



# Social and Emotional Learning Interventions

**Under the Every Student Succeeds Act**

EVIDENCE REVIEW—INTERVENTION SUMMARIES



Sean Grant, Laura S. Hamilton, Stephani L. Wrabel,  
Celia J. Gomez, Anamarie Whitaker, Jennifer T. Leschitz,  
Fatih Unlu, Emilio R. Chavez-Herrerias, Garrett Baker,  
Mark Barrett, Mark Harris, Alyssa Ramos



For more information on this publication, visit [www.rand.org/t/RR2133](http://www.rand.org/t/RR2133)

Published by the RAND Corporation, Santa Monica, Calif.

© Copyright 2017 RAND Corporation

**RAND**® is a registered trademark.

*Cover: Martin Barraud/Getty Images*

#### 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](http://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](http://www.rand.org/giving/contribute)

[www.rand.org](http://www.rand.org)

## Contents

---

Abbreviations.....	vi
Template for Intervention Summaries .....	1
4Rs Program.....	4
Building Assets–Reducing Risks (BARR) .....	8
Bully-Proofing Your School (BPYS) .....	12
Bullying Literature Project (BLP) .....	16
Caring School Communities (CSC).....	19
Class-Wide Function-Related Intervention Teams (CW-FIT) .....	22
Competent Kids, Caring Communities (CKCC) .....	25
Conflict Resolution and Peer Mediation (CR-PM).....	29
Connect with Kids (CWK).....	32
Friend to Friend (F2F) .....	35
Go Grrrls (GG).....	38
Going for the Goal (GOAL) .....	43
Good Behavior Game (GBG) .....	46
I Can Problem Solve (ICPS).....	49
INSIGHTS .....	52
KnowConflict (KC) .....	58
Making Choices (MC) .....	61
Mental Contrasting with Implementation Intentions (MCII).....	67
Michigan Model for Health (MMH).....	70
Mindfulness Training (MT) .....	73
Olweus Bullying Prevention Program (OBPP).....	80
Open Circle (OC).....	83

Peacemakers (PM) .....	86
Playworks (PW) .....	90
Positive Action (PA) .....	94
Preventing Relational Aggression in Schools Everyday (PRAISE) .....	106
Project WIN (Working Out Integrated Negotiations) .....	109
Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS) .....	112
Promoting Positive Peer Relationships (P3R) .....	122
Quiet Time (QT) .....	125
Raising Healthy Children (RHC) .....	128
RAP Club .....	131
Ready to Learn (RTL) .....	134
Real Lives (RL) .....	137
Resolving Conflict Creatively Program (RCCP) .....	140
Responding in Peaceful and Positive Ways (RIPP) .....	143
Responsive Classroom (RC) .....	150
RULER .....	157
School/Community Intervention (SCI) .....	160
School-to-Jobs (STJ) .....	164
Second Step (SS) .....	167
Skills for Growing (SFG) .....	176
Social Aggression Prevention Program (SAPP) .....	180
Social Development Curriculum (SDC) .....	183
Social Skills Improvement System Classwide Intervention Program (SSIS-CIP) .....	186
Steps to Respect (STR) .....	190
Strong Kids (SK) .....	197
Student Success Skills (SSS) .....	200
Success for Kids (SFK) .....	206
Taekwondo (TKD) .....	210

Take the Lead (TTL).....	213
Talking with TJ (TWTJ) .....	216
Too Good for Violence (TGFV) .....	219
Tools for Getting Along (TFGA).....	222
Tools of the Mind (TOTM).....	227
Urban Improv (UI).....	230
Violence Prevention Project (VPP) .....	233
We Have Skills (WHS).....	237
Yoga.....	240
Youth Matters (YM) .....	255

## Abbreviations

---

BARR	Building Assets–Reducing Risks
BPYS	Bully-Proofing Your School
CASEL	Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning
CKCC	Competent Kids, Caring Communities
CR-PM	Conflict Resolution and Peer Mediation
CSC	Caring Schools Communities
CW-FIT	Class-Wide Function-Related Intervention Teams
CWK	Connect with Kids
ESSA	Every Student Succeeds Act
GBG	Good Behavior Game
GG	Go Grrrls
ICPS	I Can Problem Solve
K	kindergarten
MC	Making Choices
OC	Open Circle
P3R	Promoting Positive Peer Relationships
PATHS	Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies
PS	positive self
RC	Responsive Classroom
RHC	Raising Healthy Children
RTL	Ready to Learn
SAPP	Social Aggression Prevention Program
SCI	School/Community Intervention
SDC	Social Development Curriculum

SEL	social and emotional learning
SES	socioeconomic status
SFK	Success for Kids
SS+	statistically significant positive result
SSIS-CIP	Social Skills Improvement System Classwide Intervention Program
STJ	School-to-Jobs
TFGA	Tools for Getting Along
UI	Urban Improv
WHS	We Have Skills
WWC	What Works Clearinghouse

# Template for Intervention Summaries

---

## Snapshot of Evidence

The snapshot provides an overview of the eligible evidence we identified for each intervention:

- **Studies:** the number of eligible studies
- **Highest tier:** the highest evidence tier achieved by the cumulative body of evidence
- **Size of evidence:** the size of the body of evidence according to the large and multisite sample requirements from the nonregulatory guidance
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** the outcome domains with statistically significant results in favor of the social and emotional learning (SEL) intervention
- **School level:** whether any studies took place at the elementary, middle, and/or high school levels
- **Setting:** whether any studies took place in urban, suburban, and/or rural communities
- **Sample:** whether any studies involved student samples predominantly from racial/ethnic minority groups and/or low socioeconomic status (SES) families
- **Purpose:** the primary goals and objectives of the intervention
- **Implementers:** who delivered the intervention to students
- **Key intervention components:** the key components of the SEL intervention
- **Intervention website:** the dedicated website address for the SEL intervention, if any
- **WWC:** the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) entry, if any
- **CASEL Guides:** whether the SEL intervention is included in an edition of the guides from the Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL; see, e.g., see CASEL, *2013 CASEL Guide: Effective Social and Emotional Learning Programs: Preschool and Elementary School Edition*, Chicago, Ill., 2013, and CASEL, *2015 CASEL Guide: Effective Social and Emotional Learning Programs: Middle and High School Edition*, Chicago, Ill., 2015).
- **Navigating SEL:** whether the intervention is included the list of programs in the 2017 review of social and emotional learning interventions by Stephanie Jones and colleagues (Stephanie M. Jones, Katharine Brush, Rebecca Bailey, Gretchen Brion-Miesels, Joseph McIntyre, Jennifer Kahn, Bryan Nelson, and Laura Stickle, *Navigating SEL from the Inside Out*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Graduate School of Education, 2017).

Following the snapshot of the body of evidence for each eligible SEL intervention, we summarize each study individually:



## Study #

The years that the study took place

- Citations for the manuscript we reviewed for the study

**Evidence tier:** The highest Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) tier we assigned to an outcome in the study (labeled as “strong,” “moderate,” or “promising” evidence)

- A brief explanation for the assigned ESSA tier

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:** When reported, we provide the following information about the students included in each study:

- **Sample size**
- **Number of classrooms**
- **Grade level**
- **Sex/gender**
- **Race/ethnicity<sup>1</sup>**
- **SES**

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:** When reported, we provide the following information about the schools where each study took place:

- **Number/location of schools**
- **Community type**
- **Grade levels served in the schools**
- **Total enrollment at schools**
- **Sex/gender**
- **Race/ethnicity<sup>2</sup>**
- **SES**

---

<sup>1</sup> Note that race/ethnicity percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding or identification of individuals with multiple categories.

<sup>2</sup> Note that race/ethnicity percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding or identification of individuals with multiple categories.

**Intervention summary:** When reported, we provide the following information about the SEL intervention in each study:

- **Staff who delivered the intervention**
- **How much**
- **Classroom curriculum**
- **Changing the learning environment**
- **Applications outside the classroom**
- **Out-of-school time**
- **Family/community involvement**
- **Professional development**
- **Implementation support**

**Comparison group:** Reported details about any intervention that students in the comparison group received in each study. The vast majority of studies described the comparison group only as receiving “business as usual” educational services.

### *Positive Results*

Each study discussion ends with a small table offering the outcome domain, measure, result, interpretation, and timing for all statistically significant positive results (SS+) on eligible outcomes in domains of interest.

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing

## 4Rs Program

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Large sample, single site
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Interpersonal
- **School level:** Elementary school
- **Setting:** Urban
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority, low SES
- **Purpose:** Train and support all kindergarten through fifth-grade (K–5) teachers in how to integrate the teaching of social and emotional skills into the language arts curriculum.
- **Implementers:** Teachers
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, changing the learning environment, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** <http://www.morningsidecenter.org/4rs-program>
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is included in the 2013 CASEL Guide—Preschool and Elementary School Edition.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

A 2004–2007 study documented in

- Joshua L. Brown, Stephanie M. Jones, Maria D. LaRusso, and J. Lawrence Aber, “Improving Classroom Quality: Teacher Influences and Experimental Impacts of the 4Rs Program,” *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 102, No. 1, February 2010, pp. 153–167.
- Stephanie M. Jones, Joshua L. Brown, Wendy L. G. Hoglund, and J. Lawrence Aber, “A School-Randomized Clinical Trial of an Integrated Social-Emotional Learning and Literacy Intervention: Impacts After 1 School Year,” *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, Vol. 78, No. 6, December 2010, pp. 829–842.
- Stephanie M. Jones, Joshua L. Brown, and J. Lawrence Aber, “Two-Year Impacts of a Universal School-Based Social-Emotional and Literacy Intervention: An Experiment in Translational Developmental Research,” *Child Development*, Vol. 82, No. 2, March 2011, pp. 533–554.

### **Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial reported individual-level results that included students who joined the study after clusters were randomized but met requirements for baseline equivalence, and this study involved only one site.

