

LESSONS FROM THE PARTNERSHIPS FOR
SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL LEARNING INITIATIVE

VOLUME 1

EARLY LESSONS FROM
**Schools and Out-of-School
Time Programs
Implementing Social
and Emotional Learning**

TECHNICAL APPENDIX

HEATHER L. SCHWARTZ, LAURA S. HAMILTON,
SUSANNAH FAXON-MILLS, CELIA J. GOMEZ,
ALICE HUGUET, LISA H. JAYCOX, JENNIFER T. LESCHITZ,
ANDREA PRADO TUMA, KATIE TOSH,
ANAMARIE A. WHITAKER, STEPHANI L. WRABEL



Commissioned by

Wallace ™

For more information on this publication, visit www.rand.org/t/RRA379-1

Published by the RAND Corporation, Santa Monica, Calif.

© Copyright 2020 RAND Corporation

RAND® is a registered trademark.

Limited Print and Electronic Distribution Rights

This document and trademark(s) contained herein are protected by law. This representation of RAND intellectual property is provided for noncommercial use only. Unauthorized posting of this publication online is prohibited. Permission is given to duplicate this document for personal use only, as long as it is unaltered and complete. Permission is required from RAND to reproduce, or reuse in another form, any of its research documents for commercial use. For information on reprint and linking permissions, please visit www.rand.org/pubs/permissions.

The RAND Corporation is a research organization that develops solutions to public policy challenges to help make communities throughout the world safer and more secure, healthier and more prosperous. RAND is nonprofit, nonpartisan, and committed to the public interest.

RAND's publications do not necessarily reflect the opinions of its research clients and sponsors.

Support RAND

Make a tax-deductible charitable contribution at
www.rand.org/giving/contribute

www.rand.org

Preface

This is the technical appendix to a report that offers early lessons from an initiative focused on social and emotional learning (SEL) in elementary schools and out-of-school time (OST) programs. The main report is available at www.rand.org/t/RRA379-1.

In 2016, in an effort to gain knowledge about how to help children develop SEL skills, The Wallace Foundation launched a six-year project called the Partnerships for Social and Emotional Learning Initiative (PSELI). Wallace selected six communities—Boston, Massachusetts; Dallas, Texas; Denver, Colorado; Palm Beach County, Florida; Tacoma, Washington; and Tulsa, Oklahoma—to explore whether and how children benefit when schools and OST programs partner to improve and align SEL, as well as what it takes to do this work. The findings and lessons outlined in the main report are based on these six communities' experiences implementing SEL for elementary school-aged students during the first two years of PSELI. This technical appendix provides a description of the study; details on methods for interviews, staff surveys, class observations, and document collection; and study limitations.

This study was undertaken by RAND Education and Labor, a division of the RAND Corporation that conducts research on early childhood through postsecondary education programs, workforce development, and programs and policies affecting workers, entrepreneurship, and financial literacy and decisionmaking. This study was sponsored by The Wallace Foundation, which seeks to support and share effective ideas and practices to improve learning and enrichment opportunities for children and the vitality of the arts for everyone. For more information and research on these and other related topics, please visit its Knowledge Center at www.wallacefoundation.org.

More information about RAND can be found at www.rand.org. Questions about this report should be directed to Heather Schwartz at heather_schwartz@rand.org, and questions about RAND Education and Labor should be directed to educationandlabor@rand.org.

Contents

Preface iii

Tables v

Abbreviationsvi

APPENDIX

Technical Appendix..... 1

 Study Description 1

 Summary 1

 Data Collection..... 2

 Staff Survey Methods and Response Rates4

 Staff Interview and Analysis Methods6

 Observation Methods8

 Document Collection..... 10

 Limitations of the Study 11

References 12

Tables

Table A.1. Data Collection Activities	3
Table A.2. Survey Content Areas and Sources	4
Table A.3. Phase 1 School and OST Staff Survey Response Rates, by Community	5
Table A.4. Number of Interviewees, by Role and Community	7
Table A.5. Number of Observations at Phase 1 Sites, by Session Type and Community	9
Table A.6. Observation Protocol Core Domains and Sources, Spring 2019	10

