

A review of the literature on social and emotional learning for students ages 3–8: Implementation strategies and state and district support policies (part 2 of 4)



What's Known

Rosemarie O'Conner

Jessica De Feyter

Alyssa Carr

Jia Lisa Luo

Helen Romm

ICF International

Social and emotional learning (SEL) is the process by which children and adults learn to understand and manage emotions, maintain positive relationships, and make responsible decisions. This is the second in a series of four related reports about what is known about SEL programs for students ages 3–8. The report series addresses four issues raised by the Regional Educational Laboratory (REL) Mid-Atlantic's Early Childhood Education Research Alliance: characteristics of effective SEL programs (part 1), implementation strategies and state and district policies that support SEL programming (part 2), teacher and classroom strategies that contribute to social and emotional learning (part 3), and outcomes of social and emotional learning in different student populations and settings (part 4). This report offers guidance on program implementation and identifies trends in integrating this learning at the state, district, and school levels.

Why this review?

To thrive in a social world, students must learn social and emotional skills, such as controlling their impulses, interpreting and understanding emotions, motivating themselves, and developing positive attitudes toward school and community (Pianta & La Paro, 2003; Raver, 2002). Therefore, early childhood

programs aim to help students develop socially and emotionally in addition to fostering academic school readiness.

This process, referred to as social and emotional learning, centers on “the development of five interrelated sets of cognitive, affective, and behavioral competencies” (CASEL, 2012). These five competencies include self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decisionmaking (see box 1 for definitions).

What the review examined

Because of recent policy interest in social and emotional learning, a large amount of information is available about SEL programs and approaches, including literature reviews, research syntheses, practice guides, and meta-analyses. Members of REL Mid-Atlantic’s Early Childhood Education Research Alliance identified the need for an organized summary that addresses school-based social and emotional learning for the general population of students ages 3–8, synthesizes the body of literature, and enables educators to easily identify the programs and strategies that are most appropriate for their setting and student population.

Research questions

With these goals in mind, the alliance developed four research questions to guide the project:

1. What are the characteristics of effective SEL programs?
2. What implementation strategies and state and district policies support SEL programming?
3. What teacher and classroom strategies contribute to social and emotional learning?
4. What outcomes have SEL programs demonstrated among different student populations and settings?

Box 1. Five competencies define social and emotional learning

The Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL) identifies these five interrelated competencies as central to social and emotional learning:

Self-awareness. Knowing what one feels, accurately assessing one’s interests and strengths, and maintaining a well-grounded sense of self-confidence.

Self-management. Regulating one’s emotions to handle stress, control impulses, and motivate oneself to persevere in overcoming obstacles, setting and monitoring progress toward the achievement of personal and academic goals, and expressing emotions appropriately.

Social awareness. Being able to take the perspective of and empathize with others, recognizing and appreciating individual and group similarities and differences.

Relationship skills. Establishing and maintaining healthy and rewarding relationships on the basis of cooperation and resistance to inappropriate social pressure; preventing, managing, and constructively resolving interpersonal conflict; and seeking help when needed.

Responsible decisionmaking. Making decisions based on a consideration of all relevant factors, including applicable ethical standards, safety concerns, and social norms; the likely consequences of taking alternative courses of action; and respect for others.

Source: CASEL, 2012.

These four research questions guided REL Mid-Atlantic’s systematic search, review, and synthesis of recent (2008–15) research reviews and meta-analyses (rather than original studies and sources) on the topic of social and emotional learning.¹ The review found 83 research syntheses that met the study inclusion criteria, including peer-reviewed journal articles, book chapters, reports, and online publications. Each synthesis was coded for criteria such as research question, methodology, relevant populations/ages, and settings. (The methodology and coding results are described in appendix A of part 1. The literature is mapped to the relevant research questions in appendix B of part 1; O’Conner, De Feyter, Carr, Luo, & Romm, 2017a.)

The social and emotional learning report series

Four related reports summarize the literature addressing each of the four research questions. This report (part 2 of 4) focuses on the second research question on implementation strategies and state and district policies. The other three reports identify several key components of effective programs and offer guidance on program selection (part 1), describe teacher and classroom strategies (part 3), and provide evidence of student outcomes (part 4; O’Conner, et al., 2017a, b, c).

Each report can stand alone as a summary of the research literature on a specific topic. The reports can be read in any order. The first section (Why this review?) and this section (What the review examined) of each report provide similar introductory information, with more detail on social and emotional learning and how it is related to executive functioning and self-regulation presented in part 1 (O’Conner, et al., 2017a).

What the review found: Implementation strategies that support social and emotional learning programs

Adopting evidence-based SEL programs and practices is the first step to making student social and emotional competence a priority (O’Conner, et al., 2017a). Successful SEL implementation requires a cycle of continuous improvement:

- Follow a purposeful, well-conceived plan.
- Start small with a commitment to expand through ongoing development.
- Measure implementation fidelity to understand what has happened in an intervention and to enhance service delivery.
- Assess SEL outcomes.

