

# Culturally Responsive Restorative Practices

## Preliminary Data From Participating Schools, 2018–2019

Austin Independent School District (AISD) received a 5-year, \$3.5 million Education Innovation and Research grant from the U.S. Department of Education in 2017 to implement culturally responsive restorative practices (CRRP) at six elementary schools and four middle schools. This report summarizes preliminary data from participating schools for the 2017–2018 and 2018–2019 school years.

### What are culturally responsive restorative practices?

Research indicates that exclusionary discipline practices (e.g., suspensions, expulsions, or other classroom removals) disproportionately affect students of color and increase the likelihood of later developmental challenges, including academic disengagement, lower academic achievement, and increased involvement in the juvenile justice system (e.g., Skiba, Arredondo, & Williams, 2014). Similar research found that students who attended schools with high suspension rates were more likely to be incarcerated as adults, with disproportionately negative effects on students of color (Bacher-Hicks, Deming, & Billings, 2019). CRRP is intended to counteract these trends by providing schools with resources and a framework to cultivate a positive, affirming school climate for all students and staff. The vision for CRRP is guided by six components:

- **Cultural proficiency:** Educators know their own cultural and racial lens, and understand the impact their biases, values, prejudices, and beliefs have on students' sense of safety and belonging, and academic success.
- **Classroom environment:** A safe, supportive classroom environment connects cultural and community-based knowledge through structures, processes, and protocols.
- **Identity safety:** Students, educators, parents, and caregivers have a sense of belonging and identity safety. All are personally affirmed, accepted, respected, included, and supported in the school environment.
- **Culturally responsive pedagogy:** Educators are facilitators of learning who vary their methods of teaching, employ asset-based pedagogy, and connect cultural and community knowledge in their classrooms to draw on the funds of knowledge so all students can learn and succeed.
- **Conditions for equity:** There is equity of voice among school leadership, staff, students, parents, and community to co-construct the school experience through collaborative and shared planning and decision making.
- **Restorative practices (RPs):** Rooted in the traditions of indigenous peoples, restorative practices are used to build trusting relationships and social harmony. RPs recognize that a strong relational foundation is necessary to repair harm, that conflict and tension are normal and natural and are resolved through processes that strengthen relationships, maintain trust, hold parties accountable, repair harm, and contribute to harmony. RPs are tiered as follows:
  - **Universal** (tier 1): Educators proactively build and universally reaffirm relationships as a means of developing the social and emotional skills of the self and students.
  - **Targeted** (tier 2): When conflict affects others in the school community,

educators employ targeted interventions to repair relationships.

- **Intensive** (tier 3): When conflict seriously impacts multiple members of the school community, educators use responsive and intensive levels of intervention involving agreed-upon stakeholders, including district and community supports, to repair and rebuild relationships.

Seven *restorative practices associates* (RPAs) supported participating schools in 2018–2019 through a mixture of relationship building, conflict resolution, coaching, professional development opportunities, circle facilitation, student lunch bunches, and numerous other duties. Because the 2018–2019 school year was the first year of CRRP implementation, RPAs devoted significant time to developing relationships with students and staff at participating schools. As the school year progressed, RPAs began coaching educators, facilitating community building circles, and delivering professional learning. In addition, RPAs shadowed and coached each other, and met regularly as a team to share problems of practice. RPAs were occasionally asked to provide targeted or intensive support (tier 2 or 3) in the form of mediation or circle facilitation when conflict or harm had occurred.

Going forward, the impact of CRRP work will be measured by reference to the following objectives:

- Reduce staff reliance on exclusionary discipline practices, with specific emphasis on disproportionality by race and gender
- Increase students’ perceptions of a safe, respectful, supportive school climate
- Increase students’ ability to make responsible decisions and engage in respectful communication with peers and adults
- Increase parents’ and caregivers’ perceptions that their child attends a safe, supportive school
- Increase teachers’ perceptions of a supportive, positive school climate
- Improve academic performance across all student groups, with specific emphasis on those who have historically underperformed their peers

## What do CRRP schools look like?

The following tables provide campus-level data on CRRP schools with respect to demographics, student discipline, standardized test performance, and perceptions of school climate. Demographic data are from the 2018–2019 school year, while student discipline, standardized test performance, and school climate data include 2017–2018 (i.e., pre-CRRP) and 2018–2019 (i.e., CRRP year one). **All data herein are intended to establish a baseline for assessing CRRP implementation and impact. As such, readers should not make causal inferences between RPA work and campus-level outcomes at this time.**

### Student and Staff Demographics

Compared with the AISD average, nine out of 10 CRRP schools had a higher percentage of (a) students of color, (b) students from low-income households, and (c) students whose primary language was not English (Tables 1 and 2). School segregation across racial and socioeconomic lines has been found to correlate with less experienced teachers, fewer resources, and lower academic performance and achievement (e.g., Reardon, Weathers, Fahle, Jang, & Kalogrides, 2019). As displayed in the following tables, these barriers were present at the majority of CRRP schools.

## Which schools are participating in CRRP?

RPAs support six elementary schools and four middle schools:

### Elementary schools

- Barrington Elementary
- Becker Elementary
- Blanton Elementary
- Blazier Elementary
- Cook Elementary
- Pickle Elementary

### Middle schools

- Burnet Middle
- Dobie Middle
- Garcia Young Men’s Leadership Academy
- Mendez Middle

Each participating school was classified as Title I for the 2018–2019 school year. With exceptions, Title I classification requires > 60% of elementary school students or > 70% middle school students to be eligible for free or reduced-price lunch.

Table 1.

**Nine of 10 CRRP schools had more students of color than did the average AISD elementary or middle school in 2018–2019.**

Level	School	N	Race				
			Asian	Black	Hispanic	Other	White
Elementary	Barrington	536	3%	8%	85%	1%	4%
	Becker	439	2%	4%	51%	2%	41%
	Blanton	505	-	11%	67%	3%	19%
	Blazier	859	2%	7%	75%	3%	12%
	Cook	440	-	9%	86%	1%	3%
	Pickle	552	1%	7%	89%	-	3%
	<b>Elementary school average (ES AVG)</b>	<b>514</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>24%</b>
Middle	Burnet	947	1%	8%	85%	1%	5%
	Dobie	574	3%	14%	79%	1%	4%
	Garcia	389	2%	25%	68%	2%	3%
	Mendez	628	-	9%	90%	-	1%
	<b>Middle school average (MS AVG)</b>	<b>875</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>24%</b>

Source. AISD Fall 2018 TSDS enrollment.

Note. Other includes students listed as two or more races, American Indian or Alaska Native, or Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander. Totals may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Table 2.

**Nine of 10 CRRP schools had more students from low-income households or whose primary language was not English than did the average AISD elementary or middle school in 2018–2019.**

Level	School	Sex		Other characteristics		
		Female	Male	Economically disadvantaged	English learner	Special education
Elementary	Barrington	47%	53%	97%	72%	14%
	Becker	50%	50%	32%	15%	7%
	Blanton	52%	48%	69%	44%	10%
	Blazier	47%	53%	69%	30%	11%
	Cook	49%	51%	93%	70%	10%
	Pickle	50%	50%	97%	81%	8%
	<b>ES AVG</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>12%</b>
Middle	Burnet	43%	57%	92%	61%	18%
	Dobie	48%	52%	95%	55%	17%
	Garcia	-	100%	93%	49%	19%
	Mendez	47%	53%	92%	46%	14%
	<b>MS AVG</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>15%</b>

Source. AISD Fall 2018 TSDS enrollment data.

Note. Economically disadvantaged = eligible for free or reduced-price lunch. Totals may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Although CRRP schools had more educators of color than did the average AISD elementary or middle school (Table 3), White educators remained the majority in middle schools and a large minority in elementary schools. The median

number of years teaching (i.e., in AISD and elsewhere) was consistently lower for CRRP educators than for the average AISD elementary or middle school in 2018–2019. Research on these trends paints a complicated picture: students of color who had a teacher of color in elementary school were less likely than students of color who did not have a teacher of color in elementary school to drop out of high school and were more likely to attend college (e.g., Gershenson, Hart, Lindsay, & Papageorge, 2017). Conversely, schools with a higher percentage of disadvantaged students had a greater concentration of teachers with fewer qualifications and less experience than did schools with a lower percentage of disadvantaged students (Goldhaber, Lavery, & Theobald, 2015), both of which contrasted with findings that students performed better academically and developmentally with more experienced teachers than they did with less experienced teachers (Kini & Podolsky, 2016).