Abbreviations

CASEL	Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning
N/A	not applicable
OST	out-of-school time
OSTI	out-of-school time intermediary
PD	professional development
PSELI	Partnerships for Social and Emotional Learning Initiative
SEL	social and emotional learning
TA	technical assistance

Appendix

Technical Appendix

In this technical appendix, we provide a summary of our study of the Partnerships for Social and Emotional Learning Initiative (PSELI) and discuss the details of the data we collected between fall 2017 and spring 2019 that inform us about the first two years of initiative implementation. Specifically, we describe the development and administration of the survey given to staff at schools and out-of-school time (OST) programs; the interviews that we conducted with staff at schools, OST programs, school districts, and out-of-school time intermediary (OSTI) organizations; the development of our observation protocol and the observations we conducted; and our review of documents from sites (schools and OST programs) and systems (school districts and OSTIs).

Study Description

Summary

PSELI was designed with two goals in mind: to benefit students and the institutions that serve them in the grantee communities and to build knowledge for the field by understanding how schools and OST programs can work together to improve and coordinate social and emotional learning (SEL) experiences for students. To help achieve these goals, The Wallace Foundation selected the RAND Corporation, a nonprofit, nonpartisan research organization, to conduct a study of PSELI implementation and outcomes. To launch the PSELI study, we first worked with each of the six communities during the planning phase (the 2016–2017 school year) to identify five to seven Phase 1 sites (each site consisting of an elementary school paired with one or more OST program partners) plus five to seven Phase 2 sites (also each consisting of an elementary school and an OST program partner). The identification process included statistical matching procedures to ensure that each community’s Phase 1 and Phase 2 sites were comparable on key demographic and performance characteristics prior to launching PSELI.

As PSELI participants, the Phase 1 sites receive enhanced SEL support during the four years of Phase 1 of PSELI, which spans the 2017–2018 through 2020–2021 school years. The SEL supports vary by community, but they typically include SEL coaching and other forms of professional development (PD) focused on SEL, on-site staff roles (e.g., a SEL champion or a full-time OST manager), the use of an evidence-based SEL curriculum in the school (optional for the OST program), and use of SEL rituals in both the school and OST program settings. Starting in 2017–2018, Phase 1 sites adopted new SEL practices and received additional resources and technical assistance (TA) (as determined by each school district and OSTI) and participated in peer-learning activities to strengthen SEL practices. In support of their ongoing improvement

efforts, Phase 1 sites have also received yearly feedback that we have put together based on our collected data.

The Phase 2 sites were not set to start implementing SEL until the 2021–2022 school year, when Phase 2 was scheduled to begin. However, in response to the coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic in spring 2020, The Wallace Foundation altered the design to give Phase 2 sites more flexibility in implementing the intensive SEL supports, curricula, and instruction, and Phase 2 sites were given the green light to launch new SEL activities starting in 2020–2021 if desired.

As part of the research, we began collecting primary data in the form of site observations, staff surveys, staff interviews, and documents in school year 2017–2018 and will continue to collect data through school year 2020–2021. We have also collected secondary data from districts and OSTIs annually over that period. These data include student performance on a SEL skill assessment called SELweb, student achievement in math and English language arts, student attendance in school and in PSELI-participating OST programs, and staff rosters and staff attendance. We will continue to collect the student academic achievement, student attendance, and staff attendance data through 2022–2023.

We have produced non-public, formative assessment reports for each community after each wave of primary data collection in Years 1–3 of the four-year Phase 1. In addition to this report on early implementation, we will produce case studies; an implementation and outcome report in 2022; a how-to guide; and a topical report, the subject of which is still to be determined.

Data Collection

Table A.1 provides an overview of each of our data-collection activities, as well as some school-led activities.

