

EXHIBIT A

Restorative Practices Training in Five Pilot Schools in TUSD 2018-19

In Order 2273, the district court stated that, “The District shall undertake a study of the effects of the pilot intervention program using restorative processes as instruction and identify positive and negative outliers among schools to determine whether there are common practices being implemented in either regard; these studies shall inform future strategy choices by the District for creating inclusive school environments and cultures of civility.”

This overview provides an explanation and analysis of the pilot intervention program using restorative practices to determine its effectiveness and whether common practices are being implemented. The district collaborated with the Special Master in developing the scope of this study and the questions to be addressed.

Background of Restorative Practices in TUSD

Tucson Unified has used Restorative Practices as one of its positive interventions to discipline for several years. During the 2018-19 school year, the district implemented a pilot program at five schools to investigate in more depth the best approach for future development of this program in the district.

School Selected

The district selected five schools to participate in the pilot program based on their discipline rates. These schools had a higher rate of exclusionary discipline or suspensions than the district for African American and Hispanic students as well as an overall higher rate of discipline infractions for the entire school when compared to district averages. The pilot schools were:

- Booth Fickett K-8
- Doolen Middle School
- Pistor Middle School
- Secrist Middle School
- Valencia Middle School

Vendor Selected

The District solicited the service of the Western Educational Equity Assistance Center (WEEAC) at Metropolitan State University of Denver¹ to provide Restorative Practices training to administrators, certificated staff, and classified support staff at the five target schools. WEEAC in turn engaged Restorative Solutions, Inc. (RSI) to provide on-site training at the District, at WEEAC's expense.

Services Provided by Vendor

RSI provided three eight-hour trainings to each school, highlighting general theories about the interconnections between restorative practices, restorative justice, and culturally responsive pedagogy with real-world strategies and best practices. At the end of the training sessions, RSI produced a narrative for each school. Each school received a follow-up debrief/evaluation. RSI also conducted a brief feedback survey at the end of the first session to identify staff attitudes towards restorative practices and school needs.

Each pilot school had allotted to them a full-time restorative and positive practices facilitator position. Each RPPF received additional training in de-escalation, retrieving pertinent student data from the EBAS (including Clarity and Synergy), and analyzing data. RPPFs, in turn, provided training to all principals and assistant principals in conjunction with RSI. This training, Culturally Responsive Approaches to Student Behavior and Discipline, provided an introduction to fundamental concepts such as discipline vs. punishment, implicit bias, school climate, and the use of circles and conferences and other restorative practices to create a supportive and restorative school environment. Principals at pilot schools used these concepts and workshop materials to train staff on creating restorative and inclusive school environments during a minimum of two professional development sessions.

Review and Analysis of Restorative Solution Data

A. Results of the narratives:

The narratives provided by RSI after each training were divided into three categories including administration feedback, teacher feedback, and RSI feedback. The narratives listed strengths and concerns about the implementation at each school in developing more positive relationships through restorative practices trainings/PDs with circles and conferences. Highlights from the narratives are listed by school:

¹ WEEAC is one of four regional Equity Assistance Centers funded by the United States Department of Education under the Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. All centers provide training and technical assistance on educational issues related to race, sex, national origin, and religion. In addition, WEEAC has an emphasis on the prevention of bullying and harassment in schools. At the request of education agencies, WEEAC assists in finding solutions to a variety of equity problems. WEEAC's work is directed to closing achievement gaps, promoting safe schools, and helping all students reach high standards.

