EVALUATING PROJECT PREVENT: IMPLEMENTATION OF RESTORATIVE PRACTICES IN HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY SCHOOLS

Presenters

Joshua Zaris Goldman, MSW, Anubhav Kidambi, MPH
Community Partners

Dr. Myrna Hogue, Kristine L. Hensley
USF Collaborators
Dr. Amy Green, Enya Vroom





ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Project and presentation made possible through a collaboration between:

- University of South Florida, Institute for Translational Research Education in Adolescent Drug Abuse
- University of South Florida, College of Behavioral & Community Sciences
- Northern Arizona University, Center for Health Equity Research
- University of South Florida, College of Public Health
- Hillsborough County Public Schools











Background



 Restorative practices (RP) definition: "restoring good relationships when there has been conflict or harm, and developing school ethos, policies, and procedures to reduce the possibility of such conflict

arising."2(p. 19)

• RP origins¹

• School culture⁵





Key principles:

- Fairness
- Respect for personal dignity
- Awareness that "the person is not the problem, the problem is the problem."^{2(p. 22)}

Key concepts:

- Using affective language
- Restorative conferences
- Problem-solving circles
- Relationship-building activities.²





Need for Restorative Practices:

- Exclusionary discipline practices³
- Racial disparities³
- School-to-prison pipeline
- Building culture and strengthening relationships





Need for evaluating Restorative practices in Hillsborough County Public Schools:

- Project Prevent
 - Summer Institute
 - Post-Institute Learning Communities
 - Site-based trainings
 - Leadership teams
 - Plans/goals





Pilot testing an instrument



LITERATURE REVIEW RESULTS

For effective implementation:

- Training²
- Resource manuals²
- Commitment from leadership¹
- Teacher and staff buy-in⁴
- School-wide implementation⁴
- Student involvement²





Purpose



PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

To conduct a program evaluation of *Project Prevent* Restorative Practice programs at Hillsborough County public schools, identify factors affecting implementation, and provide feedback to schools for current and future implementation of these practices.



Research Questions



 How effective are Restorative Practices in improving school culture?

- How frequently are specific Restorative Practice interventions being used, and to what effect?
- What are key barriers and facilitators to implementation?



Methods





- Survey creation
 - Identify impact and implementation factors in literature⁶
 - Consultation with HCPS lead on RP implementation
 - Qualtrics
- Survey distribution
 - 21 Participating schools
 - Emails
 - 30 responses from 10 schools (3 ES, 5 MS, 2 HS)



Participants

	Frequency	Percent
Administrator (ex: Principal, Asst.	6	20.0
Principal)		
Teacher	7	23.3
Guidance Counselor	6	20.0
School Social Worker	3	10.0
School Psychologist	4	13.3
ESE Specialist	2	6.7
Student Success Coach	2	6.7
Total	30	100.0



Survey Instrument:

- 24 quantitative questions
 - Likert scale

- 11 questions on specific
 RP interventions
- 6 qualitative questions







Restorative practices have reduced problem behaviors among students in my classroom/school.



- Strongly disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat agree
- Strongly agree





Since implementing restorative practices, students are more likely to mediate and/or emotionally supposetween peers.

- Strongly disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat agree
- Strongly agree



Q1 How often do you use each of the following restorative practices interventions?





		Less than once a		Multiple times a	
	Never	week	Once a week	week	Daily
Encouraging students to use affective statements (i.e., "I am" feeling statements).	0	0	0		0
Using restorative questions when talking with students about problems or conflicts.	0				
3. Proactive circles (e.g., check-in, talking, or community-building).	0	0	0		0
Responsive circles (e.g., addressing problems, issues, or relationships).	0	0	0		0
5. Repairing relationship circles.		0	0		0
6. Pre-conference meetings (i.e., meeting separately with person causing harm and person being harmed to determine if conference will be effective).					
7. Review restorative practices rules and/or principles with students.	0	0	0		0
8. Use restorative practices handouts with students.	0	0	0	0	0
9. Reentry protocol.		0	0		0,0
10. Peer mediation.		0	0		18