Table 3.

**For the 2018–2019 school year, educators at CRRP schools were more racially diverse but less experienced than the AISD elementary or middle school average.**

Level	School	N	Race					Gender		Years of experience	
			Asian	Black	Hispanic	Other	White	Female	Male	AISD	Total
Elementary	Barrington	38	-	-	68%	-	32%	82%	18%	4	5
	Becker	31	3%	3%	68%	-	26%	84%	16%	5	9
	Blanton	40	3%	5%	43%	-	26%	88%	12%	6	8.5
	Blazier	56	2%	5%	48%	2%	43%	95%	5%	7	7
	Cook	34	3%	6%	68%	-	24%	79%	21%	6	7
	Pickle	39	-	10%	62%	-	28%	79%	21%	3	9
	<b>ES AVG</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>10</b>
Middle	Burnet	74	-	11%	28%	3%	58%	54%	46%	2	4
	Dobie	47	2%	6%	28%	6%	53%	70%	30%	3	9
	Garcia	40	-	33%	20%	3%	45%	53%	48%	3	7
	Mendez	51	6%	4%	35%	2%	53%	71%	29%	2	2
	<b>MS AVG</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>

Source. AISD Fall 2018 staff demographic data.

Note. Figures represent only staff members classified as teachers. Other includes teachers listed as two or more races, American Indian or Alaska Native, or Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander. Totals may not add up to 100% due to rounding. Years of experience figures represent the median for each campus.

## Student Discipline

Encouraging a restorative response to student misconduct is a primary goal of CRRP. Research indicates that a restorative school culture is associated with reduced rates of suspensions and improved relationships (e.g., Gregory, Clawson, Davis, & Gerewitz, 2016). As detailed in Table 4, CRRP middle schools used exclusionary discipline methods (i.e., suspension, expulsion, removal) at rates well above the middle school average over the past 2 years, with between 25% and 33% of enrolled students experiencing some form of exclusionary discipline. Furthermore, students who received exclusionary discipline had an average of three or more separate incidents per school year that involved punishment in the form of exclusionary discipline. While elementary schools generally have low rates of exclusionary discipline, AISD elementary schools are specifically discouraged from suspending students in prekindergarten through grade 2. Anecdotal discussions with school staff and administrators from across AISD indicate that disciplinary incidents at elementary schools were not always recorded with fidelity, and that parents were sometimes asked to pick up their child when the child was unable to remain in the classroom.

Table 4.

**At least 25% of students at CRRP middle schools experienced exclusionary discipline over the previous 2 school years.**

Level	School	% of enrolled students disciplined		Average # of incidents per disciplined student	
		2017–2018	2018–2019	2017–2018	2018–2019
Elementary	Barrington	1%	1%	1.3	1.3
	Becker	-	-	-	1.0
	Blanton	1%	-	1.3	-
	Blazier	1%	1%	1.8	1.4
	Cook	1%	1%	2.5	2.0
	Pickle	2%	0%	1.9	-
	<b>ES AVG</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.4</b>
Middle	Burnet	25%	28%	3.1	3.8
	Dobie	36%	27%	3.8	3.2
	Garcia	31%	27%	3.2	3.4
	Mendez	26%	31%	3.9	4.6
	<b>MS AVG</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>3.0</b>

Source. AISD discipline data.

Note. Discipline includes in-school suspensions (partial, full day, and long-term), home suspensions (partial and full day), expulsions, and removals. Dash indicates no recorded incidents.

