2013

CASEL GUIDE

Effective Social and Emotional Learning Programs

Preschool and Elementary School Edition

CASEL

CASEL

(Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning)

CASEL is dedicated to advancing the science and practice of school-based social and emotional learning (SEL). CASEL's mission is to make social and emotional learning an integral part of education from preschool through high school.

Contents

Acknowledgments

CASEL takes pride in collaborating with colleagues to advance academic, social, and emotional learning. The *2013 CASEL Guide: Effective Social and Emotional Learning Programs—Preschool and Elementary School Edition* is a prime example of such collaboration.

Roger P. Weissberg, CASEL President and CEO
Paul Goren, CASEL Vice President for Research and Knowledge Use
Celene Domitrovich, CASEL Director of Research
Linda Dusenbury, Project Director

Executive Summary

Social and emotional learning (SEL) involves the processes through which children and adults acquire and effectively apply the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary to understand and manage emotions, set and achieve positive goals, feel and show empathy for others, establish and maintain positive relationships, and make responsible decisions. Effective SEL programming begins in preschool and continues through high school. The Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL) strives to advance SEL science, evidence-based practice, and policy. In an ideal world, CASEL would see every school in the nation providing evidence-based SEL programming to all students in preschool through high school.

The *2013 CASEL Guide: Effective Social and Emotional Learning Programs—Preschool and Elementary School Edition* provides a systematic framework for evaluating the quality of classroom-based SEL programs. It uses this framework to rate and identify well-designed, evidence-based SEL programs with potential for broad dissemination to schools across the United States. The primary goal of the *Guide* is to give educators information for selecting and implementing SEL programs in their districts and schools. It also documents the significant advances the SEL field has made in the past decade, establishes new and more rigorous standards for SEL program adoption, and provides suggestions for next steps for SEL research and practice.

Although many worthwhile programs are currently available, to be included in the *2013 CASEL Guide* and designated as CASEL SELect, programs had to:

- Be **well-designed** classroom-based programs that systematically promote students' social and emotional competence, provide opportunities for practice, and offer multi-year programming.

- Deliver high-quality **training and other implementation supports,** including initial training and ongoing support to ensure sound implementation.

- Be **evidence-based** with at least one carefully conducted evaluation that documents positive impacts on student behavior and/or academic performance.

CASEL began the tradition of identifying SELect programs in 2003, when it released *Safe and Sound: An Educational Leader's Guide to Evidence-Based Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) Programs* (CASEL, 2003). This ground-breaking document offered an overview of the SEL field and reviewed widely available SEL programs for kindergarten through twelfth grade. The current *Guide* builds on the tradition of *Safe and Sound* but goes much further in capturing the significant advances of the field of SEL. We now know that SEL programs are one of the most successful interventions to promote the positive development of students. Research findings from 213 controlled studies indicate that SEL programming improves students' academic achievement and positive social behavior while reducing their conduct problems and emotional distress (Durlak, Weissberg, Dymnicki, Taylor, & Schellinger, 2011). We also have a better understanding of factors that can make SEL programs more effective, which program approaches are most successful, and what it takes to achieve effective program implementation.

The *2013 CASEL Guide* provides information on 23 SELect programs. Four programs target preschool-age children, 16 are designed to be used with children in elementary school (K-5), and three serve both preschool and elementary. These programs vary in the approach they take to promoting students' social and emotional skills, but all have documented impact on students' behavior and/or academic performance. Traditionally, most SEL programs have used explicit lessons to teach students social and emotional skills. This was the most common approach of the SELect programs included in the *2013 Guide.* This *Guide* also identified several evidence-based SEL programs that provide teachers with academic content while simultaneously promoting SEL. Other programs emphasize using teacher instructional and classroom management practices to create classroom environments that foster social, emotional, and academic competence.

The *CASEL Guide* summarizes objective information about the characteristics of these nationally available, multi-year programs in a clear, easy-to-read "consumer report" format. CASEL considers the characteristics that are reviewed

especially important for high-quality programming. They include the grade range that each program targets, whether the program offers students the opportunity to practice skills that are taught, and the settings (classroom, school, family, community) in which the program promotes and reinforces the target skills. Information about professional development and implementation support is also provided, along with details about the findings of the programs' evaluation studies. If your district or school is just beginning to explore SEL, the *Guide* will help in your planning and selection of strong, evidence-based programs that serve your students' needs. If you are seeking to deepen SEL practice you have already begun, the *Guide* will help you reflect on and augment your efforts.

The *Guide* is divided into six chapters. Chapter 1 presents an overview of the field of social and emotional learning and recent developments in SEL-related research, practice, and policy. Chapter 2 introduces the underpinnings of a major new systemic district and school-wide SEL initiative CASEL has launched to take SEL to scale. Chapter 3 describes the methodology we used to review and select the 23 programs included in this *Guide.* The heart of Chapter 4 is a set of four tables that provide a consumer-guide approach to summarizing the 23 programs. For each program level (preschool and elementary school) we offer a set of two tables. One summarizes the program characteristics; the other presents an overview of the program's evaluation findings. The chapter provides explanations of each of the tables' individual components so that readers understand how to use the ratings. Finally, the chapter links to individual program descriptions in Appendix A that provide useful information for narrowing down the selection process to a few top choices. Chapter 5 presents a process to help users of this *Guide* understand the context for selecting evidence-based SEL programs, making optimal use of the *Guide* in choosing programs to investigate implementation in their districts and individual schools. Chapter 6 summarizes the key issues to consider in the process of selecting and implementing evidence-based SEL programs and suggests future directions for SEL research, practice, and policy.

CASEL believes that using high-quality evidence-based programs is critically important in fostering students' social and emotional development. While all of the CASEL SELect programs met our criteria, the outcomes of each program varied. Most demonstrated impacts on students' behavior, with outcomes such as positive social behavior and the reduction of conduct problems. Only some showed effects on emotional distress and academic performance. Given the current emphasis on accountability for academic performance and the priorities of federal funding agencies, researchers are more likely to include assessments of academic outcomes in the future when evaluating SEL programs. CASEL looks forward to including more SEL programs that document these outcomes in future versions of the *Guide.*

CASEL endorses the use of evidence-based SEL programs in the context of systemic district-wide and school-wide approaches (Devaney, O'Brien, Resnik, Keister, and Weissberg, 2006; CASEL, 2013). This starts with choosing the right program and includes integrating SEL programs with all of the school's activities and identifying strategies for monitoring how programs are used to ensure high quality. From our experience, the quality of program implementation is also a function of how prepared schools are when they adopt an SEL program, the extent to which all staff members are involved in that decision, and whether or not there is real commitment to training and implementation support. When districts and schools support high-quality program implementation, the impact of SEL programs is significantly strengthened (Durlak et al., 2011).

This *Guide* is only the first document presenting the findings of CASEL's extensive review of evidence-based programs for preschool through twelfth grade. A second *Guide* with SEL programs for middle and high schools will be published in 2013.

Both guides will be available primarily on CASEL's website (casel.org), with all chapters downloadable as PDF files. Electronic publication enables CASEL to provide updates at least annually, and thus to include additional programs as they become eligible.

Chapter 1: About This Guide

The *2013 CASEL Guide: Effective Social and Emotional Learning Programs—Preschool and Elementary School Edition* has four goals:

- To provide a systematic framework for evaluating the quality of classroom-based social and emotional learning (SEL) programs;

- To apply this framework to rate and identify well-designed, evidence-based SEL programs with potential for broad dissemination to schools across the United States;

- To share best-practice guidelines for district and school teams on how to select and implement SEL programs; and

- To offer recommendations for future priorities to advance SEL research, practice, and policy.

Social and emotional learning involves the processes through which children and adults acquire and effectively apply the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary to understand and manage emotions, set and achieve positive goals, feel and show empathy for others, establish and maintain positive relationships, and make responsible decisions. These intrapersonal and interpersonal competencies can be taught and measured, and research shows that students with these skills do better in school and in life (National Research Council, 2009, 2012; Durlak, Weissberg, Dymnicki, Taylor, & Schellinger, 2011; Goleman, 2005; Greenberg et al., 2003).

The Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL) strives to advance SEL science, evidence-based practice, and policy. Our current major focus involves a national **Collaborating Districts Initiative** to establish preschool through high school SEL programming in schools throughout the United States. We strongly recommend that schools use evidence-based classroom SEL programs as a core component of their efforts to promote students' social, emotional, and academic learning. When implemented well, these programs have a documented record of significantly improving school climate as well as students' behavior and academic performance. Many SEL programs are available to schools, but not all of them have been carefully evaluated to determine their quality and impact. This *Guide* highlights effective programs—we call them "CASEL SELect"—and provides information for educators on how to select and implement them.

CASEL views this *Guide* as a valuable resource for educational leaders and teams aspiring to implement research-based approaches to promote students' social-emotional development and academic performance. The *Guide* will also be helpful to program developers who seek to improve their SEL programs, researchers who evaluate SEL programs, and policymakers who want to encourage the use of best educational practices.

CASEL published its first review of SEL programs almost ten years ago. Many advances in SEL research, practice, and policy have occurred since the publication of *Safe and Sound: An Educational Leader's Guide to Evidence-Based Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) Programs* (CASEL, 2003). For example:

- A growing body of research links SEL to improved attitudes about school, prosocial behavior, and academic achievement, and reductions in aggression, mental health problems, and substance use (Durlak et al., 2011; Greenberg et al., 2003; Zins, Weissberg, Wang, & Walberg, 2004).

- There is increased interest in going beyond classroom-based implementation of one SEL program to coordinated, systemic school-wide and district-wide SEL programming (Devaney, O'Brien, Resnik, Keister, & Weissberg, 2006; CASEL, 2013).

- A scan of 50 states indicates that many states have established preschool through high school student learning standards that emphasize social and emotional competence (Dusenbury, Zadrazil, Mart, & Weissberg, 2011). Also, federal legislation—most notably, the Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning Act (HR 2437, 2011) has been introduced with bipartisan support.

Given the evolution of the field and growing national interest in SEL, this is an opportune time to update a review of evidence-based programs. As was the case with *Safe and Sound,* we recommend programs as "CASEL SELect" if they:

- Are **well-designed** classroom-based programs that systematically promote students' social and emotional competence, provide opportunities for practice, and offer multi-year programming.

- Deliver high-quality **training and other implementation supports,** including initial training and ongoing support to ensure sound implementation.

- Are **evidence-based** with at least one carefully conducted evaluation that documents positive impacts on student behavior and/or academic performance.

Because of the advances in SEL research and practice over the past few years, the current *CASEL Guide* differs in several ways from *Safe and Sound.* Most notably, the current *Guide* is more selective and the criteria for inclusion are more rigorous than they were in the previous review.

- Our criteria for characterizing programs as "evidence-based" are more stringent. We recommend programs that document improved student behavior only if their research included a comparison group in addition to pretest and posttest measurement of behavior.

- We have broadened the types of programs included in the current review to include lesson-based programs that provide explicit SEL skill instruction, teacher instructional practices and pedagogy, and programs that fully integrate SEL with academic content in specific core content areas.

- In the previous review we included programs for grades K-12. The current *Guide* expands our coverage to include preschool approaches. There is increasing recognition of the importance of preschool education to support child development and school readiness (Denham & Weissberg, 2004; Magnuson & Shager, 2010). In fact, all 50 states have preschool social and emotional development student learning standards (Dusenbury et al., 2011). Early childhood education is now a clear priority in federal goals and legislation (e.g., Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge, 2012) as well as state education policies (Dusenbury et al., 2011), and preschool education has expanded in the past decade.

- This *Guide* and any future ones will be more developmentally focused. Thus, we are separating the reviews of preschool, elementary, middle, and high school programming. The current *Guide* focuses on preschool and elementary (K-5) programs. The review of middle and high school programming will be released in 2013.

- This *Guide* will be revised and updated continually. Moreover, key elements of the *Guide* and future versions will be formatted specifically for presentation on CASEL's website. Our intention is to make the CASEL reviews as accessible, up-to-date, and user-friendly as possible.

In summary, this *Guide* provides educators with objective information about nationally available multi-year programs for general education classrooms. It summarizes findings in a clear, easy-to-read "consumer report" format, along with brief narrative descriptions of each program. If your district or school is just beginning work in this area, the *Guide* will help in your planning and selection of strong, evidence-based programs that serve your students' needs. If you are seeking to deepen practice you have already begun, the *Guide* will help you reflect on and augment your efforts.

Five chapters follow this introduction. Chapter 2 provides an overview of SEL. It also briefly describes the CASEL theories of action for district, school, and classroom programming that promote students' social and emotional learning. Chapter 3 summarizes the methods and rating system for the current review and highlights how they build from CASEL's previous review (CASEL, 2003). Chapter 4 presents tables with our program review findings—first for preschool and then for elementary school. Chapter 5 offers guidelines to educators for selecting and implementing evidence-based SEL programs. This includes suggestions for how district and school teams can use information

from the *Guide* and identify the best programs for their context. Chapter 6 describes major overall findings from the *Guide* and shares recommendations for improving future SEL research, practice, and policy. Appendix A provides more detailed descriptions of each SELect program and a summary of its ratings. Other appendices include citations for the evaluation reports our staff reviewed to assess the research base for the SELect programs and the references cited throughout this document.

Chapter 2: Overview of Social and Emotional Learning

An Introduction to Social and Emotional Learning

Social and emotional learning involves the processes of developing social and emotional competencies in children. SEL programming is based on the understanding that the best learning emerges in the context of supportive relationships that make learning challenging, engaging, and meaningful; social and emotional skills are critical to being a good student, citizen, and worker; and many different risky behaviors (e.g., drug use, violence, bullying, and dropout) can be prevented or reduced when multi-year, integrated efforts develop students' social and emotional skills. This is best done through effective classroom instruction, student engagement in positive activities in and out of the classroom, and broad parent and community involvement in program planning, implementation, and evaluation (Bond & Hauf, 2004; Hawkins, Smith, & Catalano, 2004; Nation et al., 2003; Weare & Nind, 2011). Effective SEL programming begins in preschool and continues through high school. CASEL has identified five interrelated sets of cognitive, affective, and behavioral competencies (see Figure 1). The definitions of the five competency clusters for students are:

- **Self-awareness:** The ability to accurately recognize one's emotions and thoughts and their influence on behavior. This includes accurately assessing one's strengths and limitations and possessing a well-grounded sense of confidence and optimism.

- **Self-management:** The ability to regulate one's emotions, thoughts, and behaviors effectively in different situations. This includes managing stress, controlling impulses, motivating oneself, and setting and working toward achieving personal and academic goals.

- **Social awareness:** The ability to take the perspective of and empathize with others from diverse backgrounds and cultures, to understand social and ethical norms for behavior, and to recognize family, school, and community resources and supports.

- **Relationship skills:** The ability to establish and maintain healthy and rewarding relationships with diverse individuals and groups. This includes communicating clearly, listening actively, cooperating, resisting inappropriate social pressure, negotiating conflict constructively, and seeking and offering help when needed.

- **Responsible decision making:** The ability to make constructive and respectful choices about personal behavior and social interactions based on consideration of ethical standards, safety concerns, social norms, the realistic evaluation of consequences of various actions, and the well-being of self and others.

Figure 1. The Five Social and Emotional Learning Core Competencies

As shown in Figure 2, the short-term goals of SEL programs are to: (1) promote students' self-awareness, self-management, social-awareness, relationship, and responsible decision-making skills; and (2) improve student attitudes and beliefs about self, others, and school. These, in turn, provide a foundation for better adjustment and academic performance as reflected in more positive social behaviors and peer relationships, fewer conduct problems, less emotional distress, and improved grades and test scores (Durlak et al., 2011; Greenberg et al., 2003).

There is a growing awareness in the U.S. among educators and policymakers about the importance of social and emotional development for successful student performance in preschool and elementary school (Camilli, Vargas, Ryan, & Barnett, 2010; Denham & Weissberg, 2004; National Association for the Education of Young Children, 2009; NAESP Foundation Task Force on Early Learning, 2011; National Research Council, 2012; National School Readiness Indicators Initiative, 2005). The five sets of SEL competencies are important from very early in life but are especially relevant as children begin to spend time with adults outside the home and to socialize with peers. Social and emotional skills play a role in determining how well-equipped children will be to meet the demands of the classroom. They also help determine whether students are able to engage fully in learning and benefit from instruction (Campbell & von Stauffenberg, 2008; Denham, Brown, & Domitrovich, 2010).

Figure 2. Outcomes Associated with the Five Competencies

SEL Approaches
- Explicit SEL Skills Instruction
- Integration with Academic Curriculum Areas
- Teacher Instructional Practices

SEL Skill Acquisition: Five Competence Areas

Improved Attitudes about Self, Others, and Schools

Positive Social Behavior

Fewer Conduct Problems

Less Emotional Distress

Academic Success

The promotion of students' social and emotional learning. Educators, parents, and policymakers who recognize that the core SEL competencies are necessary for effective life functioning also know these skills can be taught. Extensive research demonstrates that school-based SEL programs can promote and enhance students' connection to school, positive behavior, and academic achievement (Durlak et al., 2011). Classroom teachers can help students develop social and emotional competencies by directly teaching these skills, by using engaging curriculum materials, and by implementing specific instructional and classroom-management practices (Cohen, 2006; Durlak et al., 2011; January, Casey, & Paulson, 2011; Kress & Elias, 2006; Weare & Nind, 2011; Zins et al., 2004).

Some SEL programs teach social and emotional skills directly. Occasionally programs address topics such as substance abuse prevention, violence prevention, health promotion, and character education. Other SEL approaches have specific curricular and instructional components that foster safe, caring, engaging, and participatory learning environments that build student attachment to school, motivation to learn, and academic achievement (Zins et al., 2004).

Recent research has established that the quality of teacher-student interactions and the instructional practices that take place within the classroom are two important predictors of student academic performance and social adjustment (Hamre & Pianta, 2007; Mashburn & Pianta, 2006). Teacher-focused SEL programs train teachers to be more emotionally supportive of their students or to use positive discipline practices to respond to students' needs. These strategies also enhance student skill development (Allen, Pianta, Gregory, Mikami, & Lun, 2011).

As students learn social and emotional skills, it is important that they have opportunities to practice and apply the skills in actual situations and be recognized for using these skills across a variety of settings (Bond & Hauf, 2004; Hawkins et al., 2004; Nation et al., 2003; Weare & Nind, 2011). Given the importance of practice for skill mastery and the influence of adults and peers outside of the school, it is also important to coordinate classroom instruction in social and emotional development with school, family, and community activities (Albright & Weissberg, 2009; Nation et al., 2003; Weare & Nind, 2011). Genuine school-family partnerships involve the promotion of two-way communication between teachers and families and the participation of family members in students' education both at home and in school. This ensures consistency in the messages students receive and the practices they experience across multiple settings.

The success of evidence-based SEL programs and school-wide programming depends on high-quality implementation. Just selecting a strong program is not enough. Implementation and support for the program are critically important. When districts and schools support high-quality program implementation, program impact is strengthened (Durlak et al., 2011). This is why CASEL advocates the use of evidence-based SEL programs within the context of "school-wide" and "district-wide" approaches (Devaney et al., 2006; CASEL, 2013). Poor program implementation can undermine a program's success and the extent to which it has an impact on student outcomes (Greenberg, Domitrovich, Graczyk, & Zins, 2005; Durlak & Dupree, 2008; Durlak et al., 2011; Elias, 2006). School-wide factors such as discipline policies, structures, and procedures influence children's development directly (Bear, 2010) and influence the implementation process of evidence-based programs.

Given these factors, it is important for school administrators to support the effective implementation of SEL programs and to model the SEL language and practices established in the classroom. Administrators also need to endorse the use of SEL practices throughout the school building, and provide the necessary professional development (Elias, O'Brien, & Weissberg, 2006; Kam, Greenberg, & Walls, 2003). Regardless of the approach, many SEL programs incorporate school-wide practices that are designed to promote more positive and supportive relationships among teachers, students, and families and/or practices that facilitate integration and support to extend the impact of social and emotional learning programs beyond the classroom.

Social and emotional learning can serve as an organizing principle for coordinating all of a school's academic, youth development, and prevention activities (Shriver & Weissberg, 1996). It provides a common language and coordinating framework for communicating not just about SEL but about a wide range of programs and teaching approaches that schools normally provide (Elias et al., 1997; Devaney et al., 2006). When systemic social, emotional, and academic learning becomes the overarching framework for a district or school, the result is an organization whose integrated programming activities are greater than the sum of its parts.

The next two sections briefly present CASEL's theories of action for how central office and school teams can guide the design, implementation, monitoring, and continuous improvement of systemic district-wide or school-wide SEL programming (CASEL, 2013).

CASEL's District Theory of Action for Systemic SEL

As schools face the challenge of preparing students to participate in a complex, global community and workforce, the pressures for educational improvement continue to mount, and the need for systemic education reform becomes an increasing priority. As a result, many school districts are taking a more active role in improving educational outcomes for all students and making important decisions about what gets funded, implemented, and supported. Based on strong scientific evidence about the impact of social and emotional factors on students' academic learning and school success, CASEL believes that developing the capacity to support high-quality, evidence-based SEL must be an essential part of districts' improvement efforts.

