Design Subcommittee Interim Update

Presented to the PAUSD SEL Curriculum Committee - September 14th, 2016

Subcommittee Members: Sumit Bhargava, Josh Bloom (co-chair), Denise Herrmann (co-chair), Jerry Hong, Libby Horn, Vidhu Navjeevan, Miriam Stevenson, Rika Yamamoto, Scott Yarbrough, Yvonne Yeh
Tonight’s Charge

Design Subcommittee Charge: Review research, analyze data, and propose recommendations for an SEL framework, learning standards and grade level targets.

Our Charge Tonight: Develop shared understanding of key research on SEL frameworks, learning standards, and grade level targets. Provide feedback to Design subcommittee to complete development of proposed recommendations to SCC on 10/5/16.
Guiding Questions for Tonight

What **research and data** have been reviewed?

What **findings** are most important for SCC discussion?

What **feedback** is needed to complete final recommendations?
Main Sources of Research & Data

Correspondence & Conversation

Vicki Zakrzewski (Greater Good Science Center - Education Director)
Julie Norton (New Teacher Center - SEL Director)
Mary Hurley (Oakland Unified SD - District SEL & Leadership Director)
Meena Srinivasan (Oakland Unified SD - Secondary SEL & Leadership Dir.)
Peter Price (Austin Independent SD (TX) - SEL Director)
Randi Peterson (Bellevue SD, (WA) - SEL Curriculum Developer)

University of Chicago: Foundations for Young Adult Success Report

“The Wallace Report” (funded by the Wallace Foundation)

District Surveys (data provided by Allison Green, PAUSD)

State, County, City, District, School Policies & Programs
Key Findings

- “SEL” is a **rapidly evolving field** - creative/practical tension between **aligning/adapting** to latest research and working with **studied/tested** models.

- CASEL is the **most implemented/tested/robust** model out there, but is **missing critical elementscontexts** that current research and implementation suggests are needed...

- ...an **ethical and culturally-responsive (pro-social) context** examining values, mindsets, and identity - particularly in the context of race, gender, class, culture, equity, and agency.

- ...must be **tailored/adaptable** to the target community and evolving research, **systemically implemented** (beyond the classroom), and **developmentally differentiated** (age-appropriate).

- ...requires **systemic/adult capacity** and buy-in to do **deep work** in competent, safe environ’ts.

- ...must be **woven into academic practice** (teaching/learning) rather than separate from it.
Other Key Findings

**PAUSD schools are already implementing** related programs and assessments (further investigation needed) that focus on mindfulness, SEL, social justice and empathy, resilience, and character development (e.g., Project Cornerstone).

**CA Ed Code**: calls for principles of character

**SCCOE**: refers to CASEL and Mindfulness w.r.t. Student Wellness

**District surveys/studies indicate need** for belonging, meaning and purpose in learning, resiliency, healthier mindsets around definitions of success, worth, and value, and more constructive communication and connectedness between students, teachers, and parents.

Surveys also indicate need to address **systemic/cultural deficits**.
Elements of Student Wellness

Skill Development
Mindset / Values / Identity Development
Character Development
Adult Practice/Modeling
Culture & Climate
Systemic Practice/Policy
Family
School
Community
CASEL Framework

Focuses on cultivation of **awareness** and development of **skills**

Focuses on creating positive, functional **relationships** with self and others (**intra-personal** and **inter-personal**)

Skills are particularly relevant to **early and middle childhood development** - very appropriate for **pre-K and elementary**
The New Teacher Center - Modified CASEL+ Framework

Places specific emphasis on the connection between competencies and broader culture, community, and society.

Emphasizes systemic supports and barriers to manifesting competencies in a culturally relevant way.

Gives these competencies enduring meaning, purpose, relevance - goes beyond intra- and inter-, and includes the extra-personal element.
Chicago/Wallace Framework

Places specific emphasis on the key role of **mindsets** and **values** - as well as knowledge/skills and self-regulation

**Mindsets:** beliefs and attitudes about self, others, the world and the relationships between them

**Values:** beliefs about what is good, bad, important in life - guidelines for living - often **culturally defined**

Particularly relevant to **early and middle adolescents** (middle/early high school)
Chicago/Wallace Framework

Places specific emphasis on **agency** and **identity** - as well as competency

**Agency** - the ability to make **active choices** (including seeking support and guidance) in service to one’s **life goals**

**Identity** - perception of **self and one’s place/value in relation** to peers, family, community, culture, and the world

Particularly relevant to **middle adolescents** and **young adults**
Chicago/Wallace - Developmental Framework
CASEL vs Chicago/Wallace: Pros & Cons