□ Q1	What resources have you found helpful in implementing restorative practices (e.g., books, training, etc.)? Please be specific.
□ Q2	What additional resources would you find helpful to more effectively use restorative practices?
iQ □ Q3	What have been some of the barriers to implementing restorative practices (e.g., lack of resources, etc.)? Please be specific



Data Analysis:

- Collect and aggregate
- SPSS
 - Correlations
 - Subscales







Subscales (and corresponding Cronbach's Alpha)

- Perceived Impact Scale (.929)
- Training, Support, and Confidence Scale (.763)
- Frequency of Use Scale (.861)
- Perceived Personal Efficacy Scale (.911)





Results

	Perceived Impact Scale	Training, Support, and Confidence Scale	Frequency of Use Scale	Perceived Personal Efficacy Scale
N	30	29	26	30
Mean	3.99	4.22	2.77	2.80
Median	4.05	4.22	2.64	2.91
Std. Deviation	.696	.550	.751	.545
Range	3	2	3	2.29
Minimum	2	3	1	1.71
Maximum	5	5	5	4.00

SURVEY RESULTS

Sig. (2-tailed) .000 .000 .014	Correlations					
Perceived Impact Scale Pearson Correlation 1 Support, and Confidence Scale Perceived Impact Scale Pearson Correlation 1 Sig. (2-tailed) Support, and Confidence Scale Scale Scale Scale Scale Scale Scale Sig. (2-tailed) Support, and Confidence Scale Scale Scale Scale Scale Scale Scale Sig. (2-tailed) Sig. (2-tailed) Support, and Confidence Scale Scale Scale Scale Scale Scale Scale Sig. (2-tailed) Sig. (2-tailed) Support, and Confidence Scale			Correlations			
Sig. (2-tailed) .000 .000 .014				Support, and Confidence Scale	Use Scale	Personal Efficacy Scale
	Perceived Impact Scale	Pearson Correlation	1	.662**	.724**	.445*
N 20 20 20		Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.014
N 30 29 26 30		N	30	29	26	30
	Training, Support, and Confidence Scale	Pearson Correlation	.662**	1	.764**	.349
Sig. (2-tailed) .000 .004		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.064
		N		29	26	29
Frequency of Use Scale Pearson Correlation .724** .764** 1 .364	Frequency of Use Scale	Pearson Correlation	.724**	.764**	1	.364
Sig. (2-tailed) .000 .000 .008		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.068
N 26 26 26 26		N	26	26	26	26
	Perceived Personal Efficacy Scale	Pearson Correlation	.445*	.349	.364	1
Sig. (2-tailed) .014 .064 .068		Sig. (2-tailed)	.014	.064	.068	
N 30 29 26 30 ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2 tailed)	aleale and a second			29	26	30

^{**.} Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).



Most frequently used RP interventions:

RP Intervention	% multiple times per week	% daily use
1) Restorative questions	43%	40%
2) Affective statements	33%	40%
3) Pre-conference meetings	31%	21%

- 27 of 30 participants used ≥1 RP intervention multiple times a week
- 17 of 30 participants used ≥1 RP intervention every day
- Frequency of use showed significant positive correlations (p<.05) with 21 of 24 questions, 10 out of 10 on perceived impact subscale.
 - Significant positive correlation w/decreases in exclusionary practices (p=.012)



RP interventions with highest rated personal efficacy:

RP Intervention	% effective	% very effective	% combined
1) Restorative questions	60%	26.7%	86.7%
2) Affective statements	56.7%	23.3%	80%
3a) Pre-conference meetings	40%	30%	70%
3b) Proactive circles	43.3%	26.7%	70%

 Perceived personal efficacy showed significant positive correlations (p<.05) with 11 of 24 questions, 4 of 10 on perceived impact subscale.