### **Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 1,184 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** 146 classrooms
- **Grade level:** 3–4 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 51 percent female, 49 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 46 percent Hispanic/Latino, 41 percent African American, 4 percent white, 9 percent other
- **SES:** 62 percent were at or below 100 percent of the federal poverty level.

### **Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 18 schools in New York City
- **Community type:** Urban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported

- **Race/ethnicity:** The authors described participating schools as racially and ethnically diverse (attended in large majority by African American and Hispanic/Latino students).
- **SES:** Participating schools were composed primarily of students who received free school lunch.

### **Intervention Summary**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Classroom teachers.
- **How much:** The classroom curriculum involved 21 to 35 lessons over the course of the school year.
- **Classroom curriculum:** The 4Rs Program involved a comprehensive seven-unit, literacy-based curriculum in conflict resolution and social-emotional learning. Each curriculum unit focused on a specific grade-appropriate children's book, beginning with a book reading and discussion (ensuring that students understood the primary themes of the story). This was followed by three to five SEL skill lessons in which children practiced specific skills in the context of a discussion of the book. These lessons were designed to engage the children in the learning and practice of social-emotional, conflict resolution, and community building skills relevant to each unit. Each unit also included additional activities and related readings.
- **Changing the learning environment:** Teachers established a set of expectations and norms for classroom behaviors and modeled socioemotional skills and behaviors during interactions with their students.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** Teachers received 25 hours of training (over five days just prior to the beginning of the school year and/or within the first two weeks after school began, to establish their classroom communities and routines) to establish their classroom communities and routines to support teaching the 4Rs curriculum. Training was designed to (a) introduce the teachers to the curricular units and the specific lessons and activities tied to each unit, (b) give teachers an opportunity to practice conflict-resolution skills at the adult level through roleplaying and experiential learning, and (c) inspire teachers to employ the ideas and skills embodied in the curriculum in their own lives both professionally and personally.
- **Implementation support:** Teachers received ongoing coaching (a minimum of 12 contacts in one school year) from trained program staff developers. Coaches provided individually tailored support, such as modeling of class lessons, coplanning and teaching of lessons by the teacher and staff developer, and lesson observations and feedback. In addition, teachers worked in groups to coordinate and align curriculum implementation, share experiences and complementary activities, and plan as a cohesive unit. Teachers also received standardized, grade-specific teaching guides for the classroom curriculum. Teachers received learning kits with a full set of materials needed to implement the program, including the children's books, the manualized teaching guide for the appropriate grade, and a parent guide. Implementation of the two primary components of the 4Rs Program (teacher training and coaching, curriculum delivery) was systematically tracked and monitored.



**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- No additional details were reported.

*Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Interpersonal	Social Competence Scale	SS+	More socially competent behavior	Over 2 years of implementation
Interpersonal	Home Interview Questionnaire	SS+	Lower levels of hostile attribution bias	After 1 year of implementation
Interpersonal	Behavioral Assessment System for Children	SS+	Lower levels of aggressive behavior	Over 2 years of implementation

## Building Assets–Reducing Risks (BARR)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Large sample, single site
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Academic achievement, academic attainment
- **School level:** High school
- **Setting:** Suburban
- **Sample:** Low SES
- **Purpose:** Assist students in the transition to 9th grade by comprehensively addressing developmental, academic, and structural challenges through improved student-teacher relationships and explicit instruction on social and emotional competencies.
- **Implementers:** Teachers, administrators, counselors, support staff
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, changing the learning environment, applications outside the classroom, family/community involvement, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** <http://www.barrcenter.org/>
- **WWC:** Study 1 meets WWC standards without reservations (<https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Study/132>).
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

A 2011–2012 study documented in

- Maryann Corsello and Anu Sharma, *The Building Assets-Reducing Risks Program: Replication and Expansion of an Effective Strategy to Turn Around Low-Achieving Schools*, final report, October 2015.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial involved only one site.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 555 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** 9 (high school)
- **Sex/gender:** 54 percent female, 46 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 52 percent Caucasian, 37 percent Hispanic, and 11 percent African American, Asian, American Indian, or mixed races
- **SES:** 68 percent were eligible for free/reduced price lunch program.

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 1 school in Southern California
- **Community type:** Suburban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** 9–12
- **Total enrollment at schools:** 2,514 students
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** 9th grade core-subject teachers, assistant principals, administrator in charge of discipline, 9th grade counselors, social workers, and BARR coordinators.
- **How much:** The BARR I-Time Curriculum involved a 30-minute weekly lesson over the course of the school year that students took with others in their cohort as a supplement to the school curriculum.

- **Classroom curriculum:** Taught by one or more of the core-subject teachers, the BARR I-Time Curriculum aimed to foster a climate for learning with a social and emotional focus. Students learned how to build strong relationships with teachers and each another, as well as practice essential life skills (e.g., communicating effectively, setting personal goals). I-Time also addressed important issues for adolescents, such as substance use, grief, and bullying.
- **Changing the learning environment:** Students took core courses as a cohort to help the core-subject teachers cultivate connections with students and each other that allowed more-effective education. In every interaction with students, core-subject teachers addressed students' academic, emotional, social, and physical needs; worked to better understand and build on students' strengths; and proactively addressed nonacademic reasons that students fell behind and what they needed to thrive.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** Core-subject teachers discussed and used student-level data to identify persistently low-performing students and referred them to a risk review team that included the school's BARR coordinator, a school administrator, a school social worker/counselor, and other professionals as needed. In addition, administrators learned how they could integrate BARR into their school culture; learn how to use it to make decisions that further their specific school goals; and engage in ongoing support, involvement, and communication with the BARR team in their school.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** Families were invited to participate in an initial orientation and a parent advisory council. Teachers also regularly called and met with the parents of students who need more support. Students in most need of support were referred to community resources.
- **Professional development:** Teachers and administrators received two days of training on developmental assets, student-teacher relationships, and the BARR model. There were also monthly meetings in which the teachers continued to receive professional development.
- **Implementation support:** A site coordinator served as an intermediary between the school's BARR teams and principal, as well as a liaison between the school and the BARR technical assistance provider. The technical assistance provider called the BARR coordinator at least weekly. The project director ran monthly professional learning community conference calls with coordinators and administrators. A BARR Strategy Implementation Review form and other observation forms were developed to assess implementation fidelity.

**Comparison group:** "Business as usual."

- Teachers did not receive the BARR professional development or support and likely taught as they had in the past.

### *Positive Results*

<b>Domain</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Result</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>	<b>Timing</b>
Academic achievement	Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) Measures of Academic Progress (MAP): Mathematics	Effect size: 0.34	Better performance in mathematics	After 1 year of implementation
Academic achievement	Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) Measures of Academic Progress (MAP): Reading	SS+	Better performance in reading	After 1 year of implementation
Academic attainment	Administrative data	Effect size: 0.34	Higher percentage of students without at least one failure in a core course	After 1 year of implementation
Academic attainment	Administrative data	Effect size: 0.33	Higher number of credits earned in core courses	After 1 year of implementation



## Bully-Proofing Your School (BPYS)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Large sample, multiple sites
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Interpersonal, school climate and safety
- **School level:** Elementary school
- **Setting:** Not reported
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority, low SES
- **Purpose:** Reduce instances of bullying and victimization while increasing safety of students through heightened awareness, teaching protective skills, and creating a positive school climate.
- **Implementers:** Teachers, counselors
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, changing the learning environment, applications outside the classroom, family/community involvement, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** <http://schoolengagement.org/school-engagement-services/bully-proofing-your-school/>
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

A 2001–2006 study documented in

- Scott Menard and Jennifer K. Grotmeter, “Evaluation of Bully-Proofing Your School as an Elementary School Antibullying Intervention,” *Journal of School Violence*, Vol. 13, No. 2, 2014, pp. 188–209.
- Scott Menard, Jennifer Grotmeter, Danielle Gianola, and Maura O’Neal, *Evaluation of Bully-Proofing Your School: Final Report*, Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2008.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- The intervention and comparison groups were formed through a quasi-experimental design, and the authors reported insufficient information to assess baseline equivalence of the analytic sample.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 3,497 students (multiple sites)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** 3–5 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 52 percent female, 48 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 6 schools in Colorado
- **Community type:** Not reported
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** 35–64 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 18–80 percent Hispanic; 28–81 percent “minority”
- **SES:** 32–65 percent were eligible for free/reduced price lunch

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Classrooms teachers, school mental health staff.
- **How much:** Complete implementation of BPYS spanned three years. The first year was devoted to implementing the full

curriculum. The classroom curriculum consisted of seven 30–45 minute sessions each week, with two additional optional sessions on conflict resolution and diversity. The second and third years involved booster sessions to reinforce the material presented in the first year. After the classroom curriculum was completed, teachers were encouraged to hold weekly classroom meetings to discuss and acknowledge the behaviors exhibited during the previous week.

- **Classroom curriculum:** Students were taught assertiveness and protective strategies to avoid being victimized, when to use each, and when and how to intervene as bystanders when they witness bullying.
- **Changing the learning environment:** Teachers created classroom expectations and rules regarding no tolerance for bullying and increasing awareness of bullying. After the classroom curriculum was completed, classroom management continued to reinforce the caring behavior of the majority of students to not tolerate bullying.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** Teachers were given information and strategies to help them recognize bullying and intervene appropriately in bullying situations, in order to create a positive school climate that felt safe and secure.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** Parents were offered information through newsletters and follow-up workshops. Individual parents of students involved in bullying either as perpetrators or victims were given consultation.
- **Professional development:** Schools received training, technical assistance, feedback, and booster sessions from staff at BPYS and the Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence (CSPV) at the University of Colorado, Boulder. In the early fall of each intervention year, BPYS technical consultants trained schools on the BPYS curriculum (8 hours each in the first and second years, and 4 hours in the third year).
- **Implementation support:** A CSPV evaluator and BPYS technical consultant measured fidelity of program implementation during each semester using a ten-item rating scale developed by the program providers.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- Schools that had not indicated an interest in BPYS but were selected to match BPYS schools on grade levels, sociodemographic characteristics, and average student standardized test scores.