CASEL has created a theory of action that guides the efforts of district leaders to plan and implement systemic SEL. The district theory of action includes the following activities:

- **Engage stakeholders in SEL planning and implementation.** Communicate with and engage stakeholders in ongoing SEL planning, implementation, evaluation, and continuous improvement. This involves clarifying how SEL relates to other key initiatives with the goal of creating integration, coherence, and efficiency.

- **Assess SEL-related resources and needs.** Assess the districts' SEL-related programs, practices, and policies and the needs of students, families, and practitioners. The systematic assessment of resources and needs allows a district to build on existing strengths, create links among previously isolated programs and practices, and plan for meeting identified needs.

- **Develop SEL vision and long-term plan.** Create a clear vision, a long-term plan, and resources that prioritize the social, emotional, and academic success of all students. This conveys a commitment to the goals of SEL and provides a roadmap to orient all stakeholders in pursuing those goals.

- **Develop SEL learning standards and assessments.** Establish high-quality SEL learning standards to specify what students should know and be able to do in the social and emotional domain at each grade level. SEL standards establish a basis for assessing students' mastery of essential competencies, documenting their development over time, and planning for delivery of differentiated supports.

- **Adopt evidence-based SEL programs.** Maintain a focus on supporting teaching and learning practices that promote SEL. Selecting evidence-based SEL programs and implementing them effectively is crucial for improving instructional support for SEL. Evidence-based SEL programs provide practitioners with clear research-based guidance on practices that support SEL skill development. They also establish a common language for discussion of SEL competencies and provide resources for building a school and classroom climate that fosters SEL.

- **Design and implement effective professional development systems and supports.** In addition to guidance provided by learning standards and programs, practitioners need support to enact changes in instruction that enhance students' social and emotional development. This requires districts to build systems to provide ongoing, job-embedded professional development for district and school administrators, teachers, and other school personnel that integrates SEL with academic learning.

- **Adults model social-emotional competence.** District leaders are responsible for establishing shared values, norms, and expectations consistent with SEL. Part of this process involves developing expertise in SEL as well as modeling social and emotional competence with other adults and students. These capacities will allow district leaders to embody the changes they hope to inspire throughout the district.

- **Monitor SEL implementation processes and student outcomes.** As districts implement SEL, it is essential that they develop systems for monitoring processes and outcomes over time. At the district level, formal data on school climate, student social and emotional competence, and teachers' implementation of evidence-based programs can be combined with informal reports from coaches, school leaders, and other key informants to provide a comprehensive picture of SEL in the district, guide school improvement plans, and improve district support for SEL.

The *2013 Guide* was designed to support this process. It can help district planning teams as they plan to integrate and implement SEL programs in their settings by providing information on selecting and implementing evidence-based SEL programs, professional development for staff who carry out the programming, and tools for monitoring the implementation of programs and their impact on students' behavior.

CASEL's School Theory of Action for Systemic SEL

In addition to the district theory of action, CASEL has created a parallel theory of action to guide school personnel responsible for SEL programming and implementation. CASEL's school theory of action highlights the following school activities:

- **Establish a shared SEL vision with all stakeholders.** Using the district's SEL vision as a guide, the school convenes stakeholders to establish a clear SEL vision that aligns with the district's vision and includes social, emotional, and academic success for all students.

- **Conduct an SEL-related resource and needs inventory.** The school thoroughly examines ongoing activities and assesses the needs of students, families, and staff. This allows the school to build on existing program strengths, to eliminate ineffective programs, to link programs when appropriate, and to plan to meet identified needs.

- **Develop an implementation plan.** The school develops a multi-year implementation plan for SEL that outlines how the vision will be attained, including monitoring progress over time.

- **Provide ongoing professional development.** With training and coaching, schools build internal capacity to provide SEL-related professional development to staff.

- **Adopt evidence-based SEL programs.** Schools select and implement one or more evidence-based SEL programs that provide staff with research-based guidance on classroom, school, and family practices that support SEL skill development and help establish coordinated programming and a common language related to SEL.

- **Integrate school-wide policies and activities to foster the social, emotional, and academic learning of all students.** The school integrates evidence-based SEL programs and practices with student-centered instruction, curriculum, and assessments that are standards-based. Also, with support from central office staff, school leaders clarify how SEL relates to other key initiatives in the district or school, such as the Common Core State Standards, with the goal of creating seamless integration, coherence, and efficiency.

- **Use data to improve practice.** School leaders and staff use data on school climate, student social and emotional competence, and implementation of evidence-based programs to start a cycle of inquiry to enhance practice, guide school-improvement plans, and inform the district of needed supports for SEL.

The Desired Outcomes of District and School Implementation of Systemic SEL

District and school systemic SEL programming aligned with evidence-based SEL classroom programs aspires to enhance the learning experiences and outcomes for all students. It enables educators and family members to partner in creating positive relationships and a climate where each student feels connected, cared about, and physically and emotionally safe. It also establishes high expectations that support the belief that all children can learn with appropriate supports. Educators use teaching and learning strategies that are student-centered, culturally and linguistically relevant, and varied with tasks matched to the needs, interests, and developmental characteristics of students. Teachers provide explicit SEL instruction on core competencies aligned with SEL standards as well as opportunities to apply SEL skills in the context of academic instruction and daily interactions.

Ongoing SEL-related school and classroom activities foster active student voice in decision making, problem solving, and engagement for lifelong learning. Positive student outcomes will include improved social-emotional skills across the five competencies, enhanced self-esteem and connection to school, better classroom behavior, reduced conduct problems and aggression, less emotional distress, and improved academic performance.

Next Steps in Identifying and Selecting Evidence-based SEL Programs

A core element of systemic district-wide and school-wide SEL programming involves the selection and implementation of evidence-based programs. In chapter 3 we describe our framework for identifying high-quality SEL programs and the methods we used in our review. In chapter 4 we rate nationally available evidence-based SEL programs according to their research base, program design, and supports for implementation. Chapter 5 outlines some of the processes district and school teams can use to select SEL programs for their individual contexts.

Chapter 3: Review Methods

History of Program Reviews at CASEL

CASEL shared its first program review in 2003 with the publication of *Safe and Sound: An Educational Leader's Guide to Evidence-Based Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) Programs* (CASEL, 2003). In addition to demonstrating how SEL programs contribute to the main mission of our nation's schools, this publication summarized the current status of outcome research on SEL programs. It provided educators with practical information on the features of different programs that could help them select a program most relevant and suited for their particular needs. The guide presented information on 80 different programs and was, at the time, the most comprehensive research and practical survey of SEL programs available.

The response to *Safe and Sound* was enthusiastic. The guide has been downloaded from the CASEL website more than 100,000 times since its release. It stimulated the adoption of evidence-based SEL programs in schools across the country.

During the decade since the dissemination of *Safe and Sound,* several major advances have occurred in SEL research, practice, and policy that warranted updating the review. Many more research studies, including program evaluations, have become more rigorous, which increases the confidence one can place in their findings. New approaches to fostering academic, social, and emotional learning have been developed, some of which emphasize traditional explicit instruction, while others focus on pedagogy or deeper integration of SEL within academic curricula. There is also better information about the outcomes one might expect from programs offered at different grade levels. This *Guide* incorporates these new developments.

Because of the major accomplishments of SEL research over the past few years, the *2013 CASEL Guide* is different from the 2003 guide in several ways. To begin, the current *Guide* is more selective and the criteria for inclusion are more rigorous than they were in *Safe and Sound.* Other important distinctions include:

- In *Safe and Sound* we identified 80 social and emotional learning programs that met our design criteria. These programs were included whether or not they had been evaluated. Of these 80 programs, we identified 22 "SELect" SEL programs that met a higher standard for evidence of effectiveness. In this review, our criteria for inclusion as "evidence-based" are more stringent. In the 2003 review SELect programs were not required to include a comparison group. However, the evidence base for SEL programs has grown dramatically and become increasingly rigorous in the last decade (e.g., Durlak et al., 2011). In this *Guide,* the evaluations of CASEL SELect programs had to include a control group in addition to pretest and posttest measurement of behavior.

- We have broadened the types of programs included in the current *Guide.* The primary focus of *Safe and Sound* was lesson-based programs that provided explicit skill instruction in SEL. In this *Guide,* CASEL SELect programs include those that address teacher instructional practices and pedagogy and programs that fully integrate social and emotional learning with academic content in specific core content areas.

- We expanded our coverage to include preschool approaches because, as noted in the introduction, the importance of preschool education to support child development and school readiness is increasingly recognized. There is also now a stronger evidence base for SEL programming at the preschool level (Denham & Burton, 2003; Camilli et al., 2011).

- In the previous review we included programs for kindergarten through twelfth grade without distinguishing among programs for students from different age groups. Our new reviews are more developmentally focused, which is why we are separating the reviews of programs for preschool, elementary, middle, and high school. This *Guide* focuses on preschool and elementary (K-5) programs. The review of secondary school programming will be released in 2013.

Inclusion Criteria for SELect Programs

For this *Guide* we adopted rigorous criteria derived from a research-based framework. We refer to evidence-based SEL programs that meet these criteria as "SELect." Specifically, SELect programs are **well-designed** classroom-based programs that target all five areas of social and emotional competence, provide opportunities for practice, and offer multi-year programming; offer **training and other implementation support,** including initial training and ongoing support to ensure high-quality implementation; and are **evidence-based** with at least one carefully conducted evaluation that included a comparison group and pre and post measures that documented a positive impact on academic performance or other important student behaviors, including increased prosocial behavior, reduced conduct problems, and/or reduced emotional distress.

Well-designed and classroom-based. The first criterion for inclusion as a CASEL SELect program is that it must be well-designed and classroom-based. For the purpose of this *Guide,* a well-designed program is defined as addressing **all five of the CASEL competencies,** providing opportunities for practice, and being structured in a way that allows for skill development to occur over multiple years. As described in the introduction, child development research and theory suggest that the five social and emotional competencies are the building blocks of academic achievement and social adjustment (Elias, 2006; Durlak et al., 2011; Greenberg et al., 2003; Nation et al., 2003; Payton, Graczyk, Wardlaw, Bloodworth, Tompsett, & Weissberg, 2000; Zins et al., 2004).

Research has also shown that effective programs provide **repeated opportunities to practice** new skills and behaviors within the program structure and beyond to real-life situations (Durlak et al., 2011; Durlak, Weissberg, & Pachan, 2010; Hawkins et al., 2004). Durlak and colleagues (2010; 2011) provide compelling evidence that SEL programs promote better student outcomes when program implementers follow "SAFE" procedures: they use a **Sequenced** step-by-step training approach; they emphasize **Active** forms of learning that require students to practice new skills; they **Focus** specific time and attention on skill development; and they are **Explicit** in defining the social and emotional skills they are attempting to promote. Providing opportunities to practice within classroom lessons is important, but actual opportunities to practice in real-life situations are likely to have even more impact (Cohen, 2006; Nation et al., 2003; Weare & Nind, 2011). All of the programs in this *Guide* offer opportunities to practice. We also rated the extent to which opportunities for practice are available in real-life situations.

Finally, research has demonstrated that the most effective programming is **multi-year** and ideally preschool through grade 12 (Greenberg et al., 2003; Nation et al., 2003). CASEL SELect preschool programs are designed to be implemented in one or two years. Because elementary education is multi-year (K-5), CASEL SELect programs at the elementary level provide classroom instruction across multiple grades. In fact, many elementary school SELect programs cover all grade levels from kindergarten through fifth grade.

Training and other implementation support. Research has demonstrated that the effectiveness of well-designed programs depends on high-quality implementation (Aber, Brown, & Jones, 2003; Abbot, O'Donnell, Hawkins, Hill, Kosterman, & Catalano, 1998; Battistich, Schaps, Watson, & Solomon, 1996; Durlak et al., 2011; Greenberg, Domitrovich, Graczyk, & Zins, 2005). Training is an important strategy for enhancing quality of implementation (Botvin, Baker, Dusenbury, et al., 1990; Ringwalt et al., 2002; Ross, Luepker, Nelson, Saavedra, & Hubbard, 1991; Tappe et al., 1995). Teachers who receive an initial training to support a particular program are more likely to teach all of the lessons in that particular program. They will use the methods prescribed by the program more effectively than teachers who do not receive training.

Although initial training is important, research has also demonstrated that ongoing training and support beyond an initial training (Rohrbach, Gunning, Sun, & Sussman, 2010), along with coaching and/or follow-up training, enhances both the quality of teaching and student performance (Domitrovich et al., 2011; Rimm-Kaufman, Wanless, Patton, & Deutsch, 2011). Another key criterion for inclusion as a CASEL SELect program, therefore, is the ability of the program to provide training for school personnel to support high-quality implementation. We included only programs for which there was a standard, replicable training format and a United States-based team of trainers who conducted trainings in the past year. Other support for implementation includes materials such as standardized manuals, lesson plans, and needed supplies, as well as services such as technical assistance, ongoing consultation, and feedback once the program begins. Programs were required to have manuals for implementation. In addition, we assessed the extent to which they provided services beyond initial training, such as coaching and/or follow-up training.

Evidence of effectiveness. There is now good evidence regarding the effectiveness of SEL programs (Diekstra, 2008; Durlak et al., 2011; Weare & Nind, 2011; Zins et al., 2004). Empirical research is essential for determining the efficacy of programs and practices that promote SEL. How a study is conducted determines the level of confidence one can have in the findings. Although randomized controlled studies provide the highest level of confidence, other types of studies can also offer evidence of effectiveness. For example, well-controlled studies that use a comparison group and include reliable assessments of key outcomes before and after a program address many of the factors that can threaten the validity of the findings. As such, these two design features—a comparison group, and pre and post measurement—were required to qualify as a CASEL SELect program, and we included both randomized and quasi-experimental studies that contained these features. Outcome studies that met these criteria had to have sufficient clarity and no serious threats to validity.

The *CASEL Guide* also required an evaluation of each SELect program in a school setting with a preschool or elementary grade population (up to fifth grade). Outcomes had to be documented on student social or academic behavior and not just on measures of attitudes or perceptions. Group comparisons on outcomes had to be statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level, meaning that the probability was less than one chance in 20 that the results happened by chance—an acceptable level of significance in most research studies.

The Review Process

The review process began by establishing our inclusion and exclusion criteria. We then used several methods to identify potentially relevant classroom-based programs designed for use with a universal population of students. In early 2009 we put out an initial call for nominations and identified potentially relevant programs. During 2011 and early 2012, we made additional outreach efforts to program developers and researchers. At the same time we examined CASEL's original program review, *Safe and Sound,* and other major literature reviews, national reports, and key publications. We also searched national databases including but not limited to:

● *The What Works Clearinghouse,* administered by The Institute of Educational Sciences (IES) of the U.S. Department of Education (http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/);

● *The National Registry of Evidence-Based Programs and Practices,* administered by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), a branch of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (http://nrepp.samhsa.gov); and

● *Blueprints for Violence Prevention Model and Promising Programs,* administered by the Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence at the University of Colorado (http://www.colorado.edu/cspv/blueprints/).

All programs identified for possible inclusion were then examined in several different ways by teams of trained coders. If the program was classroom-based and designed for use with a universal population of students, we requested from program developers copies of all available published and unpublished outcome evaluations that would meet our criteria. Coders examined every outcome evaluation submitted by each program. We also conducted an e-mail survey completed by program developers or their designated staff about the training they offered for program implementation. We supplemented these surveys through phone contact, if necessary, to clarify answers to certain questions. Our final list consisted of 23 SELect programs.

When evaluations met our inclusion criteria and training and other support for implementation were available, we asked the programs to send us their materials. Graduate-level coders with extensive education and experience in social and emotional learning reviewed all program materials. The coders received more than 40 hours of training in the coding system from senior SEL researchers involved in the *CASEL Guide* development process. For each review, coders scanned the complete set of program materials provided by the developers in order to familiarize themselves with the overall organization and content of the program. Coders then completed an intensive content analysis of sample years of each program. In most cases this involved review of the preschool materials, first-grade materials, and fourth-grade materials, depending on whether those were found to be representative of the program as a whole. Additional grades were reviewed as necessary. Before the coders worked independently, they had to be at least 85% in agreement on all rating elements for a subset (20%) of the programs. Reliability was monitored throughout the process to maintain the same level of agreement (85%) on the remaining programs. Any disagreements in coding were eventually resolved through discussion among the raters and supervising staff. To avoid conflicts of interest, no one having any financial relationship to any program was involved in reviewing the programs or in discussions about programs. Additional information on our program ratings and a copy of our coding manuals are available on request.

The *CASEL Guide* will be ongoing and continuously updated. We will provide updates via the CASEL website to incorporate any revisions to SELect programs and conduct a full review of new approaches every year. In the future we hope to be able to examine new programs and present information on their characteristics in even more detail (e.g., programs focused on increasing cultural and linguistic sensitivity).

We welcome nominations from anyone who is aware of a program that might meet our criteria. As we have a continuous submission and review process, please contact info@casel.org to nominate new programs to be reviewed for possible inclusion in the *Guide.*

Chapter 4: Rating Framework and Ratings of CASEL SELect Programs

This chapter describes the framework we used to evaluate the programs we reviewed and the ratings assigned to each.

Tables 1 and 2 rate preschool programs. Tables 3 and 4 rate elementary school (K-5) programs. Tables 1 and 3 present "Program Design and Implementation Support" ratings. Tables 2 and 4 show "Evidence of Effectiveness" ratings. A few programs provide lessons for both preschool and elementary school students. For these programs, placement in just one set of tables or both was determined based on whether they conducted research studies documenting behavioral impacts in social or academic domains with preschool and/or elementary school students.

The tables incorporate a standard set of symbols. An empty circle indicates a minimal level of a particular element. A half circle indicates an adequate level, and a full circle indicates the element can be found extensively in the program. Each of the levels is explained in greater detail in the following descriptions.

SYMBOL	DEFINITION
○	*Minimal*
◑	*Adequate*
●	*Extensive*

For some elements we use a check mark (✔) to indicate whether the element is present in the program or not. The content of the ratings is based only on a review of the preschool and/or elementary school materials even though some programs have materials available for students beyond fifth grade.

Description of Program Design and Implementation Support Tables

Tables 1 and 3 list programs in alphabetical order focused on program design and implementation support. These tables provide information about seven topics: (1) grade range covered, (2) availability of a grade-by-grade sequence, (3) average number of sessions per year, (4) classroom approaches to teaching SEL, (5) opportunities to practice SEL skills, (6) contexts that promote and reinforce SEL, and (7) assessment tools for monitoring implementation and student behavior.

- **Grade range covered.** For each program we list the grade levels for which there are classroom lesson plans and training materials. In some cases this includes middle and high school. However, the ratings in this *Guide* are based on a review of only the preschool and/or elementary school materials.

- **Grade-by-grade sequence.** Ideally, every student should receive planned, ongoing, systematic SEL education every year from preschool through elementary school. Some programs provide guidance and lesson plans for preschool through grade 5 while others only target a subset of grades or involve repetition if the materials are used in multiple grades. A check mark for this element indicates when the materials allow for sequenced programming for each grade level across the grade range covered. If this element is blank, we provide additional information about grade levels covered in the program description in Appendix A.

- **Average number of sessions per year.** The program design table indicates the average number of sessions each year, where "session" is defined as a set of activities designed to take place in a single time period. Programs vary in terms of the amount of class time they provide or require, ranging from 8 to 140 sessions annually. Some programs do not have a defined set of lessons, and instead enhance teacher practices and methods generally. For those approaches, number of sessions or length is not applicable, since the program is designed to change the overall climate and culture through ongoing classroom instruction. These programs receive a "not applicable" (n/a) rating for this element.

- **Classroom approaches to teaching SEL.** We rated three primary research-based approaches to the classroom-based promotion of SEL.

    1. *Explicit SEL skills instruction.* Some programs provide explicit lesson plans with content and instruction designed specifically to promote social and emotional skills. These lessons typically focus on teaching skills that can be broadly applied to a variety of situations such as making friends, working cooperatively with others, coping with

stress, making decisions about potentially risky behaviors, and resolving interpersonal conflicts. Such programs may also include positive youth development efforts in domains such as health, citizenship, or character development or strategies to prevent problem behavior such as violence, substance use, or bullying. A program was considered an "explicit skills instruction" approach when it contained lesson plans and when coders could identify specific examples of where and how social and emotional competencies were explicitly taught.

2. *Integration with academic curriculum areas.* Some programs embed the teaching of social and emotional skills in a core academic subject. A program was considered "integrating with academics" when it had lessons that covered core academic content while also developing social and emotional competencies. For these, the core academic subject area is noted. For example, a program that integrates with English/language arts might use literature to promote perspective taking through character analysis, or it may ask students to identify alternative solutions or anticipate consequences of situations while reading. Many programs suggest optional strategies for integrating SEL into a core academic subject area, and this is noted in the table.

