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Abstract

This report presents the results of a project funded by the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (ICJIA) to research, test, and develop a series of data collection instruments for use by schools or school districts contemplating the implementation of Restorative Justice practices. The behavioral and policy issues addressed by this project concern school responses to conflicts and harms that occur on school property or in the context of school activities, how schools proactively and reactively address these matters, and how Restorative Justice can be incorporated into school policies, practices, and activities with positive results. In order to test several hypotheses regarding the relationship between Restorative Justice practices and school characteristics, data on school climate, discipline policy, and school incidents were collected using different tools and methods, including the administration of a School Climate Survey to students, interviews with teachers and school administrators, collection of school administrative records, and in-field classroom observation. This research project demonstrated that it is possible to collect data from different types of schools, and from different grades and age levels, for the purposes of assessing and evaluating the implementation of Restorative Justice practices. In addition, this preliminary analysis of the data collected from several school districts in several different geographic locations in the state of Illinois suggests that the research instruments developed for this project (school climate survey linked to specific hypotheses pertaining to Restorative Justice practices in schools, school discipline interview, collection of administrative data, and classroom observations) can indeed detect differences by school and by hypothesis.
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Introduction

This report presents the results of a project funded by the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (ICJIA) to research, test, and develop a series of data collection instruments for use by schools or school districts contemplating the implementation of Restorative Justice practices. Drawing from the Authority’s guide for implementing Restorative Justice in schools, Restorative Justice refers to a set of principles that guide responses to conflict and harm, and that have three main goals: accountability for wrongdoers, community safety, and competency development (pro-social skill development for wrongdoers) (ICJIA 2009). The behavioral and policy issues addressed by this project concern school responses to conflicts and harms that occur on school property or in the context of school activities, how schools proactively and reactively address these matters, and how Restorative Justice can be incorporated into school policies, practices, and activities with positive results (e.g., improved school climate and culture; reduced detentions, suspensions, and expulsions; improved student behavioral and academic outcomes; and reduced disproportionate application of school disciplinary procedures to minority students, including disproportionate minority referral to the justice system based on school problems and conflicts).

The impetus for this project resulted from the work of the Illinois Balanced and Restorative Justice Project (IBARJP). IBARJP is a statewide organization in Illinois with a mission to strengthen and expand Restorative Justice practices in Illinois and elsewhere. For the past several years, a number of Illinois school districts have approached IBARJP with plans to implement Restorative Justice practices within their schools as a means of reducing conflict and violence, and improving school climate and educational outcomes. Frequently, these requests emanate from Illinois schools participating in Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS). The PBIS goals and mission are very closely related to those of Restorative Justice, and

---

1 There are several different descriptions and conceptualizations of Restorative Justice, some oriented toward the theory and philosophy of Restorative Justice, and others oriented toward Restorative Justice programs and practices. This report does not survey or explain the varieties of definitions for Restorative Justice. For the sake of consistency, this report begins with the definition provided in the several Restorative Justice guidebooks published by ICJIA (see: http://www.icjia.state.il.us/public/index.cfm?metasection=publications).

2 See www.ibarj.org.

3 Excerpted from the PBIS website (http://www.pbisillinois.org/): “The Illinois PBIS Network is the Positive Behavior Interventions & Supports component of the Illinois Statewide Technical Assistance Center (IS-TAC) - an Illinois State Board of Education funded 7
some schools involved in the PBIS-Illinois network view Restorative Justice as a logical support and supplement to their work and emphasis on student success.

When IBARJP received requests from several school districts in Illinois for training and technical assistance to implement Restorative Justice, the IBARJP Board of Directors (specifically, the Board’s Data and Evaluation Committee) suggested that a set of data collection and evaluation instruments be developed that would allow IBARJP and the interested schools to assess the extent to which implemented Restorative Justice practices have an impact on school characteristics such as school culture and climate, school discipline policies, school behavioral problems, and the administration of discipline. Recognizing the effort and resources required to develop a concrete set of data collection instruments focused on Restorative Justice in Schools, Governors State University (GSU, an IBARJP member through the affiliation of the University’s Criminal Justice Program with IBARJP) requested funding from ICJIA to support this development activity. In response to this request, ICJIA awarded a grant to GSU for the period of October 2010 through September 2011 to support the development of a data collection protocol for the evaluation of school-based Restorative Justice practices.

This report presents documentation and measurement outcomes regarding the school-based Restorative Justice data collection protocol project funded by ICJIA. The information in this report should be of interest to a number of audiences, including school teachers, school counselors, school social workers, school police officers, school administrators, school policy and research organizations, school and student advocates, school students, and parents of school students at all educational levels, as well as justice system practitioners and Restorative Justice advocates and practitioners. In spite of the increasing amount of research and evaluation underway in school and justice agencies across the country, the knowledge base regarding effective Restorative Justice practices and approaches, and the contexts within which they can be effective, is not sufficiently large or broad such that high confidence exists that Restorative Justice is the correct approach for a variety of school initiatives promoting effective practices to benefit all children. The Illinois PBIS Network builds capacity of schools, families, and communities to promote social and academic success of all students, including those with emotional/behavioral and other disabilities.”

4 No distinction is made here regarding different types of schools – public, private, magnet, charter, etc. While levels of different types of problems may vary by school type, but it is reasonable to expect that implementing Restorative Justice practices in any school should be expected to produce measurable effects. This project focused on middle and high schools; no data collection was conducted in elementary or pre-schools.
challenges and problems. This report makes a significant contribution to this needed knowledge base. It presents the results of a literature review exploring hypotheses pertaining to Restorative Justice and school matters, the results of a research instrumentation development effort that produced new school climate and school discipline survey instruments, the preliminary results of applications of these data collection instruments in two different school settings, recommendations for making further progress in this area, and it presents the actual data collection instruments themselves.

Over the course of this project, the GSU Criminal Justice Program worked closely with IBARJP, several representatives from the MacArthur Foundation Models for Change National Resource Bank (a nationwide network of research and policy experts devoted to the success of juvenile justice reforms in Illinois and elsewhere⁵), and school teachers and officials in Alton, Illinois, and Chicago (Bronzeville Lighthouse Charter School) to draft the data collection instruments, plan for their implementation in the two above-mentioned study sites (Alton and Lighthouse), collect the data, analyze the data, and prepare the final project documentation.

The project results are encouraging. Schools and students responded positively to the project, and the data collection instruments provide key information that schools can use to evaluate the effectiveness of their attempts to incorporate Restorative Justice into their policies and practices. Readers should note, however, that this report represents an incomplete picture. Other data collection instruments and methods must be developed. The data collection instruments developed for this project must be further tested and refined. Most importantly, after the two schools participating in this effort complete their respective Restorative Justice training and technical assistance projects (IBARJP had begun the training at each school as this report was in preparation), further data collection and analysis should take place (implementation studies, post- training data collection, and data collection from matched comparison school sites) in order to provide schools in Illinois and elsewhere with a solid foundation from which to conduct ongoing assessment and evaluation of school-based Restorative Justice efforts.

⁵ See http://www.modelsforchange.net/about/States-for-change/Illinois.html.
Preparatory Activities

Literature Review

The existing descriptive, research, and evaluation literature pertaining to restorative justice is voluminous, now covering more than 20 years and thousands of documents. For this project, the literature review includes research and descriptive publications pertaining to Restorative Justice programs and practices in school settings, as well as research and publications pertaining to school and classroom climate. The primary purpose of the literature review for this project was to identify hypotheses regarding the anticipated impact of Restorative Justice programs and practices within school settings, so that this project could develop specific hypotheses, research methods, and data collection instruments to use in testing the hypotheses developed.

The focus of recent research on school climate centers on the problem of school bullying. For example, Bandyopadhyay, Cornell, and Konold (2009) reported on the development of a school climate scale based on middle school and high school student self-reports of the prevalence of teasing and bullying, aggressive attitudes, and willingness to seek help regarding teasing and bullying at school. The authors reported that the school climate surveys provided meaningful measures of the three dimensions, based on confirmatory factor analysis. This research was particularly instructive for this project, since it suggested that school climate surveys can be valid at the middle school and high school levels. In other words, school climate survey language seems to be understood by students of various ages and at different educational levels, without significant adjustments in the wording of survey questions.

Gregory, Henry, and Schoeny (2007) studied the influence of school factors, including school climate, on the implementation of violence prevention initiatives, noting the difficulties schools have in the implementation of such programs. Among other things, these researchers “…found that teacher-reported support between staff and among teachers and students predicted higher average levels of implementation,” as did teacher-reported administrative leadership (Gregory, Henry, and Schoeny, 2007, p. 250). The cornerstone of this research lies in the likelihood that school climate (school ecology) plays a significant, independent role
in the success of school violence prevention initiatives, which was identified through multi-level (hierarchical linear) analysis. This research was instructive for this school-based Restorative Justice project because it highlighted the importance of both school leadership and student-teacher interaction regarding violence prevention. Both factors can be hypothesized to be equally important for implementation of Restorative Justice in schools. Beets, et al. (2008) affirmed these findings in their study of factors associated with successful implementation of a school-based positive action program (social character and development): they found that teacher beliefs and attitudes, as well as school administrative support of such programs, turned up as significant factors in two models of school program implementation that they tested.

The December 2004 newsletter of the Michigan State University, “University-Community Partnerships Collaborative,” was especially instructive for this project. It provided an overview of 14 unique approaches to measuring school and classroom culture, climate, and environment. The approach adopted for this project was influenced strongly by several of the research instruments identified in this newsletter.

Two publications regarding the influence of Restorative Justice on school climate influenced the development of the research instruments for this project. The International Institute for Restorative Practices (IIRP) published a summary of school-based Restorative Justice programs in 2009, including data on school indicators from three schools in Pennsylvania. IIRP reported reductions in school problems in each of the three schools that had implemented Restorative Justice programs and practices, including decreases in the number of suspensions, decreases in fighting incidents and cafeteria violations, decreases in school bus infractions, and decreases in physical altercations among students (IIRP 2009). In addition, the ICJIA guide to Restorative Justice in schools suggests several other outcomes that should result from implementation of Restorative Justice Practices. For example: Restorative Justice programs can help instill behavior controls in youth and inculcate problem-solving and social skills; can encourage student and family participation in conflict resolution; and can increase the involvement of school staff in problem-solving.6

It is interesting to note that the research addressing the impact on schools of various prevention and intervention initiatives tends to address school climate more than classroom climate, indicating a possibly mistaken assumption that school-based interventions, such as violence and bullying prevention, character development, and drug abuse prevention affect all classrooms equally. This is probably not a valid assumption. It is possible that school classroom climate (e.g., the independent effect of teachers and students who occupy the same space for short time periods during the school day) can also have a significant effect on the implementation success of school innovations and improvements.

**Development of Data Collection Instruments**

Based in part on the results of the literature review summarized above, as well as on the practical knowledge regarding Restorative Justice among several members of the research team and on suggestions provided by IBARJP staff, IBARJP Board members, and representatives from the Models for Change National Resource Bank, the GSU research team developed several data collection instruments for the purposes of collecting baseline data on school characteristics that should be positively impacted by the implementation of Restorative Justice practices in schools.

Initially, the project team developed a series of hypotheses regarding the anticipated impact that Restorative Justice Practices should have on schools (school climate, mostly):

**Hypothesis #1**: Restorative Justice practices improve school climate and culture

**Hypothesis #2**: Restorative Justice practices encourage students to be more proactive in making the school safer

**Hypothesis #3**: Restorative Justice practices encourage students, teachers, parents, social workers, and others to adopt collaborative practices that support the desired improvements in school climate

**Hypothesis #4**: Restorative Justice practices reduce school problems

**Hypothesis #5**: Restorative Justice practices improve academic performance

**Hypothesis #6**: Restorative Justice practices improve approaches to school discipline
Hypothesis #7: Restorative Justice practices build student skills that serve them well later in life

Hypothesis #8: Restorative Justice practices reduce disproportionate minority contact (with the juvenile justice system)

The research team developed four distinct data collection instruments which are summarized below (see the “Data Collection Methods” section for more details regarding their implementation at several different schools in Illinois). Attachment A presents the list of hypotheses developed for this project, along with anticipated and measurable outcomes, and the specific data collection methods employed to collect the data pertaining to each hypothesis.

School climate surveys The development of the school climate survey for this project drew from several existing school-related surveys, most notably Gordon Vessels’ student climate questionnaire (MSU 2004), a school bullying survey developed by Joseph Ryan at the University of Illinois (Urbana-Champaign), and the Teaching Tolerance School Climate Questionnaire. Project staff developed the initial draft of the school climate survey, and this draft was reviewed by project advisors and collaborators (including representatives from the MacArthur Foundations’ Models for Change National Resource Bank and the University of Illinois’ Center for Prevention Research and Development, and representatives from PBIS and the Alton school district). After several revisions to the survey, project staff conducted a pilot test of the survey involving completion of 22 surveys by middle and high school students from several Illinois school districts. The pilot test experience suggested that a diverse group of middle and high school students understood most of the survey items and could complete the survey within about 10-15 minutes. Based on these results, the project team finalized the school climate survey instrument (see Attachment B). The school climate survey comprises 53 items and requires respondents to answer “Yes” or “No” to each item (“Don’t Know” response options were not included). Each of the school climate survey items addresses one of the eight hypotheses listed above (page 11), and Attachment C presents a list of the hypotheses and the climate survey items pertaining to each.

---

7 Adapted from Responding to Hate at School (www.tolerance.org/rthas/index.jsp), Mix It Up (www.mixitup.org) and the U.S. Department of Education’s “Creating a Safe and Connected School Climate” (www.scusd.edu/safe_schools/Docs_PDFs/Creating%20Safe%20Schools.pdf).
Further discussions with the Alton school district led to the creation of an automated version of the school climate survey, which was eventually administered to students at both school sites via the Internet (www.surveymonkey.com).

