

Tiered Fidelity Inventory--Restorative Practices (TFI-RP):
A Tool for Using Restorative Practices (RP) with Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS)

DRAFT: 2/11/2017

Jeffrey Sprague & Tary Tobin
University of Oregon

Directions

1. Complete the SWPBIS Tiered Fidelity Inventory (TFI; Algozzine et al., 2014, available at <https://www.pbisapps.org/Applications/Pages/PBIS-Assessment-Surveys.aspx#tfi>) and the Action Plan that goes with it. Keep these handy to refer to as each of the related Restorative Practices (RP) elements (listed below) is evaluated.

2. Fill out the *Summary Form for Scoring by Hand*, below, as you read the following list of elements of Restorative Practices (RP) and evaluate how well each RP element is being implemented, using the following scale to mark your response: 0 = Not implemented, 1 = Partially implemented, 2 = Fully implemented (Examples of what these ratings mean for each element are given below.) *Options: This paper tool, with the examples, can be used by itself (and scored by hand) and/or to facilitate completing a brief online version (without examples) which can generate a graph illustrating average rank by TFI category. See <http://tinyurl.com/tfirp>*
For more information about these items and examples, see
Sprague, J., & Tobin, T. (2017). *Aligning positive behavioral interventions and supports and restorative practices: An implementation fidelity manual*.
University of Oregon, Institute on Violence and Destructive Behavior. (May be posted soon on ResearchGate or contact ttobin@uoregon.edu)

3. Review results with your school's Tier 1 PBIS Leadership Team and make data-based decisions about next steps for your school in this effort. Note ideas for improving the implementation of RP elements to add to the Action Plan created in Step 1, above.

© Sprague, J., & Tobin, T. (2017). *Tiered Fidelity Inventory--Restorative Practices (TFI-RP):*

A Tool for Using Restorative Practices (RP) with Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS). Draft. University of Oregon, Institute on Violence and Destructive Behavior, Eugene.

TFI Tier 1 #	RP Item	1	2	3	Next Step Ideas for Future Improvement or to Maintain Success
1.1 Team Composition	1.1a				
1.2 Team Operating Procedures	1.2a				
	1.2b				
1.3 Behavioral Expectations	1.3a				
	1.3b				
1.4 Teaching Expectations	1.4a				
	1.4b				
1.5 Problem Behavior Definitions	1.5a				
1.6 Discipline Policies	1.6a				
	1.6b				
	1.6c				
	1.6d				
	1.6e				
	1.6f				
	1.6g				
	1.6h				
	1.6i				
	1.6j				
	1.7 Professional Development	1.7a			
1.7b					
1.7c					
1.8 Classroom Procedures	1.8a				
	1.8b				
	1.8c				
	1.8d				
	1.8e				
1.9 Feedback & acknowledgement	1.9a				
1.10 Faculty Involvement	1.10a				
	1.10b				
1.11 Student/Family/Community Involvement	1.11a				

	1.11b				
1.12 Discipline Data	1.12a				
	1.12b				
	1.12c				
	1.12d				
1.13 Data-based Decision Making	1.13a				
	1.13b				
1.14 Fidelity Data	1.14a				
1.15 Annual Evaluation	1.15a				

Summary Form for Scoring by Hand

Directions: For each item, check 1 or 2 or 3 according to level of implementation (1=none, 2=partial, 3=full)

Counts:

Number of items not being implemented at all ((_____ / 39)*100) = _____ %
 Number of items partially implemented ((_____ / 39)*100) = _____ %
 Number of items fully implemented ((_____ / 39)*100) = _____ %

Date: _____

School: _____

Role of Person Completing Form:

- Teacher _____
- Educational Assistant _____
- Administrator _____
- PBIS Coach _____
- SWIS Facilitator _____
- Restorative Practice Leader _____
- Evaluator _____
- Counselor _____
- Other _____ Please explain: _____

Elements of Restorative Practices Organized by the TFI Features

TFI 1.1 Team Composition

RP 1.1a Someone with Restorative Practices (RP) expertise is on the school's Tier I team.

0 = No one on the school's Tier 1 team has any RP expertise.

1 = At least one person on the school's Tier 1 team has some level of RP expertise but could use more training or experience.

2 = One or more Tier 1 team members have a high level of RP expertise (professional training and experience).

TFI 1.2 Team Operating Procedures

RP 1.2a Team members are leading and influencing the whole school staff in the use of RP.

0 = No one on the school's Tier 1 team is doing anything related to influencing any other school staff members in the use of RP.