3. *Teacher instructional practices.* Some classroom-based programs focus on instructional processes, pedagogies, and management approaches to promote a positive classroom climate. These programs actively engage students in learning at the same time they support social and emotional development. A program was considered to promote "teacher instructional practices" when it focused primarily on creating a positive classroom experience through pedagogical methods or classroom routines. These practices (e.g., authentic praise, involving students in decision making) support positive relationships among teachers and students and foster conditions for learning.

Some programs use more than one approach, and the above categories are not mutually exclusive. For this element programs were rated according to whether they included each method as a primary emphasis.

● **Opportunities to practice social and emotional skills.** Practicing newly learned behaviors is an essential component for developing social and emotional skills (Durlak et al., 2010; Durlak et al., 2011). Practice that takes place outside the lesson in real-world settings has the potential to be especially powerful. By definition all SELect programs provide students with opportunities to practice SEL skills. The rating for this element reflects the extent to which the programs provide active learning opportunities during or beyond classroom sessions. Programs received the highest rating if they provided consistent opportunities for practice of skills both within classroom lessons and beyond lessons in daily situations. Practice within the program typically includes role plays or guided self-management techniques. Practice beyond the program lessons includes applications of social and emotional skills to real-life situations, such as using self-calming or problem-solving skills during classroom or playground conflicts. The mid-level rating was given if programs provided these opportunities only during program sessions. Given the inclusion criteria, no programs received the lowest rating on this element.

● **Contexts that promote and reinforce SEL.** Because of the importance of promoting and reinforcing SEL skills across multiple settings, each program was rated for the extent to which it provided practices for extending its concepts into four different contexts: (1) the classroom beyond the SEL program lessons, (2) school-wide, (3) the family, and (4) the community.

1. *Classroom beyond the SEL program lessons.* The majority of SELect programs include classroom-based lessons. Examples of practices that extend program concepts beyond the lessons include morning meetings, peace centers, and daily check-ins. These routines support SEL throughout the day in the classroom, particularly for those programs that contain explicit lessons conducted only at specific times in the day.

2. *School-wide.* Examples of school-wide practices include creating a process that promotes collaboration among and between different classrooms, grade levels, or through engaging nonteaching personnel in activities to promote students' social and emotional competencies throughout the day.

3. *Family.* A program received credit for extending into the family if it provided routine "homework" assignments to be completed with family members, offered SEL workshops with training for parents about social and emotional learning, or other activities designed to involve families.

4.   *Community.* A program received credit for promoting SEL in the community if it provided opportunities for personal contacts, ongoing relationships, or interactive involvement of students and community members. This could take place in the classroom or outside the school building.

●   **Assessment tools for monitoring implementation and student behavior.** Programs sometimes offer tools to monitor implementation, either through teacher self-report measures or assessments completed by observers. Two columns in the table indicate whether or not each program provides these tools. The third column for this element indicates whether the program offers tools that can be used to assess the program's impact on student behavior.

Description of the Evidence of Effectiveness Tables

Tables 2 and 4 list the programs in alphabetical order focused on evidence of effectiveness. These tables present information and ratings for four topics: grade range covered, characteristics of research sample, study design, and evaluation outcomes. Additional details about the program evaluations can be found in the individual program descriptions in Appendix A.

●   **Grade range covered.** For each program we list the grade levels for which there are classroom lesson plans and training materials. In some cases this includes middle and high school. However, the ratings in this *Guide* are based on a review of only the preschool and/or elementary school materials.

●   **Characteristics of sample.** The ratings for this element reflect four characteristics of the study sample in the qualifying evaluations: the grade levels, the geographic locations (urban, suburban, rural) where the studies were conducted, student race/ethnicity, and the percentage of students receiving free or reduced lunch included in the study samples. Evaluators sometimes used "diverse" to indicate the race/ethnicity of the sample, rather than providing specific information. Many of the preschool evaluation studies were conducted in Head Start programs. Given the income eligibility levels set by Head Start, we assumed all (100%) participants in those studies qualified for free and reduced lunch.

●   **Study design.** Ratings for this element are presented across two columns. They indicate whether there were quasi-experimental or randomized clinical trials and how many of each.

●   **Evaluation outcomes.** Evaluation outcome ratings are based on the outcomes reported in at least one qualifying evaluation study. The ratings for this element are represented in four columns. They represent the outcome domains that were reviewed for program inclusion. SELect programs had to demonstrate a positive impact on a behavioral or academic performance indicator in at least one of the domains. A check mark indicates that a significant program effect was documented on an outcome in that domain as measured by observations, school records, or ratings made by teachers, parents, or students. The definitions of each outcome domain are:

1.   *Improved academic performance.* This includes significant program effects on student academic performance (e.g., grades, test scores).

2.   *Improved positive social behavior.* This includes significant program effects on measures of positive social behavior (e.g., works well with others, positive peer relations, assertiveness, conflict resolution).

3.   *Reduced conduct problems.* This includes significant reductions on measures of conduct problems (e.g., aggressive or disruptive behavior).

4.   *Reduced emotional distress.* This includes significant reductions on measures of emotional distress (e.g., depressive symptoms, anxiety, or social withdrawal).

SEL Programs for Preschool:
Rating Tables 1 and 2

TABLE 1
Preschool Program Design and Implementation Support Ratings

Program Name	Grade Range Covered	Grade-by-Grade Sequence	Average Number of Sessions Per Year	Classroom Approaches to Teaching SEL			Opportunities to Practice Social and Emotional Skills	Contexts that Promote and Reinforce SEL				Assessment Tools for Monitoring Implementation and Student Behavior		
				Explicit Skills Instruction	Integration with Academic Curriculum Areas	Teacher Instructional Practices		Classroom-wide	School-wide	Family	Community	Monitoring Implementation		Measuring Student Behavior
												Self-report	Observation	
Al's Pals	PreK-3		46 core lessons + 9 boosters	✔	Academic integration strategies provided		●	●	○	◐	○		✔	✔
HighScope Educational Approach for Preschool	PreK	✔	n/a		Academic integration strategies provided	✔	●	●	●	◐	○	✔	✔	✔
I Can Problem Solve	PreK-5		59-83 lessons	✔	Academic integration strategies provided		●	●	○	●	○	✔	✔	✔
The Incredible Years Series	PreK-2	✔	64 lessons	✔	Academic integration strategies provided for English/language arts		●	●	○	●	○	✔		
PATHS	PreK-6	✔	40-52 lessons	✔	Academic integration strategies provided		●	●	●	●	○	✔	✔	✔
Peace Works: Peacemaking Skills for Little Kids	PreK-2	✔	30-85 activities varies by grade	✔	Academic integration strategies provided		●	●	●	●	○			✔
Tools of the Mind	PreK-K	✔	n/a		✔	✔	●	●	○	●	○	✔		✔

KEY	○ Minimal	◐ Adequate	● Extensive

TABLE 2

Preschool Evidence of Effectiveness Ratings

Program Name	Grade Range Covered	Characteristics of Sample				Study Design		Evaluation Outcomes			
		Grades Evaluated	Geographic Location	Student Race/Ethnicity	% Reduced Lunch	Quasi-Experimental	Randomized Controlled Trial	Improved Academic Performance	Increased Positive Social Behavior	Reduced Conduct Problems	Reduced Emotional Distress
Al's Pals	PreK-3	PreK	Rural, Suburban, Urban	African-American, Caucasian	100	✔ (3)			✔	✔	✔
HighScope Educational Approach for Preschool	PreK	PreK	Urban	African-American, Caucasian	100		✔ (1)	✔	✔	✔	✔
I Can Problem Solve	PreK-5	PreK-K	Rural, Urban	African-American, Caucasian	100	✔ (1)	✔ (2)			✔	
The Incredible Years Series	PreK-2	PreK-1	Not reported	Diverse	100		✔ (2)		✔	✔	
PATHS	PreK-6	PreK	Rural, Suburban, Urban	African-American, Caucasian	100		✔ (1)		✔		✔
Peaceworks: Peacemaking Skills for Little Kids	PreK-2	PreK	Urban	Hispanic	Not reported		✔ (1)		✔	✔	
Tools of the Mind	PreK-K	PreK	Urban	Hispanic	80		✔ (1)			✔	

SEL Programs for Elementary School (K-5): Rating Tables 3 and 4

TABLE 3

Elementary School Program Design and Implementation Support Ratings

Program Name	Grade Range Covered	Grade-by-Grade Sequence	Average Number of Sessions Per Year	Classroom Approaches to Teaching SEL			Opportunities to Practice Social and Emotional Skills	Contexts that Promote and Reinforce SEL				Assessment Tools for Monitoring Implementation and Student Behavior		
				Explicit Skills Instruction	Integration with Academic Curriculum Areas	Teacher Instructional Practices		Classroom-wide	School-wide	Family	Community	Monitoring Implementation		Measuring Student Behavior
												Self-report	Observation	
4Rs	PreK-8	✔	35 period-long class sessions	✔	✔ English/language arts		●	●	●	●	○	✔		✔
Caring School Community	K-6	✔	Year-long, with 30-35 class meetings		Academic integration strategies provided	✔	●	●	●	●	●	✔	✔	✔
Competent Kids, Caring Communities	K-5	✔	35 lessons	✔	Academic integration strategies provided		●	●	●	●	◐	✔	✔	✔
I Can Problem Solve	PreK-5	✔	59-83 lessons	✔	Academic integration strategies provided		●	●	○	●	○	✔	✔	✔
The Incredible Years Series	PreK-2	✔	64 lessons	✔	Academic integration strategies provided for English/language arts		●	●	○	●	○	✔		
Michigan Model for Health	K-12	✔	8-14 lessons	✔	Academic integration strategies provided		●	●	◐	○	○			✔
MindUP	PreK-8	✔	15 lessons	✔	Academic integration strategies provided		●	●	○	○	○	✔		✔
Open Circle	K-5	✔	34 lessons plus supplementary lessons	✔	Academic integration strategies provided for English/language arts		●	●	●	●	○	✔		✔

KEY ○ *Minimal* ◐ *Adequate* ● *Extensive*

TABLE 3

Elementary School Program Design and Implementation Support Ratings (continued)

Program Name	Grade Range Covered	Grade-by-Grade Sequence	Average Number of Sessions Per Year	Classroom Approaches to Teaching SEL			Opportunities to Practice Social and Emotional Skills	Contexts that Promote and Reinforce SEL				Assessment Tools for Monitoring Implementation and Student Behavior		
				Explicit Skills Instruction	Integration with Academic Curriculum Areas	Teacher Instructional Practices		Classroom-wide	School-wide	Family	Community	Monitoring Implementation — Self-report	Monitoring Implementation — Observation	Measuring Student Behavior
PATHS	PreK-6	✔	40-52 lessons plus	✔	Academic integration strategies provided			●	●	●	●	○	✔	✔	✔
Positive Action	PreK-12	✔	140 lessons	✔	Academic integration strategies provided for English/language arts			●	●	●	●	●	✔		✔
Raising Healthy Children	K-6	✔	n/a	✔	Academic integration strategies provided	✔		●	●	●	●	○	✔	✔	✔
Resolving Conflict Creatively Program	PreK-8	✔	16 lessons	✔	Academic integration strategies provided for English/language arts	✔		●	●	●	●	○	✔		✔
Responsive Classroom	K-6	✔	n/a		Academic integration strategies provided	✔		●	●	●	●	○	✔		✔
RULER Approach	K-8	✔	Anchor Tools: 16 lessons + daily implementation; Feeling Words: 75 lessons		✔ English/language arts	✔		●	●	●	●	○	✔	✔	✔
Second Step	PreK-8	✔	22-28 weekly topics across 5 days/week	✔	Academic integration strategies provided			●	●	◐	◐	○	✔	✔	✔

KEY   ○ *Minimal*   ◐ *Adequate*   ● *Extensive*

TABLE 3
Elementary School Program Design and Implementation Support Ratings (continued)

Program Name	Grade Range Covered	Grade-by-Grade Sequence	Average Number of Sessions Per Year	Classroom Approaches to Teaching SEL			Opportunities to Practice Social and Emotional Skills	Contexts that Promote and Reinforce SEL				Assessment Tools for Monitoring Implementation and Student Behavior		
				Explicit Skills Instruction	Integration with Academic Curriculum Areas	Teacher Instructional Practices		Classroom-wide	School-wide	Family	Community	Monitoring Implementation		Measuring Student Behavior
												Self-report	Observation	
Social Decision Making/ Problem Solving Program	K-8	✔	30 topics	✔	Academic integration strategies provided		●	●	◐	◐	○	✔		✔
Steps to Respect	3-6	✔	11 lessons + 2 literature units (7-10 lessons in each)	✔	✔	✔	●	●	●	◐	○	✔		
Too Good for Violence	K-8	✔	7 30-60 minute lessons plus infusion activities	✔	Academic integration strategies provided		◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	✔	✔	✔
Tribes Learning Communities	K-12	✔	n/a		Academic integration strategies provided	✔	●	●	●	●	○	✔		✔

KEY	○ Minimal	◐ Adequate	● Extensive

TABLE 4

Elementary School Evidence of Effectiveness Ratings

Program Name	Grade Range Covered	Characteristics of Sample Evaluated				Study Design		Evaluation Outcomes			
		Grades Evaluated	Geographic Location	Student Race/ Ethnicity	% Reduced Lunch	Quasi-Experimental	Randomized Controlled Trial	Improved Academic Performance	Increased Positive Social Behavior	Reduced Conduct Problems	Reduced Emotional Distress
4Rs	PreK-8	3-4	Urban	African-American, Hispanic	62		✔ (1)	✔[4]	✔	✔	✔
Caring School Community	K-6	K-6	Rural, Suburban, Urban	African-American, Hispanic	0-95	✔ (2)	✔ (3)	✔	✔	✔	✔
Competent Kids, Caring Communities	K-5	4-5	Urban	Diverse	52-63	✔ (1)		✔			
I Can Problem Solve	PreK-5	PreK-1	Rural, Urban	African-American, Caucasian, Hispanic	91	✔ (1)	✔ (2)			✔	✔
The Incredible Years Series	PreK-2	PreK-1	Not reported	Diverse	59		✔ (2)			✔	✔
Michigan Model for Health	K-12	4-5	Rural, Suburban, Urban	African-American, Caucasian	11-98		✔ (1)			✔	✔
MindUP	PreK-8	4-7	Urban	Diverse	Not reported	✔ (1)			✔	✔	✔
Open Circle	K-5	4	Suburban, Urban	Diverse	Not reported	✔ (1)			✔	✔	
PATHS	PreK-6	K-5	Rural, Suburban, Urban	African-American, Caucasian	39-80	✔ (1)	✔ (4)	✔	✔	✔	✔
Positive Action	PreK-12	K-5	Urban	African-American, Asian-Pacific Islander, Hispanic	25-75	✔ (2)	✔ (2)	✔		✔	
Raising Healthy Children	K-6	1-6	Suburban	Caucasian	28-33		✔ (1)	✔	✔	✔	
Resolving Conflict Creatively Program	PreK-8	1-6	Urban	African-American, Hispanic	86		✔ (2)			✔	✔

continued on next page

[4]For students at behavioral risk.

TABLE 4 **Elementary School Evidence of Effectiveness Ratings (continued)**

Program Name	Grade Range Covered	Characteristics of Sample Evaluated				Study Design		Evaluation Outcomes			
		Grades Evaluated	Geographic Location	Student Race/Ethnicity	% Reduced Lunch	Quasi-Experimental	Randomized Controlled Trial	Improved Academic Performance	Increased Positive Social Behavior	Reduced Conduct Problems	Reduced Emotional Distress
Responsive Classroom	K-6	3-5	Urban	Diverse	35	✔ (1)		✔			
RULER Approach	K-8	5-6	Suburban	Caucasian, Diverse	6-7	✔ (1)		✔	✔		
Second Step	PreK-8	1-6	Suburban, Urban	Diverse	20-75	✔ (2)	✔ (2)		✔	✔	✔
Social Decision Making/Problem Solving Program	K-8	4-5	Suburban	Not reported	Not reported	✔ (2)		✔	✔	✔	✔
Steps to Respect	3-6	3-6	Rural, Suburban, Urban	Diverse	40		✔ (2)		✔	✔	
Too Good for Violence	K-12	3	Not reported	Caucasian, Hispanic	54		✔ (1)		✔		
Tribes Learning Communities	K-8	3	Not reported	African-American, Caucasian	30-33	✔ (1)		✔			

Chapter 5: Guidelines for Selecting Evidence-Based SEL Programs

When school and district planning teams oversee the careful selection and effective implementation of evidence-based social and emotional learning programs, the children they serve benefit socially, emotionally, and academically. This chapter shares principles, information, and guidelines that teams can use to adopt the best programs for their context.

Three key principles support the effective selection, implementation, impact, and sustainability of evidence-based SEL programs: (1) school and district teams—rather than an individual—should engage diverse stakeholders in the program adoption process; (2) implementing evidence-based SEL programs within systemic, ongoing district and school planning, programming, and evaluation leads to better practice and more positive outcomes for students; (3) it is critical to consider local contextual factors (e.g., student characteristics, programs already in place) when using the *CASEL Guide* and gathering additional information to make decisions about which programs to implement.

Principle 1: School and district teams should engage diverse stakeholders in the program selection process.

The *CASEL Guide* is designed primarily for school and district teams focused on establishing systemic approaches to SEL program implementation. District planning teams often involve central office leaders, including the chief academic officer; supervisors and staff from curriculum and instruction, professional development, student-support, research-evaluation, and finance departments; school board members; building administrators; teachers; parents; students; and community members. School teams typically include building administrators, teachers, counselors, psychologists, social workers, nonprofessional staff, parents, students, and other important stakeholders. Teams should represent a spectrum of views and concerns, yet be small enough to ensure action.

It is especially important that building principals and teachers participate actively in the program selection process. "If we are not on the plane when it takes off," goes the saying, "we will not be on it when it lands." Research indicates that SEL programs are implemented better and produce more positive benefits for students when they are delivered by classroom teachers who have the support of their principals (Durlak et al., 2011; Kam, Greenberg, & Walls, 2003).

Principle 2: Implement evidence-based SEL programs in the context of systemic district and school programming.

The best evidence-based SEL programs provide practitioners with clear research-based guidance on practices that foster improved social and emotional skills development. They also help school communities establish a unifying framework, common language, and coordinated approaches for promoting SEL. Nevertheless, although CASEL SELect programs are an important part of the district or school SEL puzzle, they are not the entire puzzle.

Chapter 2 briefly described CASEL's district and school theories of action to provide readers with a broader context about where a CASEL SELect program might fit within overall district and school priorities. School and district level teams using this *Guide* should consider four activities that will help in their adoption of SELect programs:

- Assess the district or school's current SEL programs and policies to evaluate their quality, and build from strengths as you deepen the work.

- Build systems to provide ongoing, embedded professional development in SEL for school administrators, teachers, and other stakeholders.

- Link evidence-based SEL programs and practices with student-centered instruction, curriculum, and assessments; SEL standards that specify what students should know and be able to do in the social-emotional domain; and school-family-community partnership activities.

- Use data on SEL program implementation, student social-emotional competence, school and classroom climate, and school performance to guide school improvement plans and to inform the district of needed resources for SEL.

Principle 3: Consider local contextual factors to better understand your resources and challenges.

Effective needs and resources assessments rely heavily on data related to student behaviors and the perceived needs of students, staff, and parents. It is critical to have accurate information about both the student body as a whole, as well as subgroups of students (e.g., boys and girls, students at each grade level, students from different racial and ethnic groups, special education students, and English language learners).

Every district and school has a variety of curricula, special services, policies, programs, and activities related to social and emotional learning. Systematically reviewing them will identify strengths and gaps in current programming. If your school or district already uses one or more of the SEL programs included in this review, it is important to know how well such programs are working, how many students they reach, how they integrate with each other and other school priorities, and the extent to which they support family and community involvement.

The readiness of the school or district to take on SEL programming is another critical factor to assess. Are there sufficient financial and human resources to address SEL systemically, or is it preferable to start small and build the program? Is there sufficient enthusiasm, support, and leadership, or will these need to be cultivated? Is there a high level of cooperation among teachers, administrators, and other staff, or will this need to be developed? Is there capacity to provide professional development that supports SEL?

Selecting an Evidence-Based SEL Program

Some schools may prefer to develop their own approach to SEL, rather than adopting a SELect program identified in this *Guide*. We believe it is better to start from a foundation that is evidence-based. A SELect program can serve as a base from which to coordinate school-wide SEL, family partnerships, and community programming. The benefits of using programs that embody years of scientific program development, evaluation, and evidence are worth the effort.

Assuming your team agrees with this perspective, we have organized this chapter according to principles derived from research and practice about the components of effective programs. Below we present several strategies. This information can jumpstart your selection of appropriate SEL programs. We recommend the following:

- Use Tables 1 to 4 in Chapter 4 to identify program candidates.

- Review the program descriptions to narrow your search.