**School discipline interviews** A primary concern of Restorative Justice practitioners in schools, in addition to school climate, student-to-student and student-to-teacher interactions, focuses on school discipline policies and practices. Investigation into this phenomenon, a largely administration-driven school matter, can provide supplemental and independent indications regarding the extent to which Restorative Justice practices have been adopted in a school setting. Project staff developed the school discipline interview (**Attachment D**), not based on any prior research or data collection samples, but rather based on an intuitive approach to the types of information that should be collected to inform an evaluation of school-based Restorative Justice practices. The school discipline interview measures such variables as: staff and administrator familiarity with school discipline policies, knowledge of instances for which the policy has been invoked (e.g., knowledge about recent student conflicts requiring the administration of discipline), and levels of satisfaction regarding the options staff and administrators have for dealing with student conflicts.

**School administrative data** It is common for schools and school districts to record and preserve individual- and aggregate-level information about rule infractions and consequences (typically punishments or restrictions) for the students involved. This project identified a number of different variables that may be available from schools to document the types, seriousness, and amounts of school discipline code violations by students, as well as school responses to those infractions (see **Attachment E** for a list of those variables). Project staff hypothesized that implementation of Restorative Justice practices would lessen the incidence levels and severity of school conduct code violations, and requested administrative data regarding those actions and reactions by school authorities.

**School observation protocol** The project team determined that classroom observations of student-to-student and student-teacher interaction may also provide useful data for assessing the effect of Restorative Justice practices. The literature review activity covering school climate survey instruments discovered a school
classroom observation form, also developed by Gordon Vessels (see Attachment F), that supports observations regarding student relations, student-to-student interaction (negative and positive), teacher-to-student interaction (negative and positive), and quality ratings regarding students’ kindness and respect, discipline, and caring. Project staff adopted the Vessels’ classroom observation form for use with this project.

**Classroom videotaping** Project staff also anticipated that videotaping of student-to-student and student-to-teacher interaction in the classrooms would provide opportunities to independently (from other measurement approaches) measure changes in behavior before and after the implementation of Restorative Justice practices in a school. Several different opportunities to conduct such observations were explored, including the incorporation of classroom videotaping into a school’s film class activities, as well as a unique opportunity to film elementary and pre-school students in a south suburban child development center (based on teachers’ reporting of ‘pre-bullying’ behaviors among two- to four-year olds). Such videotaping would provide a unique opportunity to conduct qualitative analysis of actual classroom interactions. Unfortunately, these opportunities did not materialize during the study period (largely due to scheduling difficulties and the requirement for active parental informed consent, not to school administrator refusal to allow such observations).

**IRB Review and Approval**

The entire research protocol described above was submitted to the Governors State University Institutional Review Board (IRB), in two phases. All research instruments except the videotaping protocol (e.g., school climate survey, school discipline interview, classroom observation instrument, and administrative data elements) were submitted for review initially, and approved on April 6, 2011 (Attachment G). Later, on June 24, 2011, the GSU IRB approved the classroom videotaping protocol, which included parent/guardian consent.

**Meetings and Planning with Schools**

Securing the participation by Illinois schools interested in implementing Restorative Practices was a very important part of this project, and one that is often overlooked in the documentation of research efforts.
The process employed by this project to develop productive working relationships with several schools in Illinois in order to successfully conduct school-based Restorative Justice research included: 1) identify schools interested in adding Restorative Justice Practices in the near future, based on new and already established relationships with IBARJP, 2) conduct many in-person and phone conference meetings, 3) obtain input from school administrators, and 4) identify school-based staff to assist with data collection, administer the surveys, and help arrange interviews and classroom observations. Following this process resulted in the successful collection of baseline data that will allow the assessment of Restorative Justice practices at the school sites.

**Step 1: Identify schools interested in adding Restorative Justice Practices in the near future, based on new and already established relationships with IBARJP**

As noted above in the introduction (p. 7) the concept for this project started with a school district that contacted IBARJP in the spring of 2010 regarding a desired district-wide implementation of Restorative Justice practices. This created urgency for baseline data collection at the school level prior to implementing BARJ practices on such a large scale. As the literature review indicates (pg. 9), currently there is little experimental or quasi-experimental research surrounding Restorative Justice practices in school settings, specifically affecting school climate change, in the United States. The initial groups of schools that expressed interest in implementing Restorative Justice practices included the Rockford, Illinois School District; the Oregon, Illinois School district; and a few other schools in the South Suburbs of Chicago. Ongoing contact with these schools revealed that the resources necessary to aid in data collection and to implement Restorative Justice practices in the near future were not available for these schools and districts. In September of 2010, the project learned that the Rockford School District was no longer able to move forward with this project. Through a partnership with PBIS (Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports\(^8\)), the Alton School District was identified as a potential partner for this project and implementation of Restorative Justice practices. Communication with Ms. Sandy

---

\(^8\) [www.pbisillinois.org](http://www.pbisillinois.org)
Crawford, the Project Director for the Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative\(^9\) in Alton, Illinois, about this project led to an agreement to move forward in the late fall of 2010.

In addition, as conversations with the Oregon School District and schools in the South Suburbs continued, it became evident that these school districts would likely not be ready for Restorative Justice practices implementation and pre-implementation data collection in 2010-2011. Project staff then decided to search for other potential school districts. An IBARJP Board member suggested the Bronzeville Lighthouse Charter school (a K-8 charter school in the South Side of Chicago), and, after initial communications, that school was identified as a potential partner for this project. Ms. Ashleigh Plauche, the principal of the Bronzeville Lighthouse school, is the key administrator at this school who demonstrated interest in both the baseline data collection and the implementation of Restorative Justice Practices during the current school year.

Both the Alton School District and Bronzeville Lighthouse joined the project based on their openness and desire for the collection of baseline data and their serious interest in implementation of Restorative Justice practices in the near future at their schools.

**Steps 2-4:** 2) Conduct in-person and phone conference meetings, 3) Obtain input from administrators, and 4) Identify staff to assist with data collection, administer the surveys, and help arrange interviews and classroom observations.

**Alton schools** The work with Ms. Crawford and the Alton School District began in October 2010. In December, Ms. Crawford brought key stakeholders into the conversations, including the PBIS External Coach for the district, the Principals of the Middle and High Schools, and the Assistant Superintendent for the district. The letter of support from the district was also finalized in December after electronic and phone communication among Ms. Crawford, Dr. Coldren, and Sara Balgoyen. On January 14\(^{th}\), 2011, Dr. Coldren and Ms. Balgoyen met with the previously mentioned stakeholders to discuss the details of the project. Alton’s interest in Restorative Justice practices as a school-wide tool for climate improvement, plus their experience with PBIS as

---

\(^9\) Safe Schools/Healthy Students is a federal Initiative through a partnership among the U.S. Departments of Education, Justice, and Health and Human Services. School districts partner with law enforcement officials, local mental health authorities, and juvenile justice officials to provide students, schools, and communities the benefit of enhanced, comprehensive services that can promote healthy childhood development and prevent violence and alcohol and other drug use. ([http://sshs.promoteprevent.org/](http://sshs.promoteprevent.org/))
a data driven framework, provided valuable insight into the type of data desired and (some) already available for collection. Also, as a school district working under the Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative, the administrators have already realized the importance of focusing on school climate in efforts to improve the overall success of the school, and they had utilized some climate surveys of staff that focused on the well-being of the students, staff and teachers.

By the end of March 2011, after approval from the IRB, arrangements for the teacher and staff interviews via phone were scheduled; they concluded in May 2011. During this time period, the project worked with Ms. Crawford to collect the administrative data and administer the student survey. Alton identified a staff person to provide and organize the administrative data. Based on the meetings with experts in the field, we identified the desired administrative data elements and worked with the staff person to obtain the relevant available data. Also, our conversations and meetings with Ms. Crawford focused on organizing the dates that students would take the survey online. It was agreed that there would be time available for most students to take this during a computer class during one week in April. Lastly, project staff conducted in-person classroom observations of four classrooms (two Middle and two High Schools) on May 4, 2011.

**Bronzeville Lighthouse school** Beginning in February 2011, the work with Ms. Plauche and the Bronzeville Lighthouse Charter School began. Project staff conducted introductory conversations through which Ms. Plauche provided more information about the Lighthouse school, and project staff provided more information to her about the baseline data collection project and Restorative Justice practices in schools. Their interest in reduction of middle school discipline referrals and improvement in outcomes, plus their focus on data driven solutions to school problems, paved the way for excellent administrative support. Additionally, the already established focus on enriching the lives of their students (including opening morning circles daily in each classroom) provided the opportunity for Restorative Justice practices to affect the school climate.

In April 2011, project staff met with Ms. Plauche at the school to determine the details of the student climate survey administration, collection of administrative data, classroom observations, and interviews of teachers and staff. The letter of support and the IRB forms were finalized and signed during this meeting as
well. Early in May 2011, Dr. Coldren and a colleague from Governors State University visited the Bronzeville Lighthouse school and were able to observe several classrooms, interview most of the administrators and a few staff members, and advise the school on ways to administer the student surveys to grades 6-8. Ms. Plauche shared the administrative data and administered the interviews shortly after this visit.

**Lessons Learned**

The experiences pertaining to this aspect of the project provided some valuable lessons regarding the development of a template for baseline Restorative Justice data collection in schools across Illinois that included the importance of flexibility, accommodation and collaboration. The process of developing these productive working relationships with schools demonstrated the importance of being flexible in many aspects. First, flexibility was key while initially identifying schools interested in Restorative Practices and data collection, and especially in understanding their motives for such data collection. For example, while the Oregon (western Illinois) and Bloom Trail (south suburban Chicago) schools expressed an interest in Restorative Justice practices, it was necessary to be flexible and understanding with them when they opted to not participate in this project after discussing the possibility of experimental research. Flexibility was also important when considering the resources available and necessary to aid in data collection and implementation of Restorative Justice practices at different schools and in different communities. Although the Rockford School District’s leadership was hopeful for large scale implementation, the other decision makers in the district, plus outside influences, eliminated the resources available for this purpose. The need for flexibility, as described above, includes the pragmatic requirement to allow sufficient time to negotiate all of the arrangements and access required to actually collect the different types of data required for a project such as this. Sufficient time must also be devoted to developing the necessary important relationships, identifying allies, and adjusting data collection instruments according to the needs of schools and school collaborators. A significant amount of time for this project was spent on such matters, especially on developing and building relationships with the schools and the allies (like PBIS) that provide the experience, knowledge and connections necessary to complete such a project.
The need for accommodation was another important lesson learned, especially regarding the schedules of the school, teachers, students, and administration. With Alton, this approach proved beneficial to the project survey results: by accommodating their request to offer the survey online, the survey was made accessible to more students, provided them with an educational experience, and resulted in a much larger sample of students than originally anticipated. In addition, accommodating the school and student schedules was very important in administering the survey. Other schedule accommodations were imperative when it came to interviewing the teachers and staff, as we worked around their busy schedules, including their class time, preparation time, and more.

Lastly, collaboration was a key component of this project at every step. To achieve success in this project, it was important to partner closely with the schools, rather than acting as an outsider imposing an external project plan. This was especially important because our relationship with these schools will not end when data collection is completed. The many needs and requests of the schools and their districts could only be accommodated by offering flexible options because of the collaborative relationships established. Also, outside partners like PBIS, the NRB, and IBARJP were key to the success of the project, and the relationships built created a successful collaborative effort.

Data Collection Methods

In order to test the hypotheses, data on school climate, discipline policy, and school incidents were collected using different tools and methods, including the administration of a School Climate Survey to students, interviews with teachers and school administrators, collection of school administrative records, and in-field classroom observation. The data collected using the aforementioned methods will permit analyses for the purpose of testing the hypotheses developed, and providing a valuable assessment of the Restorative Justice needs of the schools included in this study.

School Climate Surveys

The School Climate Survey (SCS, Attachment C) was administered to students at both Alton (n=720) schools and Lighthouse (n=87). In Alton, the survey was available to students in both Middle School (grades 6-
8) and High School (grades 9-12) who were taking a required computer class; the survey was available on their computer work stations for one week, and students completed and submitted the survey electronically using Survey Monkey™. The survey was administered for one day at the Lighthouse location with grades 6-8, where the school principal read the questions aloud and students submitted their responses electronically (also using Survey Monkey). According to the research protocol approved by the GSU Institutional Review Board, parental consent was not required for the school surveys (though signed permission from the school principals was required), since the surveys were anonymous and involved minimal risk to students. Each survey included an informed consent (Attachment H).  

Once the surveys were completed, the results were codified and tabulated in both an Excel spreadsheet and a statistical software program (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, SPSS™). The survey consisted of 53 statements, to which students were instructed to respond either ‘yes’ or ‘no.’ When this data was codified, those who responded ‘yes’ were assigned a score of 1 and those who answered ‘no’ were assigned a score of 0. Those who did not answer the question were given no score (blank). The sum of ‘yes’, ‘no’, and blank answers were calculated for all questions. The valid number of responses for each item was determined by the following equation: Total number of responses - non responses = valid responses. Percentages were calculated using only the valid number of responses.

The results were then organized to reflect question-hypothesis groups: For each hypothesis proposed, the corresponding questions to test that hypothesis were grouped together. Positive support for each hypothesis was determined by summing the ‘yes’ responses in that group for most questions; negative support was determined using the ‘no’ responses. For the negatively-worded questions, the sum of the ‘no’ responses was added to the positive support calculation, and the ‘yes’ responses were added to the positive support calculation. The valid number of responses for each hypothesis was calculated in the same way it was for individual questions, and the percentage of support for each hypothesis was determined as follows: (total positive/valid) x 10

---

10 www.surveymonkey.com
11 Subsequent attachments to this report (Attachments I and J) contain the informed consent documents pertaining to the school discipline interviews, and the planned videotaping of school classrooms.
100. The results and implications of these calculations are further discussed in the following section of this report (pg. 25).

School Discipline Interviews

Faculty and school administrators were interviewed in an attempt to assess perceptions of school discipline policies (School Discipline Interview). The School Discipline Interview was administered at both schools, and comprised of 20 questions (both open and closed ended, see Attachment D). The Alton school respondents participated in this survey via telephone. The Bronzeville Lighthouse respondents participated in this survey both in person and via telephone. The responses were then analyzed and grouped into like-suited categories to provide an overall representation of faculty concerns and perceptions.