## STAAR Performance

Students in grades 3 through 8 take the State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness (STAAR) on an annual basis. STAAR passing rates are monitored by AISD and the Texas Education Agency (TEA) and used as an indicator of academic growth and achievement. STAAR performance at CRRP schools has been mixed in recent years. As displayed in Table 5, CRRP elementary schools had substantial variation in passing rates over the past two school years, while CRRP middle schools consistently underperformed the middle school average. It should be noted that nine of 10 CRRP schools had an above average number of students whose primary language was not English, which, along with other structural factors (i.e., high concentration of inexperienced teachers, high concentration of low-income and minority students), may serve as additional barriers to student success.

Table 5.

**STAAR passing rates in math and reading were relatively stable over 2 years, although CRRP middle schools continued to underperform, compared with their AISD peers.**

Level	School	STAAR math passing rate (%)			STAAR reading passing rate (%)		
		2017–2018	2018–2019	Change	2017–2018	2018–2019	Change
Elementary	Barrington	85%	66%	-19%	56%	54%	-2%
	Becker	84%	87%	+3%	82%	91%	+9%
	Blanton	76%	75%	-1%	68%	71%	+3%
	Blazier	90%	91%	+1%	84%	90%	+6%
	Cook	88%	85%	-3%	82%	80%	-2%
	Pickle	70%	71%	+1%	71%	71%	-
	<b>ES AVG</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>-1%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>+1%</b>

Level	School	STAAR math passing rate (%)			STAAR reading passing rate (%)		
		2017–2018	2018–2019	Change	2017–2018	2018–2019	Change
Middle	Burnet	58%	61%	+3%	49%	49%	-
	Dobie	57%	54%	-3%	56%	51%	-5%
	Garcia	67%	65%	-2%	50%	55%	+5%
	Mendez	52%	34%	-18%	48%	42%	-6%
	<b>MS AVG</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>-1%</b>

Source. AISD STAAR records.

Note. Calculation of STAAR passing rates differs from that used for accountability purposes. Dashes indicate no change.

## School Climate

AISD administers student, staff, and family surveys each year to solicit feedback and measure satisfaction with the AISD experience. As displayed in Tables 6 and 7, students' perceptions of school climate at CRRP schools were largely consistent over two years and compared with the AISD average. In previous years, response rates for the staff and student survey were consistently high (i.e., greater than 70% of eligible staff and students participated), while the family survey response rate was consistently low (i.e., fewer than 20% of eligible parents or caregivers completed the survey). Readers will note that perceptions of school climate were limited to those who completed the survey and representative of the respondent's feelings at that specific point in time. As such, please use caution when drawing conclusions based on these data points.

Table 6.

**With the exception of Blanton and Cook, students' perceptions of school climate at CRRP elementary schools were largely consistent over 2 years.**

2018–2019 Student Climate Survey item	Mean agreement (% change from 2017–2018)						
	Barrington	Becker	Blanton	Blazier	Cook	Pickle	ES AVG
Students at my school follow the school rules.	2.9 (+3%)	3.2 (+3%)	2.9 (+5%)	3.1 (+2%)	2.9 (-8%)	3.1 (+3%)	3.1 (+1%)
I feel safe at my school.	3.4 (+1%)	3.6 (+4%)	3.4 (+7%)	3.7 (+2%)	3.3 (-10%)	3.6 (+5%)	3.6 (+1%)
Students at my school treat teachers with respect.	3.2 (+4%)	3.4 (+3%)	3.1 (+9%)	3.3 (+2%)	3.0 (-9%)	3.2 (-3%)	3.3 (+1%)
My classmates behave the way my teachers want them to.	2.7 (-1%)	2.9 (+1%)	2.9 (+13%)	2.9 (+2%)	2.6 (-13%)	2.8 (-4%)	2.9 (-1%)
Adults at my school listen to student ideas and opinions.	3.5 (+2%)	3.6 (-)	3.5 (+4%)	3.6 (+3%)	3.4 (-5%)	3.5 (-2%)	3.5 (+1%)
Adults at my school treat all students fairly.	3.6 (+3%)	3.6 (-2%)	3.5 (+4%)	3.7 (-)	3.4 (-11%)	3.6 (-1%)	3.6 (-)
It is easy for me to talk about my problems with adults at my school.	2.9 (-6%)	3.0 (-3%)	3.0 (+3%)	3.0 (-4%)	2.8 (-8%)	2.8 (-5%)	3.0 (-2%)
I say "no" to friends who want me to break the rules.	3.3 (-2%)	3.7 (+4%)	3.5 (+7%)	3.5 (-1%)	3.3 (+1%)	3.2 (-6%)	3.5 (-)
If I get angry with a classmate, we can talk about it and make it better.	2.9 (-6%)	3.2 (+8%)	3.1 (+7%)	3.0 (-4%)	2.7 (-12%)	3.1 (+1%)	3.1 (-2%)

Source. AISD Student Climate Survey.