- Gather additional information about your top program candidates.

- Assess the cultural sensitivity and linguistic responsiveness of the program.

- Contact and visit schools using the program.

Use Tables 1 to 4 in Chapter 4 to identify program candidates. All CASEL SELect programs meet three main criteria: they are well-designed programs that promote students' social and emotional skills; they provide quality professional development to support implementation; and they are research-based. Given that these are all effective programs that have a variety of virtues, we provide a set of considerations your team can use to identify program candidates that may best address your priorities for selection.

Your team's first step is to determine whether you are looking for a preschool program, an elementary school program, or both. This *Guide* reviews seven SELect preschool programs and 19 elementary school programs. Although certain programs have lessons that span preschool through the elementary grades, only three are listed on both sets of tables. This is because we list programs in the table only if they have documented positive behavioral impacts for students in that particular age group. Review the ratings on the two tables ("Program Design and Implementation

Support" and "Evidence of Effectiveness") that correspond to the grade levels for which you want to select a program. The description of the items in each table at the beginning of Chapter 4 will be helpful in understanding what the ratings mean and how to interpret them.

As you scan the list of programs, look first to see if any programs on the list are already being implemented in your district or school. If the program is a SELect program, well-received by your school community, and beneficial for students, you will be ahead of the game. On the other hand, many districts or schools currently implement programs that CASEL has not identified as SELect. If this is the case in your school or district, it is a cause for reflection but not necessarily for concern. A program may not be listed for a variety of reasons. One possibility is that we have not yet reviewed it.

If your district or school has programs that are not on the list, we recommend several courses of action. First, align your program to the CASEL SELect criteria so you have a better sense of whether it is well-designed, offers adequate training and support, and provides evidence of its impact and effectiveness. Second, contact the program provider to get a direct report on the extent to which the program meets our criteria. Third, please contact CASEL at info@casel.org to inform us about the program. In the future, CASEL will publish updated program reviews annually. Additional programs will be added to our recommended list in 2014 and beyond if they meet our SELect criteria.

Tables 1 to 4 list many effective SEL programs that your district or school teams will be learning about for the first time. As you review the "Program Design and Implementation Support" rating tables and the "Evidence of Effectiveness" rating tables, here are some considerations to guide your discussions and decisions about program adoption:

- **Grade range covered/Grade-by-grade sequence.** Some teams will prefer to select programs that cover every grade level their school serves so the school community aligns around a unified framework and set of activities. Other teams may believe they already have certain grades covered effectively. In these instances it will be important to determine how newly adopted programs can best be coordinated with programs that are already in place.

- **Average number of sessions per year.** Schools vary in terms of the amount of time they can devote to SEL. We encourage teams to review some programs that require fewer versus more lessons to gain a sense for how different models operate.

- **Classroom approaches to teaching SEL.** Your team may decide it is important to provide explicit instruction in SEL as a foundation for incorporating skill-development strategies throughout the day. If so, it will be necessary to identify a few times per week when this happens. Other schools may have curriculum areas where SEL could be integrated. If so, you will want to look for programs that provide "integration with academics." If your staff wants to develop greater expertise in providing pedagogies that develop SEL, you will want to pay particular attention to programs that support instructional practice.

- **Contexts that promote and reinforce SEL.** Education in SEL becomes more powerful when it is reinforced across all of the contexts where children spend their time. Districts and schools wishing to implement more systemic SEL programming may choose to adopt programs that provide guidance and strategies for classroom-wide, school-wide, and family programming. Other teams may prefer to begin with a more narrowly focused classroom program.

- **Assessment tools for monitoring implementation.** High-quality implementation is critically important to program success. Tools for monitoring implementation that are specifically aligned with the program you are using allow you to collect information to enhance the quality of implementation. It will make your job easier when a program provides these tools.

- **Assessment tools for student behavior.** Although all SELect programs have conducted controlled studies that document their positive effects on student behavior, it is critical for schools to determine if programming is beneficial in their specific situation. Ongoing evaluation is an integral part of a comprehensive plan for SEL and can

provide information that helps to revise your plan when necessary. In addition, evaluation findings supply you with evidence that what you are doing is effective, which can be useful in securing the support of your school board or external funding agencies.

- **Characteristics of sample.** When judging the strength of the research base for particular programs, it is appropriate to consider whether they have been evaluated with samples that are similar to the students in your school. Therefore, we summarize socio-demographic information for four student variables: grade level, geographic location, race and/or ethnicity, and socioeconomic status. If a program has been evaluated only with students from a limited number of grades or racial/ethnic groups, this is important for you to know. Bear in mind that research has indicated that SEL programs do not seem to have better effects for some student subgroups over others (Durlak et al., 2011), so if you are considering a program and the populations evaluated do not match your student population, it may still be worth considering.

- **Study design.** We have included information from quasi-experimental research studies and randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and the number of evaluations conducted. Both approaches include experimental and comparison groups; however, RCTs are generally more rigorous. It is likely that programs with more studies and more RCTs have stronger research foundations.

- **Evaluation outcomes.** Many SELect programs have documented beneficial effects on students' social behavior and conduct problems. It is less common to assess program effects on emotional distress or academic performance. It is important to emphasize that most program evaluations do not systematically collect data across all of these domains. Thus, if a program does not report gains in a particular area, it may be that their evaluation did not examine that area.

Review the program descriptions to narrow your search. Use the program descriptions in Appendix A to learn more about the programs that interest you. These descriptions provide more detailed information about each program including the full range of grade levels for which the program is designed and the skills the program teaches. The summaries include an overview of each program followed by a grid with the findings in Tables 1 to 4. Also included is a link to the website of the program, where you will be able to find additional information.

Cultural sensitivity and linguistic responsiveness of SEL programs are extremely important factors to consider. It was beyond the scope of this review to assess the appropriateness of each program for every possible cultural or linguistic context, but we note in the program descriptions if there is content within each program that helps teachers implement or adapt activities based on the cultures or linguistic needs of their students.

Based on your review of the descriptions of the top candidates, you should narrow your search to three or four programs you will explore more deeply.

Gather additional information about your top program candidates. Visit the websites of the SELect programs you have identified to learn more about your top program candidates. A few things you should look for are an overview of the program, a scope and sequence, sample materials, videos of the program in actual classrooms, research reports, professional development and technical assistance supports, and costs.

Once your team has settled on three or four programs that appear to meet your needs and support the goals of your SEL plan, you will need to explore these programs more deeply and gather information related to your particular situation. Consider contacting the program provider. Key concerns include securing information about program costs, training and other implementation supports such as on-site coaching and consultation, available guidance and tools for monitoring implementation and evaluating student outcomes, and the extent to which the program is culturally and linguistically appropriate for your student population. You should also ask to review program materials and contact others who have used the program. Below are suggestions of questions you may want to ask in exploring each of these issues.

- **Program costs.** The cost of an SEL program involves many different elements including materials, training and support for implementation, and support for evaluation. Cost can be affected by whether or not multiple schools will be using the program. Some programs separate costs for training and costs for materials. Other programs combine the cost of materials with the cost for training. Costs will also depend on unique circumstances in your district, such as whether the district has the capacity to support training of trainers and how much training in SEL your staff has already experienced. Questions to help you organize your conversations with program developers to determine what the cost would be in your school or district include:

   1. What is the cost of standard program materials? Are there recurring costs? Are there ways to save on costs?

   2. What is the cost of training? Are there ways of saving on the cost of training?

   3. Is there training for trainers or training for coaches? If so, what is the cost?

   4. What are the differences in cost based on location of training?

- **Training and support for implementation.** Initial training in implementing a particular SEL program is essential. Ongoing training and support is highly desirable. Questions to ask with regard to training include:

   1. How much training will staff need? How much time is required? Who should attend the training?

   2. Are there any prerequisites for participating in training?

   3. Does the training include opportunities for participants to practice using classroom materials and receive feedback? To develop a plan with colleagues for implementing the program? To use strategies such as morning meetings or a buddy system to establish a supportive classroom learning environment?

   4. After the initial staff development workshop and a period of implementation, does the program offer on-site consultation to schools to observe teachers using the program and offer feedback, facilitate group discussions about the program, and/or facilitate teachers coaching one another?

   5. Is there training for central office and building administrators on ways to support program implementation and sustainability?

- **Continuing evaluation of the program.** A process for regularly evaluating the program's impact on students should be in place from the beginning. Question to ask include:

   1. Does the program provide school districts with on-site assistance in designing an evaluation to determine the program's impact on students?

   2. Does the program provide on-site assistance in collecting and analyzing evaluation data?

   3. Does the program provide assistance in interpreting evaluation data and making appropriate recommendations?

- **Review materials.** No program should be adopted without a careful analysis of the materials. Most of the SEL program providers will allow schools to preview materials free of charge and will send sample lessons. Teachers and others who would have responsibility for using the program should review these materials. Questions to ask include:

   1. Are program materials available for review?

   2. How long can we keep the materials if we receive them in the mail?

   3. Is there a cost for review materials?

   4. How much of the program and its materials can be viewed directly on the program developer's website?

- **Information about others who have experience with the program.** Interacting with other districts and schools that have experience with the program, preferably in person, is highly desirable. Many programs will provide potential adopters with a list of schools or districts in their region that have used the program. Ideally the schools or districts you contact will be similar to your own in terms of size and student population and located close enough so you can visit and observe the program being implemented. Questions to ask include:

  1. Can colleagues who are using the program be contacted directly?

  2. Is it possible to see the program in action?

Assess the cultural sensitivity and linguistic responsiveness of the program. Research in social and emotional learning, and in child development more broadly, has consistently found that children learn best when education is relevant and appropriate to their cultural and linguistic context. The same is true with regard to materials and programming for families and caregivers. This creates special challenges when selecting programs, since many schools are multicultural, with unique combinations of different cultures and with different levels of acculturation.

In our review of SEL programs we have paid careful attention to whether and how programs have made adjustments for different cultural contexts. For example, when programs indicate that they are designed for use with particular ethnic/cultural groups, or if they suggest how content or activities can be adapted for use with different groups, we note this in our comments in the program description. As part of our review of evaluations we note which geographic and ethnic/cultural groups were represented in the study samples for each program. In future iterations of the *CASEL Guide* we plan to go deeper. For example, we will ask experts with different cultural perspectives to help us assess programs. We will also ask authorities on linguistic responsiveness to help us review program content and activities.

Your colleagues, parents, and students are the experts on the cultures and languages represented in your school or district. Questions you will want to ask related to a program's cultural and linguistic appropriateness include:

- How does the program ensure that the language, content, and activities are appropriate for the kind of community where participating schools are located?

- Has the program been evaluated with populations similar to the one in our school?

- Are there program evaluations that might provide additional information about the cultural and linguistic appropriateness of this program for different groups of students?

- Are there schools using the program in communities similar to ours in terms of culture and languages? Can the program provider identify contacts in those schools?

To further help you select a program that meets your community's needs, we also recommend:

- Think about the community where your school is located. What cultures and ethnicities are represented among the students and their families? What languages are spoken by families served by your school? How will you make decisions about SEL programs in a way that honors and celebrates different cultures and contexts in which your students live and learn? Who are the people in your school community who can help you in this process?

- Assemble a subcommittee or team made up of parents, faculty, and community stakeholders who represent the cultural perspectives in your community. Ask them to help you review and explore programs you are considering.

Contact and visit schools using the program. To complete the selection process, contact and visit one or more schools using the programs you are considering. Speak with teachers and others who have experience with the program. Observe how the program works in action. Most programs can identify individuals or schools for a visit. At a minimum, and if distance and travel are problems, try to arrange extended telephone interviews with others who have used the program. If you are able to arrange visits, prepare carefully with a set of questions and discussion topics.

Completing the Selection Process and Beyond

With all the information you have gathered, your team is now equipped to complete the selection of a SELect program to support your SEL plan. The work of your SEL leadership team will continue, however. Once you have selected the program, you will need to develop a plan for first-year implementation. It may make sense to start with a modest effort and build on solid success. For example, you might decide to pilot a program in one school, or in several grades in several schools.

You will also need to develop strategies for supporting implementation. Your committee should explore at least three kinds of on-site support: observation and feedback to teachers by program staff; meetings where teachers can discuss challenges and successes with colleagues who are more experienced with the program; and peer coaching by experienced teachers. Your school may also want to consider relatively new approaches to professional development such as incorporating the program into the school's daily routines. Teachers might be given time to meet with one another and reflect on how things are going. Ideally, you will be able to use self-assessment tools provided by the program that can assist with this type of reflection.

Your team should also develop a plan for monitoring progress and impact by using implementation and student outcome data. Although there is strong evidence suggesting SEL programs can improve students' behavior and academic performance, it is always important to monitor a program's effects in each local context. Meeting regularly to discuss and identify challenges to overcome and successes to celebrate should be an important priority.

Chapter 6: Summary and Future Directions

Promoting students' social and emotional learning is a good idea, but all potentially good ideas in education should be subject to systematic research and examination to achieve two ends. First, evaluations should be conducted to investigate and confirm the value of the good idea and determine whether it has a credible basis in fact or is wishful thinking. Second, evidence-based practice should demonstrate that the idea can be replicated successfully in multiple settings. Some ideas might be impractical to use on a wide scale, and thus be of only limited value. We believe that evidence-based research and practice has demonstrated both the scientific value and the wide applicability of academic, social, and emotional learning.

For example, there is now credible evidence from many studies that SEL programs achieve positive results (Diekstra, 2008; Durlak et al., 2011; Greenberg et al., 2003; Weare & Nind, 2011; Zins et al., 2004). We presented some of these findings in Chapter 4. Many preschool and elementary school SEL programs currently exist. This *Guide* has focused on those with the best chance of being successful in different schools and districts. We have highlighted these programs (called "CASEL SELect") because they are well-designed and have been carefully evaluated, often multiple times, to confirm their positive effects on student outcomes. Professional development services are available from the programs' developers and experienced consultants to help school staff implement each SELect program effectively. We also know that resources to provide training and ongoing support for effective program implementation are extremely important if SEL is to be widely disseminated in our nation's schools.

Although SEL is a not the "magic wand" to cure what ails many of our schools, it can be a valuable element in educating all children effectively and preparing them to meet the challenges they will inevitably face in today's world. We now know the following:

- SEL programs are associated with several important behavioral and academic benefits for students.

- A well-grounded framework exists that integrates theory, research, and practice and that can be used to guide and improve school-based SEL programs.

- Several well-conceived and carefully evaluated programs—the CASEL SELect programs—are available for preschool and grades K-5 that represent excellent options for schools.

- Viable SEL alternatives using different formats and approaches are available for different grades to achieve different ends and to serve different types of student bodies.

- Teachers and other school staff can implement SEL programs successfully.

- Resources are available to help schools select and implement SEL programs that fit their specific needs.

In sum, SEL is more than just a good idea. It has become a scientifically established, practical approach that can improve the social, emotional, and academic performance of preschool and elementary school students throughout the country. SEL deserves a place in every child's daily education.

Summary of Program Review Findings and Suggestions for Future Research

CASEL is committed to establishing the strongest possible research base to promote students' social, emotional, and academic learning. Although research on social and emotional learning has made significant advances in the past decade, more work is needed to ensure that districts and schools will be able to implement the most effective programs. Below we summarize important findings from this *2013 CASEL Guide* that have implications for future research and practice.

Study design. Using strong evidence-based programs is critically important in fostering students' social and emotional development. Although this *Guide* includes data from both quasi-experimental studies and randomized controlled trials (RCTs), findings from RCTs are generally considered more reliable because their design is more rigorous. At the

preschool level, six of the seven SELect programs were evaluated with at least one RCT. At the elementary level, fewer programs were evaluated using that design (12 of 19), but a number of programs had replications. Replications are important, given that similar findings across multiple studies also lend confidence to the validity of the findings. One goal for the future is that all SELect programs would have multiple RCT evaluations. Also, many SEL programs are evaluated by the same team that developed them. Another way to improve the evidence base would be for program developers to work with independent research teams. This would add another level of rigor to the evaluation studies.

Assessment of outcomes. Across the SELect programs, many evaluations demonstrated beneficial effects on students. These included improved classroom behavior and social relationships as well as reduced conduct problems and aggression. It was less common for programs to report positive effects on students' academic performance. Out of seven preschool programs, two improved academic performance. Ten of the 19 elementary programs reported improved academic performance. Given the current climate of accountability in educational settings and the priorities of federal funding agencies, researchers will need to include assessments of academic outcomes in future evaluations of SEL programs. This must continue to be a high priority.

Student populations. For some SELect programs the grade levels of the sample in the evaluation studies were not representative of the full grade range of students covered by the program. In the future researchers should take this into consideration when designing studies and making choices about which students should participate. We believe every student should receive planned, ongoing, systematic SEL programming every year from preschool through elementary school. This review revealed that only one SELect program provided research-based programming sequentially across those grade levels. It is critical to build strong connections between learning experiences across the critical prekindergarten through elementary years. This will require SEL standards, evidence-based curricula, assessment, and professional development to be more closely aligned, particularly with the advent of Common Core State Standards. In addition it is essential that future research provide greater clarity about how SEL relates to diverse student populations, especially since the characteristics of students and school districts are rapidly changing across the nation and we are seeing more diversity than ever before.

SEL approaches. Traditionally SEL programs have used explicit lessons to teach students social and emotional skills. This was the most popular approach of the SELect programs included in the *2013 CASEL Guide.* Although this approach requires time in the academic schedule, it is an investment that can quickly make up for itself in terms of the return on instructional time gained from increased student engagement and reduced problem behavior. An important contribution of this review and *Guide* has been to expand perspectives on evidence-based approaches to promote academic, social, and emotional learning. Several developers have created programs that integrate curricula that promote academic, social, and emotional competence into the core curriculum. Other programs emphasize instructional practices to create classroom environments that foster social and emotional learning. One important set of questions for future research should investigate the unique contribution of each of these different approaches and whether it is possible to improve the impact of programs on student outcomes when multiple approaches are used together.

SEL beyond the classroom. Social and emotional learning is more powerful when it is reinforced in all the contexts that affect children's learning and development. It is common for SELect programs to encourage classroom-based skills development throughout the day. Substantial numbers of programs have components to coordinate classroom sessions with extensive school-wide (three preschool; 12 elementary) and family involvement (five preschool; 13 elementary) programming. Future research should clarify the independent and combined effects of classroom, school-wide, and family SEL programming.

Implementation quality. The quality of program implementation is greatly influenced by how prepared schools are when they adopt an SEL program, the process through which programs are chosen, the extent to which all staff members are involved in that decision, and whether or not there is real commitment to training and support. Although

we know much more now about effective implementation procedures than we did a decade ago, more research is needed to provide schools with the information and tools they need to implement evidence-based programs successfully. Through the evaluation of CASEL's Collaborating Districts Initiative and training focused on this *Guide,* CASEL will further contribute to our understanding of how to implement evidence-based SEL programming effectively to promote positive student outcomes.

Commitment to SEL. In the current climate of high-stakes testing, schools and teachers are experiencing an unprecedented degree of pressure to demonstrate that students are making adequate academic progress. This can lead to the perception that there is no time to devote to SEL programming. Schools vary in terms of the amount of time they feel they can devote to SEL. In our work with some of the largest urban districts in the country, we have found that when there is a commitment to SEL, especially from the administration, it can be implemented in a variety of settings, under many different types of conditions, and with a wide range of students and teachers.

The Future of Social and Emotional Learning

The SEL field has experienced substantial growth and sophistication in the past few years. We hope we have captured some of that in this document. We expect the field to evolve continually over time. The future will contain important contributions from research, practice, policy, and the use of technology that will positively shape the field's evolution.

In the earlier days of SEL, programs were usually started in only a few schools to test their impact. Knowing, as we do now, that several different types of SEL initiatives can be successful on a small-scale basis, we need information on how SEL programming can be incorporated systemically on a district-wide basis to offer comprehensive services simultaneously to multiple schools and student bodies. Our hope and expectation is that CASEL's Collaborating Districts Initiative, currently operating in eight large urban school districts across the country, as well as similar efforts elsewhere, will yield useful information on how to take SEL programs successfully to scale.

On the policy front, several state boards of education have developed preschool to grade 12 learning standards related to SEL that may eventually become part of everyday educational practice (Dusenbury et al., 2011). These standards should motivate more schools to investigate and integrate SEL initiatives into their curricula. At the federal level, there are opportunities in the pending Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning Act and in the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to further promote SEL at the national level.

All of these advances in the SEL field can be enhanced by the wise use of technology. For example, the Internet can deliver up-to-date and accurate communication to a worldwide audience and thus help in the dissemination and adoption of SEL programs. CASEL plans to update this *Guide* periodically as new information appears and post the information on the website (casel.org). Webinars can bring various stakeholders together and foster the development of coalitions among like-minded groups that can drive powerful grassroots initiatives. Interactive video conferencing has the potential to reduce the cost of implementation training and ongoing support substantially. Some groups have begun to use Web-based software to collect ongoing data about implementation in order to offer feedback to practitioners. Computer-based applications and the use of smart phones can support real-time assessments of behaviors, feelings, and attitudes that can aide in both implementation and program evaluation efforts. As new technological innovations appear, so will ideas about how they can be used most effectively in SEL programming. In general, technology can be a vehicle that can dramatically improve the cost-effectiveness of SEL programming.