School Administrative Data

Data on documented school offense and actions committed by the student body was collected at both the Alton and Lighthouse school sites. Attachment E demonstrates the administrative data requested of each school; some details were readily available while others were not. Alton High School and Middle School submitted individual-level data for all grades, including offenses and infractions by current grades for the current year (Fall Semester SY 2010-2011 and prior years (SY 2008-2009 and SY 2009-2010). Alton provided data for the current class expected to graduate in 2017, including data on 264 offenses and 276 actions, as well as for other classes. This data set also included student demographic information (race, gender, grade point average, and participation in a free lunch program). The Lighthouse school provided aggregate suspension, referral and expulsion data (including the name of the teacher initiating the referral or expulsion) for the current year (Fall Semester 2010 through April 2011) and prior year (SY 2009-2010) in addition to student demographic information.

Classroom Observations

The Vessels’ Classroom Information Form (CTTA version, Attachment F) was used to document classroom activities and both student-student and student-teacher interpersonal communication activities. A member from the research team was invited into four Alton schools classrooms at different times of the day to
observe these activities, and two of the research team members conducted similar observations in several classrooms at the Bronzeville Lighthouse School. Each instance of classroom observation involved the researcher entering the room, a brief introduction of the researcher to the students, delivery of an oral informed consent statement, and then 15 to 30 minutes of observing and note taking (practicing participant observation, in which the researcher’s identity was known to the students and teacher, but the researcher did not participate in the classroom activity). See Table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Observation time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alton High School</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alton Middle School</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>15 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alton Middle School</td>
<td>Flex period&lt;sup&gt;12&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>15 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alton High School</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>15 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronzeville Lighthouse</td>
<td>English/Literature</td>
<td>Approx. 30 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronzeville Lighthouse</td>
<td>Reading/Vocabulary</td>
<td>Approx. 30 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronzeville Lighthouse</td>
<td>Science/Mathematics</td>
<td>Approx. 30 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Analysis and Findings
Alton Schools

School climate This section summarizes the school climate survey findings for the schools surveyed in Alton, Illinois, according to six different hypotheses pertaining to Restorative Justice in schools.

Hypothesis #1 suggests that implementing restorative justice practices in schools will improve school culture. The school climate survey includes a number of different statements (requiring a yes or no answer)

<sup>12</sup> ‘Flex’ period is similar an assigned class period for groups of students needing extra help in different areas (subjects like Math and Science and also for behavior concerns).
intended to measure if students feel their school climate is ‘restorative.’ Following are several examples of the school climate survey items falling under this hypothesis:

- Students are not ashamed to say they are sorry.
- Teachers talk to students with respect.
- Teachers don’t often make mean and hostile comments.
- Teachers here support each other.
- Teachers are friendly toward students.

The table (Table 2) for Hypothesis #1 below suggests that the majority of middle and high school students in Alton responded to the school climate survey in such a way that indicates the climate of both schools in Alton reflects a restorative environment. Sixty-four percent (64%) of all responses received indicated that students perceive their school culture as restorative.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Alton School Climate Survey – Hypothesis #1</th>
<th>(RJ improves school culture)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answered Favorably (agreed)</td>
<td>7,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answered Negatively (disagreed)</td>
<td>4,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Responses</td>
<td>11,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>378 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid Responses</td>
<td>11,137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3, for Hypothesis #2 below, suggests that the majority of middle and high school students disagreed with the series of statements that implied that students are encouraged to be proactive in making their school safe. Less than half of the student responses suggest that students are proactive in this area. Examples of statements included under this hypothesis include:

- Students here are often mean to each other.

---

13 Note that in these tables, the number of cases equals the number of responses received to all school climate survey items pertaining to Hypothesis #1, not to the number of students in the Alton study sample.
● Students respectfully listen to one another during class.

● Teasing and picking on others is pretty common here.

● Students will try to break up an argument before it gets too serious.

| Table 3: Alton School Climate Survey – Hypothesis #2  
(RJ makes schools safer) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answered Favorably (agreed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answered Negatively (disagreed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Responses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Response</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valid Responses</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4, for Hypothesis #3 below, suggests that the majority of middle and high school students in Alton perceive a collaborative environment supportive of improving school climate.

| Table 4: Alton School Climate Survey – Hypothesis #3  
(RJ encourages collaborative practices) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answered Favorably (agreed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answered Negatively (disagreed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Responses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Response</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valid Responses</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5, for Hypothesis #6 below, suggests that the majority of middle and high school students in Alton do not perceive school discipline practices as restorative. Fifty-eight percent (58%) of the responses to the survey items related to this hypothesis disagreed with the statements. Note that the school climate survey did not directly address Hypotheses #4 (restorative justice and school problems) and #5 (restorative justice and student academic performance).
Table 5: Alton School Climate Survey – Hypothesis #6
(RJ improves school discipline practices)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answered Favorably (agreed)</th>
<th>2,727</th>
<th>42%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answered Negatively (disagreed)</td>
<td>3,260</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Responses 5,755

No Response 168 (3%)

Valid Responses 5,587

The majority of survey responses (59%) suggest that Alton schools help students prepare for the future (this refers to the ‘capacity building’ aspect of restorative justice).

Table 6: Alton School Climate Survey – Hypothesis #7
(RJ builds student skills)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answered Favorably (agreed)</th>
<th>2,896</th>
<th>59%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answered Negatively (disagreed)</td>
<td>1,989</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Responses 5,039

No Response 154 (3%)

Valid Responses 4,885

Over 70 percent of survey responses indicate students perceive that racial discrimination, especially regarding school discipline, is not common in Alton schools.

Table 7: Alton School Climate Survey – Hypothesis #8
(RJ reduces disproportional minority referrals to court)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answered Favorably (agreed)</th>
<th>2,964</th>
<th>71%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answered Negatively (disagreed)</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Responses 4,315

No Response 115 (3%)

Valid Responses 4,200
School discipline interviews  The interviews regarding school discipline covered several topics; for example, respondent’s knowledge about school discipline and recent changes in the school discipline policy, their impressions of how school discipline is handled in the school, and whether the school discipline policy provides them with adequate means to resolve discipline problems that arise. The charts below summarize respondents’ responses to several quantitative (e.g., Yes or No) questions.

Nearly every respondent indicated familiarity with their school’s discipline policy; the one response coded as a “9” indicates a missing response (not recorded); see Chart 1 below.

The majority of respondents felt their school discipline policy was comprehensive, and was developed with input from a diverse group of school employees; see Charts 2 and 3 below.

When asked if students were involved in the development of school discipline policy (something that might be considered a restorative school discipline practice), most respondents said that students were not included (Chart 4 below).

Most respondents felt their school policy was fair and enforced consistently (Charts 5 and 6 below). When asked if the discipline policy was enforced the same “regardless of student gender, race, or background,” an equal number of respondents agreed as disagreed with this statement (Chart 7 below).

Most respondents (n=7) felt the school discipline policy could be improved regarding its content and enforcement (Charts 8 and 9 below), and most felt the changes in school discipline policy over the past three years represented improvements to the policy (Chart 10 below).

When asked if their school policy allowed them to respond adequately to school discipline issues, most responded favorably (Chart 11 below). When asked to explain if they were satisfied with the way a recent school discipline incident they had witnessed (involving a conflict between two or more students) was handled, most responded favorably as well (Chart 12 below).
Chart 1: Familiarity with school discipline policy

Are you familiar with the current school policy on student discipline?

![Bar chart showing familiarity with school discipline policy]

Chart 2: Comprehensiveness of school discipline policy

Our student discipline policy was developed with input from a diverse group of school employees.

![Bar chart showing comprehensiveness of school discipline policy]

Chart 3: Policy developed by diverse group

Our student discipline policy was developed with input from a diverse group of school employees.

![Bar chart showing policy development by diverse group]

Chart 4: Involving students in discipline policy development

Our student discipline policy was developed with input from students.

![Bar chart showing involvement of students in discipline policy development]
Chart 5: Discipline policy is fair

Chart 6: Discipline policy is enforced consistently

Chart 7: Discipline is enforced regardless of gender, race, or background

Chart 8: Content of school discipline can be improved

Chart 9: Discipline policy can be improved

Chart 10: School discipline policy has improved
Chart 12: Discipline policy allows staff to adequately respond to problems

Do you think the school discipline policy allows the staff to adequately respond to these problems when they come up?

![Frequency chart showing the response distribution.]

Chart 12: Satisfaction with the way this problem was handled

Our student discipline policy can be improved regarding its enforcement.

![Frequency chart showing the satisfaction distribution.]

Qualitative analysis of discipline interview questions The interviews regarding school discipline also asked respondents about recent and past student-to-student conflicts, how the incidents were handled, and whether they [respondents] were satisfied with the way they were handled. This qualitative analysis suggests that the most serious types of discipline problems experienced in Alton (in the recent past) involved fighting (one-on-one or group), bullying, weapons at school, and drug offenses (non-specific). According to respondents, in the month prior to the interview, incidents of fighting and verbal attacks occurred; and when asked about types of incidences in the prior six months, similar answers were provided. It appears that although some serious incidents have occurred at Alton, the most common seem to be fighting and verbal attacks. Teachers and administrators share the goal of immediate detection and punishment in an attempt to deter future behavior. The school policy for some of these more serious transgressions (physical altercations) is suspension, and administrators feel the school administers this punishment rather consistently. However, Alton school respondents deviate from the handbook in an attempt to individualize punishment (‘make it fair’) for each student; this includes mediation, contacting parents, implementation of ‘safety plans’\(^\text{14}\), and in-school detention/suspension. It is interesting to note that many of the responses indicated that the punishments seem fair to the respondents, and that the schools’ combined focus on actions and consequences, coupled with their

\(^{14}\) One respondent described the school safety plan as a policy in which “kids [are] released at different times so they don’t have to cross paths.”
eagerness to individualize punishments (one respondent referred to this as ‘creative consequences’), may explain why the majority of conflicts do not escalate to physical altercations.

**School administrative data** The three charts below summarize the administrative data received from the Alton School District pertaining to school offenses charged. The tables present the frequencies for different types of school offenses for one cohort of students during a specific school year. For example, **Chart 13** shows the frequencies for the current seniors (graduated Spring 2011), in their sophomore year (SY 08-09); **Chart 14** shows the school offense frequencies for their junior year (SY 09-10), and **Chart 15** shows the frequencies of offenses recorded for their senior year through the Fall Semester 2011. One noticeable trend in these data is the significant reduction in the frequency of offenses from the junior to senior year. Last year, this class was charged with over 500 (554) incidents of tardiness and over 300 (309) incidents of defiance or disrespect. Making some assumptions, we might conclude that in their senior year, this cohort reduced their offending somewhat (or administrators reduced their reporting). In all three years, skipping/truancy, defiance/disrespect, and tardiness are the top three ranked offense categories.
Chart 13: Alton High School Offenses, Current Seniors in 10th Grade

Gambling
Parking Viol.
Gang Activity
Disord. Conduct
Alcohol
Instigate Fight
Theft
Drugs and Narc.
Tobacco Use/Poss.
Tardy Sweep
Dress Code Viol.
Other
Inapprop. Lang.
Inapprop. Behav.
Loitering
Rule Viol.
Disruption
Tardy

Chart 14: Alton High School Offenses, Current Seniors in 11th Grade

Verbal Abuse
FIR
Fail to Serve..
Damage to Prop.
Harrassment
Gang Activity
Drugs & Narc.
Threat
Fail to ID Self
Fighting
Other
Noncompliance
Dress Code..
Innapprop. Lang.
Inapprop. Behav.
Rules Viol.
Skipping/Truancy
Tardiness
Classroom observations

**Alton High School classes** The Classroom observation categories include Primary Teaching Role, Primary Lesson Content, Student Relations, Type of Student Activity, Lesson Infusion, and Ratio of Students On-Task & Off-Task, and have more detailed descriptions ("Instructional Codes") for each (see Attachment F for a copy of the observation form used in this study). The observation form allows for coding of observations in five-minute intervals. For the two High School Classes (Reading and Chemistry), these ratings were very different. For example, in the Reading class, the Primary Teaching Role was “Information Provider” and “Stimulator of High-Level Thinking” and in the Chemistry class (because they were having a “catch up” day) the Primary Teaching Role was “Facilitator, coach, helper, and guide.” These variations also affected the Primary Lesson Content, Student Relations, Types of Student Activity and Lesson Infusion. In the Reading class, the lesson was focused on “Academic Content” and “Virtues, values, character, etc.” The students were working independently (not in groups) and also interacting with the teacher and actively participating in the
lesson. In the Chemistry class, some of the students were participating in “Cooperative learning,” while others were working independently, and similarly, some were actively participating while others were keeping to themselves (“Passive, quiet, no interaction”). The activity was focused on the “Academic Content” of the class, but students were at different places for the semester.

The Interpersonal Interactions also varied from class to class. Chart 16 below demonstrates the differences between the Reading and Chemistry classes and the number of interactions, both positive and negative, between students as well as between students and the teachers. Overall, both classes had more positive interactions than negative.

Additionally, the form has a section for quality ratings, which allow the observer to measure the following on a scale of “Poor to Good”:

1. The Teachers’ Kindness and Respect
2. Students’ Kindness and Respect
3. Teachers’ Motivation and Responsibility
4. Students’ Level of Engagement
5. Positive Discipline/Problem Prevention
6. Caring Community

For the Reading class, all except number 4 (Students’ level of engagement) received the highest rating of “Good” while #4 received one point below on the scale (Mostly good). For the Chemistry class, both the teachers and students were kind and respectful, yielding a high score of “Good” for both numbers 1 and 2, while
numbers 3 and 4 were middle of the road (“somewhat good”). Number 5 (Positive discipline/problem prevention) received a “Mostly poor” rating because of the free atmosphere of the class, yet the Caring Community rating was “Mostly good”.

Other comments from the classes included “Independent work and then class communication” and “teacher focused on articles, asked questions and provided visual aids” for the Reading class, and “Class had completed the work, kids were working independently and with groups to complete some work. Most students were off task and some were working with the teacher” for the Chemistry class.

**Alton Middle School classes**  The Classroom Instruction ratings for the two Middle School classrooms also varied because of the nature of the classes. One class was a Reading class for 7th and 8th graders while the other was a “Flex” class (targeted advisory groups). In the Reading class the primary teaching role was “Information Provider” and “Facilitator, coach, helper and guide,” whereas in the Flex class, the teacher was not providing information, but was being the “Facilitator, coach, helper and guide.” The lesson content was also very different between the two classes, the Reading class was focused on the “Academic Content” with “Students working independently” and the Flex class was focused on “Virtues, values, character, etc.,” with the students doing “Cooperative learning.” Both classes provided for time for “Students to actively participate” and infused “Virtues, values and character” into the lessons.