Table A.1. Data-Collection Activities

Data-Collection Activity	Collection Periods	Purpose	Sources for the Collection Instruments
Author-led activities			
<p>Surveys of school and OST staff</p> <p>(15–30 minutes; online)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fall 2017 • Spring 2018 • Spring 2019 • Spring 2020 • Spring 2021 	<p>Gauge adults' perception and knowledge of SEL; training received; self-reported SEL practices; and site climate.</p>	<p>We drew most questions from existing surveys, sometimes with slight wording modifications. We note survey sources in Table A.2. We also developed a few items specifically for the PSELI study.</p>
<p>Interviews: System-level district staff, OSTI staff, and coaches; Phase 1 and Phase 2 site principals; Phase 1 and Phase 2 site OST leaders; Phase 1 school teachers; Phase 1 OST instructors; and Phase 1 SEL champions</p> <p>(30–60 minutes; in-person during site visits; over the phone when in person was not possible).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fall 2017 • Spring 2018 • Spring 2019 • Spring 2020 • Spring 2021 	<p>Learn what SEL activity is planned for whom; gauge where planned activity has occurred according to the sites; gauge the nature of the district-OSTI and school-OST partnerships; and identify barriers to and enablers of SEL implementation.</p>	<p>We developed our own questions, which, in many cases, we adapted from interview protocols that we have used in other studies.</p>
<p>Site observations: Phase 1 schools and OST programs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fall 2017 • Spring 2018 • Spring 2019 • 1 day in fall, winter, and spring 2019–2020 • 1 day in fall, winter, and spring 2020–2021 	<p><i>At baseline collection:</i> Observe climate and culture.</p> <p><i>At spring follow-ons:</i> Document SEL activity.</p>	<p>For fall 2017, we adapted most items from the Forum for Youth Investment's Social Emotional Learning Program Quality Assessment (Forum for Youth Investment, 2019), with minor modifications. We developed a few items specifically for the PSELI study. We added items regarding SEL instruction for spring 2019 collections and beyond, and we changed the scales for many of the observation items to capture more variability in responses. See Table A.6 for specific sources for the spring 2019 observation protocol.</p>
<p>Document review: "Day at Wallace" documents, PD schedules, and other documents produced by PSELI staff</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing 	<p>Understand how PSELI is implemented at the system and site levels.</p>	<p>These documents were produced by PSELI staff for Wallace or for staff implementing PSELI.</p>
<p>Administrative data: Student-level attendance, school discipline, academic records, and SELweb scores; staff-level attendance and turnover</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requested December 2017 • January 2019 • January 2020 • January 2021 • January 2022 	<p>Measure the effects of PSELI on student and staff outcomes.</p>	<p>These secondary data were collected by school districts and OSTIs and provided to us via data-sharing agreements.</p>
School-led activities			
<p>SELweb Early Elementary and Late Elementary versions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fall 2017 • Spring 2019 • Spring 2020 • Spring 2021 	<p>Measure several student SEL competencies.</p>	<p>xSEL Labs produced SELweb, and we provided items for self-report for students in (1) kindergarten through third grade and (2) fourth through sixth grade. The items were drawn from other sources, including Panorama and the Berkeley Puppet Interview.</p>

Staff Survey Methods and Response Rates

We developed and administered a survey to school and OST staff to gauge staff perceptions of the importance of SEL, training received, self-reported SEL practices, and site climate. We borrowed and modified items—with permission—from several other sources and developed some new survey items of our own. We identified the topic areas for the survey to cover key theorized pathways that we developed in our research framework. See Table A.2 for a summary of the content areas that were included in the survey and the sources for the items in each.