- Booth Fickett K-8:
 - Administration: They emphasized that their focus is on culture and climate. They wanted to ensure that all the teachers received training and skills to resolve smaller issues within the classroom and to help students transition comfortably back into the classroom after being in ISI. Additionally, they stated that they were very committed to the process.
 - Teachers: They were concerned that some teachers have not embraced Restorative Practices which leads to inconsistency in implementation and divisions in the culture and climate of the school. They requested more flexible time to be able to conduct restorative circles and conversations.
 - RSI: They recommended to create a coaching/support structure to identify and intervene with burgeoning classroom issues before they escalate; consider the timing of when to conduct a circle; keep circles short and positive and use a theme or protocol to organize process; and use teachers who implement circles successfully as role models for the rest of the staff.
- Doolen Middle School:
 - Administration: They focused on student culture and addressing student gossiping about participation and how it is not 'cool' to be a good student. They felt that teachers were interested in conducting circles to build more positive relationships with students.
 - Teachers: Teachers wanted more information about the infrastructure of circles including the amount of time needed, how often, and how scripted. They were using circles and were interested in more training/PD and building processes into PLCs. They felt that they could not conduct a circle in a busy classroom, and they should be more private.
 - RSI: They recommended to find books, movies, etc. that can be used when there is a need to conduct a circle and if no other teacher is available to monitor classroom. Also, trauma informed care strategies can be used in circles.
- Pistor Middle:
 - Administration: They focused on the school structures to support implementation such as using AVID trained teachers; forum for teacher sharing; staff circles to build culture, and clear school wide expectations. Circles are implemented only by some teachers.

- Leadership team: They focused on the logistics of how to get all teachers trained and how to distribute students more equitably among teachers so that no teacher would have more of the difficult students; review discipline data regularly, and check in with students through surveys.
- Teachers: They want clear guidelines for students to understand why circles are implemented; create cross training resources for teachers; and commit to process for multiple years to establish it in the school culture.
- RSI: They recommended to create a coaching/support structure to support teachers skills and comfort with process; consider the timing of when to conduct a circle; keep circles short and positive and use a theme or protocol to organize process; and consider teacher goals of how many circles to conduct in a semester.
- Secrist Middle
 - Administration: They focused on how to roll out the training without a RPPF position filled; school is already developing positive relationships with students so this approach is very interesting; want to continue training into next year; and may start with teachers who create lots of students referrals.
 - Teachers: They felt that staff could jump in right away with the students; the new teachers need extra support and training (about 60% of staff); re-integrating students after an incident needs consistent strategies; and need for more support from the administration to build communication among teachers.
 - RSI: They recommended that circles be held after suspensions; that teachers know the referral/discipline system at the school; and that systems and structures be established to improve communication among administration and teachers; and model circles etc. for teachers.
- Valencia Middle:
 - Administration: They focused on the structure and roll out of circles for successful implementation; the need for more information on trauma responses in a circle; the need to know how to make circles meaningful for students in classes; and that staff is supportive of this approach.
 - Teachers: They discussed a long term implementation plan; creating a forum to share strategies; the need to find a way to incorporate practice when so many other activities are going on; felt that it is a good approach to building

relationships with students; how to keep students accountable to agreements; and the need to build greater trust among staff.

- RSI: They recommend that the school develop an action plan for next year that includes training/PD, coaching, roles and responsibilities, and goals; provide opportunities for staff trust building with staff circles, etc; keep circles short and positive and use a theme or protocol to organize process; and create coaching/support structure for consistency in circles.

In summary, these narratives provided some context as to what the concerns were from the staff to implement restorative practices consistently in the five pilot schools. A common theme across schools was the need for continued staff development and skills building. Additionally, teachers felt that they needed a better understanding of how to implement circles in busy classrooms where the practice may compromise student privacy and classroom management. Both administrators and teachers voiced that this initiative needs long term planning and commitment to become part of the school culture. Finally, these narratives revealed that the school staff was largely open to these new practices but they needed to develop school systems, added training, and sufficient time to blend it into school culture for sustainability.

B. Results of Student Relations Restorative Practices Implementation Assessments

A Restorative Practices questionnaire was developed from a compilation of materials including the Vermont Agency of Education Whole-School Restorative Approach Resource Guide, Denver School-Based RP Partnership Implementation Guide, and the Conflict Center's RP and Policy Assessment. Student Relations used this survey to evaluate the efficacy and effectiveness of implementation and it was administered to each of the five pilot schools. The scoring rubric for the survey is:

- 1 = Not Yet Implemented
- 2 = Needs Work in the Implementation
- 3 = Yes, it is implemented

Please see Table 1 for the summary of results.