1 = Some members of the school's Tier 1 team are doing something related to leading or influencing some other school staff members -- but not all -- in the use of RP.

2 = Team members are leading and influencing the whole school staff in the use of RP.

RP1.2b At least 80% of the school staff have indicated willingness to use RP.

0 = No attempt has been made to determine how many school staff members are interested in or willing to use RP.

1 = Some of the school staff have indicated interest in and/or willingness to use RP but not 80%.

2 = At least 80% of the school staff have indicated willingness to use RP.

TFI 1.3 Behavioral Expectations

RP 1.3a Behavioral expectations are not just rules but "agreements" developed with input from students and staff for school and for classroom.

0 = Rules or behavioral expectations are not developed as "agreements" with input from students and staff.

1 = Some of our school or classroom behavioral expectations were developed as agreements with some input from students or staff.

2 = Behavioral expectations are agreements that were developed with input from students and staff for school and classroom.

RP 1.3b Behavioral expectations include relationship topics.

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

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

2 = Behavioral expectations for school and for classrooms include topics about peer relationships and student-staff relationships.

TFI 1.4 Teaching Expectations

RP 1.4a Students have been taught (a) how to have informal RP conversations with affective statements and questions, (b) the RP circle process, and (c) what to expect if they are ever involved as a stakeholder in any role in a formal RP conference.

0 = None of that has been taught to any students.

1 = Some of that has been taught to some students.

2 = Students are taught all these things.

RP 1.4b In the classrooms, RP circles and/or Stop Everything and Dialogue (SEAD) activities (Anderson, n.d.; Riestenberg, 2012) are among the methods used to teach expectations.

0 = Neither RP classroom circles nor SEAD activities are used to teach behavioral expectations.

1 = RP classroom circles and/or SEAD activities are sometimes used by some teachers to teach behavioral expectations, but not on a systematic or school-wide basis.

2 = On a systematic, school-wide basis, RP classroom circles and/or SEAD activities are used to teach behavioral expectations.

TFI 1.5 Problem Behavior Definitions

RP 1.5a Problem behavior definitions are related to information for teachers indicating distinctions among types of behaviors that are considered (a) "serious" enough to warrant a formal RP conference that includes an administrator, (b) best handled in informal RP conversations with teachers, (c) likely to be resolved by a classroom RP circle, or (d) not appropriate for RP management.

This could be shown in a flowchart for if and when to use RP, which type (circle, conversation, conference). Note that participation in a formal RP conference should be voluntary although preliminary individual talk with teacher or principal may lead to student deciding to participate.

0 = Problem behavior definitions have not been related to any information for teachers about when to use RP or what type of RP to use and no flowchart about this for our school exists.

1 = Problem behavior definitions have been related to some information (or a flowchart) for teachers about when to use RP and/or what type of RP to use although it is still not clear.

2 = Problem behavior definitions have been related to information (or a flowchart) for teachers about when to use RP and/or what type of RP to use and it is clear so that decisions can be made quickly.

TFI 1.6 Discipline Policies

RP 1.6a District/School policies and procedures describe and emphasize preventive, instructive, and restorative (both proactive and reactive) approaches to student behavior (Algozzine et al., 2014).

0 = Discipline policy has information only on rules and reactive and punitive consequences if rules are broken.

1 = There is some information about some preventive, instructional, and/or RP approaches in the discipline policies and/or some indication of use of these approaches.

2 = RP, both proactive and reactive ones, are described in discipline policies and the school administrator reports consistent use.

RP 1.6b The school's Office Discipline Referral (ODR) form includes an RP option for a consequence / administrative decision.

0 = There is nothing about RP on the ODR form.

1 = RP is not listed on the ODR form as an option for a consequence / administrative decision but sometimes a comment is written in that mentions RP.

2 = The school's ODR form includes an RP option for a consequence / administrative decision.

RP 1.6c Discipline policies provide clear guidance (written protocols) in use of discipline procedures (e.g., office vs. classroom managed, out of school or alternative) and use of RP in connection with (or instead of) ODRs or out of school or alternative.

0 = The discipline policies do not provide clear guidance in these matters.

1 = The discipline policies provide some guidance on some of these matters but it is not clear for all of them.

2 = Discipline policies provide clear guidance (written protocols) in use of discipline procedures (e.g., office vs. classroom managed, out of school or alternative) and use of RP in connection with (or instead of) ODRs or out of school or alternative.