Our hope is that educators and researchers will work closely together to advance evidence-based SEL practice. Each has much to offer the other. For example, researchers can continue to clarify the short- and long-term benefits of SEL programs, reasons why programs produce their desired outcomes, and the parameters associated with maximum program impact for different student populations. At the same time, school staff who administer programs and consultants offering implementation supports can discover ways to adapt programs effectively for different situations

and identify training methods that are most helpful to practitioners. These developments should, in turn, shape better research studies.

SEL is a valuable component of education that facilitates children's cognitive abilities and prepares them to meet the challenges they will inevitably face in today's world. As a result of the expanding research base, SEL should now be considered a scientifically established, practical method that can improve the social, emotional, and academic performance of many preschool and elementary school students throughout the country. It deserves a prominent place in the education of all children.

The current status of school-based SEL programming is bright. If recent developments in research, practice, and policy are any indication, the future is even brighter. CASEL will continue to stay informed about the central SEL issues in the context of shifting education priorities and actively communicate our findings.

Appendix A: Program Descriptions

This section provides descriptions of each program to expand on and supplement the tables in Chapter 4. The descriptions include a brief overview of the program and an expanded summary of the information in the Chapter 4 rating tables.

Each overview paragraph begins with a description of the general goals of the program and the full range of grade levels for which the program is designed. The current *CASEL Guide* focuses on preschool and elementary programs even though some of the SELect programs included in the current *Guide* extend beyond elementary school. Although we have reviewed only the preschool and elementary grades for each program, we indicate the full range of grades covered. The descriptive paragraph also presents the general structure of the program and the skills it develops. If a program uses specific strategies those are also described. If the program has components that promote and reinforce social and emotional learning in the classroom, through school-wide programming, school-family partnerships, or school-community partnerships, we briefly describe those as well. We also point out whether or not the program provides academic integration. Cultural sensitivity and linguistic responsiveness of SEL programs are extremely important, and we note whether or not the program attempts to address these factors. Although it was beyond the scope of this review to assess the appropriateness of each program for every possible cultural or linguistic context, we note here if there is content that helps teachers implement or adapt activities based on the cultures or linguistic needs of their students. Finally, we describe the program's initial training. We indicate how long the training typically lasts, whether or not it is required, and if the program offers a train-the-trainer model to support sustainability.

Following the overview, a summary of the information in the rating tables is provided. There are two additional pieces of information provided. At the beginning of the section for evidence of effectiveness, we include a statement about the strength of the evidence. This acknowledges the diversity in evaluations that met our criteria and the strength of evaluation(s) for each program you may want to consider. For example, some evaluations were small (fewer than 200 students) and some were large (more than 1,000 students). Some programs have been replicated in multiple evaluations. Some have conducted evaluations that followed students for multiple years, but others evaluated the effectiveness of the program only through pre-post evaluations within the same year. Some evaluations involved random assignment (called "randomized control trials" or "RCTs"), and others assigned students, classes, or schools to conditions in ways that were not random. These latter types of evaluations are called quasi-experimental. Although valuable and informative, quasi-experimental designs are not as strong as randomized trials, which are less subject to possible sources of bias. To capture this diversity in strength of evaluation, we include a brief statement about how many separate evaluations there were for a program, how large the sample was in the largest evaluation for that particular program, how long the longest evaluation followed students, and whether evaluation designs were randomized or quasi-experimental.

In the section of the table summary that describes the program outcomes, we also include any additional outcomes that were found in the qualifying studies that were not part of our inclusion criteria. These outcomes are in italics while the behavioral outcomes required for inclusion are in bold face.

4Rs (Reading, Writing, Respect, and Resolution)

Program Design and Implementation Support

The *4Rs Program (Reading, Writing, Respect, and Resolution)* provides read-alouds, book talks, and sequential, interactive skills lessons to develop social and emotional skills related to understanding and managing feelings, listening and developing empathy, being assertive, solving conflict creatively and nonviolently, honoring diversity, and standing up to teasing and bullying. *4Rs* is a grade-specific program available for students in prekindergarten through eighth grade. Divided into seven units, each grade has approximately 35 lessons — one a week throughout the year. Units also include extension activities, infusion ideas, recommendations of other books, and *4Rs* Activity Sheets to reinforce students' understanding. The *4Rs* program reinforces skills and concepts covered in each unit with a Family Connection activity that students take home to complete with their caregivers and *4Rs* "Family Connections" parent workshops. *Peer mediation and Peace Helper* programs are also available to support classroom- and school-wide programming. All *4Rs* stories incorporate a variety of cultures, ethnicities, and backgrounds. Initial training for the *4Rs* program typically lasts 25-30 hours and is required. *4Rs* offers a train-the-trainer system to support sustainability.

Grade Range Covered	PreK-8
Grade-by-Grade Sequence	✔
Average Number of Sessions Per Year	35 period-long classroom sessions
Classroom Approach to Teaching SEL	Explicit skills instruction Integration with academics (English/language arts)
Opportunities to Practice Social and Emotional Skills	●
Classroom-Wide Context	●
School-Wide Context	●
Family Context	●
Community Context	○
Tools for Monitoring Implementation	✔
Tools for Measuring Student Behavior	✔

KEY

○ *Minimal*

◑ *Adequate*

● *Extensive*

Evidence of Effectiveness

4Rs has been evaluated in a large (n=1,184) randomized control trial that followed students over a three-year period.

Grades Evaluated	3-4
Geographic Location	Urban
Student Race/Ethnicity	African-American, Hispanic
Percent Receiving Reduced Lunch	62%
Evaluation Outcomes	**Improved academic performance for students at behavioral risk, increased positive social behavior, reduced conduct problems, reduced emotional distress,** *improved academic behaviors for students at behavioral risk, improved climate, improved social and emotional skill performance*

KEY

Boldface:
Behavioral Outcomes

Italics:
Additional Outcomes

Al's Pals

Program Design and Implementation Support

Al's Pals promotes resiliency in early childhood with explicit instruction to develop social competence, autonomy, and problem solving. *Al's Pals* is designed for use with children three to eight years old. It includes 46 core lessons and 9 booster lessons. Each lesson lasts approximately 10-15 minutes, with two lessons implemented per week. Children learn to get along with others, use self-control, accept differences, resolve conflicts peacefully, cope, and make healthy choices. *Al's Pals* lessons incorporate SEL concepts into academic content areas typically taught in early childhood including numeracy, literacy, and the scientific method. Teachers learn ways to establish an accepting, caring, cooperative classroom environment that fosters children's positive social-emotional growth and development. In addition, the program offers extensive suggestions and materials for generalizing and practicing new skills in class beyond the lesson. Letters to parents, to be sent home after select lessons, are also designed to reinforce new skills. *Al's Pals* provides brief suggestions for adapting the lessons based on different cultures represented in the classroom. Initial training for *Al's Pals* is either done in-person (two days) or online (seven two-hour sessions). Training is required, and *Al's Pals* offers a train-the-trainer system to support sustainability.

Grade Range Covered	PreK-3
Grade-by-Grade Sequence	PreK-K, 1-3 (booster lessons)
Average Number of Sessions Per Year	46 core lessons and 9 booster lessons
Classroom Approach to Teaching SEL	Explicit skills instruction
Opportunities to Practice Social and Emotional Skills	●
Classroom-Wide Context	●
School-Wide Context	○
Family Context	◐
Community Context	○
Tools for Monitoring Implementation	✔
Tools for Measuring Student Behavior	✔

KEY

○ *Minimal*

◐ *Adequate*

● *Extensive*

Evidence of Effectiveness

Al's Pals has been evaluated in three quasi-experimental studies, the largest of which included 37 classes. Students have been followed over the course of a single year.

Grades Evaluated	PreK
Geographic Location	Rural, Suburban, Urban
Student Race/Ethnicity	African-American, Caucasian
Percent Receiving Reduced Lunch	100%
Evaluation Outcomes	**Increased positive social behavior, reduced conduct problems, reduced emotional distress**

KEY

Boldface: Behavioral Outcomes

Italics: Additional Outcomes

Caring School Community

Program Design and Implementation Support

Caring School Community, a program designed for use in kindergarten through sixth grade, is organized around four core educational practices: *Class Meetings* (30-35 per grade), *Cross-Age Buddies, Homeside Activities,* and *Schoolwide Community-Building Activities. Class Meetings* present a schedule of lessons and activities to be implemented throughout the school year. Forty *Cross-Age Buddies* activities promote bonding between pairs of older and younger students while at the same time supporting exploration of a wide range of academic subjects. *Homeside Activities* are implemented once or twice a month. These are first reviewed in class, then completed at home with caregivers, and then reflected upon and concluded in class. *Schoolwide Community-Building Activities* are implemented throughout the school year to build relationships, share knowledge, and promote pride in the school environment. *Caring School Community* offers suggestions to support English Language Learners, and *Homeside Activities* are available in English and Spanish. Initial training for the *Caring School Community* program typically lasts half a day to two full days and is not required. *Caring School Community* offers a train-the-trainer system to support sustainability.

		KEY
Grade Range Covered	K-6	
Grade-by-Grade Sequence	✔	○ *Minimal*
Average Number of Sessions Per Year	Year-long, with 30-35 class meetings per year	◐ *Adequate*
Classroom Approach to Teaching SEL	Teacher instructional practices	● *Extensive*
Opportunities to Practice Social and Emotional Skills	●	
Classroom-Wide Context	●	
School-Wide Context	●	
Family Context	●	
Community Context	●	
Tools for Monitoring Implementation	✔	
Tools for Measuring Student Behavior	✔	

Evidence of Effectiveness

Caring School Community has been evaluated in multiple studies (three randomized control trials, two quasi-experimental studies). The largest sample included 40 schools. Students have been followed over a five-year period.

		KEY
Grades Evaluated	K-6	
Geographic Location	Rural, Suburban, Urban	**Boldface:** Behavioral Outcomes
Student Race/Ethnicity	African-American, Hispanic	
Percent Receiving Reduced Lunch	0-95%	*Italics:* Additional Outcomes
Evaluation Outcomes	**Improved academic performance, increased positive social behavior, reduced conduct problems, reduced emotional distress,** *improved academic behaviors, improved climate, improved social and emotional skill performance, substance abuse prevention*	

Competent Kids, Caring Communities

Program Design and Implementation Support

Competent Kids, Caring Communities is designed to promote important life skills in students through an average of 35 separate sets of lessons for each year for kindergarten through fifth grade. Lessons follow a common structure, including an introduction to each that provides teachers with a research-based rationale. Opening questions are designed to motivate students and focus their attention. In addition to the classroom activities, one component promotes family-school collaboration, including sessions for families designed to be led by school or district leaders. Family sessions provide information on the social and emotional competencies the program is designed to promote. They focus on developing shared understanding and goals, joint decision making between schools and families, and positive school climate. The family-school collaboration component also includes activities to support new skills and concepts at home. Initial training for *Competent Kids, Caring Communities* typically lasts one to three days and is required. The program also offers a train-the-trainer system to support sustainability.

Grade Range Covered	K-5
Grade-by-Grade Sequence	✔
Average Number of Sessions Per Year	Average of 35 lessons per grade
Classroom Approach to Teaching SEL	Explicit skills instruction
Opportunities to Practice Social and Emotional Skills	●
Classroom-Wide Context	●
School-Wide Context	●
Family Context	●
Community Context	◐
Tools for Monitoring Implementation	✔
Tools for Measuring Student Behavior	✔

KEY

○ *Minimal*

◐ *Adequate*

● *Extensive*

Evidence of Effectiveness

Competent Kids, Caring Communities has been evaluated in a small study (n=119) using a quasi-experimental design. The evaluation followed students for one year, from fourth to fifth grade.

Grades Evaluated	4-5
Geographic Location	Urban
Student Race/Ethnicity	Diverse
Percent Receiving Reduced Lunch	52-63%
Evaluation Outcomes	**Improved academic performance**

KEY

Boldface: Behavioral Outcomes

Italics: Additional Outcomes

HighScope Educational Approach for Preschool

Program Design and Implementation Support

HighScope Educational Approach for Preschool is a comprehensive system of teaching practices and educational structures designed to enhance the learning environment and to support developmentally appropriate instruction in prekindergarten. The curriculum fully integrates academic, social, and emotional learning as part of the five dimensions of school readiness identified by the National Education Goals Panel: approaches to learning; language, literacy, and communication; social and emotional development; physical development, health, and well-being; and arts and sciences. The *HighScope* approach emphasizes active participatory learning, positive adult-child interactions, an optimal learning environment, regular routines, and assessment. The daily routine established by the program incorporates a "plan, do, review" cycle that supports independent learning and assessment and includes both small- and large-group activities. The program encourages teachers to learn about students' families by making a home visit prior to the child's first day, as well as by incorporating home-based materials and activities. *HighScope* provides extensive strategies, suggestions, and professional development around supporting English Language Learners and working with a diverse population of students and families from various cultural and ethnic backgrounds. Initial training for *HighScope* varies from 2 to 20 days long, depending on needs and resources. Training is not required, and *HighScope* offers a train-the-trainer system to support sustainability.

		KEY
Grade Range Covered	PreK	
Grade-by-Grade Sequence	✔	○ *Minimal*
Average Number of Sessions Per Year	n/a	◐ *Adequate*
Classroom Approach to Teaching SEL	Teacher instructional practices	● *Extensive*
Opportunities to Practice Social and Emotional Skills	●	
Classroom-Wide Context	●	
School-Wide Context	●	
Family Context	◐	
Community Context	○	
Tools for Monitoring Implementation	✔	
Tools for Measuring Student Behavior	✔	

Evidence of Effectiveness

Beginning in the 1960s, *HighScope* has been evaluated in small randomized control trial (n=123). The sample was followed for 37 years, continuing for up to 35 years after the program.

		KEY
Grades Evaluated	PreK	
Geographic Location	Urban	**Boldface:** Behavioral Outcomes
Student Race/Ethnicity	African-American, Caucasian	
Percent Receiving Reduced Lunch	100%	*Italics:* Additional Outcomes
Evaluation Outcomes	**Improved academic performance, increased positive social behavior, reduced conduct problems, reduced emotional distress,** *improved academic behaviors, improved adult economic stability, reduced adult criminal activity*	

I Can Problem Solve

Program Design and Implementation Support

The *I Can Problem Solve* program teaches students how to generate alternative solutions, anticipate consequences, and effectively solve problems. It is designed for use in prekindergarten through the elementary grades and is divided into three sets of lessons for prekindergarten (59 lessons), kindergarten and primary grades (83 lessons), and intermediate elementary grades (77 lessons). The scripted lessons take approximately 20 minutes to implement and focus on both pre-problem-solving skills and problem-solving skills. Instruction introduces central concepts, which is then followed by explicit skill instruction in social and emotional competencies. Dialoging is a central component of this program. Beyond the lesson, teachers are encouraged to infuse program methods to support positive student-teacher interaction into their regular classroom routine. To reinforce most lessons, the program provides parent pages as well as suggested strategies for connecting with core academic subject areas. Initial training for the *I Can Problem Solve* program typically lasts one to two days and is required. *I Can Problem Solve* offers a train-the-trainer system to support sustainability.

Grade Range Covered	PreK-5
Grade-by-Grade Sequence	Prekindergarten, Kindergarten & Primary Grades, Intermediate Elementary Grades
Average Number of Sessions Per Year	59-83 lessons per year
Classroom Approach to Teaching SEL	Explicit skills instruction
Opportunities to Practice Social and Emotional Skills	●
Classroom-Wide Context	●
School-Wide Context	○
Family Context	●
Community Context	○
Tools for Monitoring Implementation	✔
Tools for Measuring Student Behavior	✔

KEY

○ *Minimal*

◑ *Adequate*

● *Extensive*

Evidence of Effectiveness

I Can Problem Solve has been evaluated in multiple trials (two randomized control trials, one quasi-experimental). The largest sample was 655 students. Students were followed within the course of a single year.

Grades Evaluated	PreK-1
Geographic Location	Rural, Urban
Student Race/Ethnicity	African-American, Caucasian, Hispanic
Percent Receiving Reduced Lunch	100% (PreK), 91% (Elementary)
Evaluation Outcomes	**Increased positive social behavior, reduced conduct problems,** *improved social and emotional skill performance*

KEY

Boldface: Behavioral Outcomes

Italics: Additional Outcomes

The Incredible Years Series

www.incredibleyears.com

Program Design and Implementation Support

The Incredible Years Series is a set of three curricula for children, teachers, and parents. The Child Training program (Dinosaur Curriculum) focuses on developing skills to understand and recognize feelings, solve problems, manage anger, and develop and maintain friendships. The program is designed for use with children ages three to eight years old and includes approximately 60 lessons, dependent upon implementation, as the program provides multiple models for implementing in the classroom. Content is presented through puppetry or video vignettes followed by group discussion. Several activities reinforce the concepts learned and provide opportunities to practice skills. Each lesson ends with a homework activity that is completed at home with parents or caregivers, and several letters to parents are sent home during the course of the program as well. Parental involvement is strongly encouraged. Training for teachers focuses on developing classroom management skills and proactive teaching strategies. Training also emphasizes the importance of building positive relationships with students and teaching social skills and problem solving in the classroom. *The Incredible Years Series* also includes a separate training program specifically for parents. Initial training for the *Incredible Years* Child Training program typically lasts 21 hours (three days) and is not required.

		KEY
Grade Range Covered	PreK-2	
Grade-by-Grade Sequence	✔	○ *Minimal*
Average Number of Sessions Per Year	64 lessons	◑ *Adequate*
Classroom Approach to Teaching SEL	Explicit skills instruction	● *Extensive*
Opportunities to Practice Social and Emotional Skills	●	
Classroom-Wide Context	●	
School-Wide Context	○	
Family Context	●	
Community Context	○	
Tools for Monitoring Implementation	✔	
Tools for Measuring Student Behavior		

Evidence of Effectiveness

The Incredible Years Series has been evaluated in two randomized control trials. The largest sample included 1,768 students and 153 teachers. Students were followed within the course of one year.

		KEY
Grades Evaluated	PreK-1	
Geographic Location	Not reported	**Boldface:** Behavioral Outcomes
Student Race/Ethnicity	Diverse	
Percent Receiving Reduced Lunch	100% (PreK), 59% (Elementary)	*Italics:* Additional Outcomes
Evaluation Outcomes	**Increased positive social behavior, reduced conduct problems,** *improved climate, improved social and emotional skill performance*	

Michigan Model for Health

Program Design and Implementation Support

The *Michigan Model for Health,* designed for use in kindergarten through twelfth grade, is the state health curriculum for Michigan. The program provides separate sets of lessons each year from kindergarten through sixth grade, with separate units to support health education topics including nutrition and physical activity; safety; alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs; personal health and wellness; and social and emotional health. The unit on social and emotional health includes 8-14 structured lessons each year that focus on making friends, identifying and understanding feelings, making decisions and solving problems, developing respect, and setting goals. Each consists of three parts: instruction, practice, and closure. Continued practice is encouraged, and most lessons provide strategies for infusing learned skills beyond the lesson. There are occasional take-home sheets and student assessments. Initial training for the *Michigan Model for Health* typically lasts one to two days. Training is offered and required in the state of Michigan and strongly encouraged in other states. Out-of-state training is dependent upon availability of trainers and support staff. The program offers a train-the-trainer system to support sustainability.

Grade Range Covered	K-12
Grade-by-Grade Sequence	✔
Average Number of Sessions Per Year	8-14 lessons per year
Classroom Approach to Teaching SEL	Explicit skills instruction
Opportunities to Practice Social and Emotional Skills	●
Classroom-Wide Context	●
School-Wide Context	◐
Family Context	○
Community Context	○
Tools for Monitoring Implementation	
Tools for Measuring Student Behavior	✔

KEY

○ *Minimal*

◐ *Adequate*

● *Extensive*

Evidence of Effectiveness

Michigan Model for Health has been evaluated in a randomized control trial with a large (n=2,512) sample of students followed over two years.

Grades Evaluated	4-5
Geographic Location	Rural, Suburban, Urban
Student Race/Ethnicity	African-American, Caucasian
Percent Receiving Reduced Lunch	11-98%
Evaluation Outcomes	**Increased positive social behavior, reduced conduct problems,** *substance abuse prevention*

KEY

Boldface: Behavioral Outcomes

Italics: Additional Outcomes

MindUP

Program Design and Implementation Support

The *MindUP* program provides separate sets of lessons for three levels: prekindergarten through second grade; third through fifth grade; and sixth through eighth grade. Beginning after the third lesson, *MindUp* establishes core practices of deep breathing and attentive listening, which are then practiced several times a day throughout the school year. These practices are designed to enhance students' self awareness, focus attention, promote self-regulation, and reduce stress. In addition there are 15 structured lessons at each level that span four units. Each lesson provides an explanation of how the content and objective of the lesson is supported by brain research. The lessons also include a "getting ready" activity, a *MindUP* warm-up, and detailed instructions to the teacher on how to engage students and support their exploration and reflection on the topic. In addition, there are suggestions for creating an "optimistic classroom." Throughout, the program works to promote generalization and support connections to academic instruction, and there are suggested lesson extensions to support social and emotional development, mathematics, physical education, health, science, literature, and journal writing. *MindUP* offers suggestions to support English Language Learners. Initial training for the *MindUP* program typically lasts one full day (seven hours), and regional and collaborative workshops last two to two and one-half days. Training is not required, and *MindUP* offers a train-the-trainer system to support sustainability.

