

# Measuring Restorative Justice in Classrooms, Schools and Districts

Ron and Roxanne Claassen, Authors of Discipline That Restores (DTR)

1.	Moral wrong of violation of persons and relationships ignored or minimized	<b>NotRJ</b> ← 1—2—3—4—5 →	<b>RJ</b>	Moral wrong of violation of persons and relationships recognized
2.	Victim, offender, and school community safety concerns ignored	<b>NotRJ</b> ← 1—2—3—4—5 →	<b>RJ</b>	Victim, offender, and school community safety concerns primary
3.	Disempower victims, offenders, and school community to act constructively as alternative to school authority coercion/punishment.	<b>NotRJ</b> ← 1—2—3—4—5 →	<b>RJ</b>	Empower victims, offenders, and school community to act constructively and cooperatively as an alternative to school authority coercion/punishment
4.	“Making things as right as possible” secondary concern	<b>NotRJ</b> ← 1—2—3—4—5 →	<b>RJ</b>	Primary focus on “making things as right as possible (repair injuries, relationships, and physical damage)
5.	Violation of rule or law is the primary focus and also determines the coercive/punishment response	<b>NotRJ</b> ← 1—2—3—4—5 →	<b>RJ</b>	Violation of rule or law points to the real problem and helps decide who needs to be invited into a cooperative process to address the real problem
6.	Victim wounds and healing ignored	<b>NotRJ</b> ← 1—2—3—4—5 →	<b>RJ</b>	Victim wounds and healing important
7.	Offender wounds and healing ignored	<b>NotRJ</b> ← 1—2—3—4—5 →	<b>RJ</b>	Offender wounds and healing important
8.	Primary decisions and activity between offender and school authority	<b>NotRJ</b> ← 1—2—3—4—5 →	<b>RJ</b>	Primary decisions and activity between offender and victim and their communities, with school authority help as needed
9.	Responses of school authority with coercion/punishment not tested by whether they are reasonable, restorative, and respectful for all parties (students, teachers, parents, administration, etc.)	<b>NotRJ</b> ← 1—2—3—4—5 →	<b>RJ</b>	All responses (cooperative and coercive - #1, #2, #3, #4) tested by whether they are reasonable, restorative, and respectful for all parties (students, teachers, parents, administration, etc.)
10.	School authorities and/or authority structures utilize coercion/punishment as primary response; victims, offenders, and community left out of process	<b>NotRJ</b> ← 1—2—3—4—5 →	<b>RJ</b>	School authorities and/or authority structures utilize coercion (respectful, reasonable, restorative) as backup when offender not cooperative or if community process is viewed as unfair by victim or offender

11.	Coercion/punishment assumed as primary mode of relating to offenders; orders are given; invitations to offender to be cooperative are not offered; no attempt at agreements	<b>NotRJ</b> ← 1—2—3—4—5 →	<b>RJ</b> Invitations to offender to be cooperative (#3 or #4) are primary; agreements preferred; coercion used as backup when offender is not cooperative
12.	Coercion/Punishment focus on restrictions and following orders	<b>NotRJ</b> ← 1—2—3—4—5 →	<b>RJ</b> Coercion (reasonable, respectful, restorative) when needed for safety focus on training and equipping for living cooperatively in school community
13.	Offender and Parents not involved in discipline process prior to coercion/punishment decision	<b>NotRJ</b> ← 1—2—3—4—5 →	<b>RJ</b> Offender and Parents encouraged and invited into cooperative aspects of a discipline process prior to and as co-creators of decisions
14.	Family and other support persons (including extended family) not involved in a discipline process before an expulsion hearing	<b>NotRJ</b> ← 1—2—3—4—5 →	<b>RJ</b> Family and other support persons (including extended family) involved in a discipline process prior to any expulsion hearing