### *Positive Results*

<b>Domain</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Result</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>	<b>Timing</b>
Interpersonal	Student self-report of physical aggression perpetration	SS+	Less perpetration of physical aggression	Over 3 years of implementation
Interpersonal	Student self-report of relational aggression perpetration	SS+	Less perpetration of relational aggression	Over 3 years of implementation
School climate and safety	Student self-report of physical aggression victimization	SS+	Less physical aggression victimization	Over 3 years of implementation and 1 year post-intervention
School climate and safety	Student self-report of relational aggression victimization	SS+	Less relational aggression victimization	Over 3 years of implementation and 1 year post-intervention
School climate and safety	Student self-report of witnessing aggression	SS+	Less witnessing of aggression	Over 3 years of implementation and 1 year post-intervention
School climate and safety	Student self-report of discouragement of bullying at school	SS+	Greater discouragement of bullying at school	Over 3 years of implementation
School climate and safety	Student self-report of perceived school safety	SS+	Higher levels of perceived school safety	Over 3 years of implementation and 1 year post-intervention

## Bullying Literature Project (BLP)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Small sample, multiple sites
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Interpersonal
- **School level:** Elementary school
- **Setting:** Not reported
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority, low SES
- **Purpose:** Promote social, emotional, and behavioral change processes through high-quality children's literature that involves characters modeling positive ways to solve conflict and engage in bystander interventions.
- **Implementers:** Teachers, counselors
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, applications outside the classroom, family/community involvement, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** There is no dedicated website for this intervention.
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.



## Study 1

Study period not reported; documented in

- Cixin Wang, Lauren Couch, Geovanna Rosas Rodriguez, and Catherine Lee, “The Bullying Literature Project: Using Children’s Literature to Promote Prosocial Behavior and Social-Emotional Outcomes Among Elementary School Students,” *Contemporary School Psychology*, Vol. 19, No. 4, 2015, pp. 320–329.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial involved fewer than 350 students, and the significant finding comes from an analysis with high attrition and that does not satisfy baseline equivalence.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 168 students (2 sites)
- **Number of classrooms:** 7 classrooms
- **Grade level:** 3–4 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 43 percent female, 57 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 63 percent Hispanic/Latino, 10 percent African American, 9 percent white, 3 percent Asian, 4 percent other; 10 percent did not report ethnicity
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 2 schools in Southern California
- **Community type:** Not reported
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** More than 60 percent ethnic minorities/nonwhite
- **SES:** More than 50 percent were eligible for free/reduced price lunch

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Classroom teachers, counselors, school psychologists.
- **How much:** The classroom curriculum consisted of five weekly 35–45 minute lessons.

- **Classroom curriculum:** During each session, counselors read a story that involved characters who model positive ways to solve conflict and engage in bystander interventions. After the story, counselors engaged students in discussion, writing, and role-play activities. All students made a promise to use the strategies taught throughout the program and help each other to make their school and classroom a safe place for all students. In sessions 2–5, providers reviewed the four “WITS strategies” (walk away, ignore, talk it out, seek help), and students were provided opportunities to share how they used strategies to cope with bullying during the previous week and were praised for using strategies.
- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** Teachers, school psychologists, and counselors received data on students’ involvement in bullying, perceived classroom climate, and social-emotional assets to make decisions based on the data (e.g., increasing supervision at bullying “hot spots”).
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** Students were encouraged to share their writing products and what they learned with their parents and siblings. A parent letter was sent home, which included a summary of the intervention and suggestions on how parents could encourage students to use the strategies at home. A list of recommended children’s books related to bullying and peer conflict that parents could read was also sent home to encourage parents to have an open dialogue with their children about bullying.
- **Professional development:** School psychologists received 4 hours of training and weekly supervision (at least 30 minutes per week).
- **Implementation support:** School psychologists completed a fidelity checklist at the end of each lesson to document whether the goals were covered, what went well, and areas for improvement for future lessons.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- The researchers used a wait-list control for their comparison group.

#### Positive Results

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Interpersonal	Children’s Social Behavior Scale—Teacher Form	SS+	More prosocial behavior	Post-intervention

## Caring School Communities (CSC)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Large sample, single site
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** School climate and safety
- **School level:** Elementary school
- **Setting:** Not reported
- **Sample:** Low SES
- **Purpose:** Promote the growth of the whole child and enhance students' prosocial characteristics through character, social, ethical, and academic development practices targeting students' attitudes, motives, and behaviors.
- **Implementers:** Teachers, administrators, support staff
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, changing the learning environment, applications outside the classroom, out-of-school time, family/community involvement, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** <https://www.collaborativeclassroom.org/caring-school-community>
- **WWC:** There is a WWC entry for this intervention but not for a study included in our review (<https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/EvidenceSnapshot/72>).
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is included in the 2013 CASEL Guide—Preschool and Elementary School Edition.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

A 2005–2006 study documented in

- Florence Chang and Marco A. Muñoz, “School Personnel Educating the Whole Child: Impact of Character Education on Teachers’ Self-Assessment and Student Development,” *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, Vol. 19, No. 1–2, June 2006, pp. 35–49.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This quasi-experimental study involved only one site, and the authors reported insufficient information to assess baseline equivalence of the analytic sample.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 3,098 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** 3–5 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 50 percent female, 50 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 65 percent white, 35 percent “minority”
- **SES:** 56 percent low income

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 16 schools in the Jefferson County Public School District, Louisville, Kentucky
- **Community type:** Not reported
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** 58 percent white, 35 percent African American, and 8 percent other (district)
- **SES:** 61 percent were from low-income families

### Intervention summary:

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Teachers, administrators, and support staff.
- **How much:** Not reported.
- **Classroom curriculum:** The CSC “Making Meaning” curriculum component involved a literature-based language arts and reading component that explicitly integrated ethical and moral conversation into the curriculum through a diverse set of reading materials with various cultures, issues, and themes.
- **Changing the learning environment:** The CSC “Developmental Discipline” component consisted of an approach to classroom management that fostered respectful and caring relationships among students and teachers.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** CSC also included schoolwide cooperative activities that encouraged students working together to solve problems and build relationships.
- **Out-of-school time:** The CSC “KidzLit” component involved after-school enrichment activities to support reading.
- **Family/community involvement:** Parents received training to support prosocial parenting skills.
- **Professional development:** An intensive professional development training was held for all teachers in the summer. Research project staff continued to hold multiple trainings and biweekly professional development activities during the school year.
- **Implementation support:** Research project staff observed delivery of “Making Meaning” and “Caring Classroom Community” using a fidelity rubric. Teachers also completed a self-report on their implementation of project components.
- Detailed pacing guides were also given to teachers to assist them in the program implementation process.

### Comparison group: “Business as usual.”

- No additional details were reported.

### Positive Results

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
School climate and safety	Student self-report	SS+	Greater perceptions of classroom supportiveness	After 1 year of implementation
School climate and safety	Student self-report	SS+	Greater perceptions of student autonomy in the classroom	After 1 year of implementation
School climate and safety	Teacher self-report	SS+	Better student-teacher relationships (greater trust in students)	After 1 year of implementation



## Class-Wide Function-Related Intervention Teams (CW-FIT)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier I
- **Size of evidence:** Large sample, multiple sites
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Intrapersonal
- **School level:** Elementary school
- **Setting:** Urban
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority, low SES
- **Purpose:** Improving students' on-task behavior through teaching classroom rules and skills, as well as the use of a group contingency plan with differential reinforcement of appropriate behaviors and minimized social attention to inappropriate behavior.
- **Implementers:** Teachers
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, changing the learning environment, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** There is no dedicated website for this intervention.
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

Study period not reported; documented in

- Debra Kamps, Howard Wills, Harriett Dawson-Bannister, Linda Heitzman-Powell, Esther Kottwitz, Blake Hansen, and Kandace Fleming, “Class-Wide Function-Related Intervention Teams ‘CW-FIT’ Efficacy Trial Outcomes,” *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, Vol. 17, No. 3, July 2015, pp. 134–14.

**Evidence tier:** Tier I (Strong)

- Randomized controlled trial with low attrition.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 159 teachers with 18–25 students per class (3 sites)
- **Number of classrooms:** 159 classrooms
- **Grade level:** K–5 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 17 schools in the Midwest
- **Community type:** 12 schools were in an urban district in a large city in the Midwest, 3 schools in an adjacent district still considered part of the metropolitan area, and 2 schools in a university community approximately 40 miles away
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** K–5
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Average of 382 students (range: 161–684)
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Average 65 percent (range: 36–93 percent) minority status
- **SES:** Average of 79 percent (range: 39–97 percent) students eligible for free/reduced price lunch

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Classroom teachers.
- **How much:** The classroom curriculum was implemented 3–4 times a week beginning in mid-to-late October and continuing through March of the same school year. The intervention procedures to change the learning environment required teachers to attend to appropriate student behaviors frequently (every 2–5 minutes).