Table A.2. Survey Content Areas and Sources

Content Area	Source
<p>Professional learning Includes items about the type, frequency, quality, and content of the SEL-related PD that staff received in the current school year</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Author-developed items • Teaching and Learning International Survey (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, undated)
<p>Use of SEL data for continuous improvement Includes items about the frequency with which staff receive or collect different types of SEL-related data; the extent to which they use SEL-related data for different purposes, such as creating an improvement plan and identifying growth areas; and their perceptions of their access to high-quality data about SEL and their skill level using SEL data</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Author-developed items
<p>SEL practices and student skills in your school or program Includes items about the extent to which staff use different types of strategies to improve school climate and safety; perceptions of their school’s SEL vision, SEL guidelines, and school culture; perceptions of their students’ SEL competencies; and the frequency with which they use different types of instructional practices and activities that support SEL</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Author-developed items • Becoming Effective Learners survey (Farrington, Levenstein, and Nagaoka, 2013) • Investing in Innovation (i3) survey (provided to the authors by CASEL and the American Institutes for Research) • Mindfulness in Teaching Scale (Frank, Jennings, and Greenberg, 2016) • Patterns of Adaptive Learning Scales (Midgley et al., 2000) • Teachers’ Views of Issues Involving Students’ Mental Health (Roeser and Midgley, 1997) • 5Essentials teacher survey (Klugman et al., 2015)
<p>School or OST program culture Includes items about staff perceptions of student behavior; school climate; and the quality of relationships between students, between students and teachers, and between school staff and OST staff</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Author-developed items • 5Essentials teacher survey (Klugman et al., 2015)
<p>Job commitment Includes items about staff satisfaction with the school or OST program in which they work, loyalty toward the school or OST program, and burnout</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5Essentials teacher survey (Klugman et al., 2015) • Investing in Innovation (i3) survey (provided to the authors by Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning and the American Institutes for Research)

The findings and lessons outlined in the main report are based on data from the administration of the survey in fall 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019. Before survey administration, we worked with all six communities to develop comprehensive lists of people

currently working with students at schools and OST programs. At schools, we invited teachers, teacher aides, administrators, specialized teachers, counselors, and nurses. At OST programs, we invited all those on the rosters who worked directly with children. School and OST staff invited to participate in the survey received hard-copy letter invitations to the survey—mailed to the schools and OST programs—and email invitations with instructions for how to access the online survey. Staff received up to five email reminders. The online survey had an approximate administration time of 15 to 30 minutes. Respondents received a \$25 Amazon gift card upon survey completion. In addition, as of spring 2018, we also offered a \$250 incentive to schools that achieved a response rate of 75–84 percent and a \$400 incentive to schools that achieved a response rate of 85 percent or higher. If the community-wide response rate for OST programs was 75–84 percent, OSTIs were offered an incentive equal to $250 \times$ number of Phase 1 and Phase 2 sites; if the response rate was 85 percent or higher, OSTIs were offered an incentive equal to $\$400 \times$ number of Phase 1 and Phase 2 sites. Table A.3 displays the number of school and OST staff who completed the survey in all six communities during each wave of data collection, plus the response rates.

Table A.3. Phase 1 School and OST Staff Survey Response Rates, by Community

	Boston	Dallas	Denver	Palm Beach County	Tacoma	Tulsa	Total
Fall 2017							
Number of Phase 1 schools	7	7	6	7	6	5	38
Number of school staff who completed the survey	158	262	199	227	168	166	1,180
Response rate: Percentage of staff invited who completed a survey	43	72	64	62	64	81	63
Number of Phase 1 OST programs	11	7	6	7	N/A	6	37
Number of OST staff who completed the survey	58	23	34	49	N/A	34	198
Response rate: Percentage of staff invited who completed a survey	61	68	83	63	N/A	71	67
Spring 2018							
Number of Phase 1 schools	7	7	6	7	6	5	38
Number of school staff who completed the survey	221	278	226	370	233	155	1,483
Response rate: Percentage of staff invited who completed a survey	80	82	76	78	86	79	80
Number of Phase 1 OST programs	11	7	6	7	N/A	6	37
Number of OST staff who completed the survey	94	24	34	59	N/A	34	245
Response rate: Percentage of staff invited who completed a survey	86	80	79	73	N/A	74	79

	Boston	Dallas	Denver	Palm Beach County	Tacoma	Tulsa	Total
Spring 2019							
Number of Phase 1 schools	7	7	6	7	6	5	38
Number of school staff who completed the survey	234	281	259	334	228	146	1,482
Response rate: Percentage of staff invited who completed a survey	71	85	84	71	88	77	79
Number of Phase 1 OST programs	16	7	6	7	36	6	78
Number of OST staff who completed the survey	100	56	61	139	61	39	456
Response rate: Percentage of staff invited who completed a survey	77	77	84	84	71	76	78

NOTE: N/A = not applicable.

