. . . . Many have indeed been victimized or traumatized" (Zehr, 2002, p. 30).

It would seem that PBIS concepts, if included in RP discussions of support, could be helpful. In schools that are using the full 3-tiered model of PBIS -- with interventions for all students, additional support for students at risk of school failure, and intensive individualized, function-based interventions for students with chronic or serious problems, then both harms and causes can be addressed. Whether or not this indicates a need for PBIS Tier 2 or Tier 3 intervention, it should be considered when RP support plans are made, especially for repeat offenders. For example, if a student, Billy, had previously been identified as a person causing harm and had participated in one of the restorative procedures, which seemed to resolve that incident, but later was involved in another serious incident, again as the person causing harm, it would seem that he did not receive the support he needed after first incident. The people in the RP conference for the second incident are trying to think of ways to support Billy. Perhaps a PBIS Tier II or III intervention would help him. And perhaps it would have helped if that had been considered initially.

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **33** of **54**

Neither RP nor PBIS has detailed models of ways to provide support for individuals who were harmed. It is important to acknowledge that those harmed include not just other students, but the whole community including teachers/staff members, parents and administrators. RP suggests that whoever is involved in the circle or conference may be able to think of something. However, there is an extensive body of literature on helping victims of bullying (e.g., Hymel & Swearer, 2015) and increasing interest trauma-infused care (e.g., Blaustein & Kinniburgh, 2010).

As shown in Figure 1, below, both PBIS and RP are concerned with providing support to students with high needs. The processes are different but could be complimentary. The important thing is for the adults who are involved with either system to be aware of what the other system has to offer and to be aware of the students who are, or should be, participating in both systems so that efforts can be coordinated.

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **34** of **54**

PBIS

Tier I
· 3-5 Positively stated behavior expectations, posted, taught to all
· Positive Reinforcement Systems
· Continuum of corrective/instructive consequences (avoid exclusion)
· Classroom management
· Universal screening for behavioral adjustment problems

Tier II
· Self-monitoring
· Behavior contract
· Curriculum adaption
· Extra social skills teaching and support

Tier III
· Functional behavior assessment
· Individualized behavior support plans
· Wraparound

Shared

· **Leadership team**
· **Coaching/Consultation**
· **All staff training and support**
· **Common area supervision**
· **Parent information, involvement and training**
· **Data-based decision making**
  o **Focus on disproportionality**
· **Written procedures and protocols developed**
· **Universal support for students**
  o **Rules and values posted and taught**
  o **Rewards and consequences systematically applied**

RP

Tier I
· Fundamental Hypothesis
· Basic Restorative PD
· Proactive Circles
· Professional Learning Groups
· Onsite Consultation
· Leadership Development

Tier II
· Impromptu Conferences Affective Statements
· Restorative Student
· Staff Circles

Tier III
· Fair Processes
· Shame Management
· Formal Conferencing
· Restorative Families
· Reintegration

Figure 1. Venn Diagram for PBIS and RP Alignment

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **35** of **54**

Conclusion

No universally accepted program of "restorative practices" in the schools exists, with or without being combined with PBIS. The field is developing; people are trying different things. Learn what others are doing. Decide what you are willing and able to try. Keep track of what you do and of the outcome for students. Share what you learn. Your willingness to share school level fidelity data using the online survey format will help us validate and improve the TFI-RP, which will be of great benefit to our field. The TFI-RP is available online with a brief introduction and citation at https://oregon.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_a5H6RcBJD8p6VF3 and with just the questions at http://tinyurl.com/tfirp.

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **36** of **54**

Appendix A: Restorative Questions

Questions for the person who caused the harm:

What happened?

What were you thinking at the time?

What have you thought about since then?

Who has been affected by what you did?

In what way have they been affected?

What do you think you need to do to make things right?

Questions for the person who was harmed:

What did you think when you realized what happened?

What impact has this incident had on you and others?