- **Classroom curriculum:** The classroom curriculum was designed to teach appropriate skills, and reinforce students' use of the skills. Three target skills were taught in classwide lessons during the initial 3–5 sessions: (1) gaining the teacher's attention, (2) following directions, and (3) ignoring inappropriate behaviors. In subsequent sessions, the teacher would (a) provide brief precorrects of skills at the start of the lesson and (b) provide incidental teaching of the skills throughout the lesson.
- **Changing the learning environment:** Teachers attended to appropriate student behaviors frequently (every 2–5 minutes); and taught students to request attention or help with lessons using appropriate behavior (i.e., raising hands) and to ignore inappropriate peer behavior. The group contingency component of CW-FIT consisted of a game format with class teams of 2–5 students and the use of a token economy, with a timer set to beep every 2–3 minutes on a variable schedule. At the beep, the teacher would award a point on the team chart to each team with all members engaged in appropriate behaviors. At the end of the class period, rewards and special activities were given as incentives to all students on each team that met the stated goal. Teachers were encouraged to provide differential reinforcement in the form of frequent, specific praise for appropriate on-task behaviors and use of the skills when awarding team points, and to individuals and groups throughout the lesson. Teachers were encouraged to give minimal attention to inappropriate behaviors.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** Teachers attended a 2-hour training workshop in the CW-FIT procedures, received modeling of the procedures for 2–3 sessions, and received weekly feedback from building coaches and researchers.
- **Implementation support:** A 13-item procedural fidelity checklist was used to determine the use of CW-FIT intervention components during sessions.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- Teachers agreed to not implement CW-FIT procedures if selected for the comparator. These teachers followed their usual classroom management procedures, which commonly included posted classroom rules, reminders about the rules, and reprimands for infractions.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Intrapersonal	Classroom observation of students	Effect size: 1.77	More on-task behavior	After 1 year of implementation

## Competent Kids, Caring Communities (CKCC)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Small sample, single site
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Intrapersonal, interpersonal
- **School level:** Elementary school
- **Setting:** Urban
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority, low SES
- **Purpose:** Meeting the social-emotional needs of urban elementary-aged children in public schools by targeting students' social-emotional competencies to result in classroom-level changes and, ultimately, improved academic learning.
- **Implementers:** Teachers
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, changing the learning environment, applications outside the classroom, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** <http://www.competentkids.org/>
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is included in the 2013 CASEL Guide—Preschool and Elementary School Edition.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

A 2001–2003 study documented in

- L. Oriana Linares, Nicole Rosbruch, Marcia B. Stern, Martha E. Edwards, Gillian Walker, Howard B. Abikoff, and Jose Ma J. Alvir, “Developing Cognitive-Social-Emotional Competencies to Enhance Academic Learning,” *Psychology in the Schools*, Vol. 42, No. 4, 2005, pp. 405–417.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This quasi-experimental study involved a confound (school) with intervention assignment, only one site, and fewer than 350 students.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 119 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** 13 classrooms
- **Grade level:** 4–5 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 54 percent female, 46 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 37 percent Caucasian, 19 percent Hispanic, 19 percent Asian American, 16 percent Arab, and 9 percent other
- **SES:** Students predominantly from working-class families of a diverse multiethnic background residing in stable, residential, low-risk neighborhoods

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 2 schools located within 20 blocks of each other in New York City
- **Community type:** Urban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** K–5
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** 52–63 percent were eligible for free/reduced price lunch

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Classroom teachers.
- **How much:** The overall intervention was a multiyear program. The classroom curriculum was delivered via weekly lessons of approximately 30 minutes each.

- **Classroom curriculum:** Grade-specific lesson plans (26–36 lessons per grade) were contained in the intervention manual. The themes for the units included including (a) Uniqueness; (b) Problem Solving and Personal Responsibility; (c) Feelings, Stress, and Coping; (d) Character and Kindness Count; (e) Tools for Self-Management, Self-Monitoring; and (f ) Mind-Body Connections. Each lesson was organized in the following sequence: Background, Motivate, Teach, Wrap Up, Assess Understanding, Life Skills, Curriculum Connections, and Performance Standards. Teachers used interactive tools, such as puppets and original characters, role playing, class discussion, modeling, music, movement, art, and drama.
- **Changing the learning environment:** To promote generalization, the intervention manual provided explicit strategies for usage during academic subjects.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** To promote generalization, the intervention manual provided explicit strategies for usage in non–classroom settings.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** Teachers received a 2-hour training workshop and attended periodic meetings interspersed throughout the school year.
- **Implementation support:** Teacher consultation was offered on an individual basis and focused on implementation issues, such as enhancing quality, addressing barriers, and using program tools effectively. Consultation activities included mentoring, modeling, coaching, and providing feedback via experiential exercises, role-play, didactic presentations, case discussions, team teaching, and demonstrations. Teachers also received an intervention manual. Observers used a CKCC observational checklist to assess fidelity to lessons.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- The comparison school was identified on the basis of similar key geographic, academic, and demographic variables to the intervention school and was invited to participate as an assessment-only school. The comparison school did not offer a formal SEL intervention, though character education themes were displayed in the school hallways.

### *Positive Results*

<b>Domain</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Result</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>	<b>Timing</b>
Intrapersonal	Morgan-Jinks Student Efficacy Scale	SS+	Higher student self-efficacy	Over 2 years of implementation
Intrapersonal	Teacher Observation of Classroom Adaptation–Revised	SS+	Better attention and concentration	Over 2 years of implementation
Intrapersonal	Teacher Observation of Classroom Adaptation–Revised	SS+	Better compliance	Over 2 years of implementation
Interpersonal	Vignette-based interviewer ratings	SS+	Better prosocial problem-solving skills	Over 2 years of implementation
Interpersonal	Teacher Observation of Classroom Adaptation-Revised	SS+	Better social and emotional competence	Over 2 years of implementation
Interpersonal	Teacher Observation of Classroom Adaptation–Revised	SS+	Less aggression	Over 2 years of implementation

## Conflict Resolution and Peer Mediation (CR-PM)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Small sample, single site
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Interpersonal
- **School level:** High school
- **Setting:** Suburban
- **Sample:** None reported
- **Purpose:** Help students constructively manage conflicts in social situations by teaching them conflict resolution and mediation procedures.
- **Implementers:** Teachers
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** There is no dedicated website for this intervention.
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.



## Study 1

A 1996 study documented in

- Laurie Stevahn, David W. Johnson, Roger T. Johnson, and Ray Schultz, “Effects of Conflict Resolution Training Integrated into a High School Social Studies Curriculum,” *Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 142, No. 3, June 2002, pp. 305–331.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial involved only one site and fewer than 350 students.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 92 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** 4 classrooms
- **Grade level:** 9 (high school)
- **Sex/gender:** 54 percent female, 46 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 1 school in 1 of the 10 largest districts in California
- **Community type:** Suburban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Nearly 2,000 students
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Classroom teacher.
- **How much:** The intervention was delivered every other day in 105-minute blocks for five consecutive weeks (17.5 hours total).
- **Classroom curriculum:** CR-PM training was integrated into the World War II history unit by having students write and role play ten negotiation and peer mediation scripts (one during each class session) to resolve historical conflicts embedded in the unit. Students first learned when a conflict was or was not present. Next, they learned an integrative negotiation procedure

consisting of six steps: (a) describing what one wants, (b) describing how one feels, (c) describing the underlying reasons for one's desires and feelings, (d) reversing perspectives, (e) inventing at least three optional agreements that maximize joint outcomes, and (f) reaching one integrative agreement and shaking hands. Finally, students learned a four-step peer mediation procedure that included (a) ending hostilities between disputants, (b) ensuring that disputants are committed to mediation, (c) facilitating integrative negotiation between disputants, and (d) formalizing the negotiated agreement by writing a contract.

- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** None reported.
- **Implementation support:** An independent observer checked a sample of completed student notebooks from each class for consistency across trained and untrained conditions.

**Comparison group:** "Business as usual."

- World War II unit (part of World Civilization social studies course required for graduation) without conflict resolution or peer mediation training. All students in both groups used the same materials and resources for the same amount of time during the unit (105 minutes every other day for five weeks).

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Interpersonal	Integrative bargaining measure	Effect size: 1.00	Better negotiation skills	Post-intervention
Interpersonal	Vignette-based student responses	Effect size: 0.86	More positive attitudes toward resolving conflict	Post-intervention

## Connect with Kids (CWK)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier II
- **Size of evidence:** Large sample, multiple sites
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Intrapersonal, civic attitudes and behaviors, school climate and safety
- **School level:** Middle and high school
- **Setting:** Urban, suburban, and rural
- **Sample:** None reported
- **Purpose:** Promote prosocial attitudes and positive behavior by teaching core character values.
- **Implementers:** Teachers
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, family/community involvement, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** <https://connectwithkids.com/>
- **WWC:** Study 1 met WWC standards with reservations (<https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Study/64592>).
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

A 2004–2005 study documented in

- B. Page and A. D’Agostino, *Connect with Kids: 2004–2005 Study Results for Kansas and Missouri*, Durham, N.C.: Compass Consulting Group, LLC, 2005.

### **Evidence tier:** Tier II (Moderate)

- This study meets WWC standards with reservations, had at least 350 students in the analytic sample, and was conducted at multiple sites.

### **Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 352 students (4 sites)
- **Number of classrooms:** 22 classrooms
- **Grade level:** 7–12 (middle and high school)
- **Sex/gender:** 20- to 73-percent female in participating classrooms
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

### **Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 6 schools from 4 school districts in Kansas and Missouri
- **Community type:** Urban, suburban, and rural schools
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** 7–12
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

### **Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Classroom teachers
- **How much:** The middle and high school program has 36 lessons introducing character traits that include 104 student activities for both core and supplemental traits (four per trait). The school or teacher decides on the number of character traits covered in each session. CWK duration may vary from one semester to an entire academic year. Lessons were implemented on average for six months (range of two to eight months).