The Interpersonal Interactions also varied from class-to-class. **Chart 17** below demonstrates the differences between the Reading and Flex classes and the number of interactions, both positive and negative, between students as well as between students and the teachers. Overall, both classes had more positive interactions than negative.
As noted above, the observation form has a section for quality ratings, which allow the observer to measure the following on a scale of “Poor to Good”:

1. The Teachers’ Kindness and Respect
2. Students’ Kindness and Respect
3. Teachers’ Motivation and Responsibility
4. Students’ Level of Engagement
5. Positive Discipline/Problem Prevention
6. Caring Community

Both classes received the highest rating of “Good” for all areas with one exception. The Reading class received a “Mostly good” rating for number 2, Students’ Kindness and Respect, as there was some talking out of turn during the class.

Lastly, the observer made other comments and notes for both classrooms including: “Teacher gave excellent positive reinforcement and allowed kids to make decisions about classroom environment” for the Reading class, and, “Terrific real conversation with kids about their weekend, etc., and one student wanted to read, she gave lots of positive reinforcement for him to stay during check in. Teacher gave LOTS of attention where needed.”

**Bronzeville Lighthouse**

**School climate** The tables below summarize the school climate survey response for six different hypotheses pertaining to restorative justice in schools. Overall, the Lighthouse students (in grades 6 through 8)
indicated they perceived their school climate to be one that is supportive of restorative justice principles for four out of the six study hypotheses examined with school climate survey data.

Hypothesis #1 suggests that implementing restorative justice practices in schools will improve school culture. The school climate survey includes a number of different statements (requiring a yes or no answer) intended to measure if students feel their school climate is ‘restorative.’ Following are several examples of the school climate survey items falling under this hypothesis:

- Students are not ashamed to say they are sorry.
- Teachers talk to students with respect.
- Teachers don’t often make mean and hostile comments.
- Teachers here support each other.
- Teachers are friendly toward students.

Table 8 shows that fifty-seven percent (57%) of the school climate survey responses from Lighthouse School students indicated that the students feel the school climate is restorative.

| Table 8: Lighthouse School Climate Survey – Hypothesis #1 (RJ improves school culture) |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------|-------|
| Answered Favorably (agreed)                  | 792                  | 57%   |
| Answered Negatively (disagreed)              | 591                  | 43%   |
| N of Responses                               | 1,394                |
| No Response                                  | 11 (1%)              |
| Valid Responses                               | 1,383                |

Hypothesis #2 pertains to student-to-student interaction, and whether students are proactive in helping make the school a safe place. Regarding this hypothesis, the responses indicate that Lighthouse students are about evenly split. Table 9 shows that forty-nine percent (49%) of responses indicate that students are proactive in helping keep the school safe, while fifty-one percent (51%) of the responses suggest the students do not feel that way. Examples of statements included under this hypothesis include:
- Students here are often mean to each other.
- Students respectfully listen to one another during class.
- Teasing and picking on others is pretty common here.
- Students will try to break up an argument before it gets too serious.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9: Lighthouse School Climate Survey – Hypothesis #2 (RJ makes schools safer)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answered Favorably (agreed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answered Negatively (disagreed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid Responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 10**, for Hypothesis #3 below suggests that the Lighthouse students respond more positively than negatively to survey items regarding collaborative practices at the school that are supportive of Restorative Justice. Sixty three percent (63%) of responses agreed with statements regarding positive collaborative practices at the school, and 37 percent of the responses did not indicate students agree with such statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10: Lighthouse School Climate Survey – Hypothesis #3 (RJ encourages collaborative practices)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answered Favorably (agreed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answered Negatively (disagreed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid Responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11, for Hypothesis #6 below, suggests that the majority of Lighthouse School students do not perceive school discipline practices as restorative. Fifty-eight percent (58%) of the responses to the survey items related to this hypothesis disagreed with the statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11: Lighthouse School Climate Survey—Hypothesis #6 (RJ improves school discipline practices)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answered Favorably (agreed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answered Negatively (disagreed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid Responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A majority of Lighthouse School student respondents (59%), shown in Table 12, feel that their school helps them prepare for the future (this refers to the ‘capacity building’ aspect of restorative justice).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 12: Lighthouse School Climate Survey – Hypothesis #7 (RJ builds student skills)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answered Favorably (agreed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answered Negatively (disagreed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid Responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13, for Hypothesis #8, shows that 75 percent of the survey responses suggest that the Lighthouse School students felt that racial discrimination, especially regarding school discipline, was not a common occurrence in their school.
Table 13: Lighthouse School Climate Survey – Hypothesis #8 (RJ reduces disproportional minority referrals to court)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answered Favorably (agreed)</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answered Negatively (disagreed)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>522</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2 (&lt;1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid Responses</td>
<td>520</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**School discipline interviews** The interviews regarding school discipline covered several topics, such as past and current employment status, respondent’s knowledge about school discipline and recent changes in their school discipline policy, their impressions of how school discipline is handled in their school, and whether their school discipline policy provides them with adequate means to resolve discipline problems that arise. The summary below covers respondents’ responses to several quantitative (e.g., Yes or No) questions.

Every respondent indicated that they are familiar with the school discipline policy (Chart 18) and nearly every respondent indicated that the school discipline policy is comprehensive (Chart 19). All respondents believed that the school discipline policy was developed with input from a diverse group of school employees (Chart 20), but none of the respondents stated that they believed the school discipline policy was developed with input from the students (Chart 21). Four out of seven respondents agreed that the school discipline policy is enforced consistently (Chart 22) and close to all of the respondents believe that the school discipline policy is fair (Chart 23). Nearly all respondents agree that the school discipline policy is enforced regardless of a student’s gender, race, or background (Chart 24), and that the school discipline policy needs to be improved regarding its content (Chart 25) and can be improved regarding its enforcement (Chart 26). Six out of seven respondents indicated that they were aware of the changes made to the school discipline policy within the past
three years, but the respondents were nearly split regarding whether these changes were an improvement over past discipline policies and procedures (Chart 27).

Four out of seven respondents agreed that the school discipline policy allows the staff to adequately respond to problems and incidents that arise (Chart 28). Three respondents indicated that they were satisfied with the way that a recent incident involving conflict between students was handled, but a majority left the answer blank (Chart 29).

Chart 18: Familiarity with current school discipline policy.

Chart 19: Comprehensiveness of school discipline policy

Chart 20: Policy was developed with input from a diverse group of school employees.

Chart 21: The discipline policy was developed with input from students.
Chart 22: The school discipline policy is fair.

Chart 23: The school discipline policy is enforced consistently.

Chart 24: The school discipline policy is enforced regardless of student gender, race, or background.

Chart 25: Content of school discipline policy can be improved.

Chart 26: The school discipline policy can be improved, regarding enforcement.

Chart 27: Changes were an improvement over past discipline policies and procedures.
Chart 28: The school discipline policy allows the staff to adequately respond to problems that arise.

Chart 29: Satisfied with the way a discipline incident was handled.

Qualitative analysis of discipline interview questions As was the case in Alton (see above), the school discipline interviews at the Lighthouse school asked respondents about recent and past student-student conflicts, how the incidents were handled, and whether they [respondents] were satisfied with the way they were handled. This qualitative review reveals that the most serious types of discipline problems reported by Lighthouse school teachers and administrators involved fights, defiant behavior, and cyber bullying. Types of incidents witnessed by respondents in the month prior to the interviews were similar: fight, verbal confrontation, and cyber bullying. When asked about incidents occurring in the prior six months, respondents gave similar responses. Since there is not a clear policy to address cyber bullying (something administrators would like to implement), calling in the parents, filing a police report, or asking that a Facebook page be removed as possible punishments do not seem to adequately address the issues at hand. However, the other incidents (verbal and physical attacks) are clearly defined, and the punishment (depending on how or if the argument escalates to violence) is usually suspension. Some respondents noted that this punishment is neither fair, in some cases, nor does it solve the problem (alleviate tension), and that perhaps a more individualized policy should be established. However, the majority of respondents did suggest that while the language of the policy should be less vague, this does not affect the positive culture that teachers and administrators work hard to create at the Bronzeville-Lighthouse school.
School administrative data  The Bronzeville Lighthouse Charter School provided school discipline data from 2008-2009, 2009-2010 (suspension data), and through April of the 2010-2011 school year (referral, suspension and expulsion data). The data for comparing suspensions in the 08-09 and 09-10 school years showed increases from year to year. The total number of suspensions, number of students suspended, and number of students suspended more than one time increased in the 2009-2010 school year. Despite this, there was a decrease in suspensions longer than two days. There were some major changes in the school during the 2009-2010 school year, including a new principal mid-year, and a change in the code of conduct to include more “suspendable” behaviors.

Table 14 shows that in 2009-2010 the majority (60%) of the suspensions were for “violence/aggression,” followed by “gross disobedience” (26% of the total suspensions). About half of the suspensions happened in the spring (March-June) (51%), with March being the highest month (29 out of 172 suspensions, 17%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suspensions by Behavior Type</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Disobedience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Disrespect</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence/Aggression</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheating</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The year-to-year suspension data comparison (see Table 15) for 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 (through April) demonstrated a slight decrease in total suspensions (124, down from 128) and a decrease in the percentage of total students suspended (down to 12% from 26.4%). The number of “lower academy” (K-5)
suspensions was proportionately higher in the 10-11 school year, comprising 60% of the total number of students suspended, compared to 40% in the 09-10 school year. This data also showed that there was a decrease in total suspensions and number of students suspended, but there was also an increase in number of students suspended more than one time. All (100%) of the 124 suspensions involved African American students, (note that the school’s student population is almost 100 percent African-American).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Data for April (10-11)</th>
<th>Year-to-date (10-11)</th>
<th>Data for April (09-10)</th>
<th>Year-to-date (09-10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of suspensions</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of students suspended</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Lower Academy students</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Upper Academy students</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of students suspended</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of students suspended more than one time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of suspensions greater than 2 days</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 15: Lighthouse School Suspension Data, School Year 2010-11, Compared to Prior Year*

*Table 16* shows the discipline referrals by behavior type which shows that the majority, nearly 100%, of discipline referrals were issued because of “disrespect,” and that almost 200 of these and other incidents happened in the classroom. Other common reasons for referrals were aggression, inappropriate language and fighting.

In addition, data was provided surrounding expulsions in the 2010-2011 school year. There were 4 expulsions total, of which 75% were male and 100% were African-American. Half of the students expelled were from the Lower Academy grades, with the other half being from the Upper Academy (grades 6-8).
Table 16: Lighthouse School Suspension Data, types of discipline referrals, 2010-2011 school year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Disobedience</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Disrespect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence/Aggression</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheating</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>119</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Classroom observations

*Observation 1.* Grade: 8th Subject: English/Literature

Demographics: 20 students

12 girls, 8 boys

20 African American

*Classroom description:* The desks were set up in pairs and trios in a U shape around the room. Students were facing one another. The setup was very conducive to group work and pair shares. Student work was posted on the walls. The lesson objectives were written on the board in the front of the room. The room was bright and well organized.

A sign was posted on the wall that indicated the appropriate hand signals for students to follow during class. 1 finger = needs a break, 2 fingers = needs a tissue, 3 fingers = needs to throw something in the trash, 4 fingers = needs to borrow supplies. The use of this system was not observed.
**Classroom instruction:** Students were working on understanding the concepts of antagonist and plot based on Hamlet by Shakespeare. The teacher’s role can be described as a facilitator (Fc), stimulator of high-level thinking (Stc), and an interactive teacher (Int). Students were very engaged with the lesson. They took turns reading passages and critically discussing each passage. The student activity can be described as active participation (Sa) and cooperative learning (Co). After reading the passages, students worked in pairs and groups to answer questions on the reading. The classroom environment was laid-back and students were engaged in the open discussion format.

**Interpersonal Interactions:** The student-to-student interactions that were observed included brief cooperation, learning-related (not disruptive), some non-disruptive off-task talk, and friendly talk. There were no negative student-to-student interactions observed. The teacher-to-student interactions that were observed included praise and encouragement, respectful reprimand/ redirection, and friendliness/openness. The student-to-teacher interactions included learning-related (not disruptive), some non-disruptive off-task talk, and friendly talk.

Examples of teacher-to-student interaction:

One student with his hand up was not called on. When the teacher neglected to call on him he called out to the teacher. Her response was, “I said wait.” The student put his hand down and sat quietly. It’s not clear if the student was using the hand signals or wanted to participate in the discussion. One student was being disruptive with a piece of paper. The teacher quietly walked over while leading the discussion, pushed the piece of paper onto the student’s desk, and quietly told the student to “stop”. The student complied.

The teacher never raised her voice to the class. When the room became loud with student chatter, the teacher responded by saying “I’ll wait,” and the students seemed to get the message. During the discussion and group work, the teacher walked around the room, assisted groups, and when a group of boys was off-task, the teacher responded with, “Gentleman, I see you off-task”. The group of boys seemed to be redirected.

**Quality Ratings:** One a scale from poor to good, the classroom characteristics were rated as follows:

- Teacher’s kindness and respect: Good
- Students’ kindness and respect: Good
Teacher’s motivation and responsibility  Good
Students’ level of engagement  Good
Positive discipline/ problem prevention  Good
Caring Community  Good

**Observation 2.** Grade: 5th  Subject: Reading/Vocabulary

Demographics: 27 students
13 boys, 12 girls
27 African American
1 teacher’s aide

*Classroom Description:* The classroom was dark, the lights were off. The desks were in rows in a U shape facing the front board. There was one student whose desk was removed from the U and in the back corner of the room. Some students sat on the front rug in front of the blackboard. The room was a bit cluttered and hard to move around in with all of the desks. There didn’t seem to be enough desks or chairs for all of the students.