What has been the hardest thing for you?

What do you think needs to happen to make things right?

(Costello et al., 2009)

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **37** of **54**

Appendix B: Restorative Circles Checklist

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: (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:

1. Safety: Are circle agreements kept? If broken, can they be restored? ___Yes ___No

2. Is there positive rapport (friendly tone) between teacher and student? ___Yes ___No

3. Do students listen to each other and show empathy? ___Yes ___No

4. Do students have a voice in circle topics and process? ___Yes ___No

5. Do students share personal experiences appropriately? ___Yes ___No

6. If the circle involves problem-solving, is the problem clearly identified and are possible solutions considered in a respectful way? ___Yes ___No

7. Do students have a positive attitude and stay focused? ___Yes ___No

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **38** of **54**

Approved C. Checklist for Restorative <u>Conferences</u>

1. 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
2. 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
3. RP conference is held as soon as reasonably possible after the harmful incident it concerns. ___ Yes ___ No
4. Conference leader directs restorative questions to the person who caused the harm (See Appendix A) ___ Yes ___ No
5. Conference leader directs restorative questions to the person who was affected or harmed (See Appendix A). ___ Yes ___ No
6. The RP conference results in consensus how to repair the harm. ___ Yes ___ No

    <u>The restorative plan includes measurable descriptions of:</u>

7. How the harm will be repaired. ___ Yes ___ No
8. How the harm will be avoided in the future. ___ Yes ___ No
9. How the person(s) who caused the harmful incident will give back to the community.

    ___ Yes ___ No

10. Specific supports for the person(s) who was affected or harmed. ___ Yes ___ No
11. Specific supports for the person(s) who caused the harmful incident.
    ___ Yes ___ No
12. Timeline for completion of responsibilities, including, if needed, follow-up meetings.

    ___ Yes ___ No

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION
FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **39** of **54**

Appendix D. Administrator's RP Process

When addressing harm, administrators will:

- Meet individually, in pre-conference sessions, with each person involved to assess the readiness of all parties to participate in a restorative response. This preliminary individual talk may be the most important thing in success or failure of mediation efforts.
- Use restorative questions in face-to-face meetings.
- If appropriate, involve teachers or other staff affected by harm caused by students (or in cases where the adults may have caused 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, community members) in reintegrating students into school and classroom.

(Riestenberg, 2012)

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **40** of **54**

Appendix E. Orienting All Faculty/Staff Members on Core "School Wide Positive and Restorative Discipline" (SWPRD) Practices for Tier 1

All are expected to:

• Understand and follow school-wide expectations and group agreements and to help others to do so also.

• Acknowledge valued behaviors, being generous with praise and recognition.

• Repair harm and correct errors in a positive way, using affective statements and restorative questions.

• Participate in circles and class meetings.

• Request assistance for dealing with chronic harm/misbehavior.

The following activities will help with orienting everyone:

o Scheduled annual training events for school leadership team members

o A faculty-wide orientation led by a leadership team

o A scheduled annual orientation specifically for new faculty members

o Documented strategies for orienting substitutes or volunteers

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **41** of **54**

Appendix F. Culture of Care: Qualitative and Quantitative Features

Qualitative Features:

o   Focus is on relationships and interactions.

o   Students treated as co-creators.

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 uses 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).

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **42** of **54**

Appendix G. 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.

Riestenberg (2012) provides information on different answers to this in different schools -- all

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **43** of **54**

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" (Riestenberg, 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" (Riestenberg, 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 Circle?

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;

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **44** of **54**

•   (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. 99-1010 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)

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **45** of **54**

References

Algozzine, B., Barrett, S., Eber, L., George, H., Horner, R., 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.pbis.org

Allen, J. P., Pianta, R. C., Gregory, A., Mikami, A. Y., & Lun, J. (2011). An interaction-based approach to enhancing secondary school instruction and student achievement. *Science, 333*, 1034-1037.