		KEY
Grade Range Covered	PreK-8	
Grade-by-Grade Sequence	PreK-2, 3-5, 6-8	○ *Minimal*
Average Number of Sessions Per Year	15 lessons per grade range covered	◐ *Adequate*
Classroom Approach to Teaching SEL	Explicit skills instruction	● *Extensive*
Opportunities to Practice Social and Emotional Skills	●	
Classroom-Wide Context	●	
School-Wide Context	○	
Family Context	○	
Community Context	○	
Tools for Monitoring Implementation	✔	
Tools for Measuring Student Behavior	✔	

Evidence of Effectiveness

MindUp has been evaluated in a small (n=146) quasi-experimental study. Students were followed within the course of a single year.

		KEY
Grades Evaluated	4-7	
Geographic Location	Urban	**Boldface:** Behavioral Outcomes
Student Race/Ethnicity	Diverse	
Percent Receiving Reduced Lunch	Not reported	*Italics:* Additional Outcomes
Evaluation Outcomes	**Increased positive social behavior, reduced conduct problems, reduced emotional distress**	

Open Circle

Program Design and Implementation Support

The *Open Circle* program, for use in kindergarten through fifth grade, is designed to equip teachers with effective practices for creating a cooperative classroom community and establishing positive relationships and effective approaches to problem solving within the classroom. The program has, on average, 34 structured lessons each year that cover relationship building and communication skills, understanding and managing emotions, and problem solving. Lessons begin with a review of the previous lesson, introduce new concepts, develop and practice new skills, provide homework/extension activities, and suggest connections to literature. Supplementary lessons are also provided to support each core lesson. The *Open Circle* program also has a separate unit on bullying, as well as separate components to support school-wide implementation and family involvement. *Open Circle* provides information on "Key Cultural Factors" and "Dimensions of Difference and Similarity" to support implementation with diverse groups. The program provides frequent suggestions and reminders for teachers regarding cultural sensitivity and ethnic norms. Additional reading is recommended for teachers, and letters to parents/caregiver are available in English and Spanish. Initial training for the *Open Circle* program typically spans four seven-hour training days and also includes two two-hour on-site training sessions. Trainings are spread across the academic year and are required.

Grade Range Covered	K-5
Grade-by-Grade Sequence	✔
Average Number of Sessions Per Year	34 lessons per grade plus supplementary lessons
Classroom Approach to Teaching SEL	Explicit skills instruction
Opportunities to Practice Social and Emotional Skills	●
Classroom-Wide Context	●
School-Wide Context	●
Family Context	●
Community Context	○
Tools for Monitoring Implementation	✔
Tools for Measuring Student Behavior	✔

KEY

○ *Minimal*

◐ *Adequate*

● *Extensive*

Evidence of Effectiveness

Open Circle has been evaluated in a small (n=152) quasi-experimental study. Students were followed within the course of a single year.

Grades Evaluated	4
Geographic Location	Suburban, Urban
Student Race/Ethnicity	Diverse
Percent Receiving Reduced Lunch	Not reported
Evaluation Outcomes	**Increased positive social behavior, reduced conduct problems**

KEY

Boldface:
Behavioral
Outcomes

Italics:
Additional
Outcomes

PATHS® (Promoting Alternative THinking Strategies)

Program Design and Implementation Support

The *Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS)* program promotes peaceful conflict resolution, emotion regulation, empathy, and responsible decision making. *PATHS* is designed for use in prekindergarten through sixth grade, with separate sets of lessons for first through fourth grade and combined sets of lessons for use in preschool and kindergarten and in fifth and sixth grade. Each lesson is scripted, beginning with an introduction that states background and goals, implementation guidelines, suggestions for engaging parents, a list of common questions and answers, supplementary activities (some of which connect to academics), and/or family handouts. Each lesson ends with reminders and suggestions for generalizing learned skills beyond the lesson to the classroom. *PATHS* lessons incorporate a variety of cultures, ethnicities, and backgrounds. Parent letters and informational handouts are available in English and Spanish. Initial training for the *PATHS* program typically lasts two days and is not required. *PATHS* offers a train-the-trainer system to support sustainability.

Grade Range Covered	PreK-6
Grade-by-Grade Sequence	✔
Average Number of Sessions Per Year	40-52 lessons per grade
Classroom Approach to Teaching SEL	Explicit skills instruction
Opportunities to Practice Social and Emotional Skills	●
Classroom-Wide Context	●
School-Wide Context	●
Family Context	●
Community Context	○
Tools for Monitoring Implementation	✔
Tools for Measuring Student Behavior	✔

KEY

○ *Minimal*
◑ *Adequate*
● *Extensive*

Evidence of Effectiveness

PATHS has been evaluated in multiple, large (e.g., n=2,397) randomized control trials in grades PreK-5 (one quasi-experimental, four RCTs). Evaluations have followed students for up to three years.

Grades Evaluated	PreK-5
Geographic Location	Rural, Suburban, Urban
Student Race/Ethnicity	African-American, Caucasian
Percent Receiving Reduced Lunch	100% (PreK), 39-80% (Elementary)
Evaluation Outcomes	**Improved academic performance, increased positive social behavior, reduced conduct problems, reduced emotional distress,** *improved academic behaviors, improved climate, improved social and emotional attitudes and skills*

KEY

Boldface: Behavioral Outcomes

Italics: Additional Outcomes

Peace Works: Peacemaking Skills for Little Kids

Program Design and Implementation Support

Peace Works: Peacemaking Skills for Little Kids is designed to promote conflict resolution skills with students in prekindergarten through second grade. The implementation structure and number of activities varies by grade, with a range of 30-85 activities available. Scripted lessons and activities cover topics such as listening skills and cooperation, using "I-care language," understanding and managing emotions, and taking responsibility. The program provides teachers with many strategies for infusing aspects of the program throughout the classroom and within core academic content areas. It also offers additional components for school-wide programs and partnering with families. Initial training for *Peace Works* typically lasts five to six hours (up to 18 hours) and is not required. A train-the-trainer system to support sustainability is offered.

		KEY
Grade Range Covered	PreK-2	○ *Minimal*
Grade-by-Grade Sequence	✔	◐ *Adequate*
Average Number of Sessions Per Year	30-85 activities, varies by grade	● *Extensive*
Classroom Approach to Teaching SEL	Explicit skills instruction	
Opportunities to Practice Social and Emotional Skills	●	
Classroom-Wide Context	●	
School-Wide Context	●	
Family Context	●	
Community Context	○	
Tools for Monitoring Implementation		
Tools for Measuring Student Behavior	✔	

Evidence of Effectiveness

Peace Works: Peacemaking Skills for Little Kids has been evaluated in a medium (n=246) randomized control trial. Students were followed over the course of one year.

		KEY
Grades Evaluated	PreK	**Boldface:** Behavioral Outcomes
Geographic Location	Urban	
Student Race/Ethnicity	Hispanic	*Italics:* Additional Outcomes
Percent Receiving Reduced Lunch	Not reported	
Evaluation Outcomes	**Increased positive social behavior, reduced conduct problems**	

Positive Action

Program Design and Implementation Support

The *Positive Action* program is designed to promote a healthy self-concept and to establish positive actions for the body and mind. The program emphasizes effective self-management, social skills, character, and mental health, as well as skills for setting and achieving goals. The *Positive Action* classroom curriculum contains separate sets of lessons for use each year, from prekindergarten through twelfth grade. Each grade has approximately 140 sequenced lessons, all of which include a step-by-step script organized around a different theme. All content is based on a single fundamental philosophy: You feel good about yourself when you do positive actions (positive self-concept), and there is a positive way (positive actions) to do everything. Additional program components support classroom-wide, school-wide, family, and community involvement. *Positive Action* offers separate units for bullying prevention, drug education, conflict resolution, and promoting a positive school climate that can each be added to the core program. Initial training for the *Positive Action* program typically lasts one-half day to five days, dependent upon scope and sequence of implementation, and is not required. *Positive Action* offers a train-the-trainer system to support sustainability.

Grade Range Covered	PreK-12
Grade-by-Grade Sequence	✔
Average Number of Sessions Per Year	140 lessons per grade
Classroom Approach to Teaching SEL	Explicit skills instruction
Opportunities to Practice Social and Emotional Skills	●
Classroom-Wide Context	●
School-Wide Context	●
Family Context	●
Community Context	●
Tools for Monitoring Implementation	✔
Tools for Measuring Student Behavior	✔

KEY

○ *Minimal*

◑ *Adequate*

● *Extensive*

Evidence of Effectiveness

Positive Action has been evaluated in multiple, large (e.g., n=1,714) randomized control trials and quasi-experimental trials (two RCTs, two quasi-experimental). Evaluations have followed students for up to a three-year period.

Grades Evaluated	K-5
Geographic Location	Urban
Student Race/Ethnicity	African-American, Asian-Pacific Islander, Hispanic
Percent Receiving Reduced Lunch	25-75%
Evaluation Outcomes	**Improved academic performance, reduced conduct problems,** *improved academic behaviors, substance abuse prevention*

KEY

Boldface: Behavioral Outcomes

Italics: Additional Outcomes

Raising Healthy Children

Program Design and Implementation Support

Raising Healthy Children, a school-wide approach designed for use with students in kindergarten through sixth grade, incorporates school, family, and individual programs to create a caring community of learners. The classroom component, *Get-Alongs,* includes eight classroom-based units with daily lessons and activities that span an eight-month period (approximately one unit per month). Academic integration strategies and recommended literature are also included. Teacher workshops on classroom management, instructional strategies, and social and emotional learning impact teacher practices in the classroom and throughout the school. School-wide implementation teams and ongoing coaching also facilitate this school-wide approach. Family involvement occurs through homework assignments that are part of the *Get-Alongs* units, family workshops, outreach, and other family activities. Initial training for *Raising Healthy Children* typically lasts one to three days and is required. Full implementation and training spans a three-year period. *Raising Healthy Children* offers a train-the-trainer system to support sustainability.

Grade Range Covered	K-6	
Grade-by-Grade Sequence	✔	
Average Number of Sessions Per Year	n/a	
Classroom Approach to Teaching SEL	Explicit skills instruction, Teacher instructional practices	
Opportunities to Practice Social and Emotional Skills	●	
Classroom-Wide Context	●	
School-Wide Context	●	
Family Context	●	
Community Context	○	
Tools for Monitoring Implementation	✔	
Tools for Measuring Student Behavior	✔	

KEY

○ *Minimal*

◐ *Adequate*

● *Extensive*

Evidence of Effectiveness

Raising Healthy Children has been evaluated in a large (n=938) randomized control trial that included summer camps and after-school tutoring, as well in-home services for students with behavioral or academic needs. The initial evaluation followed students over a 1.5-year period. Follow-up evaluations to measure substance use were conducted nine years later.

Grades Evaluated	1-6
Geographic Location	Suburban
Student Race/Ethnicity	Caucasian
Percent Receiving Reduced Lunch	28-33%
Evaluation Outcomes	**Improved academic performance, increased positive social behaviors, reduced conduct problems,** *improved academic behaviors, improved climate, substance abuse prevention*

KEY

Boldface: Behavioral Outcomes

Italics: Additional Outcomes

Resolving Conflict Creatively Program (RCCP)

www.morningsidecenter.org or
www.esrnational.org

Program Design and Implementation Support

The *Resolving Conflict Creatively Program* includes sequenced, skill-building, classroom lessons (all titled *Connected and Respected*) designed to foster the creation of caring, peaceable school learning communities for prekindergarten through eighth grade. Lessons emphasize building relationships, understanding feelings, developing empathy, managing emotions, and developing social responsibility. The program offers 16 *Connected and Respected* lessons for each grade to be implemented in workshop format. This facilitative approach includes a gathering, review of agenda, main activities and discussion, summary, and closing activities. Each lesson also includes suggestions for extension activities, infusion ideas, and connections to literature. In addition to the classroom lessons, the program includes a peer mediation and family component that are central to program implementation. A goal of the *Resolving Conflict Creatively Program* is to address stereotyping and reduce racial/ethnic/gender put-downs in the classroom. A checklist is provided for each grade level to assist in addressing this. Initial training for the program typically lasts 24-30 hours and is required. The *Resolving Conflict Creatively Program* offers a train-the-trainer system to support sustainability.

Grade Range Covered	PreK-8
Grade-by-Grade Sequence	✔
Average Number of Sessions Per Year	16 lessons per grade *(Connected and Respected)*
Classroom Approach to Teaching SEL	Explicit skills Instruction, Teacher Instructional Practices
Opportunities to Practice Social and Emotional Skills	●
Classroom-Wide Context	●
School-Wide Context	●
Family Context	●
Community Context	○
Tools for Monitoring Implementation	✔
Tools for Measuring Student Behavior	✔

KEY

○ *Minimal*

◐ *Adequate*

● *Extensive*

Evidence of Effectiveness

The *Resolving Conflict Creatively Program* has been evaluated in two large (e.g., n=11,160) randomized control trials. Evaluations have followed students over the course of two years.

Grades Evaluated	1-6
Geographic Location	Urban
Student Race/Ethnicity	African-American, Hispanic
Percent Receiving Reduced Lunch	86%
Evaluation Outcomes	**Reduced conduct problems, reduced emotional distress,** *improved social and emotional skill performance*

KEY

Boldface: Behavioral Outcomes

Italics: Additional Outcomes

Responsive Classroom

Program Design and Implementation Support

The *Responsive Classroom®* approach is designed to create classrooms that are responsive to children's physical, emotional, social, and intellectual needs through developmentally appropriate educational experiences in kindergarten through sixth grade. The approach incorporates ten essential teaching practices and practical strategies including morning meetings, rule creation, interactive modeling, positive teacher language, logical consequences, guided academic discovery, academic choice, classroom organization, collaborative problem solving, and guidelines for working with families. Teachers are encouraged to connect with parents individually on a regular basis in order to share updates and expectations about the child's development or to collaboratively address any difficulties the child may be experiencing. The *Responsive Classroom* approach incorporates many nonverbal signals (e.g., a chime or raised hand when students should pay attention) throughout the day. Extensive suggestions and strategies for including English Language Learners in Morning Meetings as well as recommendations for Morning Meeting activities that are especially conducive for ELLs are provided. Pamphlets on child development are available in Spanish, and the overview video has Spanish subtitles. Initial training for the *Responsive Classroom* approach is conducted in two parts that each last four and one-half days (30 hours). Training is required, and a train-the-trainer system to support sustainability is offered.

			KEY
Grade Range Covered	K-6		
Grade-by-Grade Sequence	✔		○ *Minimal*
Average Number of Sessions Per Year	n/a		◐ *Adequate*
Classroom Approach to Teaching SEL	Teacher instructional practices		● *Extensive*
Opportunities to Practice Social and Emotional Skills	●		
Classroom-Wide Context	●		
School-Wide Context	●		
Family Context	●		
Community Context	○		
Tools for Monitoring Implementation	✔		
Tools for Measuring Student Behavior	✔		

Evidence of Effectiveness

Responsive Classroom has been evaluated in a large (n=1,408) quasi-experimental study. The project followed students over a three-year period.

		KEY
Grades Evaluated	3-5	
Geographic Location	Urban	**Boldface:** Behavioral Outcomes
Student Race/Ethnicity	Diverse	
Percent Receiving Reduced Lunch	35%	*Italics:* Additional Outcomes
Evaluation Outcomes	**Improved academic performance,** *improved academic behaviors, improved climate*	

RULER

Program Design and Implementation Support

The RULER Approach to Social and Emotional Learning is a school-wide approach designed for use in kindergarten through eighth grade to promote emotional literacy, which includes **R**ecognizing, **U**nderstanding, **L**abeling, **E**xpressing, and **R**egulating emotions (the "RULER" skills). *RULER* implementation involves systematic professional development for the adults involved in the education of children (school leaders, teachers, support staff, and families) so that emotions become central to learning, teaching, and parenting. In the first year, teachers learn and then teach the "anchors" of emotional literacy: four tools that were designed to help both adults and students to develop their *RULER* skills, self- and social awareness, empathy, and perspective-taking ability, as well as to foster a healthy emotional climate. Subsequently teachers learn how to integrate the approach into their standard curriculum and experience *The Feeling Words Curriculum,* a language-based emotional literacy program for students. In addition, *RULER* has an interactive training program designed to provide adult family members with strategies for extending and promoting social and emotional development at home. Initial training for *RULER* typically lasts at least two days and is required. *RULER* offers a train-the-trainer system to support sustainability.

Grade Range Covered	K-8
Grade-by-Grade Sequence	✔
Average Number of Sessions Per Year	Anchor Tools: 16 lessons + daily implementation; Feeling Words: 75 lessons
Classroom Approach to Teaching SEL	Teacher instructional practices Integration with academics (English/language arts)
Opportunities to Practice Social and Emotional Skills	●
Classroom-Wide Context	●
School-Wide Context	●
Family Context	●
Community Context	○
Tools for Monitoring Implementation	✔
Tools for Measuring Student Behavior	✔

KEY

○ *Minimal*

◐ *Adequate*

● *Extensive*

Evidence of Effectiveness

RULER has been evaluated in a randomized control trial (n=273) conducted in grades 5-6. Students were followed over the course a single year.

Grades Evaluated	5-6
Geographic Location	Suburban
Student Race/Ethnicity	Caucasian, Diverse
Percent Receiving Reduced Lunch	6-7%
Evaluation Outcomes	**Improved academic performance, increased positive social behavior,** *improved academic behaviors, improved climate*

KEY

Boldface: Behavioral Outcomes

Italics: Additional Outcomes

Second Step

Program Design and Implementation Support

Second Step provides instruction in social and emotional learning with units on skills for learning, empathy, emotion management, friendship skills, and problem solving. The program contains separate sets of lessons for use in prekindergarten through eighth grade implemented in 22 to 28 weeks each year. The Early Learning program in *Second Step* also includes a unit for transitioning to kindergarten. *Second Step* uses four key strategies to reinforce skill development: brain builder games (to build executive function), weekly theme activities, reinforcing activities, and home links. Teachers are encouraged to give children daily opportunities to practice. *Second Step* also connects new skills to other areas in the curriculum (e.g., literacy, arts, dramatic arts) and provides a structure for each day of the week. The first day contains a script and main lesson. The second day includes a story and discussion. The third and fourth days involve practice activities in small and large groups. On the fifth day students read a book connected to the overall unit theme, and teachers send home a "Home Link" activity that gives students an opportunity to practice new skills with their caregivers. *Second Step* lessons and accompanying photographs incorporate a variety of cultures, ethnicities, and backgrounds. Home Link activities are available in English and Spanish. Initial training for *Second Step* typically lasts one to four hours and is not required.

		KEY
Grade Range Covered	PreK-8	
Grade-by-Grade Sequence	✔	○ *Minimal*
Average Number of Sessions Per Year	22-28 weekly topics/across 5 days per week	◑ *Adequate*
Classroom Approach to Teaching SEL	Explicit skills instruction	● *Extensive*
Opportunities to Practice Social and Emotional Skills	●	
Classroom-Wide Context	●	
School-Wide Context	◑	
Family Context	◑	
Community Context	○	
Tools for Monitoring Implementation	✔	
Tools for Measuring Student Behavior	✔	

Evidence of Effectiveness

Second Step has been evaluated in multiple randomized and quasi-experimental studies (two randomized control trials and two quasi-experimental). Students have been followed over the course of up to two years.

		KEY
Grades Evaluated	1-6	
Geographic Location	Suburban, Urban	**Boldface:** Behavioral Outcomes
Student Race/Ethnicity	Diverse	
Percent Receiving Reduced Lunch	20-75%	*Italics:* Additional Outcomes
Evaluation Outcomes	**Increased positive social behavior, reduced conduct problems, reduced emotional distress,** *improved social and emotional skill performance*	

Social Decision Making/ Problem Solving Program

Program Design and Implementation Support

The *Social Decision Making/Problem Solving Program* covers approximately 30 topics each year designed to develop self-control, social awareness, and effective decision-making skills. The program contains separate sets of lessons each year for kindergarten through eighth grade. Sessions follow a structure that includes an introduction to the topic, modeling of the skill, opportunities for practice, reflection and discussion, and suggestions for practice beyond the structured lesson. Also included are tips for teachers to support effective pedagogy and instructional practices to promote social and emotional learning, as well as strategies for integrating new skills and concepts into core academic subject areas. The program provides frequent take-home activities and supplementary books for parents on the importance of social and emotional development. The program manual includes a section for frequently asked questions that address cultural relevance. Occasional suggestions for remaining sensitive to and aware of various cultures and ethnicities are included throughout the lessons. Initial training for the program typically lasts one to three days and is not required. The *Social Decision Making/Problem Solving* program offers a train-the-trainer system to support sustainability.

Grade Range Covered	K-8
Grade-by-Grade Sequence	✔
Average Number of Sessions Per Year	30 topics per grade
Classroom Approach to Teaching SEL	Explicit skills instruction
Opportunities to Practice Social and Emotional Skills	●
Classroom-Wide Context	●
School-Wide Context	◐
Family Context	◐
Community Context	○
Tools for Monitoring Implementation	✔
Tools for Measuring Student Behavior	✔

KEY

○ *Minimal*

◐ *Adequate*

● *Extensive*

Evidence of Effectiveness

Social Decision Making/Problem Solving has been evaluated in two small (e.g., n=158) quasi-experimental studies. Students were followed over a period of five to six years.

Grades Evaluated	4-5
Geographic Location	Suburban
Student Race/Ethnicity	Not reported
Percent Receiving Reduced Lunch	Not reported
Evaluation Outcomes	**Improved academic performance, increased positive social behavior, reduced emotional distress, reduced conduct problems,** *improved academic behaviors*

KEY

Boldface: Behavioral Outcomes

Italics: Additional Outcomes

Steps to Respect

www.cfchildren.org/steps-to-respect.aspx

Program Design and Implementation Support

Steps to Respect is a school-wide program designed for use in third through sixth grade. Implementation occurs in three phases: school administrators take stock of their school environment and bullying issues; then all adults in the building are trained; and finally classroom-based lessons are taught. The program provides 11 classroom lessons with two additional literature units that contain multiple lessons in each. These lessons focus on topics such as how to make friends, understanding and recognizing feelings, and dealing with bullying. Optional extension activities are provided at the end of each lesson for social and emotional skill areas as well as academic content areas. Family handouts are also provided for each lesson. *Steps to Respect* attempts to "eliminate any visibility of differences" so the materials can be applicable to a variety of cultures and ethnic backgrounds and can span a longer period of time and relevance. All images are represented in black and white, and the lessons incorporate a variety of cultures, ethnicities, and backgrounds. Initial training for the *Steps to Respect* program typically lasts six to eight days and is not required.

Grade Range Covered	3-6
Grade-by-Grade Sequence	✔
Average Number of Sessions Per Year	11 lessons + 2 literature units per grade (7-10 lessons in each)
Classroom Approach to Teaching SEL	Explicit skills instruction, Academic integration, Teacher instructional practices
Opportunities to Practice Social and Emotional Skills	●
Classroom-Wide Context	●
School-Wide Context	●
Family Context	◐
Community Context	○
Tools for Monitoring Implementation	✔
Tools for Measuring Student Behavior	

KEY

○ *Minimal*

◐ *Adequate*

● *Extensive*

Evidence of Effectiveness

Steps to Respect has been evaluated in two randomized control trials. The largest study involved 2,940 students in 33 schools. Students in one study have been followed over a two-year period.

Grades Evaluated	3-6
Geographic Location	Rural, Suburban, Urban
Student Race/Ethnicity	Diverse, Hispanic
Percent Receiving Reduced Lunch	40%
Evaluation Outcomes	**Increased positive social behavior, reduced conduct problems,** *improved climate, improved social and emotional skill performance*

KEY

Boldface: Behavioral Outcomes

Italics: Additional Outcomes

Too Good for Violence

Program Design and Implementation Support

Too Good for Violence is a violence prevention and character education program for students in kindergarten through eighth grade that teaches character-based skills such as respect, celebrating diversity, and understanding feelings and actions. The curriculum consists of seven scripted lessons that take 30-60 minutes EACH to implement. Infusion activities that integrate social and emotional skills with academic content areas are also provided in addition to recommended readings, videos, and home activities to be completed with parents or caregivers. Family and community involvement is emphasized, and suggested activities and recommendations for teachers are provided. Initial training for the program typically lasts FIVE hours and is not required. *Too Good for Violence* offers a train-the-trainer system to support sustainability.

Grade Range Covered	K-8
Grade-by-Grade Sequence	✔
Average Number of Sessions Per Year	7 30-60 minute lessons plus infusion activities
Classroom Approach to Teaching SEL	Explicit skills instruction
Opportunities to Practice Social and Emotional Skills	◑
Classroom-Wide Context	◑
School-Wide Context	◑
Family Context	◑
Community Context	◑
Tools for Monitoring Implementation	✔
Tools for Measuring Student Behavior	✔

KEY

○ *Minimal*
◑ *Adequate*
● *Extensive*

Evidence of Effectiveness

Too Good for Violence has been evaluated in a large (n=999) randomized control trial. Students were followed over the course of one year.

Grades Evaluated	3
Geographic Location	Not reported
Student Race/Ethnicity	Caucasian, Hispanic
Percent Receiving Reduced Lunch	54%
Evaluation Outcomes	**Increased positive social behavior**

KEY

Boldface:
Behavioral
Outcomes

Italics:
Additional
Outcomes

Tools of the Mind

Program Design and Implementation Support

Tools of the Mind is an early childhood program for students in prekindergarten and kindergarten that promotes self-regulated learning and is designed to be embedded within the classroom. With a focus on early literacy, mathematics, and other cognitive competencies such as self-reflection, the program encourages teachers to scaffold student learning while encouraging use of mental "tools" through self-regulation activities, make-believe play, and a structured classroom environment that enable students to control their social, emotional, and cognitive behaviors. The *Tools of the Mind* program also provides structures for family involvement and information for parents who wish to reinforce the activities with their children outside of the program. Initial training for *Tools of the Mind* typically lasts two days and is not required. A train-the-trainer system to support sustainability is offered.

Grade Range Covered	PreK-K	
Grade-by-Grade Sequence	✔	
Average Number of Sessions Per Year	n/a	
Classroom Approach to Teaching SEL	Teacher instructional practices, Academic integration	
Opportunities to Practice Social and Emotional Skills	●	
Classroom-Wide Context	●	
School-Wide Context	○	
Family Context	●	
Community Context	○	
Tools for Monitoring Implementation	✔	
Tools for Measuring Student Behavior	✔	

KEY

○ *Minimal*

◐ *Adequate*

● *Extensive*

Evidence of Effectiveness

Tools of the Mind has been evaluated in a randomized control trial (n=210). Students were followed within the course of one year.

Grades Evaluated	PreK
Geographic Location	Urban
Student Race/Ethnicity	Hispanic
Percent Receiving Reduced Lunch	80%
Evaluation Outcomes	**Reduced conduct problems,** *improved academic behaviors, improved climate*

KEY

Boldface: Behavioral Outcomes

Italics: Additional Outcomes

Tribes Learning Communities www.tribes.com

Program Design and Implementation Support

Tribes Learning Communities aim to engage all members of the educational community — district and school administrators, teachers, family members, and community members — in ongoing, goal-oriented collaboration to create a caring and supportive environment that establishes positive expectations and promotes the active participation of all students from kindergarten through twelfth grade. The *Tribes* process includes four community strategies: attentive listening, appreciation/no put downs, the right to pass—the right to participate, and mutual respect. Key program structures and educational practices supported by the program include cooperative learning groups (comprised of three to six students) that work together throughout the entire school year and Community Circles, which provide opportunities for students to work together to solve classroom problems and build relationships. The curriculum also suggests a strategy for exploring academic content. *Tribes* materials incorporate a variety of cultures, ethnicities, and backgrounds throughout the text and images. Suggestions are provided for adaptation and sensitivity to students' ethnic backgrounds and cultural beliefs, as well as tailoring language to meet the needs of English Language Learners and students from diverse backgrounds. Program materials are available in English and Spanish. Initial training for *Tribes* typically lasts 24 hours and is spread across four days. Training is not required, and a train-the-trainer system to support sustainability is offered.

Grade Range Covered	K-12
Grade-by-Grade Sequence	✔
Average Number of Sessions Per Year	n/a
Classroom Approach to Teaching SEL	Teacher instructional practices
Opportunities to Practice Social and Emotional Skills	●
Classroom-Wide Context	●
School-Wide Context	●
Family Context	●
Community Context	○
Tools for Monitoring Implementation	✔
Tools for Measuring Student Behavior	✔

KEY

○ *Minimal*

◗ *Adequate*

● *Extensive*

Evidence of Effectiveness

Tribes has been evaluated in a large quasi-experimental (n=3288) study. A subset (n=695) was randomized. Students were followed over the course of a single year.

Grades Evaluated	3
Geographic Location	Not reported
Student Race/Ethnicity	African-American, Caucasian
Percent Receiving Reduced Lunch	30-33%
Evaluation Outcomes	**Improved academic performance,** *improved academic behaviors*

KEY

Boldface: Behavioral Outcomes

Italics: Additional Outcomes

Appendix B: References

Abbot, R. D., O'Donnell, J., Hawkins, J. D., Hill, K. G., Kosterman, R., & Catalano, R. F. (1998). Changing teaching practices to promote achievement and bonding to school. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 68*(4), 542-552.

Aber, J. L., Brown, J. L., & Jones, S. M. (2003). Developmental trajectories toward violence in middle childhood: Course, demographic differences, and response to school-based intervention. *Developmental Psychology, 39*(2), 324-348.

Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning Act of 2011, HR 2437, 112th Congress, 1st Sess. (2011).

Albright, M. I., & Weissberg, R. P. (2009). School-family partnerships to promote social and emotional learning. In S. L. Christenson & A. L. Reschley (Eds.), *The handbook of school-family partnerships* (pp. 246-265). New York: Routledge/Taylor and Francis Group.

Allen, J. P., Pianta, R. C., Gregory, A., Mikami, A. Y., & Lun, J. (2011) An interaction-based approach to enhancing secondary school instruction and student achievement. *Science, 333,* 1034-1037.

Battistich, V., Schaps, E., Watson, M., & Solomon, D. (1996). Prevention effects of the child development project: Early findings from an ongoing multisite demonstration trail. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 11,* 12-35.

Bear, G. G. (2010). *School discipline and self discipline: A practical guide to promoting student prosocial behavior.* New York: Guilford.

Bierman, K. L., & Erath, S. A. (2006). Promoting social competence in early childhood: Classroom curricula and social skills coaching programs. In K. McCartney & D. Phillips (Eds.), *Blackwell Handbook on Early Childhood Development* (pp. 595-615). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Blair, C. (2002). School readiness: Integrating cognition and emotion in a neurobiological conceptualization of children's functioning at school entry. *American Psychologist, 57*(2), 111-127.

Bond, L. A., & Carmola-Hauf, A. M. (2004). Taking stock and putting stock in primary prevention: Characteristics of effective programs. *The Journal of Primary Prevention, 24*(3), 199-221.

Botvin, G. J., Baker, E., Dusenbury, L., Tortu, S., & Botvin, E. M. (1990). Preventing adolescent drug abuse through a multimodal cognitive-behavioral approach: Results of a 3-year study. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 58*(4), 437-446.

Bowman, B. T., Donovan, S., & Burns, M. S. (Eds.). (2001). *Eager to learn: Educating our preschoolers.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. A., 1998. The ecology of developmental processes. In W. Danon (Series Ed.) & R. M. Lerner (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 1. Theoretical models of human development* (5th ed., pp. 993-1028). New York: Wiley.

Camilli, G., Vargas, S., Ryan, S., & Barnett, W. S. (2010). Meta-analysis of the effects of early education interventions on cognitive and social development. *Teachers College Record, 112*(3), 579-620.

Campbell, S. B., & von Stauffenberg, C. (2008). Child characteristics and family processes that predict behavioral readiness for school. In A. Booth & A. C. Crouter, (Eds.), *Disparities in school readiness: How do families contribute to transitions into school?* (pp. 225-258). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

CASEL — Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning. (2003). *Safe and sound: An educational leader's guide to evidence-based social and emotional learning (SEL) programs.* Chicago, IL: Author.

CASEL — Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning. (2013). *Implementing systemic district and school social and emotional learning.* Chicago, IL: Author.

Cohen, J. (2006). Social, emotional, ethical, and academic education: Creating a climate for learning, participation in democracy, and well-being. *Harvard Educational Review, 76,* 201-237.

Denham, S.A., Brown, C., & Domitrovich, C.E. (2010). "Plays nice with others": Social–emotional learning and academic success. *Early Education and Development, 21*(5), 652-680.

Denham, S. A., & Burton, R. (2003). *Social and emotional prevention and intervention programming for preschoolers.* New York: Springer.

Denham, S. A., & Weissberg, R. P. (2004). Social-emotional learning in early childhood: What we know and where to go from here. In E. Chesebrough, P. King, T. P. Gullotta, & M. Bloom (Eds.), *A blueprint for the promotion of prosocial behavior in early childhood* (pp. 13-50). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.

Devaney, E., O'Brien, M. U., Resnik, H., Keister, S., & Weissberg, R. P. (2006). *Sustainable schoolwide social and emotional learning: Implementation guide and toolkit.* Chicago, IL: CASEL — Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning.

Diekstra, R. F. W. (2008). *Effectiveness of school-based social and emotional education programmes worldwide.* In *Social and emotional education: An international analysis* (pp. 255-312). Santender, Spain: Fundacion Marcelino Botin.

Domitrovich, C., Bradshaw, C., Greenberg, M., Embry, D., Poduska, J., & Ialongo, N. (2011). Integrated models of school-based prevention: Logic and Theory. *Psychology in the Schools, 47*(1), 71-88.

Domitrovich, C. E., Graczyk, P. A., & Zins, J. E. (2003). The study of implementation in school-based preventive interventions: Theory, research, and practice. *Promotion of mental health and Prevention of Mental and Behavioral Disorder, 3,* 1-62.

Durlak, J. A., & Dupre, E. P. (2008). Implementation matters: A review of research on the influence of implementation on program outcomes and the factors affecting implementation. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 41,* 327-350.

Durlak, J. A., & Weissberg, R. P. (2010). Social and emotional learning programs that work. In R. Slavin (Ed.), *Better evidence-based education: Social-emotional learning, 2,* 4-5. York: Institute for Effective Education, University of York.

Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., & Pachan, M. (2010). A meta-analysis of after-school programs that seek to promote personal and social skills in children and adolescents. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 45,* 294-309.

Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., & Schellinger, K. B. (2011). The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: A meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions. *Child Development, 82,* 405-432.

Dusenbury, L., Zadrazil, J., Mart, A., & Weissberg, R. P. (2011). *State learning standards to advance social and emotional learning.* Chicago, IL: CASEL — Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning.

Elias, M. J. (1997). The missing piece: Making the case for greater attention to social and emotional learning. *Education Week,* December 3, 1997.

Elias, M. J., Zins, J. E., Weissberg, R. P., Greenberg, M. S., Frey, K. S., Haynes, N. M., et al. (1997). *Promoting social and emotional learning: Guidelines for educators.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Elias, M. J. (2006). The connection between academic and social-emotional learning. In M. J. Elias & H. Arnold (Eds.), *The educator's guide to emotional intelligence and academic achievement: Social-emotional learning in the classroom* (pp. 4-14). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Elias, M., O'Brien, M. U., & Weissberg, R. P. (2006). Transformative leadership for social-emotional learning. *Principal Leadership, 7*(5), 10-13.

Fullan, M., Bertrani, A., & Quinn, J. (2004) New lessons for districtwide reform. *Educational Leadership, 61,* 7-15.

Goleman, D. (2005). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ.* New York: Bantam.

Greenberg, M. T., Domitrovich, C. E., Graczyk, P. A., & Zins, J. E. (2005). *The study of implementation in school-based preventive interventions: Theory, research, and practice* (Vol. 3). Rockville, MD: Center for Mental Health Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration.

Greenberg, M. T., Weissberg, R. P., O'Brien, M. U., Zins, J. E., Fredericks, L., Resnik, H., & Elias, M. J. (2003). Enhancing school-based prevention and youth development through coordinated social, emotional, and academic learning. *American Psychologist, 58*(6&7), 466-474.

Hamre, B. K., & Pianta, R. C. (2006). Student-teacher relationships. In G. G. Bear & K. M. Minke (Eds.), *Children's needs III: Development, prevention, and intervention* (pp. 59-71). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Hamre, B. K., & Pianta, R. C. (2007). Learning opportunities in preschool and early elementary classrooms. In R. Pianta, M. Cox, & K. Snow (Eds.), *School readiness & the transition to kindergarten in the era of accountability* (pp. 49-84). Baltimore, MD: Brookes.

Hawkins, J. D., Smith, B. H., & Catalano, R. F. (2004). Social development and social and emotional learning. In J. E. Zins, R. P. Weissberg, M. C. Wang, & H. J. Walberg (Eds.), *Building academic success on social and emotional learning: What does the research say?* (pp. 135-150). New York: Teachers College Press.

January, A. M., Casey, R. J., & Paulson, D. (2011). A meta-analysis of classroom-wide interventions to build social skills: Do they work? *School Psychology Review, 40*(2), 242-256.

Kam, C., Greenberg, M. T., & Walls, C. T. (2003). Examining the role of implementation quality in school-based prevention using the PATHS curriculum. *Prevention Science, 4,* 55-63.

Kress, J. S., & Elias, M. J. (2006). School-based social and emotional learning programs. In W. Damon & R. M. Lerner (Series Eds.) & K. A. Renninger & I. E. Sigel (Vol. Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 4. Child psychology in practice* (6th ed., pp 592-618). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

MacIver, M. A., & Farley, E. (2008). *Bringing the district back in: The role of the central office in improving instruction and student achievement.* Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk.

Magnuson, K., & Shager, H. (2010). Early education: Progress and promise for children from low-income families. *Children and Youth Services Review, 32,* 1186-1198.

Mashburn, A. J., & Pianta, R. C. (2006). Social relationships and school readiness. *Early Education and Development, 17,* 151-176.

The NAESP Foundation Task Force on Early Learning. (2011). *Building and supporting an aligned system: A vision for transforming education across the pre-K to grade 3.* Alexandria, VA: NAESP.

NAEYC & NAECS/SDE. (2002). *Early learning standards: Creating the conditions for success.* Joint position statement. Washington, DC: NAEYC.

Nation, M., Crusto, C., Wandersman, A., Kumpfer, K. L., Seybolt, D., Morrissey-Kane, E., & Davino, K. (2003). What works in prevention: Principles of effective prevention practice. *American Psychologist, 50,* 449-456.

National Association for the Education of Young Children. (2009). Developmentally appropriate practice in early childhood programs serving children from birth through age 8. Washington, DC: NAEYC.

National Education Goals Panel. (1995). *The national education goals report: Building a nation of learners.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Research Council. (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school.* Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

National Research Council. (2009). *Preventing mental, emotional, and behavioral disorders among young people: Progress and possibilities.* In M. E. O'Connell, T. Boat, & K. E. Warner, (Eds.). Committee on Prevention of Mental Disorders and Substance Abuse Among Children, Youth and Young Adults: Research Advances and Promising Interventions. Institute of Medicine. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

National Research Council. (2012). *Education for life and work: Developing transferable knowledge and skills in the 21st century.* Committee on Defining Deeper Learning and 21st Century Skills, J. W. Pellegrino & M. L. Hilton (Eds). Board on Testing and Assessment and Board on Science Education, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

National School Readiness Indicators Initiative. (2005). *Getting ready: Findings from the National School Readiness Indicators Initiative.* Providence, RI: Rhode Island Kids Count.

No Child Left Behind: The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 2001, 20 U.S.C. § 6319 (2008).

Payton, J. W., Wardlaw, M. D., Graczyk, P. A., Bloodworth, M. R., Tompsett, C. J., & Weissberg, R. P. (2000). SEL: A framework for promoting mental health and reducing risk behavior in children and youth. *Journal of School Health, 70*(5), 179-185.

Payton, J., Weissberg, R. P., Durlak, J., Dymnicki, A., Taylor, R., & Schellinger, K. (2008). *The positive impact of social and emotional learning for kindergarten to eighth-grade students: Findings from three scientific reviews.* Chicago, IL: CASEL — Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning.

Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge, *77 Federal Register,* 36958-36964 (2012).

Raver, C. C. (2002). Emotions matter: making the case for the role of young children's emotional development for early school readiness. *Social Policy Report of the Society for Research in Child Development, 16*(3).

Resnicow, K., Cross, D., & Wynder, E. (1993). The know your body program: A review of evaluation studies: A review studies. *Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine, 70,* 188-207.

Rimm-Kaufman, S. E., Wanless, S., Patton, C., & Deutsch, N. (2011). *Teachers' accounts of the process of teacher change: Examining fidelity of implementation.* Paper presented at the Society for Research in Child Development, Montreal, Canada.