- **Classroom curriculum:** Teachers implemented CWK units for six character traits: honesty, kindness, perseverance, responsibility, self-control, and tolerance. For each study trait, teachers watched at least one of the CWK video segments in class with their students, facilitated an in-class discussion about the video segment(s) using the discussion questions provided in the CWK resource manual, and completed at least one of the activities provided in the CWK resource manual. Teachers also assigned two CWK TV specials for viewing at home or in class, and followed these assignments up with a formal in-class discussion, homework assignment, and/or other activity related to the special.
- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** Teachers also assigned two CWK TV specials for viewing at home or in class.
- **Professional development:** A one-day workshop was offered to teachers, including information about lectures, discussions, peer-to-peer interaction, and simulated activities that address classroom video and print materials.
- **Implementation support:** Teachers received a CWK resource manual. Teachers completed an implementation checklist to monitor fidelity. A member from the CWK network observed teachers for one of the study trait units to help ensure that teachers were implementing the curriculum correctly and to provide teachers with feedback and technical assistance.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- Comparison teachers were asked to record any character education traits and/or related activities they covered during the school year on a character education checklist provided by the researchers.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Intrapersonal	Student survey	Effect size: 0.47	Better intrapersonal character traits (perseverance, self-control, responsibility)	After 1 year of implementation
Civic attitudes and behaviors	Student survey	Effect size: 0.47	Better civic character traits (kindness, tolerance, honesty)	After 1 year of implementation
School climate and safety	Student survey	Effect size: 0.31	Better perceived character of classmates	After 1 year of implementation

## Friend to Friend (F2F)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Large sample, single site
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Interpersonal, school climate and safety
- **School level:** Elementary school
- **Setting:** Urban
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority, low SES
- **Purpose:** Reduce relational aggression by teaching students to identify their physiological reactions when involved in challenging social situations, slow themselves down, examine the social situation objectively, and then generate and evaluate multiple ways for how they could respond positively.
- **Implementers:** Teachers, counselors, support staff.
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, applications outside the classroom, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** There is no dedicated website for this intervention.
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

Study period not reported; documented in

- Stephen S. Leff, Tracy Evian Waasdorp, and Brooke S. Paskewich, “The Broader Impact of Friend to Friend (F2F): Effects on Teacher-Student Relationships, Prosocial Behaviors, and Relationally and Physically Aggressive Behaviors,” *Behavior Modification*, Vol. 40, No. 4, July 2016, pp. 589–610.

### **Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial involved only one site. The reported findings break randomization, do not account for clustering, and do not report sufficient information to assess baseline equivalence.

### **Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 665 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** 44 classrooms
- **Grade level:** 3–5 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 54 percent female, 46 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 93 percent identified themselves as African American/Caribbean American or biracial, including African American
- **SES:** Not reported

### **Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 6 schools in extremely large, urban, impoverished school district
- **Community type:** Urban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** More than 90 percent African American
- **SES:** More than 70 percent from low-income, single-parent families

### **Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Classroom teachers, master’s-level research therapist, teacher’s assistants, and students.
- **How much:** 20 small group sessions during lunch period and ten whole-class sessions.

- **Classroom curriculum:** After the first ten to 12 pull-out group sessions, the group attendees co-led classroom sessions for their peers to promote the generalization of the skills and strategies learned. These sessions ran simultaneously with the final eight to 10 sessions of the pull-out group.
- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** A pull-out group met during the lunch-recess period, led by a master's-level research therapist and a classroom teacher or teacher's assistant. The group included both relationally aggressive girls and prosocial role models (typically at a 3:1 ratio, respectively) who were selected based on an unlimited peer-nomination procedure.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** None reported.
- **Implementation support:** The research team examined the extent to which key program components were implemented within sessions and the extent to which facilitators demonstrated key or crucial process-related variables while conducting the intervention.

**Comparison group:** "Attention control."

- The comparison group received a psychoeducational attention control intervention called "Homework, Study Skills, and Organization" (HSO).

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Interpersonal	Peer-reported prosocial behaviors	SS+	More prosocial behaviors (e.g., friendliness, kind actions)	After 1 year of implementation
School climate and safety	Student-Teacher Relationship Scale (STRS)	SS+	Greater closeness between students and their teacher	After 1 year of implementation



## Go Grrrls (GG)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 2
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Small sample, multiple sites
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Intrapersonal, interpersonal
- **School level:** Middle school
- **Setting:** Urban, suburban
- **Sample:** None reported
- **Purpose:** Facilitate early adolescent female students' healthy psychosocial development in contemporary society by teaching them how to meet the demands peers, family, and society place on them.
- **Implementers:** Counselors
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** <http://www.public.asu.edu/~lecroy/gogrrrls/body.htm>
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

Study period not reported; documented in

- Craig Winston LeCroy, “Experimental Evaluation of ‘Go Grrrls’ Preventive Intervention for Early Adolescent Girls,” *Journal of Primary Prevention*, Vol. 25, No. 4, December 2004, pp. 457–473.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial involved only one site and fewer than 350 students.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 118 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** 7 (middle school)
- **Sex/gender:** 100 percent female, 0 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 62 percent white, 20 percent mixed race, 14 percent Hispanic, 2 percent Native American, 2 percent African American
- **SES:** 37 percent received free school lunch

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 1 school located in Arizona
- **Community type:** Urban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Counselors (masters of social work students and graduate psychology students).
- **How much:** 12 weekly classes lasting 60 minutes.
- **Classroom curriculum:** GG curriculum focused on general social competence promotion and addressed six tasks. Each session was linked to the previous lesson to create a sequential and integrated program that promoted mastery of the developmental tasks. Approximately two sessions were devoted to each of the six developmental tasks. Teaching techniques

included didactic instruction, class discussion, group exercises, work sheets, small group role plays, and weekly journal assignments. GG materials included verbal scripts and handouts related to themes that the curriculum was attempting to teach.

- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** GG group leaders participated in an extensive training session on how to administer the program. GG was scripted in a detailed curriculum that described how each session was to be conducted.
- **Implementation support:** All group leaders were supervised weekly to ensure that the curriculum was being carried out in a standardized manner. Weekly supervision occurred in one-to-one or small group meetings lasting 30–60 minutes. On-site consultation included observation, coaching, and feedback. Fidelity of the program components was monitored by the degree to which each session occurred as described in the curriculum program.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- No additional details were reported.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Intrapersonal	Girls Self-Efficacy Scale	SS+	Higher levels of self-efficacy	Post-intervention
Intrapersonal	Self Liking and Self Competence Scale	SS+	Higher levels of self-esteem	Post-intervention
Interpersonal	Assertiveness Scale	SS+	Greater assertiveness	Post-intervention

## Study 2

Study period not reported; documented in

- Craig Winston LeCroy, “Evaluation of an Empowerment Program for Early Adolescent Girls,” *Adolescence*, Vol. 39, No. 155, Fall 2004, pp. 427–441.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This study involved confounding with the intervention, only one site, and fewer than 350 students.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 55 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** Not reported (middle school)
- **Sex/gender:** 100 percent female, 0 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 65 percent white, 19 percent mixed race, 11 percent Hispanic, 4 percent African American, 2 percent Asian American
- **SES:** 17 percent received free school lunch

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 1 school located in the southwestern United States
- **Community type:** Suburban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Counselors (masters of social work students and graduate psychology students).
- **How much:** 12 weekly classes lasting 60 minutes.
- **Classroom curriculum:** GG curriculum focused on general social competence promotion and addressed six tasks. Each session was linked to the previous lesson to create a sequential and integrated program that promoted mastery of the developmental tasks. Approximately two sessions were devoted to each of the six developmental tasks. Teaching techniques

included didactic instruction, class discussion, group exercises, work sheets, small group role plays, and weekly journal assignments. GG materials included verbal scripts and handouts related to themes that the curriculum was attempting to teach.

- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** GG group leaders participated in an extensive training session on how to administer the program. GG was scripted in a detailed curriculum that described how each session was to be conducted.
- **Implementation support:** All group leaders were supervised weekly to ensure that the curriculum was being carried out in a standardized manner. Weekly supervision occurred in one-to-one or small group meetings lasting 30–60 minutes. On-site consultation included observation, coaching, and feedback. Fidelity of the program components was monitored by the degree to which each session occurred as described in the curriculum program.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- The comparison group involved traditional physical education.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Intrapersonal	Peer Self-Esteem Scale	SS+	Higher levels of friendship esteem	Post-intervention

## Going for the Goal (GOAL)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence:

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Large sample, single site
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Intrapersonal, interpersonal
- **School level:** Middle school
- **Setting:** Urban
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority, low SES
- **Purpose:** Teach problem-solving skills such as setting positive, reachable goals; anticipating and responding to barriers to goal attainment; using social support; and building on one's strengths.
- **Implementers:** Support staff
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** There is no dedicated website for this intervention.
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

Study period not reported; documented in

- T. C. O’Hearn and M. Gatz, “Going for the Goal: Improving Youths’ Problem-Solving Skills Through a School-Based Intervention,” *Journal of Community Psychology*, Vol. 30, No. 3, 2002, pp. 281–303.

### **Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This quasi-experimental study involved only one site, and the significant findings come from an analysis that did not satisfy baseline equivalence.

### **Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 479 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** 14 classrooms
- **Grade level:** 7 (middle school)
- **Sex/gender:** 48 percent female, 52 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** Approximately 87 percent of the middle school participants were Hispanic, 6 percent Chinese or Chinese-American, 5 percent Vietnamese or Vietnamese-American, 1 percent Cambodian, <1 percent Caucasian, and <1 percent Filipino
- **SES:** Not reported

### **Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** Two schools in Los Angeles
- **Community type:** Urban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** The schools were located in a multiethnic, predominantly Hispanic community
- **SES:** 50 percent of the students in the school district are from families below the poverty level, and approximately 25 percent receive aid to families with dependent children

### Intervention summary:

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** The intervention was delivered by 46 trained high school student leaders (two to three high school student leaders per group of ten middle school students). The high school leaders were picked by high school teachers and counselors based on their potential effectiveness in a leadership role.
- **How much:** The classroom curriculum was taught in one class period per week for ten weeks during one academic term.
- **Classroom curriculum:** Each workshop session focuses on a specific psychoeducational theme related to setting and attaining personal goals. Each session is interactive in nature, with skits and activities that facilitate student participation, and each student has their own booklet to facilitate workshop activities and written exercises.
- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** University faculty, graduate students, and teachers and counselors from the middle and high schools trained the high school students during a two-day retreat. Teachers and counselors from the high schools provided the majority of high school student leader supervision.
- **Implementation support:** The high school student leaders receive intervention manuals. Weekly reviews and preparatory sessions were led by those high school teachers who took part in the training. Attendance data were collected for the high school student leaders, and classroom observers rated high school student leaders on four dimensions of treatment fidelity.

### Comparison group: “Business as usual.”

- The comparison involved a wait-list control group.