Note. Survey response options included (1) never, (2) a little of the time, (3) sometimes, (4) a lot of the time, and don't know. Responses of *don't know* were excluded from the analysis. Dashes indicate no change. Higher scores indicate greater agreement with the survey item.



Table 7.

**Students' perceptions of school climate at CRRP middle schools were largely consistent over 2 years.**

2018–2019 Student Climate Survey item	Mean agreement (% change from 2017–2018)				
	Burnet	Dobie	Garcia	Mendez	MS AVG
Students at my school follow the school rules.	2.7 (-)	2.6 (-2%)	2.9 (+4%)	2.7 (-)	2.7 (-1%)
I feel safe at my school.	3.0 (+3%)	3.1 (+3%)	3.4 (+4%)	3.1 (-3%)	3.2 (-1%)
Students at my school treat teachers with respect.	2.8 (+1%)	2.8 (+3%)	3.0 (+5%)	2.7 (+1%)	2.9 (-1%)
My classmates behave the way my teachers want them to.	2.6 (+2%)	2.6 (+2%)	2.9 (+5%)	2.5 (-1%)	2.6 (-1%)
Adults at my school listen to student ideas and opinions.	3.1 (+3%)	3.2 (+4%)	3.3 (+2%)	3.1 (-)	3.1 (-)
Adults at my school treat all students fairly.	3.3 (+3%)	3.2 (-1%)	3.4 (+1%)	3.2 (+2%)	3.3 (+1%)
It is easy for me to talk about my problems with adults at my school.	2.6 (-3%)	2.7 (-)	2.9 (-4%)	2.6 (-1%)	2.6 (-3%)
I say “no” to friends who want me to break the rules.	3.1 (-4%)	3.1 (-)	3.3 (-)	3.1 (-3%)	3.4 (-1%)
If I get angry with a classmate, we can talk about it and make it better.	2.6 (-1%)	2.6 (+2%)	2.8 (+4%)	2.6 (-3%)	2.8 (-1%)

Source. AISD Student Climate Survey.

Note. Survey response options included (1) never, (2) a little of the time, (3) sometimes, (4) a lot of the time, and don't know. Responses of *don't know* have been excluded from the analysis. Dashes indicate no change. Higher scores indicate greater agreement with the survey item.

As displayed in Tables 8 and 9, staff at CRRP schools reported more varied perceptions of school climate in comparison with the previous year. The majority of CRRP elementary schools reported more positive school climate, with Barrington, Blanton, and Pickle reporting yearly increases of 10% or greater. Staff at CRRP middle schools reported a more challenging environment than they did in the previous year, with Burnet and Mendez experiencing numerous declines in excess of 10%. In addition, staff at Burnet and Mendez reported consistently low perceptions of school climate, compared with the middle school average for 2018–2019.

Table 8.

**Staff's perceptions of school climate at CRRP elementary schools were largely consistent with the elementary school average for 2018–2019, with Barrington and Pickle showing the largest yearly improvements in school climate.**