RP 1.6d The school administrator plans for and facilitates restorative conferences as: interacting with students, teachers, and parents and asking questions like: What happened? Who was involved? What needs to happen to set things right?

0 = No records or verbal reports or interviews indicating that this happens.

1 = Some indication that some of this happens sometimes.

2 = Records and/or verbal reports or interviews clearly indicate that restorative conferences using these questions are planned and facilitated.

RP 1.6e When addressing harm, administrators will use RP to address harm, using a formal process such as the one recommended by Riestenberg (2012).

0 = Administrators are not using RP to address harm.

1 = Administrators are not formally using RP to address harm; no formal system exists.

2 = Administrators are formally using RP to address harm.

RP 1.6f Restorative conferences, or other formal RP activities to repair harm, are co-facilitated by the professionally trained RP Coach or administrator as agreed upon by staff.

0 = Neither the RP Coach nor an administrator facilitates or there was no agreement about who does this.

1 = The RP Coach or an administrator does facilitate but this is not done in a way agreed upon by the staff.

2 = Restorative conferences, or other formal RP activities to repair harm, are co-facilitated by the professionally trained RP Coach or administrator as agreed upon by staff.

RP 1.6g Restorative conferences are documented and assessed using a checklist

0 = No records or verbal reports or interviews indicating that this happens.

1 = Some indication that something like this happens sometimes.

2 = Records and/or verbal reports or interviews clearly indicate that restorative conferences are assessed using a checklist.

RP 1.6h RP support plans include consideration of possible use (or modification) of the school's PBIS Tier II and Tier III interventions and relevant follow-up activities for that.

0 = Restorative support plans do not include any consideration of possible use (or modification) of the school's PBIS Tier II and Tier III interventions.

1 = Restorative support plans include consideration of possible use (or modification) of the school's PBIS Tier II and Tier III interventions but no relevant follow-up activities.

2 = Restorative support plans include consideration of possible use (or modification) of the school's PBIS Tier II and Tier III interventions and relevant follow-up activities are scheduled.

RP 1.6i A process is described for follow-through on agreed-upon plans made as part of a restorative practice to track accountability for repairing harm and provision of support.

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

1 = Some mention is made of RP follow-up but it's not a clear description of a process for tracking accountability for repairing harm or providing any promised support.

2 = A process is clearly described for follow-through on agreed-upon plans made as part of a restorative practice to track accountability for repairing harm and provision of any promised support.

RP 1.6j A process is described for organizing use of a "peace room" or special place for RP activities (e.g., circles, conferences, mediation) including (a) decision rules for use, (b) physical space, (c) staffing, and (d) invitations to attend.

0 = No such process about a special place for RP activities is described.

1 = Some mention is made of a special place for RP activities but the process for using that place is not spelled in detail.

2 = A process is clearly described, in detail, for use of a special place for RP activities.

TFI 1.7 Professional Development

RP 1.7a A written process is used for orienting all faculty/staff members on core School Wide Positive and Restorative Discipline (SWPRD) practices.

0 = No process for teaching staff is in place.

1 = Process is informal/unwritten, not part of professional development calendar, and/or does not include all staff or all core Tier I SWPRD practices.

2 = Formal process for teaching all staff all aspects of Tier I system, including all core Tier I SWPRD practices.

RP 1.7b All teachers, support staff, and administrators receive ongoing professional development in the use of RP.

0 = No school staff have training in the use of RP.

1 = Some school staff have some training in the use of RP.

2 = All teachers, support staff, and administrators receive ongoing professional development in the use of RP.

RP 1.7c Written orientation information on RP is available for all volunteers, substitute teachers, and guest who will be interacting with students, and clarified if they have questions.

0 = No such written information on RP is available.

1 = Some information on RP is available but not all volunteers, substitute teachers and guests are aware that it is available or have a chance to get any questions clarified.

2 = Written orientation information on RP is available for all volunteers, substitute teachers, and guest who will be interacting with students, and they are told about it and about how to get any questions they have about it answered.

TFI 1.8 Classroom Procedures

RP 1.8a Classroom behavior expectations help teach school wide expectations, are positively stated, publicly posted in all classrooms, are co-developed with students using “group agreements,” and are regularly reviewed and taught using a variety of formats (at least once per month), such as class meetings and SEAD activities (Anderson, n.d; Riestenberg, 2012).

0 = Classroom teachers are not communicating or teaching school wide expectations.

1 = Classroom teachers are informally communicating and/or teaching school wide expectations but no formal system exists.

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

RP 1.8b At least once a week, at least 15-20 minute RP circles or class meetings occur school wide according to an agreed upon schedule.

0 = Classroom teachers are not formally implementing RP circles or class meetings

1 = Classroom teachers are informally implementing RP circles or class meetings but no school wide or scheduled system exists or it is not at least once a week for at least 15 minutes.

2 = Classrooms teachers are formally conducting RP circles or class meetings according to school wide, agreed upon schedule for at least once a week for at least 15 minutes.

RP 1.8c Quality and fidelity of use of RP circles in the classroom is assessed and documented using a Checklist for RP Circles.

0 = Classroom RP circles are not being assessed or documented.

1 = Classroom RP circles are informally assessed or documented but not using any kind of checklist or tool.

2 = Classroom RP circles are formally assessed and documented using a checklist.

RP 1.8d At least once per week, a talking piece is used to share or teach or for an RP circle.

0 = Classroom teachers never use a talking piece.

1 = Classroom teachers sometimes use a talking piece but not often, not every week.

2 = Classrooms teachers use a talking piece at least once a week.

RP 1.8e Classrooms reflect a "culture of care" (Cavanagh, n.d.; 2014; Sugai, O’Keeffe, & Fallon, 2012) as indicated by the qualitative and quantitative features listed below.

Qualitative Features

- o Focus is on relationships and interactions.
- o Students treated as co-creators.
- o Power and responsibility are shared.
- o Wrongdoing and conflict are learning opportunities.
- o Capacity of students and teachers is built to solve problems nonviolently.
- o Healing harm to relationships is a focus.

Quantitative Features

- o Students are asked a question pertaining to empathy; empathy is the "ability to identify with and feel another person's concerns" (Riestenberg, 2012, p. 34).
- o The teachers uses an I statement to express feelings or model the process of adult thinking.
- o The teacher models active listening when seeking input from students (Costello et al., 2009).
- o The teacher uses affective language when talking to students and responding to minor problem behavior (reframing, offering support, giving choices; expressing feelings).
 - 0 = Classrooms do not reflect a "culture of care" as indicated by any of these features.
 - 1 = Classrooms have a few of the features of a "culture of care."
 - 2 = Classrooms have many of the features of a "culture of care."

TFI 1.9 Feedback and Acknowledgment

RP 1.9a Students and staff receive feedback on their participation in RP and acknowledgement for following agreements and cooperating to create a culture of care using RP.

0 = The school has no systematic plan that involves providing students or staff with feedback or acknowledgement related to participation in RP.

1 = Some school staff sometimes provide some feedback or acknowledgement related to participation in RP to some students or to some other staff members, but it is sporadic and not guided by any school plan.

2 = The school has developed a systematic plan that coordinates RP with PBIS and assures that students and staff receive feedback on their participation in RP and acknowledgement for following agreements and cooperating with the school's efforts to create a culture of care using RP.

TFI 1.10 Faculty Involvement

RP 1.10a All school staff participate cooperatively in RP activities as needed.

0 = School staff are not participating cooperatively in RP activities at all.

1 = Some school staff sometimes participate in RP activities but this may or may not be in a cooperative way or when needed.

2 = All school staff are participating cooperatively in RP activities when needed.

RP 1.10b The school leadership team reports the exclusionary discipline outcomes and related RP data to key stakeholder groups, including faculty, monthly.

0 = This is not happening at all.

1 = Faculty receive some information on disciplinary outcomes and related RP data sometimes but not often, not monthly.

2 = Faculty receive monthly reports on exclusionary disciplinary outcomes and related RP data.

TFI 1.11 Student/Family/Community Involvement

RP 1.11a RP has been explained to students/family/community and they participate in RP circles/chats/conferences as needed.

0 = This is not happening at all.

1 = Some explanation of RP has been given to students/family/community and sometimes some of them participate in some RP activities when needed but either the explanations or the participation, or both, need to be improved.

2 = RP has been explained to students/family/community and when needed, with very few exceptions, they participate in RP activities.

RP 1.11b The school leadership team reports the exclusionary discipline outcomes and related RP data to key stakeholder groups, including students/family/community, monthly.

0 = This is not happening at all.

1 = Students/family/community receive some information on disciplinary outcomes and related RP data sometimes but not often, not monthly.

2 = Students/family/community receive monthly reports on exclusionary disciplinary outcomes and related RP data.

TFI 1.12 Discipline Data

RP 1.12a The school staff, including teachers and administrator(s), have agreed on a process for documenting RP, including teachers' and administrators' activities, responsibilities, ways of following up on how well restorative plans are carried out, and if harmful incidents are occurring repeatedly in spite of restorative efforts or not.