Amstutz, L. S., & Mullet, J. H. (2005). *The little book of restorative discipline for schools*. Intercourse, PA: Good Books.

Anyon, Y. (2016). *Taking restorative practices school-wide: Insights from three schools in Denver*. Denver, CO: Denver School-Based Restorative Practices Partnership. Retrieved from http://safequalityschools.org/resources/entry/taking-restorative-practices-school-wide-insights-from-three-schools-in-den

Anyon, Y., Gregory, A., Stone, S., Farrar, J., Jenson, J., McQueen, J., Downing, B., Greer, E., Simmons, J. (2017 for print but 2016 online). Restorative interventions and school discipline sanctions in a large urban school district. *American Educational Research Journal*. DOI: 10.3102/0002831216675719. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Yolanda_Anyon/publication/309493942_Restorative_Interventions_and_School_Discipline_Sanctions_in_a_Large_Urban_School_District/links/5813b1b708aedc7d8961e649.pdf

Baer, D.M., Wolf, M.M., & Risley, T.R. (1968). Some current dimensions of applied behavior analysis. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1,* 91–97.

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **46** of **54**

Blaustein, M. E., & Kinniburgh, K. M. (2010). *Treating traumatic stress in children and adolescents: How to foster resilience through attachment, self-regulation, and competency*. New York: The Guildford Press

Beckman, K., McMorris, B., & Gower, A. (2012). *Restorative interventions toolkit.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Healthy Youth Development — Prevention Research Center.

Brown, P. L. (2013). *Opening up, students transform a vicious circle.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2013/04/04/education/restorative-justice-programs-take-root-in-schools.html

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 Practices.

Crone, D. A., Hawken, L. S., & Horner, R. H. (2010). *Responding to problem behavior in schools, Second edition: The Behavior Education Program*. The Guilford Practical Intervention in the Schools Series. New York: Guilford Press.

Deaton, S. (2014). *Restorative justice practices as a way of life*. Retrieved from

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **47** of **54**

http://resolutionariesinc.com/restorative-justice-practices-as-a-way-of-life/

Fixsen, D. L., Naoom, S. F., Blasé, K. A., Friedman, R. M., and Wallace, F. (2005). *Implementation research: A synthesis of the literature.* Tampa, FL: University of South Florida, Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute, The National Implementation Research Network (FMHI Publication #231).

Fronius, T., Persson, H., Guckenburg, S., Hurley, N., & Petrosino, A. (2016). *Restorative justice in U.S. schools: A research review.* San Francisco: WestEd. Retrieved from http://jprc.wested.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/RJ_Literature-Review_20160217.pdf

Glick, B., & Gibbs, J. C. (2011). Aggression Replacement Training®: A comprehensive intervention for aggressive youth (3rd ed.). Champaign, Ill: Research Press.

González, T. (2015). Socializing schools: Addressing racial disparities in discipline through restorative justice. In D. J. Losen, (Ed.), *Closing the school discipline gap: Equitable remedies for excessive exclusion* (pp. 151-165). New York: Teachers College Press.

González, T. (2016). Keeping kids in schools: Restorative justice, punitive discipline, and the school to prison pipeline. *Journal of Law and Education, 41,* 281-335.

Gregory, A., (2013). *The promise of restorative practices for reducing racial disparities in school discipline.* Collaborative on racial and gender disparities. Chicago, IL. http://gsappweb.rutgers.edu/rts/equityrsch/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. (2016, October). *Schoolwide RJ Practices.* A list provided on page 8 of an initial,

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **48** of **54**

unpublished draft for an implementation survey. (Personal communication).

Gregory, A., Clawson, K., Davis, A., & Gerewitz, J. (2015). The promise of restorative practices

for reducing racial disparities in school discipline. *Journal of Educational and*

Psychological Consultation, 25, 1-29.

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

Gregory, A., Hafen, C. A., Ruzek, E., Mikami, A. Y., Allen, J. P., & Pianta, R. C. (2016).