Staff Interview and Analysis Methods

With input from The Wallace Foundation, we created scripted interview protocols designed to highlight key dimensions of implementation and interviewees' perceptions of impact. These protocols are available upon request. As with the survey, we chose topics to align with the research framework for the study. We refined interview protocols for each round of data collection to better fit the developing initiative. Interviews ranged in duration from 30 to 90 minutes, depending on the role of the interviewee and his or her time constraints. Once per year, prior to site visits, interviewers attended a three-hour interview training session.

We conducted interviews at Phase 1 and Phase 2 sites, as well as with system-level leaders involved in the initiative. In fall 2017 and spring 2018, interviewees included PSELI staff at schools and districts, TA providers, Phase 1 and Phase 2 principals, Phase 1 teachers, Phase 1 and Phase 2 OST managers, and Phase 1 OST instructors. In spring 2019, we expanded the list of interviewees to also include district and OSTI staff members who did not work directly on PSELI, community-level SEL coaches, teachers who served as site leaders (sometimes called SEL champions), school staff members (in site-level group interviews), and OST staff members (in site-level group interviews). The numbers of interviews and types of interviewees are outlined in Table A.4.

District and OSTI partners provided us with interviewees' contact information, and we invited interviewees to participate directly via email, in most cases. In the case of group teacher or OST staff interviews, we coordinated with school and OST leaders to invite their full staff to the group interviews, also via email, and participation was voluntary. Teachers, school staff, and OST staff members were offered a \$25 incentive to participate in the form of an Amazon gift card. When possible, we conducted interviews in person. In some cases, we conducted interviews over the phone, typically because of interviewee scheduling needs. We recorded interviews with participant consent, had them professionally transcribed, and uploaded them into the qualitative analysis software Dedoose.

We conducted interview analysis in phases. We developed the coding scheme to organize interviewees' responses around key aspects of implementation and perceptions of impact. Those from the project team who served as coders attended a three-hour training during which they learned about the key elements of PSELI implementation, the coding scheme, and the interview protocols. Coders then practiced coding transcripts individually and had a one-hour follow-up training to discuss and come to consensus on how to apply codes. As a final training calibration check, coders were assigned transcripts to code as a group in order to maintain ongoing agreement and had discussion calls to resolve any discrepancies in applying codes.

Table A.4. Number of Interviewees, by Role and Community

Interviewee Role	Boston	Dallas	Denver	Palm Beach County	Tacoma	Tulsa	Total
Fall 2017							
System-level staff, total	6	4	7	9	5	6	37
School district PSELI staff	1	1	2	3	2	2	11
OSTI PSELI staff	2	1	4	4	2	2	15
TA providers	3	2	1	2	1	2	11
School staff, total	17	17	18	17	18	13	100
Phase 1 principals	7	7	6	7	6	5	38
Phase 1 teachers ^a	3	3	6	4	6	3	25
Phase 2 principals	7	7	6	6	6	5	37
OST staff, total	11	10	13	17	6	13	70
Phase 1 OST managers	6	5	6	7	6	5	35
Phase 1 OST instructors ^a	1	1	1	3	N/A ^b	3	9
Phase 2 OST managers	4	4	6	7	N/A ^b	5	26
Spring 2018							
System-level staff, total	10	6	9	9	5	8	47
School district PSELI staff	4	1	4	2	2	3	16
OSTI PSELI staff	3	2	2	4	2	2	15
TA providers	3	3	3	3	1	3	16
School staff, total	19	25	21	24	17	19	125
Phase 1 principals	7	7	6	7	6	5	38
Phase 1 teachers ^c	6	11	9	10	5	9	50
Phase 2 principals	6	7	6	7	6	5	37
OST staff, total	16	15	21	21	N/A ^b	13	86
Phase 1 OST managers	9	8	6	7	N/A ^b	5	35
Phase 1 OST instructors ^c	2	2	9	7	N/A ^b	3	23
Phase 2 OST managers	5	5	6	7	N/A ^b	5	28
Spring 2019							
System-level staff, total	18	17	13	24	21	16	109
School district PSELI staff	1	3	1	3	2	3	13
School district non-PSELI staff	5	4	5	7	6	4	31
OSTI PSELI staff	3	5	2	7	9	1	27
OSTI non-PSELI staff	2	2	0	0	1	1	6
SEL coaches	3	0	2	2	2	4	13
TA providers	4	3	3	5	1	3	19