2018–2019 Staff Climate Survey item	Mean agreement (% change from 2017–2018)						
	Barrington	Becker	Blanton	Blazier	Cook	Pickle	ES AVG
Overall, my school is a good place to work and learn.	3.3 (+16%)	3.7 (+6%)	3.4 (+3%)	3.4 (-4%)	3.5 (+6%)	3.2 (+5%)	3.4 (+1%)
My principal models social and emotional competence in the way he/she deals with students and faculty.	3.3 (+26%)	3.8 (+7%)	3.4 (+7%)	3.6 (-5%)	3.5 (+9%)	3.6 (+7%)	3.3 (+1%)
All campus staff interact with one another in a way that models social and emotional competence.	3.3 (+19%)	3.6 (+3%)	3.3 (+15%)	3.0 (+4%)	3.2 (+6%)	3.1 (+14%)	3.2 (+1%)
This school's discipline practices promote social and emotional learning (e.g., developmentally appropriate consequences, restorative justice)	3.2 (+18%)	3.5 (+5%)	3.4 (+8%)	3.5 (-)	3.2 (-)	3.0 (+2%)	3.3 (+2%)
I find my values and the values of my school are very similar.	3.1 (+8%)	3.3 (+7%)	3.2 (+6%)	3.3 (-1%)	3.1 (+1%)	3.2 (+21%)	3.2 (-)

2018–2019 Staff Climate Survey item	Mean agreement (% change from 2017–2018)						
	Barrington	Becker	Blanton	Blazier	Cook	Pickle	ES AVG
School staff clearly understand policies and procedures about student conduct.	3.3 (+15%)	3.3 (+8%)	3.1 (+9%)	3.4 (+1%)	3.1 (-3%)	3.2 (+9%)	3.3 (+1%)

Source. AISD Teaching, Empowering, Leading, and Learning (TELL) Survey.

Note. Survey response options included (4) strongly agree, (3), agree, (2) disagree, (1) strongly disagree, and don't know. Responses of *don't know* were excluded from the analysis. Dashes indicate no change. Higher scores indicate greater agreement with the survey item.

Table 9.

Staff perceptions of school climate at Dobie and Garcia were largely in line with the middle school average, whereas staff at Burnet and Mendez reported large year-over-year decreases.

2018–2019 Staff Climate Survey item	Mean agreement (% change from 2017–2018)				
	Burnet	Dobie	Garcia	Mendez	MS AVG
Overall, my school is a good place to work and learn.	2.6 (-14%)	3.3 (-2%)	3.1 (-7%)	2.3 (-14%)	3.2 (-1%)
My principal models social and emotional competence in the way he/she deals with students and faculty.	2.6 (-21%)	3.3 (-6%)	3.5 (+1%)	2.4 (-20%)	3.1 (-2%)
All campus staff interact with one another in a way that models social and emotional competence.	2.7 (-8%)	3.1 (-3%)	2.9 (-8%)	2.5 (-10%)	3.0 (-1%)
This school's discipline practices promote social and emotional learning (e.g., developmentally appropriate consequences, restorative justice).	2.6 (-8%)	3.1 (-2%)	3.3 (+1%)	2.3 (-4%)	2.9 (-)
I find my values and the values of my school are very similar.	2.5 (-13%)	3.1 (+5%)	3.3 (-1%)	2.2 (-10%)	3.0 (+1%)
School staff clearly understand policies and procedures about student conduct.	2.8 (-4%)	3.1 (-2%)	3.3 (-1%)	2.4 (+1%)	2.9 (-1%)

Source. AISD Teaching, Empowering, Leading, and Learning (TELL) Survey.

Note. Survey response options included (4) strongly agree, (3), agree, (2) disagree, (1) strongly disagree, and don't know. Responses of *don't know* were excluded from the analysis. Dashes indicate no change. Higher scores indicate greater agreement with the survey item.

Tables 10 and 11 display parents' and caregivers' perceptions of their child's school climate for the 2018–2019 school year. At elementary schools, parents and caregivers at CRRP schools reported slight decreases in their child's school climate relative to the previous year, although perceptions were consistent with the AISD elementary school average. Parents and caregivers at CRRP middle schools reported perceptions of their child's school climate that were largely in line with or above the AISD middle school average. Compared with the previous year, perceptions of school climate decreased slightly at Dobie and increased slightly at Mendez.

Table 10.

Parents' and caregivers' perceptions of their child's elementary school climate decreased slightly from the previous year but remained consistent with the elementary school average.