*Classroom Instruction:* The instruction was a vocabulary lesson to help prepare students for an upcoming standardized test. The vocabulary words were projected onto the board in the front of the room. Students were asked to write them down and take notes as the teacher instructed them. The teacher’s role was described as an information provider: the teacher directs the students and gives them the definitions. The teacher said to the students, “This is what I need you to know.....write it down.” Every now and again, she asked them if they had examples or questions. The students worked independently taking notes, and their role can be described as passive with little interaction. (Note: It was very apparent that the teacher was teaching to the test.) The aide walked around working with individual students who had questions or who struggled to stay focused.

*Interpersonal Interactions:* The student-to-student interactions observed were mostly negative. There were several nonverbal disruptions (i.e. students tilting their desks, tapping their pencils, getting up to get hand sanitizer, walking around the room, putting their heads down on the desks.) There was some disruptive off-task talk and lots of chatter. There were two verbal provocations. The first occurred when one student told another
student that he needed to go wash his shirt, but said that he never would because it’s always dirty. There was another when one student told the boy next to her to move his seat. He ignored her and she attempted to get up. The aide came over to assist and she explained the other student was crowding her. The aide told the student to move his seat over and walked away. The student did not acknowledge the aide’s request and did not move his seat over.

The teacher-to-student interactions can be described as respectful reprimand, and some praise and encouragement when students offered the correct answers. However, when a student was off-task and redirected, there didn’t seem to be any follow-through or consequence. For example, one student kept getting up, walking around the room, and going to the hand sanitizer. He was asked to sit down several times. He smacked his lips at the teacher, sat down, got back up, and there was no consequence. He ended up in the back corner of the room (where his desk was isolated from everyone else’s) and spent the lesson drawing on his arm with a pen.

The student-to-teacher interaction was predominately disruptive off-task and non-disruptive off-task. Students were not very engaged in the lesson. There was some low chatter, some walking around the room, and tapping pencils on desks. One student, who was not engaged, was asked to take notes. He did not acknowledge the teacher’s request nor take notes. There was no follow-up.

Quality Ratings:

- Teacher’s kindness and respect: Fair
- Students’ kindness and respect: Fair
- Teacher’s motivation and responsibility: Fair
- Students’ level of engagement: Poor
- Positive discipline/problem prevention: Fair
- Caring Community: Fair

Observation 3. Grade: 6th Subject: Science/Math

Demographics: 19 Students
14 boys
5 girls
18 African American, 1 Hispanic

Classroom Description: The desks were in five clusters of four, and five other desks were scattered around the room. Students faced each other in the clusters. The room was bright. On the wall was a “6th Grade Social Contract” that set the following expectations: respect, being prepared, having a positive attitude, and actively participating.

Classroom Instruction: The first part of the class (9:45-10:15) involved a science lesson. The second portion (10:15-10:30) was a math activity. The teacher led an open discussion on the scientific method in preparation for an upcoming science fair at which the students would present their projects. During the science discussion, the teacher served as a facilitator and an information provider. The time was spent going over last-minute questions or concerns about the upcoming presentations. Students raised their hands to comment or ask questions.

During the math activity, the teacher pulled up a worksheet on the overhead projector. Students worked independently on the worksheet as the teacher walked around monitoring students and keeping them on task. After independent work, the teacher went through the answers with the students as a group. Students actively participated in sharing their answers.

Interpersonal Interactions: The student-to-student interaction included nonverbal disruption, some disruptive off-task talk, and some non-disruptive off-task talk. For example, one student played with a cloth bandage during the lesson. The teacher quietly walked over and took it away. There was no discussion or student reaction. On a few occasions, students got chatty and a bit disruptive, the teacher responded by counting backwards from five. Students seemed to get the message and the teacher never got to zero. At one point, a student got a question wrong and the other students laughed at him. The student didn’t react and neither did the teacher.
The teacher-to-student interaction was respectful redirect and praise and encouragement. For example, when students asked repetitive questions or a question that had already been answered, the teacher pulled up two quotes on “excellence” on the projector. He asked students to read the quotes and encouraged them to do their best work. Another example occurred when a student answered a question inaccurately; the teacher asked the other students if they agreed and what the consensus was. (Note: When we introduced ourselves to the teacher and explained why we were observing, his response was, “Well, I have four students out today, so our peace in the classroom is pretty good.”)

Quality Ratings:

- Teacher’s kindness and respect: Good
- Students’ kindness and respect: Good
- Teacher’s motivation and responsibility: Average
- Students’ level of engagement: Average
- Positive discipline/problem prevention: Good
- Caring Community: Good

Comparisons of Alton and Lighthouse

**School climate** Analysis of the Lighthouse and Alton school climate survey data reveal both similarities and differences among student responses. This section examines the school climate survey results for both schools. It is worth noting that significantly more surveys were collected from the Alton Schools (689) than the Lighthouse School (87). The overall trends for responses from both schools were quite similar, with just a few noted differences.

**Similarities** When examining the results question by question, a similar pattern emerges, and it is revealed that students answered similarly for the majority of the questions. In other words, despite the difference in the number of respondents, student responses remained comparable (see Charts 30 and 31.).

This result yields two major assumptions for both internal and external validity of the measures developed by this research project. First, the survey instrument appears to have been worded appropriately for
the target population. Although further testing of this instrument is encouraged in future related projects, it does not appear to have problems with internal validity issues, at least on face value. Second, the students from these different schools seem to view their schools’ discipline and conflict mediation policies similarly; they share common experiences and frustrations to some extent. This directly addresses measures of external reliability: Since these two schools share comparable results, it may be possible to generalize these results to other like-suited schools. Again, repeated experimentation is required in order to substantiate these claims.

**Chart 30: Survey Questions – percent positive responses**

![Chart 30](image)

**Chart 31: Survey questions – percent negative responses**

![Chart 31](image)
Hypotheses  This research project identified eight hypotheses concerning school climate and school outcomes expected from the implementation of restorative justice practices. The survey instrument collected data on six of the eight hypotheses, with each item in the school climate survey addressing one of these 6 hypotheses. It was expected that the responses would show support for each of the hypotheses or that the responses would enable administrators and restorative justice advocates to determine what restorative justice program would be best suited for each test school. Just as seen in the question-by-question analysis, when grouped by hypothesis, the schools exhibit similarities:

Hypothesis 1: Restorative Justice practices improve school climate and culture: The questions that tested this hypothesis asked students to gauge the current school climate, from level of respect among students and faculty to the amount of time spent dealing with bad behavior. The responses generated (Table 17) suggest that current school climates in the Alton and Lighthouse schools are positive. Although restorative justice practices theoretically improve on school climate, implementing them in relatively stable climates (as seen at both schools) may improve the likelihood for success regarding desired outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Positive school climate</th>
<th>Negative school climate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lighthouse</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alton</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 2: Restorative Justice practices encourage students to be more proactive in making the school safer: Survey items included under this hypothesis asked students to agree or disagree with statements about specific actions that they take when a problem, like talking out of turn or consoling a sad student, occurs.

Responses varied, which resulted in only a slight difference between the two study sites. Taking a closer look (Table 18), however, it appears that students at both schools experience teasing and bullying, with 71 percent of

---

15 See Attachment A for a description of the different hypotheses.
responses at Alton and 83 percent of responses at Lighthouse agreeing with the statement: “Students here are often mean to each other.” In addition, 70 percent of responses at Alton and 85 percent at Lighthouse agreed with the statement: “Teasing and picking on others is pretty common here.” These results strongly support the need for improved conflict mediation practices at both schools so that students can learn how to work out their differences. It is also worth noting that less than half of the students at both schools indicate that they are encouraged to be proactive in resolving conflicts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Safe school</th>
<th>Unsafe school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lighthouse</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alton</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 3: Restorative Justice practices encourage students, teachers, parents, social workers, and others to adopt collaborative practices that support the desired improvements in school climate: Both schools displayed high levels of tolerance for differences in race and culture and reported little to no differences in the ways students from varying cultural backgrounds are treated by each other and/or the teachers and administrators at the school. Responses (Table 19) suggest that students feel comfortable talking to teachers in both schools if problems arise, as evidenced by an overwhelming number of students disagreeing with the statement: “There aren’t any teachers in this school I can talk to if I have a problem,” and agreeing with the statement: “At school there are adults I can talk to, who care about what happens to me.”

---

62% of Alton school respondents answered negatively (No) to this question, and 75% of Lighthouse students answered negatively.
67% of Alton school respondents answered positively (Yes) to this question, and 75% of Lighthouse students answered positively.
Hypothesis 6: Restorative Justice practices improve approaches to school discipline: The questions categorized under this hypothesis addressed the current system of rules and consequences at each school. Student responses (Table 20) suggested that school rules do not seem fair (85% of responses at Lighthouse and 74% of responses at Alton), and that students do not generally determine consequences (about 75% of students at both schools agreed with this). At both schools, responses indicate that a more positive approach to school discipline could be achieved (56% of students surveyed felt that the current approach is negative).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 19: School Comparison Hypothesis #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration exists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighthouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 20: School Comparison Hypothesis #6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with disciplinary approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighthouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 7: Restorative Justice practices build student skills that serve them well later in life: These questions address the degree to which teachers encourage independent decision-making, discuss students’ future plans, and bolster student confidence. Three of the seven items included under this hypothesis focused on the role of the teacher, and students from both schools seem to agree that the teachers are actively engaging students to make their own decisions and show them how to be successful. However, there were some interesting differences between the schools as well (Table 21). When asked if there were numerous group
activities for students to join, 57 percent of Lighthouse students suggested that there were not, whereas the Alton students agreed that there were (79%). This did not seem to affect the confidence level of the students, because when asked if they “feel like [they] will be a better person because [they] go to this school,” Lighthouse respondents agreed (52%) while Alton respondents disagreed (61%). Overall, these results suggest that the faculty and students would benefit from adding a restorative justice skills set to the current practices in order to better prepare students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Focus on student success</th>
<th>No focus on student success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lighthouse</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alton</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis 8: Restorative Justice practices reduce disproportionate minority contact (with the juvenile justice system):** For the most part, student responses (Table 22) to the items included under this hypothesis overwhelmingly suggested that both schools practice equal treatment; especially when the questions were specific. Only one question seemed to elicit a split response: “All students are treated equally in this school, no matter what their background.” 59% of Lighthouse respondents and 49% of Alton respondents disagreed with this statement. It appears that both schools are attempting to reduce disproportionate minority contact by treating students equally.

---

18 Questions that specifically asked respondents about the treatment of Black or Hispanic students resulted in overwhelmingly positive support for equal treatment, as well as questions that addressed police involvement.
Table 22: School Comparison Hypothesis #8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Equal treatment</th>
<th>Disproportionate treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lighthouse</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alton</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Differences**  Upon closer examination of each question, a few differences between the test schools became evident. As noted in the previous section, one of these differences was the number of activities offered to students. Alton school students agreed that there were a lot of group activities offered at school, whereas the Lighthouse students tended to disagree with this. Additional differences observed:

- **Statement: Students here aren’t afraid to say they are sorry**: Although Lighthouse respondents were split on this statement (55% agreed; 45% disagreed), 65 percent of Alton school respondents disagreed with this statement (35% agreed). This question tested Hypothesis 1, which measured school culture. These results suggest that Alton students could benefit from a conflict mediation program which encourages verbal apologies and condones labeling.

- **Statement: Teachers talk to students with respect**: This question was also one that gauged the school culture. Again, the Lighthouse school results were split (46% agreed and 54% disagreed), while 61 percent of Alton students tended to agree with this statement (39% disagreed). At the Alton schools, it appears that the problems are arising between students and not between students and teachers, as evidenced in the Hypothesis 2 (safe environment) results, which highlighted the ongoing practice of teasing and bullying amongst students.

- **Statement: Adults in this school go out of their way to make me feel safe**: This question tested Hypothesis 3 (degree of collaboration), but is also a measure of school safety and climate (Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2). Results indicated that 67 percent of Lighthouse respondents agreed with this statement (33% disagreed). Alton respondents were slightly more inclined to disagree with this
statement (52% disagreed and 48% agreed). Although both schools experience bullying, Lighthouse students feel safer at school than do Alton students.

- **Statement: Teachers work out conflicts peacefully here**: Although Lighthouse respondents produced split results (49% agreed while 51% disagreed), about 70 percent of Alton students agreed with this statement (30% disagreed). It stands to reason that if the teachers are working out their conflicts peacefully, then students could or should model this practice. This can be achieved with a conflict mediation program.

**School discipline comparison** The interviews regarding school discipline covered several topics; for example, past and current employment status, respondent’s knowledge about school discipline and recent changes in their school discipline policy, their impressions of how school discipline is handled in their school, and whether their school discipline policy provides them with adequate means to resolve discipline problems that arise.

The summary below looks at the responses to school discipline interview questions from Alton and Lighthouse and notes any similarities or differences between the two study sites. This summary discusses respondents’ responses to several quantitative (e.g., Yes or No) questions.\(^{19}\)

Nearly every respondent from Alton indicated familiarity with their school’s discipline policy, and every respondent from Lighthouse indicated familiarity with the school’s discipline policy (Charts A1 and L1 below).

The majority of respondents, from both schools, felt their school discipline policy was comprehensive and was developed with input from a diverse group of school employees (Charts A2, A3, L2, and L3 below).

When asked if students were involved in the development of school discipline policy (something that might be considered a restorative practice), most respondents said that students were not included (Charts A4 and L4 below).

\(^{19}\) As a note, any missing or incomplete data is marked as “missing/left blank” or with the number “9”.
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Most respondents felt their school discipline policy was fair (Charts A5 and L5), but responses fluctuated when respondents were asked if the school discipline policy was enforced consistently (Charts A6 and L6 below). Data from Alton indicated that six out of 10 respondents felt that the school discipline policy was enforced consistently, three respondents felt it was not, and one left the answer blank (Chart A6). Data from Lighthouse indicated that only four out of seven respondents felt the school discipline policy was enforced consistently (Chart L6). When asked if the discipline policy was enforced equally, regardless of student gender, race, or background,” respondents’ answers were also mixed. At Alton, half believed that the school discipline policy was enforced equally, regardless of gender, race, or background and half believed it was not (Chart A7). At Lighthouse, however, nearly all the respondents indicated that the school discipline policy was enforced equally, regardless of gender, race, or background (Chart L7).