Interviewee Role	Boston	Dallas	Denver	Palm Beach County	Tacoma	Tulsa	Total
School staff, total	19	25	21	24	17	19	125
Phase 1 principals	7	7	6	7	6	5	38
Phase 1 teachers in group interviews	27	38	40	33	32	25	195
Phase 1 site leaders	6	7	5	5	4	5	32
Phase 2 principals	7	7	6	7	6	5	38
OST staff, total	39	29	37	41	23	29	198
Phase 1 OST managers	9	9	6	7	3	5	39
Phase 1 OST instructors in group interviews	23	16	26	27	16	19	127
Phase 2 OST managers	7	4	5	7	4	5	32

NOTES: Because some schools are served by more than one OST program and some OST programs are linked to more than one school, the number of OST managers interviewed is sometimes different from the number of sites in a community.

^a In fall 2017, we randomly sampled one teacher and one OST instructor per Phase 1 site to interview.

^b In fall 2017 and spring 2018, we did not report on interviews for OST leaders or OST staff in one community because its OST programs were not yet selected.

^c In spring 2018, we sought to interview two school teachers and two OST instructors at each Phase 1 site by recruiting up to four randomly selected teachers and four randomly selected OST instructors (if applicable) per site.

Observation Methods

We conducted one day of site observations at all Phase 1 and Phase 2 sites in fall 2017 and two days of observations at Phase 1 sites in spring 2018. In spring 2019, we hired staff in each of the six communities to conduct three days of observations at Phase 1 sites. On each day, an observer arrived in the morning for student arrival and left after observing a portion of the OST program. They conducted observations of both instructional sessions (i.e., academic classes, such as a math and English language arts; specials classes or sessions, such as music, art, and guidance counseling; and afterschool activities, such as sports, arts and crafts, and homework clubs) and noninstructional sessions (e.g., arrival, breakfast, recess, transitions between classes, free time). Observing both instructional and noninstructional sessions throughout the day was important because SEL programming is unlikely to be restricted to a single course period. And the behaviors that adults model throughout the school day are important to the development of children’s SEL skills. Furthermore, observing the transitions and the downtime in a school day (e.g., from buses to the cafeteria, from breakfast to homeroom, from class to class, the lunch period, the period between the school day and the start of OST programming) can help us understand the explicit and implicit social and emotional messages a child receives. Table A.5 indicates the number of observations performed at Phase 1 sites in fall 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019.

Table A.5. Number of Observations at Phase 1 Sites, by Session Type and Community

