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Graduation Rate with UC/CSU requirements – 37%.

OUSD-37% drop out rate. CA rate 18%

66% of students who dropout enter justice system

Staying in school is a major predictor of not going to prison

Urban Strategies Report found that:
- Af. Am boys are 17% of student pop and 42% of suspensions
- 44% of Af. Am boys suspended for defiance
- Af. Am males with multiple suspensions less likely to be proficient or advanced in ELA or math.
The Voluntary Resolution Plan (VRP) is an agreement between the OUSD and the OCR to eliminate unequal punishment of our African American students. By listening to and partnering with families and organizations, and changing our practices, we are developing the culture, climate, and conditions for success that will transform our discipline practices from punitive to restorative.
Restorative Justice

- Based on indigenous values & practices
- Is NOT a program
- Is a way of thinking, a philosophical framework – a movement
- Is a way of responding relationally to wrong doing in our schools, justice system, and communities
- Community building in school and classroom
RJ is a *theory* of justice that

- Emphasizes repairing harm
- Invites all those affected to collaboratively figure out how to repair the harm
- Gives equal attention to community needs, victim’s needs, and offender accountability, and growth
Different Questions

Retributive Justice
• What rule/law was broken?
• Who broke it?
• How do we punish them?

Restorative Justice
• What harm was caused and to whom?
• What are the needs and obligations?
• How should all affected repair the harms?
Punishment

- Involves coercion
- is intended to hurt
- obstructs communication
- encourages denial and defiance
- is a top-down tool of social control
- is ineffective
What are the effects of punishment?

- Doesn’t provide true accountability
- Changes the focus of the harm done to resenting the giver of the punishment
- Offender blames punisher rather than take responsibility
- Take out frustration on classmates
- Doesn’t get to the root cause of the conflict or the systemic dis-ease
Restorative justice is based on the ideal that ‘because crime hurts, justice should heal’ (Braithwaite). The harm should be matched not by further harm but by restorative effort.
Disciplinary infractions are a violation of people and impact interpersonal relationships.

Violations create obligations.

The central obligation is -- as much as possible -- to repair any harm done.
Restorative Justice in schools

- RJ as **Community Building** through strengthening relationships among all stakeholders – students, families, teachers and admin

- RJ as **Intervention** when wrongdoing happens. Provides structure and process to repair harm

- RJ as **Re-integration** of the victim and offender, which reduces isolation and increases safety and belonging
3 Tiers of School Based Restorative Justice

Tier 1: Relationships
Creating a safe and caring whole-school environment Entire school community

Tier 2: Non-punititive response to harm
Restorative Discipline

Tier 3: Individualized Support
Re-entry
Restorative Justice Practices

Community Conferencing, Conflict Mediation, Harm Circles

Tier 1 Relationships

Tier 2 Non-punitive Response to harm

Tier 3 Re-entry

Supported Re-entry, Welcome Circles, Circles of Support & Accountability (COSA)

Community Building Circles, Restorative Conversations, Social-Emotional

Tier 1 Relationships
Justice

Justice exists when systems, institutions, and relational patterns are all aligned, oriented and operating so that every living being has full and fundamentally equal access to the resources and opportunities needed for full community thriving and individual actualization.

-David Anderson Hooker
Continuum of Restorative Practices

1. Does the practice address harms, needs, and causes?
2. Does it adequately attend to the needs of those harmed?
3. Are offenders encouraged to take responsibility?
4. Are all relevant stakeholders involved?
5. Is there an opportunity for dialogue and participatory decision-making?
6. Is the practice respectful to all parties?
RJ Practices

CONFERENCING MODELS: creating spaces for dialogue

Circles

Restorative conversations

Community Conferencing

Family Group Conferences

Victim Offender Mediations
Student Circles

• Gossip
• Arguments/Fights
• Theft
• Bullying
• Race relations
• Acculturation challenges
• Sexist and derogatory language
• Relationships issues; jealousy
• Boys circles/girls circles
• Healing circles
Benefits

• Safer, caring school climate
• Empathy for victim and offender
• Lower recidivism
• More learning time
• Increased parent satisfaction, partnership
• Greater social-emotional learning
• Fewer suspensions & expulsions
• Increased accountability and healing
• Attention to root causes
| 1.          | Alliance Middle                          | 17.        | Skyline High                       |
| 2.          | Barack Obama Academy                     | 18.        | United for Success Middle          |
| 3.          | Bunche Continuation High                 | 19.        | West Oakland Middle                |
| 4.          | Castlemont High                          |            |                                  |
| 5.          | Coliseum College Prep                    |            | MS Peer RJ programs                |
| 6.          | Community Day School                     |            |                                  |
| 7.          | Dewey Academy                            |            |                                  |
| 8.          | Edna Brewer Middle                       |            |                                  |
| 9.          | Glenview Elementary                      |            |                                  |
| 10.         | Madison Middle                           |            |                                  |
| 11.         | McClymonds High                          |            |                                  |
| 12.         | Melrose Leadership                       |            |                                  |
| 13.         | Met West High                            |            |                                  |
| 14.         | Montera Middle                           |            |                                  |
| 15.         | Roots Middle                             |            |                                  |
| 16.         | Sankofa Academy                          |            |                                  |
|            |                                          |            |                                  |
| 1.          | Bret Harte                               |            |                                  |
| 2.          | Claremont                                |            |                                  |
| 3.          | Edna Brewer                              |            |                                  |
| 4.          | Elmhurst                                 |            |                                  |
| 5.          | Frick                                    |            |                                  |
| 6.          | Madison                                 |            |                                  |
| 7.          | Montera                                 |            |                                  |
| 8.          | Westlake                                 |            |                                  |
How are the models aligned?

• Both are “whole-school” models focused on changing host environment (immersion v. program) to create the conditions needed for learning

• Both are aligned with Response to Intervention (RtI) with attention to (3) Tiers: prevention, early intervention and intensive support

• Both are effective strategies to lower racially disproportionate discipline by changing adult responses to students behavior

• Both support social-emotional learning for adults and students

• Both are designed to support student achievement by removing social and emotional barriers to learning
Domains for Hypothesis Generation

- Peer Influences
- Curriculum
- Home/Community
- Classroom Environment

Focus on “alterable” rather than “unalterable” hypotheses

Flint Simonson – PBIS Washington
Meaningful Student Engagement & Da Town Researchers

• In focus groups, students recommended an Adult/Student Code of Conduct

• Clear expectations for behavior for everyone

• It should be developed through restorative process in an inclusive way that is site specific

• Code of Conduct visible in 3 locations: bathrooms, classrooms, attendance office
Student Voice

• “We, OUSD students, believe that clear, consistent, reciprocal expectations of adults and students are critical to a positive and safe culture... We recommend district-wide full implementation and evaluation of culturally responsive RJ processes in all schools, rather than punitive approaches...”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SWPBIS</strong></th>
<th><strong>WSRJ</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rule based</td>
<td>Relationship-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult-driven</td>
<td>Adult &amp; student driven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defining appropriate behavior</td>
<td>defining values &amp; guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactively teaching expected behavior</td>
<td>Practicing SEL skills needed for expected behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent consequences for inappropriate behavior</td>
<td>Real &amp; meaningful consequences (accountability and healing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data-based decision making</td>
<td>Inclusive data-based decision making</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Claudia Vincent and Jeffrey Sprague
It's all fun and games until someone figures out the function of your behavior.