### Positive Results

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Intrapersonal	Locus of Control Scale	SS+	Better self-control	Post-intervention
Interpersonal	Means-Ends Problem Solving Procedure	SS+	Better social problem-solving skills	Post-intervention



## Good Behavior Game (GBG)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Large sample, multiple sites
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Academic achievement
- **School level:** Elementary school
- **Setting:** Urban, suburban, and rural
- **Sample:** Low SES
- **Purpose:** Decrease disruptive behavior in elementary school-age children through interdependent group contingencies.
- **Implementers:** Teachers
- **Key intervention components:** Changing the learning environment, family/community involvement, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** <http://goodbehaviorgame.org/>
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

Study period not reported; documented in

- Robert Weis, Karen J. Osborne, and Emily L. Dean, “Effectiveness of a Universal, Interdependent Group Contingency Program on Children’s Academic Achievement: A Countywide Evaluation,” *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, Vol. 31, No. 3, July 2015, pp. 199–218.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This quasi-experimental study did not report sufficient information to assess baseline equivalence requirements.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 949 students (6 sites)
- **Number of classrooms:** 49 classrooms
- **Grade level:** 1–3 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 50 percent female, 50 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 82 percent white, 7 percent African American, 2 percent Latino, 1 percent Asian American, and 8 percent mixed
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** Schools were located within one Midwestern county.
- **Community type:** Urban, suburban, and rural
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Range of 1,780 to 6,931
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** 8 to 87 percent of students at participating schools were eligible for free or reduced-price school lunch.

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Classroom teachers.
- **How much:** Teachers implemented the intervention daily for one academic year.
- **Classroom curriculum:** None reported.
- **Changing the learning environment:** The teacher divided students into two or more teams, announced the beginning of “the

game,” and initiated regular classroom instruction. During instruction, the teacher monitored students’ behavior and gave marks to the teams whose members violated classroom rules, previously established by the teacher and students. Members of the team with the lowest number of marks, or all teams that fell below a certain threshold of rule violations, were declared winners of the game and given a small prize or privilege, such as early release for recess or access to certain toys on the playground. Reinforcement was contingent on the team members’ behavior collectively rather than on the actions of an individual student. Additional components included (a) special activities in which students and teachers mutually establish classroom rules; (b) idiosyncratic terminology to indicate acts of rule-following and rule violations; (c) use of prompts and discriminative stimuli to initiate game play; (d) random selection of students for potential reinforcement; (e) use of transition cues and hand signals to facilitate classroom transitions; and (f) teacher-written praise notes, or *tootles*, to acknowledge the appropriate behavior of individual students.

- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** The intervention involved parent activities to facilitate generalization of self-regulation skills to the home.
- **Professional development:** Training consisted of the recommended one-day on-site workshop led by the developer of the GBG and one additional booster session.
- **Implementation support:** Teachers received assistance from a peer mentor to help them implement the intervention in their classrooms. Fidelity was monitored by a psychologist trained in the GBG who consulted with teachers and conducted biannual evaluations of teachers implementation, teacher satisfaction, and student outcomes. A detailed, user-friendly treatment manual described game implementation, rationale, and common problems experienced by new users. Teachers also received ancillary materials, such as posters (e.g., to remind students of appropriate behavior), timers (e.g., to monitor the length of each game), and predetermined reinforcers (e.g., cards that contained prizes for the winners of each game) to facilitate implementation of the game by school personnel who might have limited experience with behavioral interventions and/or group contingencies.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- No additional details were reported.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Academic achievement	Measures of Academic Progress	SS+	Better performance in mathematics	After 1 year of implementation
Academic achievement	Measures of Academic Progress	SS+	Better performance in reading	After 1 year of implementation

## I Can Problem Solve (ICPS)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Small sample, single site
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Interpersonal
- **School level:** Elementary school
- **Setting:** Urban
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority, low SES
- **Purpose:** Increase prosocial behavior and reduce aggressive behavior through teaching cognitive processing and problem-solving skills. A key principle is that the child, rather than the teacher, must solve the problem at hand to help the child develop the habit of creating solutions to problems, considering consequences for his or her actions, and thinking for herself or himself.
- **Implementers:** Teachers
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, changing the learning environment, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** <http://www.icanproblemsolve.info/>
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is included in the 2013 CASEL Guide—Preschool and Elementary School Edition.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

Study period not reported; documented in

- Douglas Boyle and Connie Hassett-Walker, “Reducing Overt and Relational Aggression Among Young Children: The Results from a Two-Year Outcome Evaluation,” *Journal of School Violence*, Vol. 7, No. 1, February 2008, pp. 27–42.

### **Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This quasi-experimental study involved only one site and fewer than 350 students. The authors reported adjusted analyses only for multiple group comparisons, and unadjusted analyses either were not significant or did not meet baseline equivalence requirements.

### **Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 226 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** K–1 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 54 percent female, 46 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 85 percent Hispanic, 6 percent African American, 5 percent white, and 4 percent Asian American
- **SES:** 93 percent received free/reduced-price lunch

### **Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** Not reported
- **Community type:** Urban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Racially and ethnically diverse school district with a predominantly Hispanic population
- **SES:** The school district had one of the lowest per capita incomes in the state, with nearly one-quarter of the city’s children living in poverty.

### **Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Classroom teachers.
- **How much:** 83 lessons delivered twice a week over four months each in kindergarten and 1st grade.

- **Classroom curriculum:** Teachers provided lessons focusing on training children to generate a variety of solutions to interpersonal problems; think through the consequences of each potential solution; and identify thoughts, feelings, and motives that can generate problem situations. The curricula included a stated purpose of each lesson; a list of suggested materials; and a teacher script, which explained the basic steps in conducting the lessons.
- **Changing the learning environment:** ICPS included specific suggestions for integrating what was taught into day-to-day classroom happenings, a technique called *ICPS dialoguing*.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** Teachers attended a kickoff training session, with a subsequent booster training held several months later focusing on the ICPS dialoguing technique. Teachers' specific issues with implementing ICPS in their classrooms were addressed at follow-up training.
- **Implementation support:** Teachers received a manual, and there was a protocol for observing teachers' ICPS lessons for fidelity.

**Comparison group:** "Business as usual."

- No additional details were reported.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Interpersonal	Preschool Social Behavior Scale	SS+	Less relational aggression	After 2 years of implementation
Interpersonal	Preschool Social Behavior Scale	SS+	Less overt aggression	After 2 years of implementation
Interpersonal	Hahnemann Behavior Rating Scale and the Preschool Social Behavior Scale	SS+	More prosocial behavior	After 1 and 2 years of implementation

## INSIGHTS

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 2
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Large sample, multiple sites
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Intrapersonal, interpersonal, academic achievement, school climate and safety
- **School level:** Elementary school
- **Setting:** Urban
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority, low SES
- **Purpose:** Support children's ability to self-regulate by enhancing their attention and behavioral repertoire through a comprehensive intervention with teacher, parent, and classroom programs.
- **Implementers:** Teachers, counselors, support staff
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, changing the learning environment, family/community involvement, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** <https://insightsintervention.com/>
- **WWC:** Some analyses in Study 2 meet WWC standards without reservations (<https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Study/81849>).
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

Study period not reported; documented in

- Sandra McClowry, David L. Snow, and Catherine S. Tamis-LeMonda, “An Evaluation of the Effects of ‘INSIGHTS’ on the Behavior of Inner City Primary School Children,” *Journal of Primary Prevention*, Vol. 26, No. 6, November 2005, pp. 567–584.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial broke randomization (one school dropped out and was replaced), reported insufficient information to assess the baseline equivalence of the analytic sample, and involved only one site and fewer than 350 students..

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 148 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** 46 classrooms
- **Grade level:** 1–2 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 45 percent female, 55 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 89 percent African American, 9 percent Hispanic, 2 percent mixed race
- **SES:** 86 percent qualified for free-lunch programs

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 6 schools located in the northeastern United States
- **Community type:** Urban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported.

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Puppet therapists and facilitators.
- **How much:** The classroom curriculum involved 10 weekly, one-hour sessions.
- **Classroom curriculum:** Students learned content intended to enhance their empathy skills; facilitate their appreciation of the uniqueness of family members, friends, and teachers; and teach them to employ problem-solving techniques when they



encounter daily dilemmas. Puppets and other drama techniques were used to teach the children that, based on temperament, various situations are easy for some individuals while challenging for others. The puppets also were engaged with the children to enhance their ability to problem-solve daily dilemmas.

- **Changing the learning environment:** Providers instructed teachers on how to incorporate reinforcement of skill building throughout the school day.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** Providers instructed parents on how to incorporate reinforcement of skill building at home.
- **Professional development:** Providers took a graduate level course that covered content areas related to the program and received an additional 30 hours of training.
- **Implementation support:** Providers received a manual that detailed the content for each of the intervention sessions. To maintain program fidelity, facilitators met weekly with the principal investigator who reviewed videotapes of their parent and teacher sessions and discussed issues related to the conduct of the children's program.