Session Type	Boston	Dallas	Denver	Palm Beach County	Tacoma	Tulsa	Total
Number of Phase 1 sites	7	7	6	7	6	5	38
Fall 2017							
School sessions, total	44	47	42	54	43	35	265
Instructional sessions	37	38	37	42	36	29	219
Noninstructional sessions	7	9	5	12	7	6	46
OST sessions, total	18	17	16	20	N/A	13	84
Instructional sessions	16	14	14	15	N/A	13	72
Noninstructional sessions	2	3	2	5	N/A	0	12
Spring 2018							
School sessions, total	152	146	134	166	150	115	863
Instructional sessions	68	60	57	83	71	50	389
Noninstructional sessions	84	86	77	83	79	65	474
OST sessions, total	52	75	71	74	N/A	44	316
Instructional sessions	20	28	26	37	N/A	23	134
Noninstructional sessions	32	47	45	37	N/A	21	182
Spring 2019							
School sessions, total	297	239	184	181	221	205	1,327
Instructional sessions	135	122	99	84	95	106	641
Noninstructional sessions	162	117	85	97	126	99	686
OST sessions, total	104	118	73	75	31	64	465
Instructional sessions	36	47	38	45	13	34	213
Noninstructional sessions	68	71	35	30	18	30	252

To collect these data in a systematic fashion, we developed an observation protocol that gathers a combination of closed-ended dichotomous and Likert-scale items regarding explicit and implicit SEL instruction, school climate, student-student interactions, student-teacher interactions, safety, and the continuity of SEL activities and instruction from the school day to the OST program. The protocol also includes some open-ended items that allow observers to record details about the context needed to interpret the data. As with the survey, we developed some of the items but also borrowed and modified items with permission from several other sources (see Table A.6). We identified these core domains to cover the elements listed in our research framework. With the goal of reaching interrater reliability so that observers in the six communities could rate the same items in the same ways, we developed the protocol to be extremely explicit about what is being measured and how to determine whether the item is present or not.

After our experience using the protocol in fall 2017, we refined it for spring 2018 and again for spring 2019. See Table A.6 for a list of the core domains in the spring 2019 observation protocol and the sources for the items in each.

Table A.6. Observation Protocol Core Domains and Sources, Spring 2019

Core Domain	Sources
Climate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Author-developed items • SEL PQA: Safe Space domain (Forum for Youth Investment, 2019) • A TSRS Codebook (provided to the authors by Stephanie Jones, Harvard University)
Instructional strategies that support students' SEL skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Author-developed items • SEL Youth and School-Aged Program Quality Assessment: Basic Skills (Forum for Youth Investment, 2018) • A TSRS Codebook (provided to the authors by Stephanie Jones, Harvard University)
Explicit SEL instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Author-developed items • A TSRS Codebook (provided to the authors by Stephanie Jones, Harvard University) • Representatives from CASEL and the Forum for Youth Investment^a
Quality of explicit SEL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEL Program Quality Assessment (Forum for Youth Investment, 2019) • K–5 <i>Second Step</i> Lesson Observation Form (Committee for Children, 2012) • A TSRS Codebook (provided to the authors by Stephanie Jones, Harvard University)

NOTE: TSRS = Teaching Style Rating Scale.

^a We consulted with Sherrie Raven from CASEL and Joe Bertolotti from the Forum for Youth Investment on item creation.

To reliably rate the observation protocol, all observers participated in a three-day in-person training at the RAND Pittsburgh Office one or two weeks before each wave of observations began. During trainings, observers watched between six and ten videos of elementary school classroom and OST program activities each day, rating each video individually. The trainer and one additional staff person had independently rated all 20-plus videos prior to the training, discussed them, and established a preferred set of ratings for each video. The videos depicted academic and enrichment scenes from a variety of sources, including public videos from YouTube and other sources, as well as proprietary videos from the David P. Weikart Center for Youth Program Quality.

On each training day, the trainer led a group discussion after each video that started with counts of each observer's rating on each observation protocol item. Observers then discussed differences in ratings, developed a consensus on the appropriate rating for each video, and edited the observation protocol wording for clarity. All observers achieved reliability on the protocol, as indicated by the fact that their ratings agreed with the preferred rating for each video on at least 80 percent of the items on the final videos.

Document Collection

As of spring 2018, we requested and collected relevant documents related to PSEL, such as policy documents, organizational charts, strategic plans (updated yearly), goal trees, PD plans, OST program materials, and SEL practice and curriculum guides. We collected these documents both from participating school districts and OSTIs and from schools and OST programs. We

request documents multiple times per year to ensure that we have the most updated versions. Once a year, we review collected documents to gain a deep understanding of PSELI and community policies, practices, and progress; complement the data we analyze to generate formative feedback for communities and sites; and corroborate some of our findings from interviews and observations.