0 = Nothing like this is happening.

1 = We are starting to do this but it is not all worked out yet.

2 = We have agreed on a process for documenting RP, as described above.

RP 1.12b School staff are using the process we agreed upon to document RP activities.

0 = Nothing like this is happening.

1 = Some school staff are sometimes using the process we agreed upon for documenting RP but not consistently.

2 = School staff are consistently using the process we agreed upon for documenting RP.

RP 1.12c In addition to the discipline data that is collected and graphed, as described in the TFI, the school is collecting data on RP, analyzing that data, and relating the RP data to discipline data.

0 = We have no data on RP.

1 = RP data are collected sometimes but not consistently and/or not analyzing or relating it to discipline data.

2 = RP data are collected, analyzed, and related to discipline data.

RP 1.12d The school has a system for consistently documenting use of RP in connection with (or instead of) an office discipline referral (ODR), in-school suspension (ISS), or out-of-school suspension (OSS).

0 = Nothing like this is happening.

1 = We are starting to do this but it is not all worked out yet or it is not being consistently used yet.

2 = The school has a system for consistently documenting use of RP in connection with (or instead of) an ODR, ISS, or OSS.

TFI 1.13 Data-based Decision Making

RP 1.13a The school leadership team reviews the exclusionary discipline outcomes and related RP data monthly.

0 = Nothing like this is happening.

1 = This happens but not monthly.

2 = The school leadership team reviews the exclusionary discipline outcomes and related RP data monthly.

RP 1.13b At least one goal in the data-based action plan of the School Climate Leadership [Tier 1] team is focused on RP.

- 0 = There is no data-based action plan developed by a Tier 1 team.
- 1 = There is a Tier 1 team data-based action plan but it does not include an RP goal.
- 2 = The Tier 1 team has a data-based action plan that includes at least one RP goal.

TFI 1.14 Fidelity Data

RP 1.14a The Tier 1 team reviews and uses data on the fidelity of implementation of RP practices, using tools such as this document, at least annually.

- 0 = No data on fidelity of implementation of RP collected.
- 1 = RP fidelity information is collected informally and/or reviewed or used less than annually.
- 2 = RP fidelity of implementation data are collected systematically, and reviewed and used annually in school improvement planning.

TFI 1.15 Annual Evaluation

RP 1.15a Tier I team documents fidelity of implementation of RP and evidence related to its effect on student outcomes and school climate, at least annually (including year-by-year comparisons), shares the evaluation with stakeholders (staff, families, community, district), and makes decisions regarding future processes related to RP based on the evaluation.

- 0 = No evaluation of fidelity of RP implementation takes place or evaluation occurs without data.
- 1 = Evaluation of fidelity of RP implementation conducted, but not annually, or outcomes are not used, or not shared with stakeholders.
- 2 = Evaluation of fidelity of RP implementation is conducted annually, shared with stakeholders, and used to make relevant decisions.

References

- Algozzine, B., Barrett, S., Eber, L., George, H., Lewis, T., Putnam, B., Swain-Bradway, J., McIntosh, K., & Sugai, G. (2014). *School-wide PBIS Tiered Fidelity Inventory*. OSEP Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports. Retrieved from [https://www.pbisapps.org/Resources/SWIS%20Publications/SWPBIS%20Tiered%20Fidelity%20Inventory%20\(TFI\).pdf](https://www.pbisapps.org/Resources/SWIS%20Publications/SWPBIS%20Tiered%20Fidelity%20Inventory%20(TFI).pdf)
- Anderson, C. (no date). *Restorative justice and circles*. Sensibilities Prevention Services. Retrieved from <http://www.cordeliaanderson.com/SEAD&CircleTools>
- Cavanagh, T., Vigil, P., & Garcia, E. (2014). A story legitimating the voices of Latino/Hispanic students and their parents: Creating a restorative justice response to wrongdoing and conflict in schools. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 47(4), 565-579.
- Costello, B., Wachtel, J., & Wachtel, T. (2009). *The restorative practices handbook for teachers, disciplinarians and administrators*. Bethlehem, PA: International Institute for Restorative Practice.
- Riestedberg, N. (2012). *Circle in the square: Building community and repairing harm in school*. St. Paul, MN Living Justice Press.
- Sugai, G., O'Keeffe, B. V., & Fallon, L. M. (2012). A contextual consideration of culture and school-wide positive behavior support. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 14, 197-208.