Each step in the continuous improvement cycle is described below.

Follow a purposeful, well-conceived plan

Implementation is the process of executing a plan—in this case, putting an SEL intervention into practice. How a SEL program is implemented matters (CASEL, 2012; Domitrovich, Moore, Thompson, & CASEL, 2012; Durlak & DuPre, 2008; Durlak, Weissberg, Dymnicki, Taylor, & Schellinger, 2011; Humphrey, 2013; Merrell & Gueldner, 2010a). A meta-analysis of 213 SEL programs found that those that reported implementation problems (for example, programs that failed to conduct all specified activities or to train staff properly) were far less successful than programs that reported sound implementation (Durlak et al., 2011). Research in several fields, including social and emotional learning, has shown that the extent to which program components or activities are implemented as designed (implementation fidelity) varies considerably and that this variation is related to differences in the achievement of expected outcomes.

Because schools and teachers implementing social and emotional learning face real-world constraints, program components must sometimes be adapted. Evidence of effective implementation of SEL programs is growing, but more research is needed on exactly which components of individual programs can be adapted without jeopardizing outcomes and which need to be implemented exactly as prescribed.

Start small, then phase in implementation, expand gradually, and support teachers

Schools that have successfully implemented SEL programs have started with pilot projects, examined them thoroughly, and then committed to ongoing development (Merrell & Gueldner, 2010a; Van Velsor, 2009). A useful framework for conceptualizing the full implementation cycle at a school is described in the *CASEL Practice Rubric for Schoolwide SEL Implementation*, which outlines 10 steps over three phases, along with a set of factors that enhance implementation, such as providing ongoing professional development, evaluating practices and outcomes, and nurturing partnerships with families and the community (CASEL, 2006; box 2).

Once a plan for social and emotional learning has been introduced in a school or district, teachers need direct implementation support. In practice, this support is best provided by a trained mentor or instructional coach who can conduct observations and provide ongoing feedback. However, not all teachers will receive this support, and many operate in schools without a formal SEL implementation plan. Some basic strategies for incorporating social and emotional learning into the classroom are therefore offered in box 3.

Next, measure implementation

Determining whether an SEL program has been implemented as designed requires measuring the implementation, a step that is often overlooked. A recent meta-analysis of the SEL literature noted that only

Box 2. Steps in implementing schoolwide social and emotional learning

The Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL) has developed a useful framework for conceptualizing the full implementation cycle for schoolwide social and emotional learning that incorporates 10 steps over three phases:

Readiness phase

- Step 1. Principal commits to schoolwide social and emotional learning (SEL) initiative.
- Step 2. Principal engages key stakeholders and creates SEL steering committee.

Planning phase

- Step 3. Develop and articulate a shared vision.
- Step 4. Conduct a schoolwide needs and resources assessment.
- Step 5. Develop an action plan for implementation.
- Step 6. Review and select evidence-based programs or strategies.

Implementation phase

- Step 7. Conduct initial professional development activities.
- Step 8. Launch social and emotional learning instruction in classrooms.
- Step 9. Expand classroom programming and integrate social and emotional learning schoolwide.
- Step 10. Revisit implementation activities and adjust for continuing improvement.

Source: CASEL, 2006.

Box 3. Strategies for social and emotional learning implementation in the classroom

Having some basic strategies for incorporating social and emotional learning (SEL) into the classroom can be helpful, especially for teachers in schools without a formal SEL implementation plan:

- Obtain the necessary materials.
- Know and understand the content.
- Estimate the time needed for preparation and implementation.
- Obtain technical support.
- Measure student progress.
- Manage behavior.
- Pay attention to instruction.
- Practice skills across settings and over time.
- Keep your audience in mind.
- Review concepts frequently.
- Include families in social and emotional learning.

Source: Merrell & Gueldner, 2010b.

57 percent of studies reported implementation fidelity (Durlak et al., 2011), and only a third of studies that demonstrated positive effects of SEL programs examined the association between implementation and outcomes (Jones & Bouffard, 2012).

Beyond explicating the relationship between implementation and outcomes, measuring implementation serves to (Domitrovich & Greenberg, 2000, as cited in Humphrey, 2013):

- Document exactly what happened in an intervention.
- Understand the intervention and how its pieces and users interact.
- Provide ongoing feedback that can enhance service delivery.
- Advance knowledge of how to replicate program effects in other settings.

Implementation is usually assessed in terms of “dosage,” or how much of the intervention is delivered, and “fidelity,” or how closely implementation follows the program manual or instructions (Domitrovich et al., 2012; Merrell & Gueldner, 2010a). Other aspects of implementation, such as reach (Is the intervention delivered to all students in the school?) and participant responsiveness (What percentage of students completed the program assignments?), are also important to understanding how the program works in practice (Humphrey, 2013). Many published SEL programs provide tools for measuring implementation.

Implementation can be assessed with both quantitative and qualitative measures. Measures tailored to specific program activities are likely to be quantitative, using rating scales to describe aspects of implementation fidelity. While quantitative measures cannot describe complex processes, they can be easily modeled against program outcomes. Qualitative measures, such as interviews and focus groups, observations, and document reviews, are better at capturing complex processes, but they are more time and resource intensive (Humphrey, 2013).