Closing the racial discipline gap in classrooms by changing teacher practice. *School*

Psychology Review, 45, 171-191.

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

Horner, R. H. (March 27, 2003). *Extending positive behavior support to whole schools:*

Sustainable implementation. Keynote Address. First International Conference on

Positive Behavior Support. Orlando: Florida.

Horner, R. H., Kincaid, D., Sugai, G., Lewis, T., Eber, L., Barrett, S., Rossetto Dickey, C.,

Richter, M., Sullivan, E., Boezio, C., Algozzine, B., Reynolds, H., & Johnson, N. (2014).

Scaling up school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports: The experiences

of seven states with documented success. *Journal of Positive Behavioral Interventions,*

16, 197-208.

Horner, R., Sugai, G., Kincaid, D., George, H., Lewis, T., Eber, L., Barrett, S., & Algozzine, B.

(2012). *What does it cost to implement school-wide PBIS?*[15] Retrieved from

http://www.pbis.org/common/cms/files/pbisresources/20120802_WhatDoesItCostToImpl

---

[15] Cost information for districts initiating PBIS Tier 1, if 15 schools, initial estimate of $4,633 per school and on-going annual costs of $400. Costs for Tiers 2 and 3 not estimated but suggestions for doing a local estimate are given.

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **49** of **54**

ementSWPBIS.pdf

Hymel, S., & Swearer, S. M. (2015). Four decades of research on school bullying. *American Psychologist, 70*, 293-299.

Institute of International Restorative Practices (IIRP). (2011). "The 11 Essential Elements" in an online program overview of SaferSanerSchools™ Whole-School Change through Restorative Practices (http://www.iirp.edu/pdf/WSC-Overview.pdf).

Kidde, J., & Alfred, R. R. (2011). *Restorative justice: A working guide for our schools*. San Leandro, CA: Almeda County Health Care Services Agency, School Health Services Coalition. Retrieved from http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/D2_Restorative-Justice-Paper_Alfred.pdf

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/.

Leverson, M., Smith, K., & McIntosh, K. (2015). *PBIS CR companion guide*. Unpublished working draft[16]. Eugene, University of Oregon, College of Education.

Lewis, T.J., Barrett, S., Sugai, G., & Horner, R. H., Mitchell, B.S., & Starkey, D. (2016). *Training and professional development blueprint for positive behavioral interventions and supports*. Eugene, OR: National Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavior Interventions and Support. Retrieved from http://www.pbis.org

---

[16] This has recently been revised and completed and is expected to soon be available on https://www.pbisapps.org/Applications/Pages/PBIS-Assessment.aspx

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **50** of **54**

Maiese, M. (2005) *Voice*. Posted on *Beyond Intractability*. Conflict Information Consortium, University of Colorado, Boulder. http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/voice

Mirsky, L. (2014, September). Study shows youth are less aggressive with restorative practices. Retrieved from http://restorativeworks.net/2014/09/aggression-replacement-training-csf-buxmont/

Pranis, K. (2005). *The little book of circle process: A new/old approach to peacemaking*. Intercourse, PA: Good Books.

Restorative Practices Working Group. (2014, March). *Restorative practices: Fostering healthy relationships and promoting positive discipline in schools.* Retrieved from http://www.otlcampaign.org/sites/default/files/restorative-practices-guide.pdf

Riestenberg, N. (2012). *Circle in the Square.* St. Paul, MN: Living Justice Press.

Sailor, W., Dunlap, G., Sugai, G., & Horner, R. (Eds.). (2009). *Handbook of positive behavior support.* New York: Springer.

Shaffer, D. R. (2009). *Social and personality development*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Sprague, J. R., & Golly, A. (2004). *Best behavior: Building positive behavior support in schools.* Longmont, Colorado: Sopris West Educational Services.