In both school sites, nearly all of the respondents felt the school discipline policy could be improved regarding its content and enforcement (Charts A8, A9, L8 and L9 below), and most felt the changes in school discipline policy over the past three years represented improvements to the policy (Charts A10 and L10 below).

When asked if their school policy allowed them to respond adequately to school discipline issues, most responded favorably (Charts A11 and L11 below). When asked to explain if they were satisfied with the way a recent school discipline incident they had witnessed (involving a conflict between two or more students) was handled, most responded favorably as well (Charts A12 and L12 below).
Chart A1: Familiarity with School Discipline Policy

Are you familiar with the current school policy on student discipline?

Chart L1: Familiarity with School Discipline Policy

Are you familiar with the current school policy on student discipline?

Chart A2: Comprehensiveness of School Discipline Policy

Our SDP (School Discipline Policy) is comprehensive.

Chart L2: Comprehensiveness of School Discipline Policy

Our SDP (School Discipline Policy) is comprehensive.

Chart A3: Policy Developed by Diverse Group

Our SDP was developed with input from a diverse group of school employees.

Chart L3: Policy Developed by Diverse Group

Our SDP was developed with input from a diverse group of school employees.
Chart A7: Discipline is Enforced Regardless of Gender, Race, or Background

Our SDP is enforced regardless of student gender, race, or background.

Chart L7: Discipline is Enforced Regardless of Gender, Race, or Background

Our SDP is enforced regardless of student gender, race, or background.

Chart A8: Content of School Discipline Can Be Improved

Our SDP can be improved regarding its content.

Chart L8: Content of School Discipline Can Be Improved

Our SDP can be improved regarding its content.

Chart A9: Enforcement of School Discipline can be improved

Our SDP can be improved regarding its enforcement.

Chart L9: Enforcement of School Discipline Can Be Improved

Our SDP can be improved regarding its enforcement.
Chart A10: School Discipline Policy has Improved

Do you think these changes were an improvement over the past discipline policies and procedures.

Chart L10: School Discipline Policy has Improved

Do you think these changes were an improvement over the past discipline policies and procedures.

Chart A11: Discipline Policy Allows Adequate Responses

Do you think the SDP allows the staff to adequately respond to these problems when they come up?

Chart L11: Discipline Policy Allows Adequate Responses

Do you think the SDP allows the staff to adequately respond to these problems when they come up?

Chart A12: Satisfied with the Way A Discipline Incident was Handled

Were you satisfied with the way it was handled?

Chart L12: Satisfied with the Way A Discipline Incident was Handled

Were you satisfied with the way it was handled?
Qualitative analysis of discipline interview comparison  It appears that the Alton and Lighthouse schools experience disrespectful verbal transgressions between both students and students and teachers. Both schools also reported that positive school culture (focusing on the positive, creating leaders, and stressing consequences) is important in establishing a safe environment, and that Restorative Justice practices can assist in this endeavor. At the Alton Schools, the administrators and teachers have already begun implementing mediation and other informal techniques to peacefully reconcile conflicts. Although they noted that this process consumes time and energy of all involved, it alleviates stress by addressing the root causes of the conflict. Many times, all parties come to an agreement, thereby reducing future conflicts.

Since some of the more common incidents at the Lighthouse School include verbal arguments, cyber bullying, and disrespect, respondents were supportive of adopting Restorative Justice practices in order to better address these stressors. Just as it has been recognized at Alton schools, resolving conflicts peacefully by discussing the events and the consequences may reduce the number of verbal or physical attacks between parties involved in mediation or other informal practices.

Neither school suggested that the input of the student should be requested when [re]examining the school’s discipline policy, although many students seemed to want to be a part of this process (see the results from the School Climate Survey). However, some respondents, from both the Alton and Lighthouse schools, would like to see more parent involvement. Peer jury in conjunction with peer mediation may be a way in which students, parents, and administrators can increase school safely with their valued input in the discipline policies and practices.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Feasibility of School-Based Restorative Justice Data Collection

There is a tendency in Restorative Justice groups to lament the lack of school participation in community collaborative processes such as those required by the Restorative Justice philosophy. The experience relating to this project suggests that a re-orienting of this perspective is in order. The

---

20 This is an observation based on the authors’ experiences, not a research finding.
implementation challenges encountered (e.g., invitations and subsequent retractions from several schools, relationship-building, scheduling problems, and compromises regarding data collection) certainly represented difficulties that had to be overcome. However, it is our observation that these difficulties and challenges did not emanate from school-based avoidance or disregard for the potential that Restorative Justice has to offer; rather, they came from the real challenges that school teachers and administrators face on a daily basis to accomplish their primary mission: education of students. School teachers and administrators keep a strong focus on this mission, to their credit, and only when they are convinced that participation in Restorative Justice practices (and research relating to those practices) will benefit their primary mission (or, at least, when they are convinced that participation in Restorative Justice will not detract from their primary mission) will they participate in a meaningful way in the types of activities our research project suggested and requested.

In our estimation, the schools involved in this project were exemplary collaborators. This is, of course, due to a strong selection bias. The schools involved in this study had already made the decision to implement restorative justice practices before the research team requested their cooperation and participation in research activities. Thus, it is not expected that all schools approached with requests to collect the data required for this research project comply? For example, schools that might be selected as comparison or control schools in an experimental design. Nonetheless, the research team collected a substantial amount of information from several different schools during this research project (public schools, private schools, high schools, middle schools, rural schools, urban schools), using several different data collection methods (online surveys, face-to-face interviews, collection of administrative data, and participant observation in classrooms). In situations involving active school interest in implementing Restorative Justice practices, the experience with this project suggests that the feasibility of school-based Restorative Justice data collection is strong. However, researchers planning to conduct data collection in a manner similar to this project should plan for significant preparatory planning and relationship-building, which lays the groundwork for successful research in schools.
Key Factors to Plan and Account for

In any research project, there is a myriad of factors for which to plan. This section addresses several that were particularly important and helpful for this project, and does not intend to account for all possible factors and contingencies. It also includes some unanticipated events and obstacles, which are impossible to plan for directly (though their probability can certainly be anticipated).

Several sections of this report refer to the importance of relationship-building with school personnel. As trite as such a comment may sound, it is vital to keep relationship-building at the forefront of research plans. In most instances, researchers will collect data from people they do not know (teachers and administrators), and often that data will pertain to people they care about very much (e.g., fellow teachers and administrators, and students). In addition, the act of collecting data inevitably pulls them away from their primary tasks. Thus, both the acts of planning and organizing research in schools, and actually collecting data, involve exchange relationships with individuals. Researchers ask people for data and information, and understandably, the data and information providers expect something in return, which is usually simply to be treated with respect for their time and for the work that they do, and perhaps also to achieve school improvements based on the research. This observation applies to many research situations, not just to school-based Restorative Justice research; however, the focus of Restorative Justice on interpersonal relations and relationship building makes this issue more salient for Restorative Justice research in schools. Restorative Justice researchers often feel strongly that they must practice what they profess.

Other sections of this report also refer to the need for flexibility and compromise regarding school-based Restorative Justice research. This, too, is a nearly universal issue in social science research that takes place within school and other service organizations. The research practices that produce the highest probability of successful completion of a research project involve flexibility and compromise. Compromise need not lessen the validity of research; it may just mean a delay in data collection plans. It may, too, mean a change in sampling approach. For example, this project began with plans to collect school climate surveys from random samples of school students. Discussion with school personnel in one instance led to a compromise in sampling:
instead of a truly random sample, students taking a mandatory computer class in two high school grades were offered the opportunity to participate in an online survey while they were in the computer laboratory for a regularly scheduled class. This produced a sizeable sample of students (almost 800) that covered several grades (and thus several age groups), and that met the purposes of the research project.21

For several reasons, mostly scheduling problems, it was not possible to conduct the classroom videotaping initially planned. In one instance, a school suggested that the research team work with a school film class to conduct the classroom taping, but after several discussions it turned out not to be feasible. In this instance, the requirement of active parental consent for taping was an impediment as well: this requirement doubled the amount of time and effort required to complete videotaping data collection. In another instance, a unique filming opportunity arose in a research-ready pre-school (school classrooms were pre-equipped with two-way observation booths), but it came up during an abbreviated summer session, and again, obtaining active parental consent in a timely fashion proved difficult and unfeasible.

Other factors that school-based Restorative Justice researchers should plan and account for include the following:

- Different formats for administrative data files. While it may be likely that schools within a district collect administrative data in similar fashions, perhaps even using similar databases, it is less likely that schools in different jurisdictions will use similar formats and databases. Different types of schools (e.g., public versus private) will likely collect data in different systems, and have different capabilities for extracting data in helpful formats for researchers. In some cases, it may not be possible to collect individual-level (student-level) data without sampling and coding data from paper files. Such differences in administrative data systems will not likely prevent the collection of administrative data, though it will require researchers to budget enough time to work through these contingencies.

---

21 Such a sample may not have satisfied the demands of a more rigorous experimental design. Still, in the research situation encountered with this project, the likelihood is that a strict random sample would require more time (and resources) to achieve; it would not have been rejected by the schools.
Different schools, and different school districts, will have different levels of resources (personnel and other resources) to devote to the tasks required for data collection. In one case, for this project, it was possible to pay for the services for a “liaison” from the district office, who facilitated data collection, while another school did not have the personnel available to devote to such a task, even if they could be paid for the work. One school district may have a programmer who can extract data from computer files easily and cheaply, while another school district may not have programming resources to spare. This is another example suggesting that researchers thoroughly investigate data and other resources at school sites before planning for data collection.

Researchers will encounter different leadership styles in schools and school districts. This is natural and to be expected, and it serves as another signal for researchers to be prepared to be flexible when working with school personnel.

Research administrators should devote careful attention the training of research staff. This project entailed the use of several staff (some of them volunteers) for data collection, which resulted in some differences in the data collected (this pertains to the qualitative classroom observations). Additional staff training in this instance would likely have resulted in more consistency in qualitative data collection across different school sites.

Finally, researchers should prepare themselves for a detailed Institutional Review Board (IRB) review of research protocols. School-based research in middle and high schools involves protected subjects (youth), which automatically increases the scrutiny of the IRB and which frequently results in requirements for active parental consent (obtaining signed informed consent forms from parents and guardians of potential student research subjects). These protections are important and mandated by federal law governing research involving human subjects. Often, they produce contingencies that, again, require extra planning and extra time and resources for researchers. Sometimes they will result in small sample sizes, or they will prove to be unworkable, depending on time and resource constraints.
Utility of School-Based Restorative Justice Data

This research project demonstrated that it is possible to collect data from different types of schools, and from different grades and age levels, for the purposes of assessing and evaluating the implementation of Restorative Justice practices. In addition, this preliminary analysis of the data collected from several school districts in several different geographic locations in the state of Illinois, using several different data collection methods, suggests that the research instruments developed for this project (school climate survey linked to specific hypotheses pertaining to Restorative Justice practices in schools, school discipline interview, collection of administrative data, and classroom observations) can indeed detect differences by school and by hypothesis. Thus, the preliminary indication is that the research instruments are sensitive to key evaluation research questions pertaining to Restorative Justice practices in schools. At this juncture, it appears that the research instruments can measure key phenomena related to Restorative Justice, and that they are likely to produce useful results in an evaluation situation (e.g., a pre-/post-design or an experimental design), though this remains to be tested with additional data collection and additional scale analysis regarding the school climate survey.

Recommendations for the future

In the future, several developments would contribute to the research conducted through this project. There should be additional applications of the data collection protocols described here (and contained in the various attachments to this report) in additional schools in Illinois and elsewhere. The data collected with the instruments developed for this project should be further analyzed, especially the school climate survey. The data from this survey should be analyzed using appropriate statistical techniques to test the validity of the overall scale and the various subscales (by hypothesis). Such an analysis would likely reveal that there are redundant items in the school climate questionnaire, and that some sub-scales are more valid and reliable than others. This is a critical analysis task that should be completed before too much replication of its administration takes place.

\[22\] It is important to note here that the preliminary analysis referred to does not entail a full, statistical analysis of the properties and sub-scales in the school climate survey. Additional analysis will be required to determine the sociometric qualities of the school climate instrument.
Toward the end of this research project, an interesting development occurred that points to the need for additional protocol development regarding school-based Restorative Justice research. A pre-school in the south suburbs of Chicago approached the research team with a request for assistance. Teachers in the school had observed what they perceived to be ‘pre-bullying’ activities among pre-school students (ages 3-4). They asked for Restorative Justice training. The research team felt that a new set of instruments would be required for evaluation of Restorative Justice practices in a pre-school setting. Further research and inquiry into the phenomenon of ‘pre-bullying’ behaviors is warranted (with the appropriate cautions against net-widening). In any case, in the event that pre-schools and elementary schools develop interest in Restorative Justice practices, research instruments developed specifically for younger students, and teachers and school administrators who work with younger students, should be developed and tested for validity and reliability as well.