**Comparison group:** "Attention control."

- In the Read Aloud after-school program, teachers read a different book to students each week (for ten weeks) and asked them to talk and draw pictures about the story and its characters. Teachers were paid a small stipend and provided with books and basic supplies, such as drawing pads, markers, and crayons.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Interpersonal	Parent daily report	SS+	Fewer child behavior problems at home	Post-intervention

## Study 2

Study period not reported; documented in

- Elise Cappella, Erin E. O'Connor, Meghan P. McCormick, Ashley R. Turbeville, Ashleigh J. Collins, and Sandee G. McClowry, "Classwide Efficacy of INSIGHTS: Observed Teacher Practices and Student Behaviors in Kindergarten and First Grade," *Elementary School Journal*, Vol. 116, No. 2, December, 2015, pp. 217–241.
- Meghan P. McCormick, Elise Cappella, Erin E. O'Connor, and Sandee G. McClowry, "Context Matters for Social-Emotional Learning: Examining Variation in Program Impact by Dimensions of School Climate," *American Journal of Community Psychology*, Vol. 56, No. 1–2, September 2015, pp. 101–119.
- Meghan P. McCormick, Elise Cappella, Erin E. O'Connor, Jennifer L. Hill and Sandee G. McClowry, "Do Effects of Social-Emotional Learning Programs Vary by Level of Parent Participation? Evidence from the Randomized Trial of INSIGHTS," *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, Vol. 9, No. 3, 2016, pp. 364–394.
- Erin E. O'Connor, Elise Cappella, Meghan P. McCormick, and Sandee G. McClowry, "Enhancing the Academic Development of Shy Children: A Test of the Efficacy of INSIGHTS," *School Psychology Review*, Vol. 43, No. 3, September 2014a, pp. 239–259.
- Erin E. O'Connor, Elise Cappella, Meghan P. McCormick, and Sandee G. McClowry, "An Examination of the Efficacy of Insights in Enhancing the Academic and Behavioral Development of Children in Early Grades," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 106, No. 4, November 2014b, pp. 1156–1169.

### **Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- The findings from this randomized controlled trial that officially meet WWC standards without reservations were all not statistically significant, while the statistically significant findings included joiners in analyses and reported insufficient information to assess baseline equivalence of the analytic sample.

### **Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 435 students (3 sites)
- **Number of classrooms:** 122 classrooms
- **Grade level:** K–1 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 48 percent female, 52 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 75 percent African American, 16 percent Hispanic, 9 percent biracial
- **SES:** 87 percent qualified for free/reduced-price lunch

### **Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 22 schools
- **Community type:** Urban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** 78 percent African American, 43 percent Hispanic/Latino, 1 percent white, and 6 percent other
- **SES:** 90 percent qualified for free/reduced-price lunch programs

### **Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Classroom teachers and graduate students in psychology, education, and educational theater with varied racial/ethnic backgrounds.
- **How much:** The classroom curriculum involved ten weekly, 45-minute sessions. The parent and teacher meetings involved ten weekly, two-hour sessions; one meeting was jointly held with parents and teachers, while the others were separate teacher sessions focused on classroom management and parent sessions focused on parenting skills.
- **Classroom curriculum:** Student sessions focused on empathy and self-regulation using puppets, workbooks, flash cards, and videos. Although the facilitators had primary responsibility for conducting the classroom sessions, teachers participated in the sessions, especially when the students practiced resolving dilemmas.
- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** Parents were trained to match a student's temperament to one of four typologies, which could guide the choice of strategies for learning and self-regulation, and to use a "scaffold-and-stretch approach" when students encountered challenges.
- **Professional development:** INSIGHTS facilitators attended a semester-long graduate course (weekly 2-hour sessions) before conducting the intervention. New facilitators were also trained by experienced facilitators to use the intervention materials.
- **Implementation support:** Facilitators followed scripts, used checklists, and documented sessions to maintain fidelity to the program model. Facilitators participated in weekly supervision sessions with the program developer, in which they discussed challenges, implementation logistics, participant concerns, and deviations from the program model. Parent and teacher sessions were videotaped and reviewed for coverage of content and effectiveness of facilitation.

**Comparison group:** "Attention Control."

- A ten-week, 45-minute session after-school supplemental reading program. Teachers attended two early literacy workshops, which were also presented to parents.

### *Positive Results*

<b>Domain</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Result</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>	<b>Timing</b>
Intrapersonal	Leiter-R	SS+	Better sustained attention	Over 2 years of implementation
Interpersonal	Sutter–Eyberg Student Behavior Inventory	SS+	Fewer behavior problems	Over 2 years of implementation
Academic achievement	Letter-Word Identification subtest of the Woodcock-Johnson III Tests of Achievement	SS+	Better performance in reading	Over 2 years of implementation
Academic achievement	Applied Problems subtest of the Woodcock-Johnson III Tests of Achievement	SS+	Better performance in mathematics	Over 2 years of implementation
School climate and safety	Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS)	SS+	Higher levels of classroom emotional support	Over 2 years of implementation

## KnowConflict (KC)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Small sample, single site
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Interpersonal
- **School level:** High school
- **Setting:** Urban
- **Sample:** None reported
- **Purpose:** Foster conflict-resolution skills through interactive skill education.
- **Implementers:** Teachers
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum.
- **Intervention website:** There is no dedicated website for this intervention.
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

Study period not reported; documented in

- Anne M. Mauricio, Francesca Dillman-Carpentier, and John Horan, “An Experimental Evaluation of an Internet-Delivered Conflict Resolution Skills Curriculum in a Secondary School Setting,” *Journal of School Violence*, Vol. 4, No. 3, October 2005, pp. 37–48.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial did not meet attrition standards and reported insufficient information to assess baseline equivalence. This study also involved only one site and fewer than 350 students.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 198 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** 9 (high school)
- **Sex/gender:** 52 percent female, 48 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 1 school
- **Community type:** Urban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** “Large” high school
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Classroom teachers.
- **How much:** 8 weekly sessions.
- **Classroom curriculum:** Students were guided through a series of interactive lessons that use audio and video modeling of requisite skills to develop mastery. Each lesson was designed to address a series of objectives that, together, provide the skills

necessary to deal with basic conflict issues. Through the use of interactive scenarios, irrational thoughts underlying rage were exposed, and coping skills and rational trains of thought were substituted.

- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** None reported.
- **Implementation support:** None reported.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- No additional details were reported.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Interpersonal	Attitudes Toward Guns and Violence Questionnaire (AGVQ): Aggressive Response to Shame subscale	SS+	Healthier attitudes about refraining from violence	Post-intervention

## Making Choices (MC)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 2
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Large sample, multiple sites
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Intrapersonal, interpersonal
- **School level:** Elementary school
- **Setting:** Rural
- **Sample:** None reported
- **Purpose:** Teach students how to encode and interpret social and environmental information, identify and manage feelings, and generate appropriate goals and responses in play and classroom interactions.
- **Implementers:** Teachers, counselors
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, changing the learning environment, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** <http://ssw.unc.edu/jif/makingchoices/index.htm>
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.



## Study 1

Study period not reported; documented in

- Paul R. Smokowski, Mark W. Fraser, Steven H. Day, Maeda J. Galinsky, and Marticia L. Bacallao, “School-Based Skills Training to Prevent Aggressive Behavior and Peer Rejection in Childhood: Evaluating the Making Choices Program,” *Journal of Primary Prevention*, Vol. 25, No. 2, October 2004, pp. 233–251.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial involved a confound (provider) with the intervention, only one site, and fewer than 350 students.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 101 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** 4 classrooms
- **Grade level:** 3 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 54 percent female, 46 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 68 percent white, 22 percent African American, 5 percent Latino, 3 percent Native American or Asian
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** One school in a southeastern state
- **Community type:** Rural
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** “Mid-sized elementary school”
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** 33 percent identified as racial/ethnic minorities.
- **SES:** 25 percent qualified for free/reduced lunch subsidy.

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Classroom teachers and a master’s-level social work student.
- **How much:** The classroom curriculum involved weekly 45-minute lessons throughout the academic year.
- **Classroom curriculum:** The MC curriculum involved a theoretically based sequence of steps in processing social information. Each unit of MC corresponded to one of seven steps in processing social information: (a) understanding and regulating

emotions, (b) encoding social and environmental cues, (c) interpreting cues and intentions, (d) setting relational goals, (e) formulating alternative social strategies, (f) selecting prosocial strategies, and (g) enacting a selected strategy. Lessons were organized around one unit on emotions and six units on the sequential steps of social information processing. New concepts were introduced with didactic instruction, then group-oriented techniques were used to reinforce the content. The teaching methods in the manual included group activities and discussion, games, stories, and role-plays.

- **Changing the learning environment:** Teachers were encouraged to use the MC problem-solving techniques when disputes arose between children during the school day.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** The master's-level social work student received training in MC from the research team.
- **Implementation support:** The master's-level social work student followed the MC manual. The manual outlined 25 sequential skill-building lessons and the objectives for each lesson, provided a list of required materials, reviewed previous material (the skills build on each other), and suggested one or more activities.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- The comparison group involved a standard health curriculum.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Intrapersonal	Carolina Child Checklist—Teacher Form	SS+	Better cognitive concentration	After 1 year of implementation
Interpersonal	Carolina Child Checklist—Teacher Form	SS+	Better social contact	After 1 year of implementation
Interpersonal	Carolina Child Checklist—Teacher Form	SS+	Less overt aggression	After 1 year of implementation
Interpersonal	Carolina Child Checklist—Teacher Form	SS+	Higher levels of peer acceptance	After 1 year of implementation

## Study 2

A 2000–2003 study documented in

- Mark W. Fraser, Maeda J. Galinsky, Paul R. Smokowski, Steven H. Day, Mary A. Terzian, Roderick A. Rose, and Shenyang Guo, “Social Information–Processing Skills Training to Promote Social Competence and Prevent Aggressive Behavior in the Third Grades,” *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, Vol. 73, No. 6, December 2005, pp. 1045–1055.
- Mark W. Fraser, Jung-Sook Lee, Lawrence L. Kupper, and Steven H. Day, “A Controlled Trial of the Making Choices Program: Six-Month Follow-Up,” *Research on Social Work Practice*, Vol. 21, No. 2, March 2011, pp. 165–176.
- Mark W. Fraser, Aaron M. Thompson, Steven H. Day, and Rebecca J. Macy, “The Making Choices Program: Impact of Social-Emotional Skills Training on the Risk Status of Third Graders,” *Elementary School Journal*, Vol. 114, March 2014, pp. 354–379.
- Mary A. Terzian, Jilan Li, Mark W. Fraser, Steven H. Day, and Roderick A. Rose, “Social Information–Processing Skills and Aggression: A Quasi-Experimental Trial of the Making Choices and Making Choices Plus Programs,” *Research on Social Work Practice*, Vol. 25, No. 3, 2015, pp. 358–369.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This quasi-experimental study involved a confound (year) with the intervention and only one site.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 548 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** 29 classrooms
- **Grade level:** 3 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 54 percent female, 46 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 68 percent white, 22 percent African American, 5 percent Latino, 3 percent Native American or Asian, 2 percent other
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 2 schools in Chatham County, North Carolina
- **Community type:** Rural
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported

- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Classroom teachers and program specialists with training in educational counseling, psychology, or social work.
- **How much:** The classroom curriculum involved 23 weekly and sequential sessions (45 minutes each).
- **Classroom curriculum:** The MC curriculum involved a theoretically based sequence of steps in processing social information. Each unit of MC corresponded to one of seven steps in processing social information: (a) understanding and regulating emotions, (b) encoding social and environmental cues, (c) interpreting cues and intentions, (d) setting relational goals, (e) formulating alternative social strategies, (f) selecting prosocial strategies, and (g) enacting a selected strategy. The problem-solving process was introduced to students, who then practiced skills through interactive play-related activities and rehearsal. Each lesson began with a review of previous material and then introduced new concepts through a participatory activity. Other activities involved group exercises in which students were required to imagine the intentions behind the actions of comic strip characters. Students also were asked to perform skits that dramatized the skills of self-talk and sequential problem solving.
- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** None reported.
- **Implementation support:** Providers had access to an MC program manual.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- The comparison group involved a standard health curriculum.