**CASEL**

- **Accessible**, translatable, familiar
- **Abundant** resources/support
- **Well-tested**, strong foundation
- **Less current**, comprehensive
- **Lacks deeper**, “more mature” transformational elements
- **Lacks developmental** model

**Chicago/Wallace**

- Inline with **current** research
- Emphasizes **deeper**, more transformational factors
- Has **developmental** model, cultural & systemic focus
- **More abstract**, less familiar
- **Untested**, little developed
Key Findings: Oakland Unified

Began ~5 years ago when CASEL was the only available framework

Immediately worked to adapt/augment to fit community culture - race, gender, equity, social-justice and academic engagement

Consciously decided to move slowly, not rush to program implementation

Focused on developing adult/systemic capacity (leadership, teachers, community)

In parallel, implemented programs on small scale, voluntary basis where capacity already existed - let those experiences inform evolution of framework and broader program development

Recently, began using Chicago/Wallace as additional guide to program/practice

Now in Year 5, just starting to implement broad-based programming
Began ~5 years ago using CASEL framework
Focused primarily on students (not adults)
Also encountered lack of “culture” piece in CASEL
SEL happens differently at different schools, recognize need for it to be infused in every aspect of school (not just one class period)
Now beginning to focus on cultivating adult capacity
Suggested perhaps drawing from both frameworks (CASEL & Wallace)
Key Findings: Bellevue SD (WA)

Began ~6 years ago using CASEL+

SEL Consortium likely to align to CASEL-language community friendly/universal

Development/implementation more complicated than anticipated

Initial focus on anti-bullying transitioned to pro-social development

WA state is emphasizing cultural responsiveness, SEL dominant culture focused

Easier to get elementary staff on board, much harder for secondary

Time to orient/train teachers thoughtfully is crucial, buy-in is essential

Ex: New Haven, CT spent a full year working w/adults before students

Looking at combining character development with SEL
Key Findings: Connection to Implementation

Cultivating **adult capacity** is critical (prof. dev., parent ed., involvement, buy-in)

Shifting **organizational practice/culture** is critical (leadership, policy, commun. inv’t)

Developing capacity takes **time, investment, and patience** - don’t rush to programs

Can be concurrent with **pilot programming** - informs ongoing framework refinement

**Adapting framework to fit community** is hard work, iterative, req’s broad collab’tion
Questions to Discuss

Given the development of **framework, objectives, & targets** will be informed by further process & collaboration: **how specific** can/do these recommendations need to be by our Oct 5th report for other subcommittees to make progress?

How should **already existing programs** in various PAUSD schools inform the development and adoption of our framework?

Is there anything else we should **look at more deeply** to answer these questions?

What are the **deepest needs** our SEL programming is trying to meet?
   (Consider not just students, but schools, district, & community.)

Should our framework focus only on **traditional SEL skill development** as outlined by CASEL, or should it also explicitly address **broader, deeper, contextual factors** such as mindsets, values, character, identity, agency, equity, and cultural difference?

To what extent should our framework specifically **target our systems** (i.e. adult structures/capacity - school, community, culture) in addition to our classrooms (i.e., students)
"Quality support for SE needs" - 11% → 11% → 27% (15% don’t know/NA)

“Inviting environment” - 5% → 9% → 25%

“Supportive environment” - 4% → 6% → 22%

“Meaningful participation” - 6% → 6% → 13% (11% don’t know/NA)

“Motivated to learn” - 4% → 8% → 17%

“Treat all students w/respect” - 4% → 4% → 17%

Issues of race/culture - incr. from ES → MS → HS, but ~30% don’t know/NA at all levels
Collegiality, Sense of Mission, Positive Environment drops ES to HS by ~40%
Supportive Workplace, Responsibility to Improve School drops ES to HS by ~25%
Provides Resources to do Job Effectively drops ES to HS by ~20%
Safe Place for Students ES & HS ~same (~95%) / for Staff drops ES to HS by ~20%
Pos. Stud’t/Staff Rel’ships & Hi Expect’ns: (nearly all adults) - drops ES to HS ~50%
Soc/Emo Support, Conflict Mg’t, Bullying Prev.: (strong agree) - 50%(ES) vs 25%(HS)
Respect, Diversity, Equity, Cultural Sens’ty: (strongly agree) - 40%(ES) vs 30%(HS)
School encourages empathy/self-control: (agree/strongly) - 95%(ES) vs 80%(HS)
School **Connectedness** (high): 75%, 67%, 69%

Caring Adult **Relationships** (high): 47%, 34%, 41%

**Meaningful** Participation (high): 29%, 15%, 17%

Academic **Motivation** (high): 49%, 38%, 37%

Experienced **Harassment/Bullying** (last 12 mos): 31%, 28%, 23%

Perceived **Safety** at School (safe/very safe): 85%, 85%, 81%