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Key Questions: Overall CDI Evaluation

- What are the outcomes in districts? In schools?
- How did the districts implement SEL over time?
- What factors influence implementation quality?
- To what extent and in what respects are intended student-level outcomes realized?
- How are realized student outcomes associated with the school- and district-level implementation of the CDI?
Key Questions: Focus of this Presentation

• What is the progress of district activities and outcomes as summarized by rubric scores?
  ▪ 2011 and 2012 scores for Cohort 1
  ▪ 2012 scores for Cohort 2

• Student social and emotional competence at baseline

• Challenges and solutions

• Next steps
Methods

• Two cohorts of districts:
  • Cohort 1 = Anchorage, Austin, and an R&D district, Cleveland
  • Cohort 2 = Chicago, Nashville, Oakland, Sacramento, Washoe County

• District interviews
  ▪ 97 stakeholders across the 8 districts were interviewed

• Data examined
  ▪ Planning documents, communication materials, handouts, district reports, consultant input
  ▪ Districtwide staff SEL surveys
  ▪ Student data, climate data, student social and emotional skills ratings

• Triangulation of data → District rubric scores and district reports
Rubric Scores for Cohort 1 Districts: 2011 (Planning Phase) and 2012 (Implementation Year 1)
### 2012 Rubric Scores: Cohort 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needs &amp; resources</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central office expertise</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD programs</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Align resources</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEL standards for PK–12</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence-based programs</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate SEL with other initiatives</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous improvement</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive climate</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder commitment</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles &amp; responsibilities</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grade 7 Students’ Social and Emotional Competence: Baseline

Caution: Data are combined across all districts and all survey types. Data do not represent any one district. Reliability for some scales was low.
Caution: Data are combined across all districts and all survey types. Data do not represent any one district. Reliability for some scales was low.
Findings about Student Social and Emotional Competence Across All Districts at Baseline

Results for seventh grade students

- Females rate themselves more highly than males for self-management, social awareness, and relationship skills.
- For self-awareness and social awareness, American Indian and White students rated themselves the highest, followed by multi-racial, Native Hawaiian, Black, Hispanic, and Asian students, and finally Alaska Native students.
Findings about Student Social and Emotional Competence Across All Districts at Baseline

Results for tenth grade students

- Females rate themselves more highly than males for responsible decision making.
- American Indian students rated themselves higher than all other racial groups (Native Hawaiian and Alaska Native students were not included because n=14 and n=5).
Sample Grade 7 Subgroup Results: Social Awareness

Caution: Data are combined across all districts and all survey types. Data do not represent any one district. Reliability for some scales was low.
Caution: Data are combined across all districts and all survey types. Data do not represent any one district. Reliability for some scales was low.
Strengths Across Districts

- Even in a climate of fiscal austerity, districts have still managed to support SEL.
- All districts have expressed a desire to go to scale with SEL.
- Willingness to take on SEL standards seriously.
- Focus on professional development.
- Efforts at aligning foundational efforts and early and intensive interventions.
- Insight into the relationship between SEL and deep learning and the whole child.
- Insight into the relationship between SEL and disparities in discipline, attendance, and learning.
Challenges: Multiple Initiatives

• In every district there was concern expressed about:
  ▪ the rapid pace of program turnover
  ▪ being overburdened with too many initiatives at once
  ▪ “innovation fatigue”
Challenges: Understanding

• SEL is sometimes:
  ▪ seen as “soft” by some educators
  ▪ regarded as a distraction
  ▪ confused with PBIS, character education, student support, and other initiatives
Challenge: Implementation

• School autonomy and variation present challenges for supporting high-quality SEL implementation

• Linking elementary-middle-high school SEL has been a challenge
Challenge: Turnover

• Who is the champion for the CDI? How to ensure sustainability when there is turnover in key staff?
• Strategic use of SEL metrics can support high-quality SEL implementation
• Some districts do well with data use, but don’t have SEL-related metrics available
• Some districts have SEL metrics available, but have not systematically supported use of those data
CDI Evaluation Activities 2012–13

• Site visits in spring
  ▪ Interviews with key district stakeholders
  ▪ SEL lead / team phone interviews
  ▪ Document review: focus on evidence of CDI implementation

• Districtwide staff SEL survey
  ▪ Central office: relevant staff
  ▪ Schools: Principals, teachers, student support staff

• Teacher ratings of Grade 3 students’ SEL

• Grade 7 & 10 student self-report of SEL skills

• No school case studies
Next Steps

• AIR evaluation team will contact districts to develop/revise data collection plans for 2012–13 by the end of December
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