The source of the data is another consideration in measuring implementation. Data can be obtained either by self-reporting (for example, completed by the teacher or program instructor) or by requesting feedback from an independent observer (usually a professional). Self-reporting measures are more subjective than independent observations and may result in somewhat higher scores overall; however, they tend to be cost-effective and can be more than adequate for internal monitoring of implementation fidelity. Independent observations are less subjective and tend to be better measures of program outcomes, but they are more costly and therefore may be more appropriate for a larger implementation study. Because unforeseen

factors may influence implementation fidelity from day to day, measuring implementation on more than one occasion can increase accuracy (Humphrey, 2013).

Finally, assess social and emotional learning outcomes

Monitoring and measuring student social and emotional skills enable educators to determine students' baseline levels of competence, evaluate whether a program is working and for whom, document improvements for funders and other stakeholders, and improve implementation (Denham, Ji, & Hamre, 2010; Kendziora, Weissberg, Ji, & Dusenbury, 2011).

Several systematic reviews have examined and summarized measures for assessing the social and emotional skills of young students (for example, Denham et al., 2010; Humphrey et al., 2011). An approach that uses multiple methods and sources to collect information on a student's social and emotional development is recommended because the behavior of young students can vary over time and contexts (McCabe & Altamura, 2011) and because different informants (students, peers, teachers, parents) can offer different perspectives (Humphrey, 2013).

Students' social and emotional skills can be measured by direct observation, rating scales completed by parents or teachers, peer evaluations, and role playing or interviews. Self-reports (for example, a survey completed by the student) are often used with older students, but are not generally recommended before grade 3 because of young children's inability to report reliably (Child Trends, 2014).

Although student and classroom assessment tools are included in some SEL programs, it may be better to develop school or program assessments on site after reviewing existing tools. Assessments should be goal driven, and results should be integrated into the curriculum. Student assessments should also be practical and relatively straightforward to implement in a school setting.

An effective assessment has several characteristics (Kendziora et al., 2011):

- Has accompanying documentation that includes a description of the measure, the construct assessed, and any assignment of items to scales.
- Can be administered by teachers, school personnel, and mental health professionals.
- Can be completed quickly (10–20 minutes per student).
- Gives standards or benchmarks that can be used to compare individual scores.
- Can be used for multiple purposes, including student assessment, screening, and evaluating program effects.
- Is amenable to electronic administration and scoring.

Finally, measures used to assess student social and emotional skills should be culturally equivalent, ecologically valid (generalizable to the setting), and linguistically accessible across subgroups (Garner, Mahatmya, Brown, & Vesely, 2014). To date, however, SEL assessments have been designed and used for a homogeneous White population, with a few exceptions (for example, Leff, Cassano, MacEvoy, & Costigan, 2010), and rarely has their applicability to students in different ethnic groups been examined (Humphrey, 2013). More work is needed in this area.

What the review found: Federal, state, and district policies that support implementation of social and emotional learning programs

This section addresses the second part of the research question—state and district policies to support social and emotional learning—and discusses types of support that can be provided for SEL implementation.

Additional practice-oriented resources on state and district supports for implementing SEL programs are listed in the appendix. Although the research question focused on state and district policies, this report also summarizes legislative efforts at the federal level. Implementation of an SEL program is more likely to succeed if it is supported by administrators and policymakers at the federal, state, and district levels.

Effective and sustainable SEL programming requires leadership, resources, and legislative support by the state and district (CASEL, 2012; Dusenbury, Weissberg, Goren, & Domitrovich, 2014; Jennings & Greenberg, 2009; Zinsser, Weissberg, & Dusenbury, 2013). In a recent national teacher survey, 90 percent of teachers reported that social and emotional learning is an important part of education. They also noted that to implement SEL programming effectively, teachers need more help from their states, districts, and schools (Bridgeland, Bruce, & Hariharan, 2013).

Federal legislative efforts

The National Association of School Psychologists, the National Education Association, and the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development have championed proposed federal legislation that prioritizes social and emotional learning, with an emphasis on promoting and supporting evidence-based SEL programming in elementary and secondary schools (Zinsser et al., 2013). Federal legislation on SEL programming has garnered bipartisan support in recent years but has not been enacted.

Federal SEL legislation introduced in Congress between 2013 and 2015 would mandate the following elements in implementing SEL programs:

- Require training for teachers in SEL programming (HR497).
- Make social and emotional learning eligible for professional development funds (HR850).
- Provide teachers with training and tools to support students' social and emotional learning (S897).
- Prepare teacher candidates in social and emotional learning (HR4509).
- Support research on social and emotional learning (HR4509).