Finally, as a direct result of the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority’s long-standing interest in, and support of, Restorative Justice practices, as well as the MacArthur Foundation’s investment in Restorative Justice through its Models for Change initiative, ICJIA and other funding organizations should support the development and application of Restorative Justice in schools and other government and social service organizations. Much has been learned in the past several decades regarding the efficacy and effectiveness of Restorative Justice (see, for example, Sherman & Strang 2007), but this learning does not extend enough into schools; more work is needed in this area to determine if we can reach a higher level of confidence that school resources should be diverted from other areas to Restorative Justice.
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Attachment A: Summary of Restorative Justice Hypotheses, Outcomes, and Data Collection Methods

Attachment B: School Climate Survey

Attachment C: School Climate Questionnaire Items Grouped by Restorative Justice Hypotheses

Attachment D: School Discipline Interview

Attachment E: Administrative Data Requested from Schools

Attachment F: Vessels’ Classroom Observation Form
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Attachment I: Informed Consent – Discipline Interview

Attachment J: Informed Consent – Video Taping
### SUMMARY OF SCHOOL RESTORATIVE JUSTICE HYPOTHESES, OUTCOMES, AND DATA COLLECTION METHODS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Data collection method(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Restorative Justice practices improve school climate and culture</td>
<td>• Student, faculty, staff feelings about school safety&lt;br&gt;• Help-seeking behavior by students&lt;br&gt;• Student-to-student, student-to-teacher relationships&lt;br&gt;• Feelings about school pride&lt;br&gt;• Observations about school upkeep and appearance&lt;br&gt;• Parent/guardian involvement in school matters</td>
<td>• School climate surveys&lt;br&gt;• Classroom observation (field observer or video camera)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Restorative Justice practices encourage students to be more proactive in making the school safer</td>
<td>• Students refrain from harmful or hurtful behaviors&lt;br&gt;• Students encourage other students to refrain from harmful or hurtful behaviors&lt;br&gt;• Students apply restorative practices in conflict situations</td>
<td>• School climate surveys&lt;br&gt;• School administrative records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Restorative Justice practices encourage students, teachers, parents, social workers, and others to adopt collaborative practices that support the desired improvements in school climate</td>
<td>• Levels of participation in Restorative Justice ‘events’ (circles, conferences, etc.)</td>
<td>• Observation of Restorative Justice ‘events’&lt;br&gt;• Surveys of Restorative Justice event participants&lt;br&gt;• Interviews with Restorative Justice event participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Restorative Justice practices reduce school problems</td>
<td>• Incident reports (overall, and in specific problem areas like hallways, buses and bus stops, cafeteria)&lt;br&gt;• Detentions, suspensions, expulsions&lt;br&gt;• Referrals to police</td>
<td>• School administrative records (aggregate)&lt;br&gt;• School administrative records (individual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Restorative Justice practices improve academic performance</td>
<td>• GPA&lt;br&gt;• Grade advancement&lt;br&gt;• Standardized test scores&lt;br&gt;• Homework completion</td>
<td>• School administrative records (aggregate)&lt;br&gt;• School administrative records (individual)&lt;br&gt;• Interviews with teachers and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Restorative Justice practices improve approaches to school discipline</td>
<td>• Revisions to student conduct codes&lt;br&gt;• RJ represented in problem-solving options&lt;br&gt;• Participation in school discipline&lt;br&gt;• Satisfaction with school discipline policy&lt;br&gt;• Attitudes about school discipline</td>
<td>• School climate surveys&lt;br&gt;• Surveys of teachers, staff, and students&lt;br&gt;• Interviews with teachers, staff, and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Restorative Justice practices build student skills that serve them well later in life</td>
<td>• Graduation&lt;br&gt;• Employment&lt;br&gt;• Relationships&lt;br&gt;• Self-esteem&lt;br&gt;• Leadership&lt;br&gt;• Problem-solving&lt;br&gt;• Friendships and social networks</td>
<td>• Surveys (post-graduation)&lt;br&gt;• Administrative records</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SUMMARY OF SCHOOL RESTORATIVE JUSTICE HYPOTHESES, OUTCOMES, AND DATA COLLECTION METHODS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Data collection method(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8. Restorative Justice practices reduce disproportionate minority contact (with the juvenile justice system) | - Racial/ethnic profiles of: school referrals to police, police referrals to court, adjudications, and days in detention  
  - Students suspended and expelled                                           | - School, police, and court administrative records                        |
Attachment B

School Climate Survey

There are 53 sentences on this survey. They are all related to our school and how things happen, how people get along, and how people treat each other. We are interested in your thoughts about each statement. Please circle “Yes” or “No” after each statement to let us know if you agree with it. Please do your best to circle an answer for each statement.

Thank you!

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Students here are not ashamed to say they are sorry.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Students often help other students feel better when they are sad.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teachers help students work out their conflicts peacefully here.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Students help determine consequences for breaking rules at this school.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Students are encouraged to take part in helping run the school here.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Black and Hispanic kids are picked on more by teachers in this school.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Teachers here don’t take time to talk with students and listen to them.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Few students here break rules on purpose to make teachers mad.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Our school shows respect for people from all backgrounds and cultures.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>When a student gets in trouble here, it’s not the end of the world.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Teachers encourage students to make their own decisions here.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>All students are treated equally in this school, no matter what their background is.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Teachers talk to students with respect.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Students here are often mean to each other.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Good behavior is noticed and rewarded here.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Students think the school rules are fair.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Teachers talk to students about their future.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>In this school, if you’re Black or Hispanic and you get in trouble, the school will always call the police.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Teachers don’t often make mean and hostile comments.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Students respectfully listen to one another during class.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>There aren’t any teachers in this school I can talk to if I have a problem.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Teachers here do not shout at students.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Teachers and staff try to show students how to be successful.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Teachers in this school don’t care what your race is; they treat you fairly.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Teachers here support each other.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Students from different social classes, races and ethnic groups get along well at this school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Students do not act up when the teacher has to leave the room.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I often see parents at this school helping out.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Some students are punished worse than others for the same broken rule.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>There are lots of group activities for students to join at this school.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>This school sends students to the police for the smallest problems.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Teachers spend more time dealing with bad behavior than teaching here.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Teasing and picking on other students is pretty common here.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>At school there are adults I can talk to, who care about what happens to me.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Teachers here do not hit students.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>This school makes me feel confident.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Once a student goes to the police station from this school, they’re not allowed back in.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>This school is a caring and fair community.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Students will try to break up an argument before it gets too serious.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>When there are problems at this school, teachers and parents work together to solve them.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Some teachers ignore the rules around here.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>I feel like I will be a better person because I go to this school.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Teachers treat students with respect, no matter what the student’s background is.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Students let other students know when they are being unfair or bothering others.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Adults in this school go out of their way to make me feel safe.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Kids who break rules here usually get what they deserve.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Students here are proud of their school.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Teachers here do not spend a lot of time with students who progress slowly due to a disability.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Teachers are friendly toward students.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>The teachers here respect me.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>I don’t listen to others when I don’t agree with them.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Students I don’t like can still have good ideas.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Teachers argue and shout at other teachers or staff here.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Climate Questionnaire Items Grouped by Restorative Justice Hypotheses

H1: Restorative Justice practices improve school climate and culture

1. Students are not ashamed to say they are sorry. (1)
2. Teachers here don’t take time to talk with students and listen to them. (1)
3. Teachers talk to students with respect. (1)
4. Teachers don’t often make mean and hostile comments. (1)
5. Teachers here support each other. (1)
6. Students from different social classes, races and ethnic groups get along well at this school. (1)
7. Teachers spend more time dealing with bad behavior than teaching here. (1)
8. This school is a caring and fair community. (1)
9. Teachers treat students with respect, no matter what the student’s background is. (1)
10. Students here are proud of their school. (1)
11. Teachers here do not spend a lot of time with students who progress slowly due to a disability. (1)
12. Teachers are friendly toward students. (1)
13. The teachers here respect me. (1)
14. I don’t listen to others when I don’t agree with them. (1)
15. Kids I don’t like can have good ideas. (1)
16. Teachers argue and shout at other teachers or staff here. (1)

H2: Restorative Justice practices encourage students to be more proactive in making the school safer

17. Students often help other students feel better when they are sad. (2)
18. Few students here break rules on purpose to make teachers mad. (2)
19. Students here are often mean to each other. (2)
20. Students respectfully listen to one another during class. (2)
21. Students do not act up when the teacher has to leave the room. (2)
22. Teasing and picking on others is pretty common here. (2)
23. Students let other students know when they are being unfair or bothering others. (2)
24. Students will try to break up an argument before it gets too serious. (2)

H3: Restorative Justice practices encourages students, teachers, parents, social workers, and others to adopt collaborative practices that support the desired improvements in school climate

25. Teachers help students work out their conflicts peacefully here. (3)
26. Good behavior is noticed and rewarded here. (3)
27. Our school shows respect for people from all backgrounds and cultures. (3)
28. There aren’t any teachers in this school I can talk to if I have a problem. (3)
29. I often see parents at this school helping out. (3)
30. At school there are adults I can talk to, who care about what happens to me. (3)
31. When there are problems at this school, teachers and parents work together to solve them. (3)
32. Adults in this school go out of their way to make me feel safe. (3)

H6: Restorative Justice practices improve approaches to school discipline

33. Students help determine consequences for breaking rules at this school. (6)
34. Students think the school rules are fair. (6)
35. When a student gets in trouble here, it’s not the end of the world. (6)
36. Teachers here do not shout at students. (6)
37. Teachers here do not hit other students. (6)
38. Some students are punished worse than others for the same broken rule. (6)
39. Some teachers ignore the rules around here. (6)
40. Kids who break rules here usually get what they deserve. (6)

H7: Restorative Justice practices build student skills that serve them well later in life.
41. Students are encouraged to take part in helping run the school here. (7)
42. Teachers encourage students to make their own decisions here. (7)
43. Teachers talk to students about their future. (7)
44. Teachers and staff try to show students how to be successful. (7)
45. There are lots of group activities for students to join at this school. (7)
46. This school makes me feel confident. (7)
47. I feel like I will be a better person because I go to this school. (7)

H8: Restorative Justice practices reduce disproportionate minority contact (with the juvenile justice system)
48. Black and Hispanic kids are picked on more by teachers in this school. (8)
49. All students are treated equally in this school, no matter what their background is. (8)
50. In this school, if you’re Black or Hispanic and you get in trouble, you will automatically be sent to the police. (8)
51. Teachers in this school don’t care what your race is; they treat you fairly. (8)
52. This school sends students to the police for the smallest problems. (8)
53. Once a student goes to the police station from this school, they’re not allowed back in. (8)
Attachment D

School Discipline Interview

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this interview. In addition to conducting surveys in this school regarding school climate, we are interested in learning about this school’s philosophy about school discipline, how it has changed in recent years, if it has, and your perceptions regarding how school discipline is administered here at this school.

Remember, you do not have to answer these questions. You can withdraw at any time if you would like to, and you may skip over any question if you don’t want to answer it.

We appreciate your time today and your willingness to discuss school matters with us.

First, please let me ask a few questions about you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What is your position or title at this school?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How long have you worked in this position at this school?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Did you work at this school before you took the position you are currently in?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Did you work at any other school or schools before you came to this school?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. If yes, how long were you in the education business before you came to this school?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do you have a frequent role in the administration of discipline at this school?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. If yes, can you please describe this role?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. In addition to the position/title you mentioned earlier, do you have any other jobs or functions at this school?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Now I’d like to ask several questions about this school’s policy toward student conduct and discipline.

10. Are you familiar with the current school policy on student discipline?  
    |___ Yes ___ No |
   
If “No,” go to item 11 below. Then skip to item 18.  
If “Yes” go to item 12 below.

11. Why did you answer “No” to this question?  
    |___ Policy not published/available ___ Not aware of a policy ___ Forgot to read it ___ Read it but don’t remember it ___ Don’t care about it ___ Other reason: ________________ |

12. Please circle “Yes” or “No” to indicate your response to the following questions or statements about your school’s policy on student discipline:

12a. Our student discipline policy is comprehensive.  
    |Yes No Don’t Know |

12b. Our student discipline policy was developed with input from a diverse group of school employees.  
    |Yes No Don’t Know |

12c. Our student discipline policy was developed with input from students.  
    |Yes No Don’t Know |

12d. Our student discipline policy is fair.  
    |Yes No Don’t Know |

12e. Our student discipline policy is enforced consistently.  
    |Yes No Don’t Know |

12f. Our student discipline policy is enforced the same regardless of student gender, race, or background.  
    |Yes No Don’t Know |

12g. Our student discipline policy can be improved regarding its content.  
    |Yes No Don’t Know |

12h. Our student discipline policy can be improved regarding its enforcement.  
    |Yes No Don’t Know |

13. Do you know if your student discipline policy has changed within the past three years?  
    |___ Yes ___ No |

If “Yes,” go to item 14 below.  
If “No,” skip to item 18.
14. Can you describe how the policy has changed in recent years?

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

15. Do you think these changes were an improvement over past discipline policies and procedures?  ___ Yes  ___ No

16. Please explain your answer:

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

The next section of the interview will involve several questions about any actual experiences you have had regarding student discipline in this school.

17. If you are frequently involved in the administration of discipline at this school (see item 6), please respond to the following questions:

17a. What are the most serious types of discipline problems that you come across?

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

17b. Do you think the school discipline policy allows the staff to adequately respond to these problems when they come up?  ___ Yes  ___ No

17c. Please explain your answer:

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17d. What are some of the most frequent types of discipline problems that you come across?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. In the past month, have you witnessed or observed an incident of a student violation of the school’s rules that involved a conflict between two or more students?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If “Yes”, go to item 18a. If “No,” go to item 19.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18a. Without naming any names, please describe the incident; what happened?:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18b. How was the incident handled, and what was the outcome, for any students, faculty, or staff involved, if any?:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18c. Were you satisfied with the way it was handled?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18d. Please explain your answer:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>In the past 6 months, have you witnessed or observed an incident of a student violation of the school’s rules that involved a conflict between two or more students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If “Yes”, go to item 19a. If “No,” go to item 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19a.</td>
<td>Without naming any names, please describe the incident; what happened?:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19b.</td>
<td>How was the incident handled, and what was the outcome, for any students, faculty, or staff involved, if any?:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19c.</td>
<td>Were you satisfied with the way it was handled?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19d.</td>
<td>Please explain your answer:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Do you have any other thoughts, observations, or comments about school discipline policy and the way it is communicated or administered at this school? If so, please let us know:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you very much for your time today.
Attachment E

List of Administrative Data Requested from Schools

Student:

- Grade Level
- Race
- Gender
- GPA
- Free/Reduced Lunch Option

Discipline data at student, school and district level:

- Suspensions (in school & out)
- Expulsions
- Discipline referrals & actions taken
- Police Contact (or SRO)
- Arrests at School
- Truancy

Other:

- Graduation Rates
- Drop Out Rates
- Information for Illinois Youth Survey
Attachment F

Vessels’ Classroom Observation Form

### Vessels’ Classroom Observation Form – CTTA Version

**Teacher:** __________  
**Date:** __________  
**Time:** __________  
**Grade:** __________  
**School:** __________  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Classroom Instruction</strong></th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>10-15</th>
<th>20-25</th>
<th>30-35</th>
<th>40-45</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minutes of Active Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Teaching Role (Ip, Fc, Stc, N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artful Learning® Stage (Ini, Be, Im, Le, N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Lesson Content (Ac, Art, Vir, N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Relations (Co, Vs, Ind, N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Student Activity (Sa, Int, Pa, N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson infusion (Art, Vir, Ac, N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of Students On-Task &amp; Off-Task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interpersonal Interactions