USF UNIVERSITY OF SURVEY RESULTS

- All respondents reported comfort using RP
- All respondents reported ability to explain benefits of RP
- Frequency of reviewing RP rules and/or principles with students
 - Correlation w/ perceived personal efficacy subscale (p=.006)
 - And 9 out of 10 measures on perceived impact subscale (p=.000)
- Frequency of restorative questions and frequency of responsive circles
 - Significantly positively correlated with 8 out of 10 measures on perceived impact subscale (p<.005)
- Estimated % of school staff using RP significantly positively correlated with 16 of 24 questions, 9 of 10 on perceived impact subscale.



Qualitative results

- Facilitators: Circle Forward book, district trainings
 - Additional resource books, ongoing trainings
- Barriers: lack of teacher buy-in, time limitations
- Increase school-wide implementation, teacher/staff buy-in
- Increase parental involvement
- Fidelity checks
- Include restorative practices in college curriculum



Limitations

- Different stages of implementation among schools
- Difficulties in obtaining survey responses
- Small sample size



Next Steps and Implications



USF UNIVERSITY OF SOLITH FLORIDA NEXT STEPS

- Connect restorative way of being to School Improvement Plans
- Continue efforts to strengthen school culture by setting up meetings with leadership
- Including RP's in the schools strategic and mental health plan
- Survey can be used to measure ongoing implementation efforts, as well as in pre- and post-survey format.



IMPLICATIONS FOR ADOLESCENT BEHAVIORAL HEALTH

- Using restorative practices demonstrated positive impact on school culture.
- Training and level of support found to affect use and impact of RP.
- Resource manuals, school-wide implementation, and teacher buy-in found to be important facilitators.
- Fidelity in implementation and evaluation are necessary to expand the use and impact of restorative practices.







- 1. Kane J, Lloyd G, McCluskey G, et al. Generating an inclusive ethos? Exploring the impact of restorative practices in Scottish schools. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. 2009;13(3):231-251.
- 2. McCluskey G. Restoring the possibility of change? A restorative approach with troubled and troublesome young people. *International Journal on School Disaffection*. 2010;3:19-25.
- 3. Gonzalez T. Keeping kids in schools: restorative justice, punitive discipline, and the school to prison pipeline. *Journal of Law & Education*. 2012;41(2):281-335.
- 4. Fronius T, Persson H, Guckenburg S, et al. *Restorative Justice in U.S. Schools: A Research Review.* San Francisco, CA: WestEd, 2016.
- 5. School Culture. *The Glossary of Education Reform.* Retrieved from https://www.edglossary.org/school-culture/
- 6. Sprague J, Tobin T. Aligning positive behavioral interventions and supports and restorative practices: an implementation fidelity manual. *University of Oregon, Institute on Violence and Destructive Behavior.* 2017.



Appendix



Example questions from Survey:

How much do you agree or disagree with following statements about restorative practices (RP)? 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Somewhat Disagree 3=Neither Agree nor Disagree 4=Somewhat Agree 5=Strongly Agree

- Restorative practices have reduced problem behaviors among students.
- Since implementing restorative practices, student-teacher relationships have improved.
- Since implementing restorative practices, I have issued less disciplinary actions such as detentions, referrals, and/or suspensions.
- I have been adequately trained to effectively use restorative practices with students.
- I feel comfortable using restorative practices with students.
- Feedback from staff such as myself is valued as part of RP implementation.



Example questions from Survey:

How often do you use each of the following Restorative Practices interventions?

0=Never 1=Less than once a week 2=Once a week 3=Multiple times a week 4=Daily

Then, rate the level of effectiveness when using each RP intervention.

0=N/A 1=Not effective 2=Somewhat effective 3=Effective 4=Very Effective

Encouraging students to use affective statements (i.e., "I am" feeling statements)

Frequency ____ Effectiveness ____

 What additional resources would be helpful for you to more effectively use RP?

USF

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA®