DIGITAL COMMONS
@ UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA

Journal of Practitioner Research

Volume 8 | Issue 1 Article 1

2023

Rethinking In-School Suspension through Restorative Practices

Lacey Bass
Kennesaw State University, lwhitlo7@students.kennesaw.edu

Rachel E. Gaines
Kennesaw State University, rgaines7@kennesaw.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/jpr

Part of the Other Education Commons, and the Secondary Education Commons

Recommended Citation

Bass, Lacey and Gaines, Rachel E. (2023) "Rethinking In-School Suspension through Restorative Practices," *Journal of Practitioner Research*: Vol. 8 : Iss. 1 , Article 1.
https://doi.org/10.5038/2379-9951.8.1.1224

Available at: https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/jpr/vol8/iss1/1

This Practitioner Research is brought to you for free and open access by the Open Access Journals at Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Practitioner Research by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usf.edu.

Rethinking In-School Suspension through Restorative Practices

Abstract:

This self-study focuses on the implementation of restorative practices (RP) with high school students assigned in-school suspension (ISS) for violating school rules. The investigation focuses on the use of two restorative practices (community circles and digital behavior modules) as modes of restoration and behavioral change. Data from school disciplinary records indicate that students who participated in the RP were unlikely to become "repeat offenders" (i.e., return to ISS for the same offense). Analyses of structured reflections, observational logs, and student work samples suggest that the success of the program grew out of the trusting, collaborative relationships built in community circles; and the self-knowledge and self-regulatory skills developed through the digital behavior modules. Implications for teachers and school/district leaders are discussed along with directions for future research on the effect and implementation of restorative practices.

Background

School is meant to be a place of learning and academic growth; however, these opportunities are rarely offered when it comes to student behavior and school discipline. Swift referrals and even quicker consequences are enforced, which, for many students, makes school feel more like a correctional institution than a source of nurturing and mentoring. Punitive measures such as in-school and out-of-school suspension were designed to teach students to "accept the consequences of their actions," but since their inception, they have been met with controversy and disappointing outcomes (Allman & Slate, 2011, p. 2). Alternatively, restorative practices (RP) are meant to reframe school discipline systems as learning opportunities for students in need of targeted support. RP-based approaches to school discipline are concerned not just with rule-breaking and criminality,

> but also conflicts, offenses, and transgressions that can take place in the community and in everyday contexts, and not only as a response to the conflict, but in a preventive approach to care for relationships (Lodi et al., 2022, p. 2).

The myriad positive outcomes associated with these types of interventions include decreased infractions (and therefore fewer suspensions and expulsions), and positive school climate (Lodi et al., 2022). RP also helps teachers and staff build

trust with students and introduce them to tools/strategies they can use to understand and regulate their own behavior. In doing so, students develop coping skills that will serve them inside and outside of school. Restorative practices have also been found to significantly reduce disciplinary inequity (Anyon et al., 2016), particularly when embedded within structures such as *in-school suspension* (*ISS*; Gregory & Fergus, 2017), which transform "entire school communities [into] punitive environments focusing on social control over academic learning" (Johnson et al., 2019, p. 167; see also Gregory et al., 2016).

In the ten years I have been teaching, I have seen first-hand the importance of ensuring that students feel heard, safe, and respected the moment they walk through my door. Yet, as an In School Suspension (ISS) teacher, making students feel heard, safe, and respected can be particularly complicated. At some point, I realized behavior in my classroom was not a reflection of my relationship with the students. Instead, countless factors affect student behavior including parenting practices (Beach, 2014) and students' interactions with other school personnel. Specifically, for students of color and other minoritized populations, Gregory and Fergus (2017) note "that educators' own social and emotional competencies strongly influence students' motivation [and] school climate in general" and "individual beliefs and structural bias can lead educators to react harshly to behaviors that fall outside a white cultural frame of reference" (p. 117). As such, when students come into ISS already angry, upset, or disengaged, I recognize that something happened (or is happening) outside the classroom to elicit the emotional response that led to their behavior in my classroom. This led me to wonder how implementing restorative practices in my ISS classroom could help students learn to manage their own behavior and disrupt the patterns I was seeing of students returning to ISS time and time again.

Literature Review

Two central concepts are explored in the following literature review. First, school discipline, and in-school suspension specifically, is defined and the efficacy of such programs is explored. Then, I provide a more nuanced picture of restorative practices and how they affect students and schools.

In-School Suspension and Punitive Behavior Interventions

Unpacking the systemic and structural racism in schools in the United States and the broader education system requires critical examination of the discourses, narratives, norms, and practices regarding student (mis)behavior and discipline. In the context of the current study, it is particularly useful to examine

DOI: <p>https://doi.org/10.5038/2379-9951.8.1.1224</p>

punitive behavior interventions (e.g., zero tolerance policies, in-school suspension) both in terms of their effectiveness in reducing undesirable student behavior and promoting positive student outcomes, as well as how they have perpetuated and exacerbated disciplinary inequity in schools.

In the 1990s, "schools began to implement stricter disciplinary policies and practices" as a "get tough on crime" attitude swept the nation (Wood, 2014, p. 399). This included a rise in the zero-tolerance policies that had gained popularity during the "war on drugs" of the 1980's (Allman & Slate, 2011, p. 3). While the federal government developed and enforced harsh sentences for drug users, schools began implementing the same policies, which resulted in non-negotiable punishments for certain infractions, regardless of context or whether it was a student's first rule violation. Many of these policies have remained in place and have led countless students to be suspended or expelled at rates that interfered with their ability to access an education while, simultaneously, educators were being told to "leave no child behind." Students with discipline records were indeed being left behind.

In-school suspension (ISS) is another common punitive consequence for student (mis)behavior. ISS is meant to serve as a less severe form of punishment for students who commit minor infractions. For example, a student who brings nicotine (a legal substance) to school receives ISS, whereas a student with marijuana (illegal in the state) receives out-of-school suspension (OSS) and is referred to law enforcement. In my experience as an ISS teacher, ISS typically is designed to isolate students who have committed behavioral infractions by containing them in a single classroom where they are not allowed to interact even with one another. A major drawback of ISS (and OSS) is that students miss educational opportunities because they are isolated from their teachers and peers (Allman & Slate, 2011). Oftentimes students are not allowed to ask the staff overseeing ISS for help with the work they have been assigned while suspended; and even when they are allowed to do so, staff rarely specialize in core academic content areas. Unfortunately, ISS has been found to "negatively affect a student's self-esteem and even increase their likelihood of dropping out" (Allman & Slate, 2011, p. 4). These negative outcomes may be related to the ways in which punitive programs like zero-tolerance and ISS fail to address the root causes of behavior and reactions, including teacher bias (Lustick et al., 2020; Riddle &

Sinclair, 2019) as well as students' lack of support in developing emotional and behavioral skills necessary for self-regulation (Hulvershorn & Mulholland, 2018).

Restorative Behavior Practices

Unlike the punitive practices described previously, restorative practices (RP) aim to address the disputes and root causes that elicited a given behavior. According to Daly (2002), it is impossible to define restorative justice or RP because the terms "[encompass] a variety of practices at different stages of the criminal process" and across countless contexts including (but not limited to) adults and juvenile courts, family welfare and social services, workplaces, and schools (p. 57). Because the definition and implementation of RP is necessarily different across settings, it cannot be described precisely without consideration of context. Broadly, however, after an injustice has been perpetrated, those involved (typically victims, perpetrators, family and community members, and facilitators) "participate in discussions about the incident, to process who was affected and how it has impacted the community, and to determine collectively what needs to be done to repair the harm" (Smith et al., 2018, p. 3). In schools, however, where students' transgressions often are "victimless," yet recurring (e.g., truancy, tardiness), RP are less oriented toward justice for victims, and more toward building social skills and supports to prevent students from continuing to engage in behaviors that have negative consequences for themselves or those around them (Leland & Stockwell, 2021).

For teachers to implement RP successfully requires understanding the foundations of behavior management (Drewery & Kecskemeti, 2010), as well as how teachers' own behavior can earn or degrade students' trust. Specifically, RP ask teachers, as well as students and parents, to "reach for language that opens options, and invites the other into useful dialogue," that presents students with options as opposed to "my way or the highway" (p. 106). For example, teachers may be asked to reflect on how exterior triggers, including their own behavior, may have elicited a reaction from a student.

Using RP as the primary method of school discipline provides students with "the ability to solve problems, instead of treating students as an inconvenience that needs [to be] fixed" (Wood, 2014, p. 406). RP give teachers the chance to educate students on "citizenship in a diverse world, including teaching the skills of conflict resolution," which are crucial for emerging adults to become positive participants in their communities, both inside and outside of school (Hulvershorn & Mulholland, 2018, p. 119). For example, Hulvershorn and Mulholland (2018) studied the effects RP policies had on climate in schools that

https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/jpr/vol8/iss1/1
DOI: <p>https://doi.org/10.5038/2379-9951.8.1.1224</p>

had previously implemented strict punitive policies, including zero tolerance. They found that RP policies not only benefited students in terms of promoting "communication skills, kindness, empathy, and caring" (p. 110), but they also saw increased disciplinary equity based on race and gender. Additionally, Lustick et al. (2020) found that across three schools that implemented RP programs in place of punitive behavior policies, suspension rates drop dramatically, which suggests a decline in "repeat offenders." Once again, this suggests that RP equips students with the skills and resources needed to help them regulate their emotions and behavior in adaptive ways.

The Current Study

At the time of this study, I taught ISS, as well as academic classes at the remedial and Advanced Placement (AP) levels. At the time, I was intentional and consistent about classroom and behavior management in my AP and remedial classes, but I could not say the same for ISS. Although student (mis)behavior in the academic classes could cause stress, I found that if I treated each student with respect and valued their walk of life, I could connect with even the most reluctant learner. Specifically, I did not promote punishment or reward systems, instead focusing on building a culture of understanding and respect in each classroom. When my students violated behavioral expectations or rules, I redirected them by explaining how their behavior affects others (often myself) as opposed to handing down a consequence. In doing so, I built trusting relationships with and between students, which is important because "children who develop positive relationships with their teachers… are more socially adjusted as they mature" (Forsberg & Leko, 2021, p. 1). This led me to wonder why I was not using similar techniques with my ISS students and how the restorative approaches could help them succeed in school.

Prior research indicates that restorative behavior practices *can* have a positive impact on students, teachers, and the larger school community; yet no prescribed RP program is universally effective. Still, the neutrality of one should not prevent the implementation and examination of others. The effectiveness of any set of RP policies necessarily depends on individual teacher, student, and contextual dimensions. As such, I conducted self-study research to examine the implementation of a self-designed RP program in my ISS classroom to answer the following research question: *How does my implementation of a self-designed*

system of restorative practices in my ISS classroom influence students and their behavior?

Methodology and Methods

Self-study methods were used to examine my implementation of a self-designed restorative practices (RP) program in my ISS classroom. Self-study was appropriate for this research as it offers a transparent and systematic approach to personally situated inquiry designed to "improve students' learning through modification in teachers' instruction" (Samaras, 2011, p. 145). Specifically, through rigorous data collection, consistent reflection and note taking, and collaboration with critical friends, self-study enables practitioners to analyze their own instructional decisions, behaviors, perceptions, and beliefs with a greater level of validation and verification. Furthermore, Feldman (2003) states that the goal of self-study research is "to improve [our practice] in a particular direction that will affect what happens in our colleges, universities, and schools" (p. 27). This aligns with my mindset toward restorative practices, as I want my contributions to this field to aid in reforming discipline procedures to benefit students.

Research Context

I teach at Riverside High School (pseudonym), a middle-class suburban high school in the southeastern United States. Of our nearly 2,000 students, 63.1% identify as white, 20.6% as Hispanic, 8.3% as Black, 4.3% as multiracial, 3.6 % as Asian, and 0.1% as American Indian. Approximately 20% of students receive free and reduced lunch. On average, the demographics of my classes (which include AP, remedial, and ISS) all roughly match broader school demographics.

This self-study is situated specifically in the context of my first period ISS class. Our classroom is self-contained, meaning students may not even leave to go to the bathroom (although there is a bathroom attached to the classroom which they may use). We are only able to seat 12 students in ISS at one time, so the environment is kept relatively small, which gives a great opportunity for us to get to know and work with each student. Over the course of this study, I saw 92 students. Although I describe student behavior, paraphrase recalled conversations

DOI: <p>https://doi.org/10.5038/2379-9951.8.1.1224</p>

with my ISS students, and use aggregated class data, the students are not "participants" in this self-study, and therefore are not described individually.

Restorative Practices Program

I designed the RP program for our school. Specifically, during my ISS class, students participated in RP via digital modules and/or community circles. Their participation was determinant in their eligibility for "a reduced sentence" in ISS.

Digital Modules

The first stage of RP was a series of digital modules that students completed on the school's curriculum portal. When students were consigned to ISS, they were assigned digital modules aligned with their infraction (e.g., a student referred for vaping would complete the vaping module). Through the portal, I was able to monitor students' progress in the modules and access the reflections they wrote on topics including (but not limited to) how they connect their behavior to their actions, what previous incidents led to their behaviors, and their self-identified triggers. Additional information about the contents of digital modules is provided in the findings.

Community Circles

The second stage of RP involved community circles in which students either had one-on-one conversations with me about their behavior, the context, and possible triggers; or collaborated with peers who had received a similar consequence on how to adjust their behavior in the future. Throughout the course of community circles, I maintained records and observations of my interactions with students and wrote detailed reflections on these experiences. Additional information about various community circles is provided in the findings.

Data Sources

I collected data from three sources (two qualitative and one quantitative) to address the question guiding this study. The first qualitative data source was a reflective journal I maintained during the implementation of the RP program. I wrote three structured entries (pre-reflection, mid-reflection, and post-reflection) based on a series of prompts I had designed to elicit specific types of thoughts, feelings, and perceptions throughout the process. In the pre-reflection, I focused on why I wanted to pursue this topic and how I envisioned it helping students. My

mid-study reflection looked back at previous RP sessions and their impact on students. The post-study reflection sought to analyze the effects of these practices on student conduct. Between these three structured entries, I also made observational entries to capture and reflect on important moments.

An additional qualitative data source involved student performance records from their participation in digital modules and community circles. Information collected through the curriculum portal (in which they completed the digital module) included student questionnaires, trigger charts, and personal reflections. I also made observational notes as I reviewed students' work in these modules (e.g., self-identified triggers, previous incidents that led to their behaviors). I also maintained records of my interactions with students and how the completed modules affected their subsequent behavior.

Quantitative data came from monthly school-wide student behavior and performance records I received in my capacity as ISS teacher. These reports documented every disciplinary referral each month and whether each student had previously been referred for the same behavior (i.e., "repeat offenders"). I used these records to track their progress and identify changes in their behavior. These records included information on the number of consequences received by each student (before and after partaking in RP), as well as behavioral referral trends for those enrolled in my ISS class. These trends were useful in determining whether and how the RP program influenced behavior of "frequent flyers" in ISS.

Analysis

To analyze the quantitative data, I created multiple visualizations using data from the monthly school-wide student behavior and performance records. Doing so allowed me to identify trends and patterns in student behavior. This included looking for trends in repeat offenses.

Qualitative data were analyzed using a modified version of Bogdan and Bilken's (2007) coding category. This approach is well suited for self-study by providing "structure and organization to analyze with more focus" (Samaras, 2011, p. 203). I started by looking for common trends or repeated ideas in my three reflections, noting relevant topics and excerpts as I read. Then I followed a similar procedure for my observation logs. From these sources, I recognized that I had been primarily focused on (a) the ways relationships were built through RP, and (b) how students developed skills and strategies to help them self-regulate their emotions and behavior at school. As I continued to re-read and annotate the qualitative data sources, I identified codes within these categories that helped

DOI: <p>https://doi.org/10.5038/2379-9951.8.1.1224</p>

illustrate and explain how RP facilitated the development of relationships and self-regulatory skills and strategies (see Table 1).

Table 1

Categories and Codes

Category	Codes
Relationship Building	Common Goals Mutual Support Trust
Strategy/Skill Development	Identifying Triggers Seeking Support Expressing Thoughts and Feelings

Role of Critical Friends

Self-study is strengthened by working with critical friends (Samaras, 2011). My critical friends included a faculty member from my master's program as well as two full-time K-12 teachers who were also students in my program. Importantly, these classmates and I taught in different districts and communities. The diversity of our teaching contexts, experiences, and perspectives helped mitigate the threat of confirmation bias. All three critical friends provided feedback at each stage of this study that challenged my ideas and increased the rigor of my analysis.

Findings

To describe my findings, I begin by using the quantitative data to illustrate trends in student behavior in the months following the implementation of the RP interventions. Then, the qualitative findings provide insight into how specific aspects of the RP program implemented in ISS may have influenced student behavior in line with the documented trends.

Trends in Student Behavior

Over six months of data collection, my school received 115 behavior referrals. Almost half involved first-time and/or minor offenses and therefore did

not result in referral to ISS. However, most referrals to ISS (64.1%; see Table 2) involved vaping and being tardy to class.

Table 2

Repeat Offender Data by Module

RP Modules	Students	"Repeat Offenders"
Vaping	17	1
Tardiness	8	0
Positive Social Interaction	5	2
Vandalism	4	0
Alcohol	2	0
Bullying	3	0
Total	39	3

Each student placed in ISS for vaping had to complete a six-part module that involved (a) reading and responding to an article, (b) watching and taking notes on two videos, (c) writing a synthesis of the information they learned, (d) creating an original anti-vaping poster, and (e) writing a letter of apology to their body for the damage caused by vaping. They also participated in a daily community circle in which they talked about their behavior and created strategies for staying out of trouble at school and away from using vapes. Of the 17 students who were sent to ISS for vaping, only one became a "repeat offender" (i.e., got sent to ISS for vaping a second time; see Table 2).

In the first two months of school, eight students were assigned to ISS for accumulating seven tardies. Students who came to ISS for this reason had to complete a six-part digital module in which they (a) reviewed the school's tardy policy, (b) took a quiz on the policy to make sure they understood it, (c) watched a video about the importance of time management, (d) wrote a reflection on the video, (e) wrote a letter of apology to their teachers, and (f) created a plan to help them get to class/school on time. These students also participated in a daily community circle where they discussed why they were having trouble getting to class/school on time and how they could develop a strategy to do better. Once a

https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/jpr/vol8/iss1/1
DOI: <p>https://doi.org/10.5038/2379-9951.8.1.1224</p>

student had been sent to ISS for accumulating seven tardies, every subsequent tardy got them sent back to ISS. As such, it is particularly noteworthy that none of the eight students who were sent to ISS for accumulating seven tardies in the first two months of school returned to ISS in the following four months, meaning none of them was late for school or for a single class after participating in RP. Table 2 includes a complete list of the RP modules students completed in ISS and the number of “repeat offenders” for each behavior.

Building Relationships, Support, and Strategies through Community Circles

My reflective journals often focused on and prioritized my relationships with students. Specifically, I was able to build and strengthen relationships during community circles. The students and I got to know each other as a team working towards a common goal (i.e., their success) without positioning me solely as an enforcer of school policy, but also as a collaborator and stakeholder in their happiness and success. My ISS students would come back to see me once they were released from ISS to let me know how they were doing, and I would ask about their grades and if they were staying out of trouble.

Those who had previously been “frequent flyers” in ISS expressed how they felt like everyone saw them as troublemakers without ever getting to know them. However, community circles, particularly the one-on-one sessions, created an opportunity for me to demonstrate sincere interest and effort in getting to know them and the issues they were facing that contributed to their behavior. As noted in my reflective journal, by not treating the students like “ISS delinquents,” I was able to build a positive bond. These students began to gain confidence in seeking me, or another trusted adult, to help them when they felt they might behave in a way that could get them in trouble or when they felt triggered. The community circles created a space where their peers and I not only coached students on their behavior, but we also presented ourselves as people they can go to when they need support.

A powerful example of this involved my interactions with a student who had been assigned nine days of ISS. This student, who was a repeat offender in the 2020-21 school year, came with the disclaimer that he was a “tough case.” On his first day in ISS, he was defiant, disrespectful, and almost earned additional time in ISS. I took him for a walk that day to help him cool down and let him know that I would be there to work with him over the duration of his term in ISS. He and I met over the course of the nine days, and during community circles we would talk about his triggers, how to identify them, and how to redirect his responses in a more positive way. Over those nine days, I reflected on how he

talked about his classes and grades, and the change in his tone when talking about teachers. In my reflective journal, I wrote that as the days went on, he opened up with me more and more, eventually sharing that he was lashing out in school in response to an ongoing situation at home.

In another instance, he expressed intense frustration with a teacher he did not know who had written him up in the hallway. He had been trying to walk away from the teacher because he knew that he was being triggered and could react negatively if he continued to engage. As he began walking toward my room, the teacher stepped in front of him, blocking him from seeking the support he needed at that moment. Once he was able to speak with me, he expressed feelings of dejection when this teacher prohibited him from attempting to implement the strategies, we had been discussing in community circles (i.e., disengaging from triggering interactions, seeking support). Fortunately, his willingness to express this openly allowed me to advocate on his behalf. Specifically, I explained the situation to school administrators, who immediately removed the referral from his record. This interaction illustrates the importance of positive and open dialogue when working with students who have been labeled as “troublemakers.”

Another key piece in building relationships during community circles involved allowing students to talk to one another and to me about the rationale behind their decisions. This allowed us to collaborate in thinking through their behaviors. This is exemplified by a pattern that emerged in my reflective journals. After each community circle with a group of students, I wrote about how we were able to connect that day, what I learned, and how they appeared to be responding to RP. Each day, as I learned more about my students, they expressed themselves more often, and appeared to look forward to our community circle time.

Once released from ISS, I also noticed that if these students found themselves in danger of getting in trouble at school, they would come to my room to talk it out and I would help them through their situation. The practices instilled in students through the digital modules and community circles helped them identify their triggers, such that they knew when to come see me, an ISS classmate, or another trusted adult before deciding with punitive consequences.

Discussion

Practitioners often have personal, professional, and knowledge-building/theoretical goals for their research. Personally, working with students on their behavior is my favorite aspect of education. I love teaching students who need someone to show that they care about their success. This self-study gives me

hope and direction as I continue to advocate for a shift in schools' behavior programs, away from punishing students for "bad" behavior, and toward restorative models designed to teach students the skills necessary to understand, monitor, and regulate their own behavior and avoid making impulsive decisions that result in punitive consequences.

My professional goal in this research was to improve school climate and reduce behavior referrals as a means of promoting learning and achievement for groups of students who often struggle academically due to the amount of class they miss while serving suspensions (Allman & Slate, 2011). Ultimately, my findings regarding the dramatic reduction in "repeat offenders" suggests that the RP program I used in ISS (i.e., community circles and digital modules) helped keep them out of ISS, which increases continuity of learning in their academic classes.

The impact of the program can be attributed in part to students' positive reaction to the digital modules and community circles. Specifically, the digital modules appeared to reduce the number of repeat offenders by helping students recognize their behavioral triggers and how to redirect their focus when they are upset. Community circles allowed students to develop positive student-teacher and peer-to-peer relationships which served as sources of support as they strove to manage their own in-school behavior. These students no longer felt alone or misunderstood, but rather had developed a sense of community with me and with one another.

Previous studies suggest that teachers' responses to student behavior can shape student-teacher relationships (Drewery & Kecskemeti, 2010), which is why the implementation of RP relies upon teachers and staff who sincerely believe that all students are teachable, even when it comes to regulating their behavior. Unfortunately, students who receive frequent referrals become known even to teachers who have never met them personally. They are constantly and repeatedly held accountable for past actions without being afforded opportunities for growth or change. In response, the RP process "depends on the community to hold others accountable *and 'promote the well-being of its members*,'" (Darby, 2021, p. 404; emphasis added). To do so as an ISS teacher, I must remain unbiased, so I choose to give my students a clean slate each time we meet. I hold them accountable for the infraction that landed them in ISS, but never hold their previous behaviors

against them so we can unpack what happened and work together to determine a path forward.

This study contributes to the growing body of research on the potential for RP to begin dismantling the school-to-prison pipeline (Darby, 2021), while teaching students valuable skills and strategies that will help them manage their emotions and behavior both inside and outside of school (O'Shauggnessy et al., 2019; Schwartz, 2008). High school students are still negotiating and experimenting with identities, and imagining their possible futures, which makes high school a critical time to help them develop positive traits and behaviors without sending them destructive messages about their value and potential through punitive measures alone. These punitive measures do not deter "problem" behavior, which is why ISS teachers tend to see the same students repeatedly, and why those students tend to lose self-esteem and drop out of school at higher rates (Allman & Slate, 2011). The fact that so few students in this self-study returned to ISS after participating in digital modules and community circles illustrates how RP can disrupt the negative reinforcement that typically comes from in-school suspension.

Conclusions

I have never been a huge proponent of punishing students' "misbehavior." I always give students the benefit of the doubt that our miscommunications can be solved through discussion. I chalk "bad behavior" up to a lapse in relationships. It is rarely just something I did that led to the behavior, and if it was, we explore what we can do to repair whatever needs fixing. This study allowed me to examine this work systematically and in conversation with prior research on restorative practices. Through this process, I identified ways my ISS RP program, and this field of research, can be expanded to advance the implementation and understanding of RP.

For educators, the implications of this research are clear. Students can learn to manage their own behavior through restorative practices (or other deliberately designed programs and activities) that create opportunities for students to create supportive, trusting relationships with school personnel and help them identify strategies they can use to regulate their emotions and behavior. Specifically, as seen in the findings about community circles, teachers (or other relevant school personnel) should engage students in open dialogue and critical self-reflection as means to achieve shared goals about students' academic success and wellbeing. As demonstrated by the success of the digital modules, it is also imperative to help students identify the triggers that tend to elicit problematic

https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/jpr/vol8/iss1/1
DOI: <p>https://doi.org/10.5038/2379-9951.8.1.1224</p>

behavior, identify resources and sources of support, and develop strategies to de-escalate or otherwise manage their behavior when triggered. This can be accomplished through community circles and digital modules, as described in the study. However, there may be other models that are appropriate for a given school or context.

Based on this self-study, I also plan to augment the RP program in ISS. As described in the study, the RP program may have supported students' academic outcomes by keeping "repeat offenders" out of ISS and in their academic classes. Moving forward, I plan to expand the academic arm of the RP program by developing practices that target work completion. Specifically, adding work completion as a restorative behavior may further support students' academic engagement and success. In turn, this may help restore some of the self-esteem that often is lost when students become "frequent flyers" in ISS (Allman & Slate, 2011).

This process also highlighted the need for school/district leaders to rethink their approaches to curbing tardiness. Specifically, many of the 243 students who were referred to administration for tardies over the course of the study were routinely late to first period, often due to recurring transportation issues (e.g., need to drop a sibling off at a different school first). As such, I proposed that our district amend our tardy policy, which previously stated that students who accumulated seven tardies across all their classes would be assigned to ISS. Sending students to ISS for repeated first period tardies ultimately removed students from that class for the entire period when they typically missed only a portion of it (if tardy). As such, the proposed policy, which we are currently piloting, says that students who are consistently tardy to a particular class (e.g., first period) must attend that class in full; then return to ISS to serve the rest of the day. This may help address the learning loss that can come from frequent tardies while still giving students opportunities through RP in ISS to develop strategies and skills to help them be on time in the future.

Additional research is needed to advance understanding of how to implement effective RP programs that target the needs of students as well as teachers, parents, and the community. Specifically, studies on various stakeholders' (e.g., district administration, school administration, teachers, students, parents) perceptions of RP would be valuable for advocates, who may need to address different concerns and needs across constituencies when developing RP policies for a school or district. Lastly, longitudinal studies tracing behavioral and academic outcomes for students involved in RP would help

students, parents, teachers, and school leaders understand the long-term implications of developing and implementing these types of programs in schools.

DOI: <p>https://doi.org/10.5038/2379-9951.8.1.1224</p>

References

Allman, K. L., & Slate, J. R. (2011). School discipline in public education: A brief review of current practices. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation, 6*(2), 1-8.

Anyon, Y., Gregory, A., Stone, S., Farrar, J., Jenson, J., McQueen, J., Downing, B., Greer, E., & Simmons, J. (2016). Restorative interventions and school district sanctions in a large urban school district. *American Educational Research Journal, 53*(6), 1-35. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831216675719

Beach, C. (2014). *At-risk students: transforming student behavior*. R&L Education.

Bogdan, R. C., & Bilken, S. K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods.* Pearson.

Daly, K. (2002). Restorative justice: The real story. *Punishment & Society, 4*(1), 55-79.

Darby, M. W. (2021). Ending the school-to-prison pipeline in South Carolina through legislative reform. *Journal of Law and Education, 50*(2), 390-424. https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/ending-schooi-prison-pipeline-south-carolina/docview/2597292756/se-2?accountid=11824

Drewery, W., & Kecskemeti, M. (2010). Restorative practice and behaviour management in schools: Discipline meets care. *Waikato Journal of Education*, *15*(3), 101–113. https://doi.org/10.15663/wje.v15i3.85

Feldman, A. (2003). Validity and quality in self-study. *Educational Researcher, 32*(3), 26–28.

Forsberg, M. L., & Leko, M. M. (2021). Improving relationships and student outcomes through restorative practices. *Intervention In School and Clinic*. https://doi.org/10.1177/10534512211047589

Gregory, A., Clawson, K., Davis, A., & Gerewitz, J. (2016). The promise of restorative practices to transform teacher-student relationships and achieve equity in school discipline. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 26*(4), 325-353. https://doi.org/10.1080/10474412.2014.929950

Gregory, A., & Fergus, E. (2017). Social and emotion learning and equity in school discipline. *The Future of Children, 27*(1), 117-136. https://www.jstor.org/stable/44219024

Guilfoyle, K. (1992, April). *Communicating with students: The impact of interactive dialogue journals on the thinking and teaching of a teacher educator.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Hulvershorn, K. & Mulholland, S. (2018). Restorative practices and the

integration of social emotional learning as a path to positive school climates. *Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching & Learning*, *11*(1), 110–123. https://doi.org/10.1108/JRIT-08-2017-0015

Johnson Jr., O., Jabbarim J., Williams, M., & Marcucci, O. (2019). Disparate impacts: Balancing the need for safe schools with racial equity in discipline. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Science, 6*(2), 162-169. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F2372732219864707

Lodi, E., Perrella, L., Lepri, G. L., Scarpa, M. L., & Patrizi, P. (2022). Use of restorative justice and restorative practices at school: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 19*(96), 1-34. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19010096

Leland, W., & Stockwell, A. (2021). Anti-oppressive restorative justice: Behavior analysis in alternatives to policing. *Behavior Analysis in Practice, 2021*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40617-021-00633-0

Lustick, H., Norton, C., Lopez, S. R., & Greene-Rooks, J. H. (2020). Restorative practices for empowerment: A social work lens. *Children & Schools, 42*(2), 89–97. https://doi.org/10.1093/cs/cdaa006

O'Shauggnessy, A. (2018). Transforming teaching and learning through mindfulness-based restorative practices. In M. Thorsborne, N. Riestenberg, & G. McCluskey (Eds.) *Getting More out of Restorative Practice in Schools* (pp. 144-158). Jessica Kingsley.

Riddle, T. & Sinclair, S. (2019). Racial disparities in school-based disciplinary actions are associated with county-level rates of racial bias. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 116*(17), 8255–8260. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1808307116

Samaras, A.P. (2011). S*elf-study teacher research: Improving your practice through Collaborative Inquiry*. SAGE.

Schwartz, K. D. (2008). Adolescent brain development: An oxymoron no longer. *Journal of Youth Ministry*, *6*(2), 85–93.

Smith, L. C., Garnett, B. R., Herbert, A., Grudev, N., Vogel, J., Keefner, W., Barnett, A., & Baker, T. (2018). The hand of professional school counseling meets the glove of restorative practices: A call to the profession. *Professional School Counseling, 21*(1), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1177/2156759X18761899

Wood, K. (2014). Restoring our children's future: Ending disparate school discipline through restorative justice practices. *Journal of Dispute Resolution, 2014*(2), 395–414.