| Table 1. Assessing Implementation of School-Wide Restorative Practices | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Scoring: 1 = Net Yet, 2 = Needs Work, and 3 = Yes. Each section has an aggregated score | | | | | | |
| No. Questions | | Booth Fickett | Doolen Middle | Pistor Middle | Secrist Middle | Valencia Middle |
| 13 | Leadership Vision and Commitment | 1.9 | 1.4 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.5 |
| 11 | Staff Buy In, Training and Relationship Building | 1.6 | 1.3 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.6 |
| 12 | Restorative Language and Practices | 1.6 | 1.2 | 2.5 | 2.8 | 2.5 |
| 8 | Organizational Culture and Climate – Relational Ecology | 1.9 | 1.0 | 2.8 | 2.6 | 2.6 |
| 10 | Restorative Practices Infrastructure | 2.2 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.6 |
| 6 | School Discipline Policies and Handbooks | 1.7 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 2.8 | 3.0 |
| 14 | Performance Evaluation and Support Structures | 1.7 | 1.1 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 2.7 |
| 7 | Student Engagement and Leadership | 1.1 | 1.0 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 2.3 |
| 8 | Parent Engagement and Leadership | 1.4 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.6 |
| 5 | Explicit Links with Learning and Engagement | 1.4 | 1.2 | 2.3 | 2.8 | 2.6 |
| 4 | Data Collection and Decision Making | 1.0 | 1.3 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| 2 | Long Term Sustainability | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 2.0 |
| 100 | Survey Grand Average | 1.6 | 1.3 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 2.5 |

Additionally, Student Relations evaluated the schools using a Restorative Practices assessment based on seven common benchmarks to evaluate further how closely schools were following the District's Restorative Practices model. The same scoring criteria (1 = Net Yet, 2 = Needs Work, and 3 = Yes) was used for both surveys.

Please see Table 2 for a summary of results.

Table 2. Implementation Benchmarks (Denver School-Based RP Partnership)

Scoring: 1 = Not Yet, 2 = Needs Work, and 3 = Yes.

| | Booth Fickett K-8 | Doolen Middle | Pistor Middle | Secrist Middle | Valencia Middle |
|---|-------------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Benchmark 1: There is a common understanding of why Restorative Practices are being used. | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Benchmark 2: Foundational structures to support RP implementation are in place. | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Benchmark 3: A method of collecting and analyzing data is developed. | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Benchmark 4: Educators, both new and returning, are trained in Restorative Practices. | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Benchmark 5: Restorative language and culture have been established. | NA | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Benchmark 6: Families and students are well-informed of the shift to Restorative Practices. | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Benchmark 7: Preventative measures, not just reactive measures, are being taken to improve school climate. | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 |

The results of the two surveys suggest that each of the five pilot schools are at a different readiness level to implement restorative practices. According to the surveys, Pistor, Secrist, and Valencia already have the majority of structures in place for successful implementation. On the other hand, Booth Fickett and Doolen do not yet have the vision, staff buy in, and infrastructure in place to implement restorative practices and will need additional district support and training.

It should be noted that this study uncovered concerns on the part of TUSD leadership and school staff regarding the services provided by the vendor, including a lack of training focus, variations in implementation, and differences in strategies presented from school to school.

C. Review and Analysis of Discipline Data at Pilot Schools

Discipline data is presented below by school. The data shows a two year comparison of discipline types such as all discipline, aggression, harassment/threat/intimidation, and other violations that would be most responsive to restorative practices at the schools.

| Table 3. Booth Fickett – 2 Years of Discipline Rates | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|
| | 2017-2018 | 2018-2019 |
| Enrollment | 990 | 863 |
| All Discipline | 105 (11%) | 150 (17%) |
| Aggression Only | 50 (5%) | 101 (12%) |
| Harassment, Threat/Intimidation | 24 (2%) | 26 (3%) |
| Other Violations | 24 (2%) | 77 (9%) |

The data from Booth Fickett shows an increase of 6% in all discipline over 2 years. Aggression and other violations incidents doubled or more during that time.

| Table 4. Doolen – 2 Years of Discipline Rates | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| | 2017-2018 | 2018-2019 |
| Enrollment | 834 | 795 |
| All Discipline | 158 (19%) | 196 (25%) |
| Aggression Only | 115 (14%) | 143 (18%) |
| Harassment, Threat/Intimidation | 26 (3%) | 34 (4%) |
| Other Violations | 3 (0%) | 23 (3%) |

The data from Doolen is similar to Booth Fickett with an increase of 6% overall in all discipline rates.

| Table 5. Pistor – 2 Years of Discipline Rates | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| | 2017-2018 | 2018-2019 |
| Enrollment | 918 | 882 |
| All Discipline | 148 (16%) | 165 (19%) |
| Aggression Only | 109 (12%) | 126 (14%) |
| Harassment, Threat/Intimidation | 36 (4%) | 30 (3%) |
| Other Violations | 27 (3%) | 21 (2%) |

The data from Pistor shows an increase of in 3% the total discipline.

| Table 6. Secrist – 2 Years of Discipline Rates | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|
| | 2017-2018 | 2018-2019 |
| Enrollment | 507 | 482 |
| All Discipline | 93 (18%) | 148 (31%) |
| Aggression Only | 71 (14%) | 104 (22%) |
| Harassment, Threat/Intimidation | 10 (2%) | 24 (5%) |
| Other Violations | 8 (2%) | 34 (7%) |

The data from Secrist shows the largest gain of the five schools with a 13% increase in all discipline over two years.

| Table 7. Valencia – 2 Years of Discipline Rates | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| | 2017-2018 | 2018-2019 |
| Enrollment | 1062 | 1011 |
| All Discipline | 197 (19%) | 181 (18%) |
| Aggression Only | 131 (12%) | 135 (13%) |
| Harassment, Threat/Intimidation | 45 (4%) | 42 (4%) |
| Other Violations | 15 (1%) | 18 (2%) |

The data from Valencia shows a decrease of 1% in all discipline over two years. Aggression, harassment, threat/intimidation and other violations were relatively constant.

| Table 8. All Middle Schools – 2 Years of Discipline Rates | | |
|--|------------------|------------------|
| | 2017-2018 | 2018-2019 |
| Enrollment | 7461 | 7356 |
| All Discipline | 1096 (15%) | 1241 (17%) |
| Aggression Only | 790 (11%) | 900 (12%) |
| Harassment, Threat/Intimidation | 200 (3%) | 204 (3%) |
| Other Violations | 138 (2%) | 166 (2%) |

The TUSD middle school discipline trends also indicate an uptick in overall discipline rates by about 2% from 2017-18 to 2018-19. The new Student Code of Conduct, rolled out in 2018-19 across the district, may have contributed somewhat to these increases.

In summary, discipline types (all discipline, aggression, harassment/threat/intimidation, and other) listed in Tables 3 – 8 were selected because they would most likely be affected by restorative practices. The rates of these discipline types increased from 2017-18 to 2018-19 at all the schools in this study, except Valencia. This data indicates that the discipline rates at Booth-Fickett, Doolen, and Secrist were not positively impacted by the trainings. When these three schools are compared to district average over the last two years, their discipline rates exceeded the district average increase by 11% (Secrist) and 4% (Booth-Fickett and Doolen). Additionally, Valencia's and Pistor's discipline rates were largely comparable to the district's overall rate and suggests that the pilot program's impact at those schools was effectively neutral.

Some contextual conditions of the RPPF role at each of the schools may also help to explain the lack of measurable impact from the restorative practice pilot program on discipline rates. They are:

- Booth Fickett: The Restorative Facilitator took two leaves of absences during the second semester which slowed down program implementation, support, and monitoring. Additionally, during the first semester, the school had many substitute teachers during the first quarter while the district was waiting for the placement of international teacher hires at the school.
- Doolen: The Restorative Facilitator was utilized frequently for PBIS and other duties which slowed down the restorative practice program implementation, support, and monitoring.

- Pistor: The Restorative Facilitator was utilized frequently for PBIS and other duties which slowed down the restorative practice program implementation, support, and monitoring.
- Secrist: The Restorative Facilitator was on a leave of absence during the entire year.
- Valencia: The Restorative Facilitator was hired in December and got underway with the position duties in January.

Overall Analysis of Pilot Effectiveness and Reflection on Common Practices Being Used

This study reviewed the available data on the impact of the restorative practices pilot program at five schools in TUSD. According to the narratives provided by RSI, some inroads were made in training teachers and administrators in restorative practices with the use of restorative circles or conferences and de-escalation strategies. The survey data revealed that Pistor, Secrist, and Valencia have the infrastructure in place to be able to provide restorative practices successfully. However, Booth Fickett and Doolen need to establish a vision and gather buy in from their staff before implementing restorative practices as an integral part of their school culture.

Additionally, uneven implementation of the pilot program occurred across the schools for a variety of reasons. The discipline data shows a net increase among three of the pilot schools (Booth Fickett, Doolen, and Secrist) when compared to the district average over the last two years. This data suggests that the pilot program did not positively impact discipline rates at those schools. The remaining two schools, Pistor and Valencia were essentially comparable to overall district trends at the middle school level. These results suggest that even if the pilot program did have an effect on some teachers' relationships with students, it was not sufficient to be measurable in the school's discipline rates.

In summary, the schools involved in the pilot study appeared to have taken the first steps in restorative practice implementation through greater awareness by the school staff in general and also specifically, with individual teachers who were willing to practice the skills in their classrooms that they received during the trainings.

As noted above, district leadership was dissatisfied with services from the vendor including roll out and implementation, quality of the trainings, and data provided. As a result of the feedback about RSI from the school staffs and analysis of the effectiveness of the pilot, TUSD decided not to renew its contract with Restorative Solutions Inc.

2019-20 and Beyond: Future Strategy Choices

Rather than have a vendor train TUSD staff in restorative practices, a 'train the trainer' model was chosen for 2019-20 to develop internal capacity within the district for the five existing pilot schools as well as five new schools. Again with support from WEEAC, three Restorative Practice Facilitators (RPPFs) and the Student Relations Program Coordinator have attended trainings and are now the RP trainers for TUSD schools. These four trainers will train principals during ILA and will train teachers at their schools during the 2019-20 school year. Additionally, an on-line training will be provided that is self-paced with an assessment at the end of the training. To streamline this process for a consistent roll-out across the district, the Student Relations department has also created an operational handbook, a questionnaire, and consistent reporting formats for all the schools.

The district will consider for the 2020-21 school year: 1) investing further resources in social emotional learning practices, and 2) reviewing the revised version of restorative practices before deciding whether to implement the program more widely, including determining if more resources would be needed for successful implementation. It may also decide to use restorative practices only as a Tier 3 supplement.

Comparison of Five Target Restorative Practices Schools and Five TUSD Schools with High Rates of Inclusivity and Low Discipline Rates

Student Relations compared the five target Restorative Practices (RP) schools (Secrist MS, Pistor MS, Valencia MS, Doolen MS, and Booth-Fickett K-8) with five middle or K-8 schools that had high rates of inclusivity and low rates of discipline. Because the pilot schools were all middle or K-8 schools, only middle or K-8 schools were used in the comparison. The schools selected all showed high rates of inclusivity and low rates of discipline when compared to the pilot group and other district schools. The schools selected were Dodge MS, Gridley MS, Mansfield MS, Borman K-8, and Robins K-8.

Comparing strategies and practices of the two sets of schools, based on ongoing supervision of schools by the Student Relations department, led to three observational conclusions:

1. The difference is not due to different programs or strategies being implemented at some schools and not at others.
2. Schools with higher rates of inclusivity and lower rates of discipline are committed to implementing these programs with a high degree of fidelity. These schools all have functioning discipline committees that meet regularly, they all utilize discipline data to inform decision-making, they all make regular use of restorative circles and conferences and they all have discipline flow charts and procedures in place that are reviewed on a regular basis.

3. The successful schools have foundational structures and systems in place to support the successful implementation of district programs and practices. (Discipline committee, PBIS committee, PBIS matrix, a system to share discipline data with faculty and staff, parental support, community support, continual training, etc.)

Accordingly, both sets of schools use the same general inclusiveness/preventive-discipline strategies that the District has determined to employ District-wide: PBIS, restorative justice, culturally responsive pedagogy and courses. However, there appear to be differences in the fidelity and buy-in of the implementation of strategies by school staff, between the two sets of above and below average discipline schools. The District concludes that improvement is not as likely to come from a change in strategies as it is from continued efforts to strengthen the delivery infrastructure for the strategies at outlier schools. Thus, the District will continue to monitor inclusiveness and discipline data, and target schools which appear to be negative outliers each year for more intensive training and monitoring each year, including perhaps pairing of above and below average schools for site visits and sharing of practices. With on-going training and support, all TUSD schools can implement highly functioning programs and practices that benefit the student, faculty, staff and community.