State supports for social and emotional learning include adopting and measuring state social and emotional learning standards

At the same time as federal legislative efforts are being promoted, states and districts are developing strategic, systematic supports to help schools and teachers implement social and emotional learning (Yoder, 2014). As the research base builds, so do efforts to put SEL programs into practice. District and school SEL programming is a major area of growth (CASEL, 2012). The most comprehensive work in this area is carried out by the Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL), which is the leading organization for evidence-based information on social and emotional learning. CASEL's State Scan Scorecard Project tracks the development of high-quality SEL standards in all states (Dusenbury et al., 2014).

States are enacting legislation and adjusting priorities to incorporate social and emotional learning more explicitly into education practice. Illinois and Kansas have developed comprehensive, freestanding SEL standards, and other states have made substantial progress. Policymakers who want to learn more about the status of social and emotional learning in education in their state, institute statewide SEL policies or initiatives, or build on state work in social and emotional learning can begin by considering answers to the following questions (Heller, 2013):

- What is the current level of knowledge about and support for social and emotional learning among education policy leaders in your state?
- What is the status of social and emotional learning in your state?

- What actions have other states taken to support social and emotional learning?
- Should the state board of education conduct a work session on social and emotional learning?
- What policy levers can be used to support social and emotional learning in your state?
- What other means—beyond policymaking—can the state board of education use to support social and emotional learning?

Developing state SEL standards is receiving increasing attention in the literature (Dusenbury et al., 2014; Gordon, Ji, Mulhall, Shaw, & Weissburg, 2011; Kendziora et al., 2011; O'Brien & Resnik, 2009; Zinsser et al., 2013). All 50 states have learning standards for academic subjects. Forty nine states have adopted comprehensive SEL standards at the preK level. However, only two states—Illinois and Kansas—have developed comprehensive learning standards for social and emotional learning that are vertically aligned from preK through grade 12 (Dusenbury et al., 2014).

State SEL standards provide guidance for schools and districts in several areas (Jones & Bouffard, 2012):

- The kinds of SEL skills that are important for academic learning.
- How to align academic and SEL goals.
- How to make SEL goals explicit and concrete.

Many states have integrated aspects of social and emotional learning into their academic standards. However, if SEL standards are integrated into other standards without first being defined on their own, the effort tends to be scattered, lacking in comprehensiveness, and not developmentally sequenced across grade levels (Dusenbury, et al., 2014). Additionally, when standards are developed separately and independently for different ages, the aspects of growth and development that are emphasized and the language used to describe social and emotional learning may be inconsistent as a student progresses from grade to grade (Zinsser et al., 2013). For these reasons, comprehensive, freestanding SEL standards with developmental benchmarks for each grade level are recommended (see box 4).

Finally, some states have begun to align their SEL standards across grades. Idaho and Washington, for example, have developed SEL standards that span preK through grade 3, and Illinois and Kansas have aligned their preK and K–12 standards (Dusenbury et al., 2014). Once state SEL standards are developed, they can be aligned with academic standards such as the Common Core State Standards, which already include related items like communication, cooperation, and problem solving (Dusenbury et al., 2014; Zinsser et al., 2013). Many instructional activities can meet SEL and academic standards simultaneously. Making these connections explicit and providing teachers with tools to implement them will enhance the extent to which evidence-based practices can be brought to the classroom.

Box 4. Developing social and emotional learning standards at the state level

The following principles can guide development of comprehensive, freestanding social and emotional learning standards with developmental benchmarks:

- Standards should encompass the full range of social and emotional competencies.
- Standards are most useful when they are written clearly and can easily inform practice.
- Standards for each age or grade should clearly build on previously acquired skills or goals and align with the next phase or stage of standards.
- Standards are strengthened when they include strategies to support high-quality implementation, including adoption of evidence-based programs, employment of assessments that allow teachers to monitor student progress, and use of high-quality professional development.

Source: Zinsser et al., 2013.

District supports for social and emotional learning include engaging stakeholders, assessing resources and needs, adopting evidence-based programs, and integrating social and emotional learning into teacher and administrator evaluation systems

Based on research and practice with district and school SEL implementation, CASEL's Collaborating Districts Initiative supports districts' capacity to promote social and emotional learning (CASEL, 2012). CASEL created a theory of action to guide district leaders in planning and implementing systemic social and emotional learning, which includes the following eight activities (CASEL, 2012):

- Engage stakeholders in SEL planning and implementation.
- Assess SEL-related resources and needs.
- Develop an SEL vision and long-term plan.
- Develop SEL standards and assessments.
- Adopt evidence-based SEL programs.
- Design and implement effective professional development systems and supports for social and emotional learning.
- Have educators model social and emotional competence.
- Monitor the SEL implementation processes and student outcomes.

Additional district supports include incorporating evidence-based SEL teaching practices in educator evaluation systems; connecting social and emotional learning to other district initiatives, such as college and career readiness standards, school climate, and antibullying efforts (Yoder, 2014); and incentivizing connections between social and emotional learning and academic achievement (Jones & Bouffard, 2012).

Support for integrating social and emotional learning into performance evaluation systems for both teachers and administrators is gaining ground (Yoder, 2014). If the evaluation system integrates professional SEL standards, educators are more likely to receive the tools, supports, and resources they need to foster the social and emotional competence of their students (see Yoder, 2014, for examples of how SEL instructional strategies can be embedded into three popular professional teaching frameworks).