Sprague, J. R., & Golly, A. (2013). *Best behavior: Cultivate a schoolwide system of positive behavior supports, 2nd ed.* Dallas, TX: Voyager Sopris Learning.

Sprague, J. & Tobin, T. (2016). *Restorative practices in a tiered fidelity inventory framework (TFI-RP): An evaluation tool.* University of Oregon, College of Education, Institute on Violence and Destructive Behavior, Eugene.

Sugai, G., & Horner, R. H. (2009). Responsiveness-to-intervention and school-wide positive behavior supports: Integration of multi-tiered approaches. *Exceptionality, 17*, 223-237.

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **51** of **54**

Sugai, G., Horner, R. H., Dunlap, G. Hieneman, M., Lewis, T. J., Nelson, C. M., Scott, T.,
Liaupsin, C., Sailor, W., Turnbull, A. P., Turnbull, H. R., III, Wickham, D. Reuf, M., &
Wilcox, B. (2000). Applying positive behavioral support and functional behavioral
assessment in schools. *Journal of Positive Behavioral Interventions, 2*, 131-143.

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. (Personal
communication).

Swain-Bradway, J., & Mathews-Johnson, J. (2016). *Restorative practices across tiers:
Elementary example.* National PBIS Leadership Forum. Retrieved from
https://www.pbis.org/Common/Cms/files/Forum16_Presentations/A13_Swain_Bradway_
et_al.pdf

Taylor-Green, S. J., & Kartub, D. T. (2000). Durable implementation of schoolwide behavior
support: The high five program. *The Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 2*, 233-
235.

Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports. (2010).
*Implementation blueprint and self-assessment: Positive behavioral interventions and
supports.* Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education
Programs. Retrieved from
http://www.pbis.org/common/cms/files/pbisresources/SWPBS_ImplementationBlueprint
_vSep_23_2010.pdf

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION
FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **52** of **54**

Thorsborne, M., & Blood, P. (2013). *Implementing restorative practices in schools: A practical guide to transforming school communities.* Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Tobin, T. J., Vincent, C. G., Horner, R. H., Rossetto Dickey, C., & May, S. A. (2012). Fidelity measures to improve implementation of behavioural support. *International Journal of Positive Behavioural Support, 2*(2), 12-19.

Van Ness, D. W., & Strong, K. H. (2015). *Restoring justice: An introduction to restorative justice, 5th ed.* New York: Routledge.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Vincent, C. G., Inglish, J., Girvan, E. J., Sprague, J. R., & McCabe, T. M. (2016). School-wide positive and restorative discipline (SWPRD): Integrating school-wide positive behavior interventions and supports and restorative discipline. In Skiba, R. J., Mediratta, K., Rausch, M. K. (Eds.), *Inequality in school discipline: Research and practice to reduce disparities* (pp. 115-134). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wadhwa, A. (2016). *Restorative justice in urban schools.* New York: Routledge.

Wachtel, T., & Mirsky, L. (2008). *Safer saner schools: Restorative practices in education.* Bethlehem, PA: International Institute for Restorative Practices.

Wolery, M. R., Bailey, D. B., Jr., & Sugai, G. M. (1988). *Effective teaching: Principles and procedures of applied behavior analysis with exceptional students*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Restorative Practices Working Group. (2014). *Restorative practices: Fostering healthy relationships & promoting positive discipline in schools: A guide for educators.* Retrieved from http://www.otlcampaign.org/sites/default/files/restorative-practices-

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **53** of **54**

guide.pdf

Zehr, H. (2002). *The little book of restorative justice*. Intercourse, PA: Good Books.

Zulfa, M. K. (2015). *A case study examining the restorative justice practices implemented in three California high schools.* Doctoral Dissertations and Projects. Paper 1033. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/doctoral/1033/

ALIGNING POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES: AN IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MANUAL Jeffrey Sprague (jeffs@uoregon.edu) & Tary Tobin (ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Page **54** of **54**