#### Student-to-Student(s) Negative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hostile</th>
<th>Verbal Provocation</th>
<th>Physical Provocation</th>
<th>Physical Aggression</th>
<th>Learning-Related But Disruptive</th>
<th>Non-Disturbing But Disturbing</th>
<th>Hostile / Harsh / Demanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Courteousness / Politeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Student-to-Student(s) Positive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendly Talk</th>
<th>Smiles, etc.</th>
<th>Satisfied Help</th>
<th>Voluntary Help</th>
<th>Brief Cooperation (&lt;5 minutes)</th>
<th>Extended Teamwork</th>
<th>Relationship Building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Teacher-to-Student(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respecful Request / Redirect</th>
<th>Praise or Encouragement</th>
<th>Anger Toward Teacher</th>
<th>Disrespect to Teacher</th>
<th>Learning Related to Disruptive</th>
<th>Learning Related to Non-Disruptive</th>
<th>Voluntary Help</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Student-to-Teacher Negative & Positive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kindness or Affection</th>
<th>Non-Disturbing Off-Task Talk</th>
<th>Courteousness Politeness</th>
<th>Friendly Talk and Smiles</th>
<th>Kindness or Affection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Quality Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher’s Kindness and Respect</th>
<th>Students’ Kindness and Respect</th>
<th>Teacher’s Motivation and Responsibility</th>
<th>Students’ Level of Engagement</th>
<th>Positive Discipline / Problem Prevention</th>
<th>Caring Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Instructional Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ac</th>
<th>Art</th>
<th>Be</th>
<th>Bo</th>
<th>Co</th>
<th>Fc</th>
<th>Im</th>
<th>In</th>
<th>Ini</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic content</td>
<td>Arts infusion / facilitation</td>
<td>Becoming stage of Artful Learning</td>
<td>Both arts and virtue infusion</td>
<td>Cooperative Learning</td>
<td>Facilitator, coach, helper, guide</td>
<td>Implementing stage Artful Learning</td>
<td>Students Working Independently</td>
<td>Initiating Stage of Artful Learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ip</th>
<th>inf</th>
<th>Le</th>
<th>Ne</th>
<th>Pa</th>
<th>Sa</th>
<th>Sr</th>
<th>Vr</th>
<th>Vs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Provider</td>
<td>Interactive Teaching</td>
<td>Leading Stage of Artful Learning</td>
<td>Neither Arts nor Virtues infusion</td>
<td>Passive, Quiet, No Interaction</td>
<td>Students Activity Participating</td>
<td>Stimulator High-Level Thinking</td>
<td>Virtues, values, character, etc.</td>
<td>Competition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memo

To: Dr. James Coldren  
From: Becky Nugent, IRB Co-Chair  
CC: Chip Coldren, IRB Co-Chair  
Date: April 6, 2011  
Re: School Based Restorative Justice

Project Number: #11-03-07

We are pleased to inform you that your proposal has been approved by the GSU Institutional Review Board. You may begin your research. Please be advised that the protocol will expire on April 6, 2012, one year after the date of approval.

At the end of the year, if your research is completed, please inform the IRB in writing of the closing date. If you intend to collect data using human subjects after that date, the proposal must be renewed by the IRB. If you make any substantive changes in your research protocols before that date, you must inform the IRB and have the new protocols approved. Please include the exact title of your project and the assigned IRB number in any correspondence about this project.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Becky Nugent at 708-235-2105 or b-nugent@govst.edu.
Attachment H
Informed Consent

RESEARCH SUBJECT INFORMED CONSENT FORM
Governors State University School Climate Survey

Please read this consent form carefully and ask as many questions as you like before you decide whether you want to participate in this research study. You are free to ask questions at any time before, during, or after your participation in this research.

Project Information

| Project Title: School-Based Restorative Justice Study | Organization: Governors State University |
| Site IRB Number: 11-03-07 (approved 4/6/11) | Location: Alton |
| Principal Investigator: James Coldren | PI Phone: 708-534-4390 |

1. PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY
You are being asked to participate in a research study about school climate. School climate refers to the general way things run at your school, peoples’ attitudes at school, how people treat each other at school, and other matters about how it feels to be at your school on a day-to-day basis. The reason for doing this research is to see if some of the programs going on at the school help make the school a better place for teachers, staff, and students. Someday, researchers may return, after some new programs have been started at your school, to ask these same questions to see if the school has changed for the better after the programs have started.

2. PROCEDURES
You will be asked to complete a survey with about 50 questions on it. Each question requires a “yes” or “no” answer. The survey will take less than 30 minutes to complete. You will not be asked to put your name or any other information about yourself on the survey, so no one will know what answers you gave to the survey.

3. POSSIBLE RISKS OR DISCOMFORT
We do not think there are any risks or possible harm that can come to you as a result of taking this survey, because we’re asking about your observations about what happens in your school. There are a few questions about what happens to students who get in trouble at your school, and about some problems that may happen at your school, but there are no questions about you personally. There is a chance that you might feel uncomfortable when answering those questions. Remember, you can stop taking this survey at any time, and you can skip over any question you would like to.

4. POSSIBLE BENEFITS
There are no direct benefits to you for participating in this survey. Your participation will not help your status at the school. If you are a student, taking the survey will not help your grades or academic record in any way. Your participation is strictly voluntary.

It is possible that your participation will help improve school climate and the way things are run at this school, and you might help make this school a better place for students.
5. **CONFIDENTIALITY**
   Since we do not record your name on the survey form, once the surveys are done and we leave the school, no one will ever know what answers you gave to the survey. The researchers will keep this information in a locked file in the researcher’s office, and any computer files containing research information will be kept in a computer system protected by passwords.

   Your participation in this study will be treated as confidential. The results of the study may be published, but we will not present the results of the study in a way that your individual responses will be known.

   Any records or data obtained as a result of your participation in this study may be inspected by the sponsor or by a governmental agency, by the Governors State University Institutional Review Board (research ethics review board), or by the persons conducting this study. Otherwise these records will be kept confidential.

6. **YOU MAY DECLINE TO PARTICIPATE**
   You are free to choose whether or not to participate in this study. There will be no penalty or loss of benefits if you choose not to participate.

7. **AVAILABLE SOURCES OF INFORMATION**
   Any further questions you have about this study will be answered by the Principle Investigator:

   Name: James R. Coldren, Jr.
   Contact Information: 708-534-4390, jcoldren@govst.edu

   * Any questions you may have about your rights as a research subject will be answered by a member of the Governors State University Institutional Review Board:

   Name: Becky Nugent
   Contact Information: 708-235-2105, bnugent@govst.edu

8. **AUTHORIZATION**
   I have read and understand this consent form. By taking the survey, I provide my voluntary consent to participate in this research study. I understand that I may choose not to participate, and that there will be no negative consequences for me if I choose to not participate.
Attachment I
Informed Consent – Discipline Interview

Please read this consent form carefully and ask as many questions as you like before you decide whether you want to participate in this research study. You are free to ask questions at any time before, during, or after your participation in this research.

Project Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title: School-Based Restorative Justice Study</th>
<th>Organization: Governors State University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site IRB Number: 11-03-07 (approved 3/28/2011)</td>
<td>Location: Lighthouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Investigator: James Coldren</td>
<td>PI Phone: 708-534-4390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY**
   You are being asked to participate in an interview about how school discipline is handled at your school. For the purposes of this study, school discipline refers to the formal rules and guidelines that exist at your school regarding student conduct, student-teacher interaction, and student-to-student interaction, generally known as a student conduct code. The reason for doing this research is to see if some of the programs at your school help improve the disciplinary policy and process and help reduce student discipline problems. Someday, researchers may return, if new restorative justice programs have been started at your school, to ask these same questions to see if the school has changed after the programs have started.

2. **PROCEDURES**
   You are being asked to complete an interview that includes about 20 questions about your responsibilities regarding school discipline, your thoughts and opinions about how student discipline is handled at your school, and any observations you have made regarding recent rule infractions by students. Depending on your responses to the questions, the survey could take about 45 minutes.

3. **POSSIBLE RISKS OR DISCOMFORT**
   We do not think there are any risks or possible harm that can come to you as a result of completing this interview, because we’re asking about your observations about what happens in your school. There are a few questions about what happens to students who get in trouble at your school, about some problems that may happen at your school, and about your opinions regarding how the school deals with these matters. There is a chance that you might feel uncomfortable when answering those questions. Remember, you can stop taking this survey at any time, and you can skip over any question you would like to.

4. **POSSIBLE BENEFITS**
   There are no direct benefits to you for participating in this interview. Your participation will not help your status at the school in any way. Your participation is strictly voluntary. It is possible that your participation will help improve school climate and school discipline procedures at this school, and you might help make this school a better place for students.

5. **CONFIDENTIALITY**
   We do not record your name on the interview form. However, we do record information about your position and title, as well as your years of service. The researchers will keep this information confidential for the duration of the study. The completed interview forms will be kept in a locked file in the researcher’s office, and any computer files containing research information will be kept in a computer system protected by passwords.
Your participation in this study will be treated as confidential. The results of the study may be published, but we will not present the results of the study in a way that your individual responses will be known.

We will destroy the survey forms within three years of the completion of the study.

Any records or data obtained as a result of your participation in this study may be inspected by the sponsor or by a governmental agency, by the Governors State University Institutional Review Board (research ethics review board), or by the persons conducting this study. Otherwise these records will be kept confidential.

6. **YOU MAY DECLINE TO PARTICIPATE**
You are free to choose whether or not to participate in this study. There will be no penalty or loss of benefits if you choose not to participate.

7. **AVAILABLE SOURCES OF INFORMATION**
Any further questions you have about this study will be answered by the Principal Investigator:

Name: James R. Coldren, Jr.
Contact Information: 708-534-4390, jcoldren@govst.edu

- Any questions you may have about your rights as a research subject will be answered a member of the Governors State University Institutional Review Board:

Name: Becky Nugent
Contact Information: 708-235-2105, bnugent@govst.edu

8. **AUTHORIZATION**
I have read and understand this consent form. I provide my voluntary consent to participate in this research study. I understand that I may choose not to participate, and that there will be no negative consequences for me if I choose to not participate.

Participant name (printed): ____________________________ Date: __/__/___
Participant signature: ____________________________
Attachment J
Informed Consent – Video Taping

Please read this consent form carefully and ask as many questions as you like before you decide whether you want to participate in this research study. You are free to refuse to participate in this videotaping project, and there will be no negative consequences if you decide to not participate.

### Project Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title: School-Based Restorative Justice Study</th>
<th>Organization: Governors State University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site IRB Number: 11-03-07 (approved 3/28/2011)</td>
<td>Location: Alton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Investigator: James Coldren</td>
<td>PI Phone: 708-534-4390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY**
   You are being asked to participate in a research study about school climate. School climate refers to the general way things run at your school, peoples’ attitudes at school, how people treat each other at school, and other matters about how it feels to be at your school on a day-to-day basis. The reason for doing this research is to see if some of the programs going on at the school help make the school a better place for teachers, staff, and students. Someday, researchers may return, after some new programs have been started at your school, to make additional video recordings of classrooms at your school.

2. **PROCEDURES**
   You will be asked to allow someone to make a video recording of your classroom for a time period of 10-30 minutes. You may or may not be visible in this classroom video recording, but there is a chance that you will be recorded. No questions will be asked of you. The camera will record what occurs in the classroom, and the video recording will be studied by researchers at a later date.

3. **POSSIBLE RISKS OR DISCOMFORT**
   We do not think there are any risks or possible harm that can come to you as a result of participating in this video recording project, because we’re making observations about what normally happens in your classroom. There is a chance that you might feel uncomfortable as a result of being recorded. Remember, you can refuse to take part in this video recording activity.

4. **POSSIBLE BENEFITS**
   There are no direct benefits to you for participating in this project. Your participation will not help your status at the school. If you are a student, allowing the recording will not help your grades or academic record in any way. Your participation is strictly voluntary. It is possible that your participation will help improve school climate and the way things are run at this school, and you might help make this school a better place for students.

5. **CONFIDENTIALITY**
   The researchers will keep the video recording in a locked file in the researcher’s office, and any computer or video files containing research information will be kept in a computer system protected by passwords.

   Your participation in this project will be treated as confidential. The only people who view the video recording will be members of the research team, and they will not include any names or any identifying information in the research summaries or reports that they write based on the video recording. The results of the study may be published, but we will not present the results of the study in a way that your individual identify will be known.
Any records or data obtained as a result of your participation in this study may be inspected by the sponsor or by a governmental agency, by the Governors State University Institutional Review Board (research ethics review board), or by the persons conducting this study. Otherwise these records will be kept confidential.

The video files will be destroyed within three years of the conclusion of this research project.

5. **YOU MAY DECLINE TO PARTICIPATE**
   You are free to choose whether or not to participate in this study. There will be no penalty or loss of benefits if you choose not to participate.

6. **AVAILABLE SOURCES OF INFORMATION**
   Any further questions you have about this study will be answered by the Principle Investigator:

   Name: James R. Coldren, Jr.
   Contact Information: 708-534-4390, jcoldren@govst.edu

   Any questions you may have about your rights as a research subject will be answered by a member of the Governors State University Institutional Review Board:

   Name: Becky Nugent
   Contact Information: 708-235-2105, bnugent@govst.edu
7. **AUTHORIZATION**

My signature below confirms that conditions of my consent to be video recorded have been explained to me, and I understand the following:

I am not required to be video recorded and I am under no obligation to have this session recorded.

I can withdraw my permission at any time during or after the session.

This recording will be viewed by members of the Governors State University research team only.

My name will not be mentioned in any research products or reports; the contents of the video recording will remain confidential within the research team at Governors State University.

The recording will be destroyed within three years of completion of the research project.

I may revoke this video consent at any time.

I may contact the Research Director for this project at Governors State University at any time with questions or concerns at 708-534-4390, jcoldren@govst.edu.

I may contact the Institutional Review Board at Governors State University at any time with questions or concerns at 708-235-2105, bnugent@govst.edu.

________________________________________________ __________________
(Signature of Student) (Date)

________________________________________________ __________________
(Signature of Research Staff) (Date)