Limitations of the Study

PSELI data collection has been especially comprehensive and offers an opportunity to document implementation lessons, as well as the effects of implementation on student and staff outcomes. But the research has limitations that are important to note.

One limitation pertains to the data that we are gathering to document implementation and stakeholder responses to PSELI. Although these data come from multiple sources, none of them provides complete or objective feedback about how SEL programs and practices were implemented.

Our observations should not be interpreted as representative of what happens over the course of a full school year. They are snapshots of operations at sites and cannot capture the full experience of those who are present on an ongoing basis. In both fall 2017 and spring 2018, site observations focused on understanding the climate and culture of the schools and OST programs in the PSELI communities. In spring 2018, we added observation items to examine explicit SEL instruction. In spring 2019, we added items to examine the specific SEL instructional approaches that Phase 1 sites have selected. In other words, the observational rubrics themselves have also evolved over the course of this project.

Survey and interview data rely on the self-reports of stakeholders who voluntarily participate in these activities, and we have no independent means of verifying the accuracy of their responses. Self-reported data can be susceptible to various forms of bias. For example, it is important to recognize that, although teachers and OST staff are important sources of information about students' SEL skills because they interact with them daily, responses to the survey questions should not be interpreted as objective measures of students' skills and could be affected by such factors as differences in how staff interpret the questions or by a tendency to provide socially desirable answers.

To protect survey respondents' confidentiality, when reporting results for a group of respondents, we do not include results that are based on fewer than ten respondents. Because many OST sites hire fewer than ten staff, our ability to report site-level OST staff findings is limited. To provide communities with as much survey data as we can, we have worked with the communities to bundle OST programs into groups (e.g., groups of Phase 1 OST programs run by the same operator) where possible.

References

- Committee for Children, “K–5 *Second Step* Lesson Observation Form,” 2012. As of July 17, 2020:
https://www.cfchildren.org/wp-content/uploads/misc-docs/K-5_Lesson_Observation.pdf
- Farrington, Camille, Rachel Levenstein, and Jenny Nagaoka, “*Becoming Effective Learners* Survey Development Project,” Society for Research on Educational Effectiveness Fall 2013 Conference, Washington, D.C., 2013.
- Forum for Youth Investment, *Youth and School-Age Program Quality Assessment (YPQA)*, Ypsilanti, Mich., 2018.
- , *Social Emotional Learning Program Quality Assessment (SEL PQA)*, Ypsilanti, Mich., 2019.
- Frank, Jennifer L., Patricia A. Jennings, and Mark T. Greenberg, “Validation of the Mindfulness in Teaching Scale,” *Mindfulness*, Vol. 7, No. 1, 2016, pp. 155–163.
- Klugman, Joshua, Molly F. Gordon, Penny Bender Sebring, and Susan E. Spote, *A First Look at the 5Essentials in Illinois Schools*, Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Consortium on Chicago School Research, June 2015.
- Midgley, Carol, Martin L. Maehr, Ludmila Z. Hruda, Eric Anderman, Lynley Anderman, Kimberley E. Freeman, Margaret Gheen, Avi Kaplan, Revathy Kumar, Michael J. Middleton, Jeanne Nelson, Robert Roeser, and Timothy Urdan, *Manual for the Patterns of Adaptive Learning Scales*, Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan, 2000.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, “TALIS Teaching and Learning International Survey—Complete Database,” OECD Education Statistics database, undated. As of July 17, 2020:
https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/data/oecd-education-statistics/talis-teaching-and-learning-international-survey-complete-database_3eba0bf4-en
- Roeser, Robert W., and Carol Midgley, “Teachers’ Views of Issues Involving Students’ Mental Health,” *Elementary School Journal*, Vol. 98, No. 2, 1997, pp. 115–133.