Implications of the review findings

Research shows that SEL programs implemented according to design are more effective than those that are improvised. Successful SEL implementation should follow a continuous improvement process that includes having a purposeful, well-conceived plan; starting small with a commitment to ongoing development; measuring implementation fidelity to understand what happened during an intervention and to enhance service delivery; and assessing SEL outcomes. Schools and teachers are implementing social and emotional learning within real-world circumstances and constraints, and this means that components must sometimes be adapted to fit specific requirements. More research is needed on exactly which components of individual programs can be adapted without jeopardizing program outcomes and which need to be implemented exactly as prescribed.

As the research suggests, effective and sustainable SEL programming requires leadership, resources, and legislative support from the state and district. States can support social and emotional learning by adopting and measuring state SEL-related indicators, such as comprehensive, freestanding SEL learning standards. Districts can support social and emotional learning by engaging stakeholders, assessing resources and needs, adopting evidence-based SEL programs, and integrating social and emotional learning into teacher and administrator evaluation systems.

Implications of the social and emotional learning report series

Decades of SEL research have begun to answer some of the questions educators, researchers, and policy-makers have asked about what really works in supporting students' overall development, keeping them engaged in school, and giving them the knowledge and skills to thrive from childhood through adulthood. However, although great strides have been made, some SEL research areas remain largely uncharted. This SEL report series identified five areas where additional focus would strengthen knowledge about evidence-based practices:

- Some research syntheses have identified general quality issues with the literature base, such as reliance only on self-reports or lack of data on the reliability and validity of measures (Durlak et al., 2011; Humphrey, 2013).
- Only a small number of studies report data on implementation, and even fewer connect implementation data with outcomes.
- Few studies report on how outcomes differ by social and cultural factors or by gender.
- SEL assessments have been designed and used mostly for a homogeneous White population, and rarely have efforts been made to assess the applicability of the instruments to students in different racial/ethnic or language groups.
- Finally, because schools and teachers implement social and emotional learning within real-world circumstances and constraints, components must sometimes be adapted to fit specific requirements. More research is needed on exactly which components of individual programs can be adapted without jeopardizing program outcomes and which need to be implemented exactly as prescribed.

The promise of social and emotional learning as an educational approach is only as strong as the methods used to understand and develop it. Attention to these key research gaps will provide better evidence and therefore better services to support students and families.

Appendix. Resources on state and district supports for implementing social and emotional learning

This appendix is a compilation of resources for educators and policymakers on implementing social and emotional learning, including state and district supports. The resources include rubrics, standards, frameworks, planning guides, and policies from publications and websites. Although table A1 is not an exhaustive list of resources on state and district supports for implementing social and emotional learning, it provides a starting point.

Table A1. Resources on state and district supports for implementing social and emotional learning

Resource	Description
CASEL (Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning). (2006). <i>CASEL practice rubric for schoolwide SEL implementation</i> . http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED505360	The CASEL practice rubric is designed to help schools understand how their current activities fit into broader schoolwide change and how to take social and emotional learning to the next level. The rubric is designed for use by principals and their social and emotional learning (SEL) planning teams but can be adapted for district use.
CASEL. (2008). <i>Connecting social and emotional learning with mental health</i> . Washington, DC: National Center for Mental Health Promotion and Youth Violence Prevention. http://www.promoteprevent.org/sites/www.promoteprevent.org/files/resources/ConnectingSEL_2.pdf .	This guide gives strategies for connecting mental health supports with schoolwide SEL programming for use by district personnel (project directors), principals, teaching staff, student support staff, and community health providers (page 5).
CASEL. (2011). <i>Funding and resources for social and emotional learning</i> . http://static1.squarespace.com/static/513f79f9e4b05ce7b70e9673/t/52ec7894e4b0f2c10ae6ed30/1391229076181/funding-and-resources-close-to-home-5-3-11.pdf .	This CASEL document provides information on funding resources for social and emotional learning.
CASEL. (2014). <i>What are the key features of high-quality standards for SEL?</i> https://static1.squarespace.com/static/513f79f9e4b05ce7b70e9673/t/52f96da6e4b0847e7b068194/1392078246509/key-features-of-high-quality-SEL-standards-2-10-14.pdf .	This CASEL handout provides information on the key features of high-quality standards for social and emotional learning, including links to state websites and resources.
CASEL's Building and Implementing SEL Standards webpage: http://www.casel.org/state-page/ .	This CASEL webpage reviews state SEL standards and includes slide presentations, handouts, reports, and briefs on state standards and recommendations.
CASEL's Partner Districts webpage: http://www.casel.org/partner-districts/ .	This CASEL webpage for its Collaborating Districts Initiative contains information about the initiative and links to participating school district information.
CASEL's SEL Policy webpage: http://www.casel.org/policy/ .	This CASEL webpage contains a discussion of federal, state, and local policies and legislation, as well as policy recommendations to sustain social and emotional learning.
CASEL's State Scan Scorecard Project webpage: http://www.casel.org/state-scan-scorecard-project .	This webpage for the CASEL State Scan Scorecard Project contains maps and tables summarizing state progress on comprehensive SEL standards in preK and K–12 for 50 states.
Center on the Social and Emotional Foundations for Early Learning: http://csefel.vanderbilt.edu/resources/state_planning.html .	The Center on the Social and Emotional Foundations for Early Learning (CSEFEL) website has state planning resources. These include state work summaries, a state collaborative planning tool kit, planning documents, and links to individual state resources.