2018–2019 Parent Survey item	Mean agreement (% change from 2017–2018)						
	Barrington	Becker	Blanton	Blazier	Cook	Pickle	ES AVG
My child attends school in a safe learning environment.	3.6 (-)	3.7 (-1%)	3.5 (-3%)	3.6 (-1%)	3.5 (-1%)	3.5 (-)	3.6 (-1%)
My child likes going to school.	3.5 (-1%)	3.5 (-1%)	3.5 (-4%)	3.5 (-5%)	3.5 (-1%)	3.5 (-1%)	3.6 (-1%)
My child is treated with respect by other students.	3.3 (-1%)	3.4 (-1%)	3.2 (-)	3.3 (-4%)	3.3 (-4%)	3.4 (-)	3.4 (-1%)

Source. AISD Parent Survey.

Note. Survey response options included (4) strongly agree, (3), agree, (2) disagree, (1) strongly disagree, and don't know. Responses of *don't know* were excluded from the analysis. Dashes indicate no change. Higher scores indicate greater agreement with the survey item.



Table 11.

**Parents' and caregivers' perceptions of their child's middle school climate were somewhat mixed over the past two years but remained in line with or above the middle school average.**

2018–2019 Parent Survey item	Mean agreement (% change from 2017–2018)				
	Burnet	Dobie	Garcia	Mendez	MS AVG
My child attends school in a safe learning environment.	3.3 (+1%)	3.4 (-3%)	3.4 (-)	3.4 (+3%)	3.2 (-4%)
My child likes going to school.	3.5 (+1%)	3.3 (-5%)	3.3 (-)	3.5 (+6%)	3.2 (-3%)
My child is treated with respect by other students.	3.2 (-1%)	3.2 (-5%)	3.0 (+4%)	3.4 (+5%)	3.1 (-3%)

Source. AISD Parent Survey.

Note. Survey response options included (4) strongly agree, (3), agree, (2) disagree, (1) strongly disagree, and don't know. Responses of *don't know* were excluded from the analysis. Dashes indicate no change. Higher scores indicate greater agreement with the survey item.

## Conclusion

Year 1 of CRRP implementation was best characterized by the EIR grant coordinator who said that RPAs needed to work “at the speed of trust.” The process of becoming a culturally responsive, restorative educator requires critical examination of how established policies and practices are insufficient to ensure student success. Moreover, such examination will inevitably challenge preexisting beliefs about an educator’s identity when one’s students face numerous systemic barriers to success, both inside and outside the classroom.

CRRP implementation for the 2019–2020 school year will focus on ensuring that all school staff engage in the formal CRRP learning process through professional development opportunities led by RPAs and staff from the AISD Department of Cultural Proficiency and Inclusiveness. Staff from the AISD Department of Research and Evaluation will continue to support formative and summative program evaluation for EIR grant staff.

## References

- Bacher-Hicks, A., Billings, S., Deming, D., & National Bureau of Economic Research. (2019). *The school to prison pipeline: Long-run impacts of school suspensions on adult crime* (Nber working paper series, no. 26257). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Gershenson, S., Hart, C., Hyman, J., Lindsay, C., Papageorge, N., & National Bureau of Economic Research. (2018). *The long-run impacts of same-race teachers* (Nber working paper series, no. 25254). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Goldhaber, D., Lavery, L., & Theobald, R. (2015). Uneven playing field? Assessing the teacher quality gap between advantaged and disadvantaged students. *Educational Researcher*, 44(5), 293–307.
- 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.
- Kini, T., & Podolsky, A. (2016). Does teaching experience increase teacher effectiveness? A review of the research. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute.
- Reardon, S., Weathers, E., Fahle, E., Jang, H., & Kalogrides, D. (2019). Is separate still unequal? New evidence on school segregation and racial academic achievement gaps. (CEPA working paper No.19-06). Retrieved from <https://cepa.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/wp19-06-v092019.pdf>
- Skiba, R., Arredondo, M., & Williams, N. (2014). More than a metaphor: The contribution of exclusionary discipline to a school-to-prison pipeline. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 47(4), 546–564.



Cason Fayles, MA

### Department of Research and Evaluation



4000 S IH 35 Frontage Rd | Austin, TX 78704  
512.414.1724 | fax: 512.414.1707  
[www.austinisd.org/dre](http://www.austinisd.org/dre) | Twitter: @AISD\_DRE

December 2019

Publication 18.49