Ringwalt, C. L., Ennett, S., Vincus, A., Throne, J., Rohrbach, L. A., & Simons- Rudolph, A. (2002). The prevalence of effective substance use prevention curricula in U.S. middle schools. *Prevention Science, 3*(4), 257-267.

Rohrbach, L. A., Graham, J. W., & Hansen, W. B. (1993). Diffusion of a school-based substance abuse prevention program: Predictors of program implementation. *Preventive Medicine, 22*(2), 237-260.

Rohrbach, L. A., Gunning, M., Sun, P., & Sussman, S. (2010). The Project Towards No Drug Abuse (TND) dissemination trial: Implementation fidelity and immediate outcomes. *Prevention Science, 11,* 77-88.

Ross, J. G., Luepker, R. V., Nelson, G. D., Saavedra, P., & Hubbard, B. M. (1991). Teenage health teaching modules: Impact of teacher training on implementation and student outcomes. *Journal of School Health, 61*(1), 31-34.

Schaps, E., Battistich, V., & Solomon, D. (2004). Community in school as key to student growth: Findings from the Child Development Project. In J. E. Zins, R. P. Weissberg, M. C. Wang, & H. J. Walberg (Eds.), *Building academic success on social and emotional learning: What does the research say?* (pp. 189-207). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Shriver, T. P., & Weissberg, R. P. (1996, May). No new wars! *Education Week, 15,* 33-37.

Smith, D. W., McCormick, L. K., Steckler, A. B., & McLeroy, K. R. (1993). Teachers' use of health curricula: Implementation of Growing Healthy, Project SMART, and the Teenage Health Teaching Modules. *Journal of School Health, 63*(8), 349-354.

Tappe, M.K., Galer-Unti, R.A., & Bailey, K.C. (1995). Long term implementation of Teenage Health Teaching Modules by trained teachers: A case study. *Journal of School Health, 65*(10), 411-415.

Weare, K., & Nind, M. (2011). Mental health promotion and problem prevention in schools: What does the evidence say? *Health Promotion International, 26*(s1), s29-s69.

Weissberg, R. P. (2007). Advances in SEL research. *American Educational Research Association, 1*(1), 1-8.

Zins, J. E., Weissberg, R. P., Wang, M. C., & Walberg, H. J. (Eds.). (2004). *Building academic success on social and emotional learning: What does the research say?* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Appendix C:
Program Evaluation References

4Rs

Brown, J. L., Jones, S., LaRusso, M. D., & Aber, J. L. (2010). Improving classroom quality: Teacher influences and experimental impacts of the 4Rs program. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 102,* 153-167.

Jones, S. M., Brown, J. L., Hoglund, W., & Aber, J. L. (2010). A school-randomized clinical trial of an integrated social-emotional learning and literacy intervention: Impacts after one school year. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 78*(6), 829-842.

Jones, S. M., Brown, J. L., Aber, J. L. (2011). Two-year impacts of a universal school-based social-emotional and literacy intervention: An experiment in translational developmental research. *Child Development, 82,* 533-554

Al's Pals

Lynch, K. B., Geller, S. R., & Schmidt, M. G. (2004). Multi-year evaluation of the effectiveness of a resilience-based prevention program for young children. *The Journal of Primary Prevention, 24,* 335-353.

Caring School Community

Battistich, V. (2000). Effects of a school-based program to enhance prosocial development on children's peer relations and social adjustment. *Journal of Research in Character Education, 1,* 1-17.

Battistich, V., Schaps, E., Watson, M., & Solomon, D. (1996). Prevention effects of the Child Development Project: Early findings from an ongoing multisite demonstration trial. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 11,* 12-35.

Battistich, V., Schaps, E., Watson, M., Solomon, D., & Lewis, C. (2000). Effects of the Child Development Project on students' drug use and other problem behaviors. *The Journal of Primary Prevention, 21,* 75-99.

Battistich, V., Schaps, E., & Wilson, N. (2004). Effects of an elementary school intervention on students' "connectedness" to school and social adjustment during middle school. *The Journal of Primary Prevention, 24,* 243-262.

Battistich, V., Solomon, D., Watson, M., Solomon, J., & Schaps, E. (1989). Effects of an elementary school program to enhance prosocial behavior on children's cognitive-social problem-solving skills and strategies. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 10,* 147-169.

Chang, F., & Muñoz, M.A. (2006). School personnel educating the whole child: Impact of character education on teachers' self-assessment and student development. *Journal of Personality Evaluation in Education, 19,* 35-49.

Marshall, J. C., & Caldwell, S. D. (September 2007). "Caring School Community™ Implementation Study: Four Year Evaluation Report." *Final technical report on Grant R215S020232,* Office of Safe and Drug Free Schools, Fund for the Improvement of Education, U.S. Department of Education.

Muñoz, M. A., & Vanderhaar, J. E. (2006). Literacy-embedded character education in a large urban district: Effects of the Child Development Project on elementary school students and teachers. *Journal of Research in Character Education, 4,* 27-44.

Solomon, D., Battistich, V., Watson, M., Schaps, E., & Lewis, C. (2000). A six-district study of educational change: Direct and mediated effects of the Child Development Project. *Social Psychology of Education, 4,* 3-51.

Solomon, D., Watson, M. S., Delucchi, K. L., Schaps, E., & Battistich, V. (1988). Enhancing children's prosocial behavior in the classroom. *American Educational Research Journal, 25,* 527-554.

Competent Kids, Caring Community

Linares, L. O., Rosbruch, N., Stern, M. B., Edwards, M. E., Walker, G., Abikoff, H. B., & Alvir, J. M. (2005). Developing cognitive-social-emotional competencies to enhance academic learning. *Psychology in the Schools, 42*(4), 405-417.

HighScope Educational Approach for Preschool

Belfield, C. R., Nores, M., Barnett, W. S., & Schweinhart, L. J. (2006). The HighScope Perry Preschool Program: Cost-benefit analysis using data from the age-40 follow-up. *The Journal of Human Resources, 41*(1), 162-190.

Berrueta-Clement, J. R., Schweinhart, L. J., Barnett, W. S., Epstein, A. S., & Weikart, D. P. (1984). *Changed lives: The effects of the Perry Preschool program on youths through age 19 (Monographs of the HighScope Educational Research Foundation, 8).* Ypsilanti, MI: HighScope Press.

Farnworth, M., Schweinhart, L. J., & Berrueta-Clement, J. R. (1985). Preschool intervention, school success and delinquency in a high-risk sample of youth. *American Educational Research Journal, 22,* 445-464.

Heckman, J. J., Moon, S. H., Pinto, R., Savelyev, P. A., & Yavitz, A. Q. (2010a). The Rate of Return to the HighScope Perry Preschool Program. *Journal of Public Economics, 94*(1-2), 114-128.

Heckman, J. J., Moon, S. H., Pinto, R., Savelyev, P. A., & Yavitz, A. Q. (2010b). A Reanalysis of the HighScope Perry Preschool Program. *Quantitative Economics, 1*(2).

Muennig, P., Schweinhart, L., Montie, J., & Neidell, M. (2008). Effects of a prekindergarten educational intervention on adult health: 37-year follow-up results of a randomized controlled trial. *American Journal of Public Health, 99,* 1431-1437.

Nores, M., Belfield, C. R., Barnett, W. S., & Schweinhart, L. J. (2005). Updating the economic impacts of the HighScope Perry Preschool Program. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 27*(3), 245-261.

Schweinhart, L. J., Barnes, H. V., & Weikart, D. P. (1993). *Significant benefits: The HighScope Perry Preschool Study through age 27 (Monographs of the HighScope Educational Research Foundation, 10).* Ypsilanti, MI: HighScope Press.

Schweinhart, L. J., Berrueta-Clement, J. R., Barnett, W. S., Epstein, A. S., & Weikart, D. P. (1985, Summer). Effects of the Perry Preschool Program on youths through age 19 — A summary. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 5,* 26-35.

Schweinhart, L. J., Montie, J., Xiang, Z. Barnett, W. S., Belfield, C. R., & Nores, M. (2005). *Lifetime effects: The HighScope Perry Preschool Study through age 40.* Ypsilanti, MI: HighScope Press.

Schweinhart, L. J., & Weikart, D. P. (1980). *Young children grow up: The effects of the Perry Preschool Program on youths through age 15* (Monographs of the HighScope Educational Research Foundation, 7). Ypsilanti, MI: HighScope Press.

Schweinhart, L. J., & Weikart, D. P. (1981, December). Effects of the Perry Preschool Program on youths through age 15. *Journal of the Division for Early Childhood.* Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Schweinhart, L. J., & Weikart, D. P. (1983). The effects of the Perry Preschool Program on youths through age 15 — A summary. In Consortium for Longitudinal Studies, *As the twig is bent . . . Lasting effects of preschool programs.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Schweinhart, L. J., & Weikart, D. P. (1997). The High/Scope preschool curriculum comparison study through age 23. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 12,* 117-143.

Schweinhart, L. J., Weikart, D. P., & Larner, M. B. (1986). Consequences of three preschool curriculum models through age 15. *Early Child Research Quarterly, 1,* 15-45.

Schweinhart, L. J., Weikart, D. P., & Larner, M. B. (1986). Rejoinder: Child-initiated activities in early childhood programs may help prevent delinquency. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 1,* 303-312.

Weikart, D. P., Epstein, A. S., Schweinhart, L. J., & Bond, J. T. (1978). *The Ypsilanti Preschool Curriculum Demonstration Project: Preschool years and longitudinal results through fourth grade (Monographs of the HighScope Educational Research Foundation, 4).* Ypsilanti, MI: HighScope Press.

I Can Problem Solve

Boyle, D., & Hassett-Walker, C. (2008). Reducing overt and relational aggression among young children: The results from a two-year outcome study. *Journal of School Violence, 7,* 27-42.

Feis, C. L., & Simons, C. (1985). Training preschool children in interpersonal cognitive problem-solving skills: A replication. *Prevention in Human Services, 3*(4), 71-85.

Kumpfer, K. L., Alvarado, R., Tait, C., & Turner, C. (2002). Effectiveness of school-based family and children's skills training for substance abuse prevention among 6-8-year-old rural children. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors, 16*(45), S65-S71.

Shure, M. B., & Spivack, G. (1982). Interpersonal problem-solving in young children: A cognitive approach to prevention. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 10*(3), 341-356.

Shure, M. B., & Spivack, G. (1980). Interpersonal problem solving as a mediator of behavioral adjustment in preschool and kindergarten children. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 1,* 29-44.

Shure, M. B., & Spivack, G. (1979). Interpersonal cognitive problem solving and primary prevention: Programming for preschool and kindergarten children. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 2,* 89-94.

Incredible Years Training Series

Webster-Stratton, C., Reid, M. J., & Hammond, M. (2001). Preventing conduct problems, promoting social competence: A parent and teacher training partnership in Head Start. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 30*(3), 283-302.

Webster-Stratton, C., Reid, M. J., & Stoolmiller, M. (2008). Preventing conduct problems and improving school readiness: Evaluation of the Incredible Years Teacher and Child Training Programs in high-risk schools. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 49,* 471-488.

Michigan Model for Health

O'Neill, J. M., Clark, J. K., & Jones, J. A. (2011). Promoting mental health and preventing substance abuse and violence in elementary students: A randomized control study of the Michigan Model for Health. *Journal of School Health, 81*(6), 320-330.

MindUP

Schonert-Reichl, K. A., & Lawlor, M. S. (2010). The effects of a mindfulness-based education program on pre- and early adolescents' well-being and social and emotional competence. *Mindfulness, 1,* 137-151.

Open Circle

Hennessey, B. A. (2007). Promoting social competence in school-aged children: The effects of the Open Circle program. *Journal of School Psychology, 45,* 349-360.

Peaceworks: Peacemaking Skills for Little Kids

Pickens, J. (2009). Socio-emotional programme promotes positive behaviour in preschoolers. *Child Care in Practice, 15*(4), 261-278.

Promoting Alternative THinking Strategies (PATHS)

Domitrovich, C. E., Cortes, R., & Greenberg, M. T. (2007). Improving young children's social and emotional competence: A randomized trial of the preschool PATHS curriculum. *Journal of Primary Prevention, 28,* 67-91.

Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group. (1999). Initial impact of the Fast Track prevention trial for conduct problems: I. The high-risk sample. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 67,* 631-647.

Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group. (1999). Initial impact of the Fast Track Prevention Trial for Conduct Problems II: Classroom Effects. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 67,* 648-657.

Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group. (2010). The effects of a multiyear universal social-emotional learning program: The role of student and school characteristics. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 78,* 156-168.

Greenberg, M. T., & Kusché, C. A. (1998). Preventive intervention for school-age deaf children: The PATHS curriculum. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education,* 49-63.

Kam, C., Greenberg, M. T., & Kusché, C. A. (2004). Sustained effects of the PATHS curriculum on the social and psychological adjustment of children in special education. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 12,* 66-78.

Positive Action

Beets, M. W., Flay, B. R., Vuchinich, S., Snyder, F. J., Acock, A., Li, K.-K., Burns, K., Washburn, I. J., & Durlak, J. (2009). Use of a social and character development program to prevent substance use, violent behaviors, and sexual activity among elementary-school students in Hawaii. *American Journal of Public Health, 99,* 1438-1445.

Flay, B. R., & Allred, C. G. (2003). Long-term effects of the Positive Action program. *American Journal of Health Behavior, 27*(Supplement 1), S6-S21.

Flay, B. R., Allred, C. G., & Ordway, N. (2001). Effects of the Positive Action program on achievement and discipline: Two matched-control comparisons. *Prevention Science, 2,* 71-89.

Li, K.-K., Washburn, I., DuBois, D. L., Vuchinich, S., Ji, P, Brechling, V., Day, J., Beets, M. W., Acock, A. C., Berbaum, M., Snyder, F., & Flay, B. R. (2011). Effects of the Positive Action Programme on Problem Behaviors in Elementary School Students: A Matched-pair Randomised Control Trial in Chicago. *Psychology and Health, 26,* 187-204.

Snyder, F., Flay, B., Vuchinich, S., Acock, A., Washburn, I., Beets, M., & Li, K.-K. (2010). Impact of a social-emotional and character development program on school-level indicators of academic achievement, absenteeism, and disciplinary outcomes: A matched-pair, cluster-randomized, controlled trial. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness, 3,* 26-55.

Raising Healthy Children

Brown, E. C., Catalano, R. F., Fleming, C. B., Haggerty, K. P., & Abbott, R. D. (2005). Adolescent substance use outcomes in the Raising Healthy Children Project: A two-part latent growth curve analysis. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 73,* 699-710.

Catalano, R. F., Mazza, J. J., Harachi, T. W., Abbott, R. D., Haggerty, K. P., & Fleming, C. B. (2003). Raising healthy children through enhancing social development in elementary school: Results after 1.5 years. *Journal of School Psychology, 41,* 143-164.

Haggerty, K. P., Fleming, C. B., Catalano, R. F., Harachi, T. W., & Abbott, R. D. (2006). Raising Healthy Children: Examining the impact of promoting healthy driving behavior within a social development intervention. *Prevention Science, 7,* 257-267.

Harachi, T. W., Abbott, R. D., Catalano, R. F., Haggerty, K. P., & Fleming, C. B. (1999). Opening the black box: Using process evaluation measures to assess implementation and theory building. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 27,* 711-731.

Resolving Conflict Creatively Program (RCCP)

Aber, J. L., Jones, S. M., Brown, J. L., Chaudry, N., & Samples, F. (1998). Resolving conflict creatively: Evaluating the developmental effects of a school-based violence prevention program in neighborhood and classroom context. *Development and Psychopathology, 10,* 187-213.

Aber, J. L., Brown, J. L., & Jones, S. M. (2003). Developmental trajectories toward violence in middle childhood: Course, demographic differences, and response to school-based intervention. *Developmental Psychology, 39,* 324-348.

Responsive Classroom

Brock, L. L., Nishida, K. K., Chiong, C., Grimm, K. J., & Rimm-Kaurman, S. E. (2008). Children's perceptions of the social environment and social and academic performance: A longitudinal analysis of the Responsive Classroom approach. *Journal of School Psychology, 46,* 129-149.

Rimm-Kaufman, S. E., & Chiu, Y. I. (2007). Promoting social and academic competence in the classroom: An intervention study examining the contribution of the Responsive Classroom approach. *Psychology in the Schools, 44,* 397-413.

Rimm-Kaufman, S. E., Fan, X., Chiu, Y. I., & You, W. (2007). The contribution of the Responsive Classroom approach on children's academic achievement: Results of a three-year longitudinal study. *Journal of School Psychology, 45,* 401-421.

Rimm-Kaufman, S. E., & Sawyer, B. E. (2004). Primary grade teachers' self-efficacy beliefs, attitudes toward teaching, and discipline and teaching practice priorities in relation to the "Responsive Classroom" approach. *The Elementary School Journal, 104,* 321-341.

Sawyer, L. B. E., & Rimm-Kauffman, S. E. (2007). Teacher collaboration in the context of the Responsive Classroom approach. *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice, 13,* 211-245.

RULER Approach

Brackett, M. A., Rivers, S. E., Reyes, M. R., & Salovey, P. (2012). Enhancing academic performance and social and emotional competence with the RULER Feeling Words Curriculum. *Learning and Individual Differences, 22,* 218-224.

Hagelskamp, C., Brackett, M. A, Rivers, S. E., & Salovey, P. (2012). Improving classroom quality with The RULER approach to social and emotional learning: Proximal and distal outcomes. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Rivers, S. E., Brackett, M. A., Reyes, M. R., Elbertson, N. A., & Salovey, P. (in press). Improving the social and emotional climate of classrooms: A clustered randomized controlled trial testing The RULER Approach. *Prevention Science.*

Second Step

Frey, K. S., Nolen, S. B., Edstrom, L. V. S., & Hirschstein, M. K. (2005). Effects of a school-based social-emotional competence program: Linking children's goals, attributions, and behavior. *Applied Developmental Psychology, 26,* 171-200.

Grossman, D. C., Neckerman, H. J., Koepsell, T. D., Liu, P., Asher, K. N., Beland, K., & Rivara, F. P. (1997). Effectiveness of a violence prevention curriculum among children in elementary school: A randomized controlled trial. *JAMA, 277,* 1605-1611.

Holsen, I., Smith, B. H., & Frey, K. S. (2008). Outcomes of the social competence program Second Step in Norwegian Elementary Schools. *School Psychology International, 29,* 71-88.

Holsen, I., Iversen, A. C., & Smith, B. H. (2009). Universal social competence promotion programme in school: Does it work for children with low socio-economic background? *Advances in School Mental Health Promotion, 2,* 51-60.

Schick, A., & Cierpka, M. (2005). Faustlos: Evaluation of a curriculum to prevent violence in elementary schools. *Applied and Preventive Psychology, 11,* 157-165.

Social Decision Making/Problem Solving Program

Elias, M. J., Gara, M. A., Schuyler, T. F., Branden-Muller, L. R., & Sayette, M. A. (1991). The promotion of social competence: Longitudinal study of a preventive school-based program. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 61*(3), 409-417.

Elias, M. J., Gara, M., Ubriaco, M., & Rothbaum, P. A. (1986). Impact of a preventive social problem solving intervention on children's coping with middle-school stressors. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 14*(3), 259-275.

Steps to Respect

Brown, E. C., Low, S., Smith, B. H., & Haggerty, K. P. (2011). Outcomes from a school-randomized controlled trial of Steps to Respect: A bullying prevention program. *School Psychology Review, 40*(3), 423-443.

Frey, K. S., Hirschstein, M. K., Edstrom, L. V., & Snell, J. L. (2009). Observed reductions in school bullying, non-bullying aggression, and destructive bystander behavior: A longitudinal evaluation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 101,* 466-81.

Frey, K. S., Hirschstein, M. K., Snell, J. L., Van Schoiack Edstrom, L., MacKenzie, E. P., & Broderick, C. J. (2005). Reducing playground bullying and supporting beliefs: An experimental trial of the Steps to Respect program. *Developmental Psychology, 41,* 479-91.

Hirschstein, M. K., Van Schoiack Edstrom, L., Frey, K. S., Snell, J. L., & MacKenzie, E. P. (2007). Walking the talk in bullying prevention: Teacher implementation variables related to initial impact of the Steps to Respect Program. *School Psychology Review, 36,* 3-21.

Too Good for Violence

Hall, B. W., & Bacon, T. P. (2005). Building a foundation against violence: Impact of a school-based prevention program on elementary students. *Journal of School Violence, 4*(4), 63-83.

Tools of the Mind

Barnett, W. S., Jung, K., Yarosz, D. J., Thomas, J., Hornbeck, A., Stechuk, R., & Burns, S. (2008). Educational effects of the Tools of the Mind curriculum: A randomized trial. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 23,* 299-313.

Tribes Learning Communities

Kiger, D. (2000). The Tribes process TLC: A preliminary evaluation of classroom implementation & impact on student achievement. *Education, 120,* 586-592.

Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning

815 West Van Buren Street, Suite 210 Chicago, IL 60607

www.casel.org   ●   info@casel.org   ●   312.226.3770