(continued)

Table A1. Resources on state and district supports for implementing social and emotional learning*(continued)*

Resource	Description
<p>Dusenbury, L., Weissberg, R. P., Goren, P., & Domitrovich, C. (2014). <i>State standards to advance social and emotional learning: Findings from CASEL's state scan of social and emotional learning standards, preschool through high school</i>. Chicago, IL: Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning and Social and Emotional Learning Research Group, University of Illinois at Chicago. http://static.squarespace.com/static/513f79f9e4b05ce7b70e9673/t/52f95691e4b0a41caba778b8/1392072337661/casel-brief-on-state-standards-january-2014.pdf.</p>	<p>This CASEL guide provides findings from a state scan of social and emotional learning standards (preschool through high school). The guide contains numerous examples from states that are developing SEL learning standards, including links to state websites and resources.</p>
<p>Gordon, R., Ji, P., Mulhall, P., Shaw, B., & Weissberg, R. P. (2011). Social and emotional learning for Illinois students: Policy, practice and progress. In <i>The Illinois Report: 2011</i> (pp. 68–83). Urbana, IL: Institute for Government and Public Affairs. http://static.squarespace.com/static/513f79f9e4b05ce7b70e9673/t/526a24fce4b0dda0159b1a88/1382687996949/social-and-emotional-learning-for-illinois-students-policy-practice-and-progress.pdf.</p>	<p>This chapter summarizes Illinois SEL standards and describes how they were developed. Figure 1 illustrates the Illinois SEL standards framework, a pyramid with a few broad goals at the top, several learning standards and benchmarks in the middle, and numerous performance descriptions at the bottom. Table 1 provides the Illinois Social and Emotional Learning Goals and Standards. Table 2 provides benchmarks associated with learning standard 1A: Identify and Manage One's Emotions and Behavior.</p> <p>The chapter also provides links to examples of state innovations in social and emotional learning from Kansas, Pennsylvania, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Washington (page 80).</p>
<p>Isakson, E. A., Davidson, L. L., Higgins, L. B., & Cooper, J. L. (2011). <i>State-level indicators for social-emotional development: Building better systems</i>. New York, NY: National Center for Children in Poverty. http://www.nccp.org/publications/pdf/text_997.pdf.</p>	<p>This report from the National Center for Children in Poverty provides information on state indicators for social and emotional development. Table 1 presents the number of states that adopted selected SEL indicators: child abuse rate, developmental/mental health screenings, mental health consultation in early childhood education, foster care stability, expulsion from early childhood education, maternal depression screening, and kindergarten assessment of social and emotional skills. Figure 4 provides a framework for getting started with state-level SEL indicator development.</p>
<p>National Center on Safe Supportive Learning Environments: http://safesupportivelearning.ed.gov/events/webinar/integrating-social-emotional-learning-state-and-district-policies.</p>	<p>This webinar from the National Center on Safe Supportive Learning Environments includes a panel discussion of how states and districts are integrating SEL into their state and district initiatives.</p>
<p>O'Brien, M. U., & Resnik, H. (2009). The Illinois social and emotional learning (SEL) standards: Leading the way for school and student success. <i>Illinois Principals Association Practitioners Bulletin</i>, 16(7), 1–5. https://static1.squarespace.com/static/513f79f9e4b05ce7b70e9673/t/5307b83fe4b0749b708a7d71/1393014847799/the-illinois-sel-standards-leading-the-way-for-school-and-student-success.pdf.</p>	<p>This bulletin from the Illinois Principals Association describes the 10 steps in the SEL implementation cycle (adapted from CASEL, 2006). It also presents the Illinois Social and Emotional Learning Standards, which encompass the five core skill areas described by CASEL (page 2), as well as steps for successful leadership for SEL programming (page 3).</p>
<p>Yoder, N. (2014). <i>Teaching the whole child: Instructional practices that support social-emotional learning in three teacher evaluation frameworks</i>. Washington, DC: Center on Great Teachers and Leaders at American Institutes for Research. http://www.gtlcenter.org/sites/default/files/TeachingtheWholeChild.pdf.</p>	<p>This brief from the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders at American Institutes for Research identifies teaching practices that are related to SEL. Table 2 provides a crosswalk of 10 teaching practices and three common professional teaching frameworks: the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS), Danielson's Framework for Teaching, and the Marzano Observational Protocol.</p>
<p>Zinsser, K. M., Weissberg, R. P., & Dusenbury, L. (2013). <i>Aligning preschool through high school social and emotional learning standards: A critical and doable next step</i>. Chicago, IL: Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning. https://static1.squarespace.com/static/513f79f9e4b05ce7b70e9673/t/52ac836ce4b0532c165d4f2e/1387037548200/Zinsser+et+al++brief+on+state+standards--20131214.pdf.</p>	<p>This guide contains background information and recommendations for developing and aligning state SEL learning standards. Table 1 provides examples of standards and benchmarks across all age bands of the Illinois SEL standards.</p>

Source: Authors' analysis based on literature identified in the review and other sources, 2008–15.

Note

1. The goal of the literature search was to summarize research syntheses and identify useful resources for stakeholders. The aim was not to conduct an exhaustive search and analysis of original research studies, which has already been done.

References

- Bridgeland, J., Bruce, M., & Hariharan, A. (2013). *The missing piece: A national teacher survey on how social and emotional learning can empower children and transform schools*. Washington, DC: Civic Enterprises. <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED558068>
- CASEL (Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning). (2006). *CASEL practice rubric for schoolwide SEL implementation*. Chicago, IL: Author. Retrieved June 12, 2014, from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED505360>
- CASEL (Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning). (2012). *Effective social and emotional learning programs*. Chicago, IL: Author. Retrieved June 12, 2014, from <http://static.squarespace.com/static/513f79f9e4b05ce7b70e9673/t/526a220de4b00a92c90436ba/1382687245993/2013-casel-guide.pdf>.
- Child Trends. (2014). *Measuring elementary school students' social and emotional skills: Providing educators with tools to measure and monitor social and emotional skills that lead to academic success* (Publication No. 2014–37). Bethesda, MD: Author. Retrieved June 12, 2014, from <http://www.childtrends.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/2014–37CombinedMeasuresApproachandTablepdf1.pdf>.
- Denham, S. A., Ji, P., & Hamre, B. (2010). *Compendium of preschool through elementary school social-emotional learning and associated assessment measures*. Chicago, IL: Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning and Social and Emotional Learning Research Group, University of Illinois at Chicago. Retrieved June 12, 2014, from <http://www.casel.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/compendium-of-preschool-through-elementary-school-social-emotional-learning-and-associated-assessment-measures.pdf>.
- Domitrovich, C. E., & Greenberg, M. T. (2000). The study of implementation: Current findings from effective programs that prevent mental disorders in school-aged children. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 11(2), 193–221.
- Domitrovich, C. E., Moore, J. E., Thompson, R. A., & the CASEL Preschool to Elementary School Social and Emotional Learning Assessment Workgroup. (2012). Interventions that promote social-emotional learning in young children. In R. Pianta (Ed.), *Handbook of early childhood education* (pp. 393–415). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- 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(3), 327–350.
- 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(1), 405–432. <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ927868>
- Dusenbury, L., Weissberg, R. P., Goren, P., & Domitrovich, C. (2014). *State standards to advance social and emotional learning: Findings from CASEL's state scan of social and emotional learning standards, preschool through high school*. Chicago, IL: Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning and Social and Emotional Learning Research Group, University of Illinois at Chicago. Retrieved June 12, 2014, from <http://static.squarespace.com/static/513f79f9e4b05ce7b70e9673/t/52f95691e4b0a41caba778b8/1392072337661/casel-brief-on-state-standards-january-2014.pdf>.

- Garner, P., Mahatmya, D., Brown, E., & Vesely, C. (2014). Promoting desirable outcomes among culturally and ethnically diverse children in social emotional learning programs: A multilevel heuristic model. *Educational Psychology Review*, 26(1), 165–189.
- Gordon, R., Ji, P., Mulhall, P., Shaw, B., & Weissberg, R. P. (2011). Social and emotional learning for Illinois students: Policy, practice and progress. In University of Illinois Institute of Government and Public Affairs (Ed.), *The Illinois Report: 2011* (pp. 68–83). Urbana, IL: Institute for Government and Public Affairs. Retrieved June 12, 2014, from <http://static.squarespace.com/static/513f79f9e4b05ce7b70e9673/t/526a24fce4b0dda0159b1a88/1382687996949/social-and-emotional-learning-for-illinois-students-policy-practice-and-progress.pdf>.
- Heller, R. (2013). Social-emotional learning. *From Practice to Policy*, 1(1), 1–8. Retrieved June 12, 2014, from <http://www.nasbe.org/wp-content/uploads/FPP-Social-Emotional-Learning.pdf>.
- Humphrey, N. (2013). *Social and emotional learning: A critical appraisal*. Washington, DC: Sage.
- Humphrey, N., Kalambouka, A., Wigelsworth, M., Lendrum, A., Deighton, J., & Wolpert, M. (2011). Measures of social and emotional skills for children and young people: A systematic review. *Educational & Psychological Measurement*, 71(4) 617–637.
- Jennings, P. A., & Greenberg, M. T. (2009). The prosocial classroom: Teacher social and emotional competence in relation to student and classroom outcomes. *Review of Educational Research*, 79(1), 491–525. <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ879159>
- Jones, S. M., & Bouffard, S. M. (2012). Social and emotional learning in schools: From programs to strategies. *Social Policy Report*, 26(4), 1–33. <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED540203>
- Kendziora, K., Weissberg, R. P., Ji, P., & Dusenbury, L. A. (2011). *Strategies for social and emotional learning: Preschool and elementary grade student learning standards and assessment*. Newton, MA: National Center for Mental Health Promotion and Youth Violence Prevention, Education Development Center, Inc. Retrieved June 12, 2014, from <http://www.casel.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/strategies-assessment-SEL-EDC.pdf>.
- Leff, S. S., Cassano, M., MacEvoy, J. P., & Costigan, T. (2010). Initial validation of a knowledge-based measure of social information processing and anger management. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 38(7), 1007–1020.
- McCabe, P. C., & Altamura, M. (2011). Empirically valid strategies to improve social and emotional competence of preschool children. *Psychology in the Schools*, 48(5), 513–540.
- Merrell, K. W., & Gueldner, B. A. (2010a). Using social and emotional learning within school systems. In K. W. Merrell & B. A. Gueldner (Eds.), *Social and emotional learning in the classroom: Promoting mental health and academic success* (pp. 148–164). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Merrell, K. W., & Gueldner, B. A. (2010b). The essentials of using social and emotional learning in the classroom. In K. W. Merrell & B. A. Gueldner (Eds.), *Social and emotional learning in the classroom: Promoting mental health and academic success* (pp. 48–67). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

- O'Brien, M. U., & Resnik, H. (2009). The Illinois social and emotional learning (SEL) standards: Leading the way for school and student success. *Illinois Principals Association Practitioners Bulletin*, 16(7), 1–5.
- O'Conner, R., De Feyter, J., Carr, A., Luo, J. L., & Romm, H. (2017a). *A review of the literature on social and emotional learning for students ages 3–8: Characteristics of effective social and emotional learning programs (part 1 of 4)*. (REL 2017–245). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Mid-Atlantic.
- O'Conner, R., De Feyter, J., Carr, A., Luo, J. L., & Romm, H. (2017b). *A review of the literature on social and emotional learning for students ages 3–8: Outcomes for different student populations and settings (part 4 of 4)*. (REL 2017–248). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Mid-Atlantic.
- O'Conner, R., De Feyter, J., Carr, A., Luo, J. L., & Romm, H. (2017c). *A review of the literature on social and emotional learning for students ages 3–8: Teacher and classroom strategies that contribute to social and emotional learning (part 3 of 4)*. (REL 2017–247). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Mid-Atlantic.
- Pianta, R. C., & La Paro, K. (2003). Improving early school success. *Educational Leadership*, 60(7), 24–29.
- 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), 3–19.
- Van Velsor, P. (2009). School counselors as social-emotional learning consultants: Where do we begin? *Professional School Counseling*, 13(1), 50–58. <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ880415>
- Yoder, N. (2014). *Teaching the whole child: Instructional practices that support social-emotional learning in three teacher evaluation frameworks*. Washington, DC: Center on Great Teachers and Leaders at American Institutes for Research. Retrieved June 12, 2014, from <http://www.gtlcenter.org/sites/default/files/TeachingtheWholeChild.pdf>.
- Zinsler, K. M., Weissberg, R. P., & Dusenbury, L. (2013). *Aligning preschool through high school social and emotional learning standards: A critical and doable next step*. Chicago, IL: Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning. Retrieved May 16, 2014, from <http://www.casel.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Zinsleretalbriefonstatestandards-20131214.pdf>.

REL 2017–246

The National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE) conducts unbiased large-scale evaluations of education programs and practices supported by federal funds; provides research-based technical assistance to educators and policymakers; and supports the synthesis and the widespread dissemination of the results of research and evaluation throughout the United States.

February 2017

This report was prepared for the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) under Contract ED-IES-12-C-0006 by Regional Educational Laboratory Mid-Atlantic administered by ICF International. The content of the publication does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of IES or the U.S. Department of Education, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

This REL report is in the public domain. While permission to reprint this publication is not necessary, it should be cited as:

O’Conner, R., De Feyter, J., Carr, A., Luo, J. L., & Romm, H. (2017). *A review of the literature on social and emotional learning for students ages 3–8: Implementation strategies and state and district support policies (part 2 of 4)* (REL 2017–246). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Mid-Atlantic. Retrieved from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs>.

This report is available on the Regional Educational Laboratory website at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs>.

The Regional Educational Laboratory Program produces 7 types of reports



Making Connections

Studies of correlational relationships



Making an Impact

Studies of cause and effect



What’s Happening

Descriptions of policies, programs, implementation status, or data trends



What’s Known

Summaries of previous research



Stated Briefly

Summaries of research findings for specific audiences



Applied Research Methods

Research methods for educational settings



Tools

Help for planning, gathering, analyzing, or reporting data or research