### *Positive Results*

<b>Domain</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Result</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>	<b>Timing</b>
Interpersonal	Carolina Child Checklist—Teacher Form	SS+	Greater social competence	After 1 year of implementation
Interpersonal	Carolina Child Checklist—Teacher Form	SS+	Better social contact	After 1 year of implementation
Interpersonal	Child Behavior Checklist—Teacher Form	SS+	Less overt aggression	After 1 year of implementation
Interpersonal	Social Experience Questionnaire (SEQ)	SS+	Less social aggression	After 1 year of implementation
Interpersonal	Skill-level activity	SS+	Less hostile attribution	After 1 year of implementation
Interpersonal	Skill-level activity	SS+	Better social information-processing	After 1 year of implementation
Interpersonal	Skill-level activity	SS+	Better formulation of prosocial goals	After 1 year of implementation
Interpersonal	Skill-level activity	SS+	Better responsible decisionmaking	After 1 year of implementation

## Mental Contrasting with Implementation Intentions (MCII)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Small sample, single site
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Intrapersonal, academic attainment
- **School level:** Middle school
- **Setting:** Urban
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority, low SES
- **Purpose:** Improve students' overall performance in school by teaching them a metacognitive strategy for converting positive thoughts and images about a desired future into self-regulated behavior change.
- **Implementers:** Support staff
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum.
- **Intervention website:** There is no dedicated website for this intervention.
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

Study period not reported; documented in

- Angela L. Duckworth, Teri A. Kirby, Anton Gollwitzer, and Gabriele Oettingen, “From Fantasy to Action Mental Contrasting with Implementation Intentions (MCII) Improves Academic Performance in Children,” *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, Vol. 4, No. 6, November 2013, pp. 745–7533.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial involved only one site and fewer than 350 students.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 77 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** 5 (middle school)
- **Sex/gender:** 52 percent female, 48 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 73 percent Hispanic, 27 percent African American
- **SES:** 85 percent were eligible for free/reduced-price lunch

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 1 school
- **Community type:** Urban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Specifics not reported (a “trained interventionist”).
- **How much:** Three 1-hour sessions with groups of four to five students at the midpoint of the academic year (separate follow-up sessions took place two days and three weeks after the initial session).
- **Classroom curriculum:** The program combined mental contrasting, a strategy for pursuing (i.e., committing to and striving for) goals, with the formation of implementation intentions, a strategy of planning out one’s goal. Students were instructed to

think about their most important achievable wish or goal related to schoolwork, the best outcome in fulfilling this wish or achieving this goal, something that could prevent them from achieving this wish or goal, and how they could overcome this obstacle. Students were then taught, using a template, how to make an implementation intention or “Wish-Outcome-Obstacle-Plan” and encouraged to apply this “WOOP” exercise to any of their wishes and goals—academic or otherwise. Students received a small reminder card for what the WOOP exercise entailed to take along with them.

- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** None reported.
- **Implementation support:** None reported.

**Comparison group:** “Positive Thinking” control exercises.

- Students in the comparison group spent the same amount of time learning to think positively about their wishes.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Intrapersonal	Teacher self-report	Effect size: 0.49	Better preparedness for school	Several weeks post-intervention
Academic attainment	Administrative data	SS+	Higher attendance rates	Several weeks post-intervention



## Michigan Model for Health (MMH)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier I
- **Size of evidence:** Large sample, multiple sites
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Interpersonal
- **School level:** Elementary school
- **Setting:** Urban, suburban, and rural
- **Sample:** Low SES
- **Purpose:** Enhance health-promoting behavior through skills-based learning targeting several important cognitive, attitudinal, and socioemotional factors.
- **Implementers:** Teachers
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** [http://www.michigan.gov/mdhhs/0,5885,7-339-73971\\_4911\\_4912\\_74286---,00.html](http://www.michigan.gov/mdhhs/0,5885,7-339-73971_4911_4912_74286---,00.html)
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is included in the 2013 CASEL Guide—Preschool and Elementary School Edition.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

A 2005–2008 study documented in

- James M. O’Neill, Jeffrey K. Clark, and James A. Jones, “Promoting Mental Health and Preventing Substance Abuse and Violence in Elementary Students: A Randomized Control Study of the Michigan Model for Health,” *Journal of School Health*, Vol. 81, No. 6, June 2011, pp. 320–330.

**Evidence tier:** Tier I (Strong)

- This randomized controlled trial has low attrition.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 3,383 students (at least 2 sites)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** 4–5 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 46 percent female, 54 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 54 percent white, 38 percent African American, 8 percent mixed or other
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 58 schools (42 in Michigan and 16 in Indiana)
- **Community type:** 28 percent were in urban communities, 31 percent in rural communities, and 41 percent in suburban communities.
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** 46 percent of students were eligible for federally funded free/reduced-price lunch programs (range: 11 to 98 percent).

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Teachers (classroom or health teacher).
- **How much:** The fourth grade curriculum consisted of 25 lessons over 12 weeks and the fifth grade curriculum 28 lessons over 14 weeks. Lessons took place during a typical class period of 40–50 minutes.

- **Classroom curriculum:** Students received classroom lessons on social and emotional health, interpersonal communication, social pressure resistance skills, drug use prevention, and conflict resolution skills.
- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** Teachers received a 12-hour curriculum training with follow-up support provided as needed.
- **Implementation support:** Every two weeks, teachers also completed an online survey to report the number and type of lessons taught and whether they needed support in preparing for or teaching the lessons. In addition, one teacher in each building was designated to assist other teachers and to monitor implementation to ensure the lessons were taught as designed and within the expected time frame.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- Teachers in both the SEL intervention and comparison schools received a 2-hour training session on the purpose, objectives, and school-level activities of the evaluation study. Teachers and schools in both the intervention and comparison groups also received an incentive to participate in the study, including a stipend and free curriculum materials and training. The comparison teachers did not receive the curriculum or training until after completion of the study.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Interpersonal	Student self-report on items from the State Collaborative on Assessment and Student Standards-Health Education Assessment Project (SCASS-HEAP): Social and Emotional Health Skills	SS+	Better social and emotional skills	Over 2 years of implementation
Interpersonal	Student self-report on items from the State Collaborative on Assessment and Student Standards-Health Education Assessment Project (SCASS-HEAP): Interpersonal Communication	SS+	Better interpersonal communication	Over 2 years of implementation
Interpersonal	Teen Conflict Survey: Adapted	SS+	Less aggressive behavior	Over 2 years of implementation

## Mindfulness Training (MT)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 3
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Large sample, multiple sites
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Intrapersonal, interpersonal
- **School level:** Elementary and middle school
- **Setting:** Urban
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority, low SES
- **Purpose:** Help students improve their quality of life and reduce their stress through practicing mindfulness.
- **Implementers:** Support staff
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** There is no dedicated website for this intervention.
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

A 2000–2001 study documented in

- Maria Napoli, Paul Rock Krech, and Lynn C. Holley, “Mindfulness Training for Elementary School Students: The Attention Academy,” *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, Vol. 21, No. 1, July 2005, pp. 99–125.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial involved only one site and fewer than 350 students.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 228 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** 9 classrooms
- **Grade level:** 1–3 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 2 schools located in a southwestern U.S. city
- **Community type:** Not reported
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** 48 percent female, 52 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Support staff (trained mindfulness instructors).
- **How much:** The classroom curriculum involved 45-minute sessions twice a month over a period of 24 weeks.

- **Classroom curriculum:** Mindfulness training was conducted in a separate classroom in which desks and chairs were moved to the side, and a large space in the middle was opened where students could place a mat or blanket and sit on the floor. Exercises, such as paying attention to the breath, movement activities, and sensory stimulating activities, were used to facilitate “being in the moment.” The sequential structure of the classes was breathing exercises, a body-scan visualization application, a body movement–based task, and a postsession debriefing or sharing of instructor feedback with the class.
- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** None reported.
- **Implementation support:** None reported.

**Comparison group:** “Attention control.”

- This comparison group involved supplemental reading or quiet activity.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Intrapersonal	ADD-H Comprehensive Teacher Rating Scale and Test of Everyday Attention for Children	Effect size: 0.49	Better attention	Post-intervention
Intrapersonal	Test Anxiety Scale	Effect size: 0.39	Lower levels of test anxiety	Post-intervention
Intrapersonal	Test of Everyday Attention for Children	Effect size: 0.60	Better selective attention	Post-intervention
Interpersonal	ADD-H Comprehensive Teacher Rating Scale	Effect size: 0.47	Better social skills	Post-intervention

## Study 2

A 2012–2013 study documented in

- Erica M. S. Sibinga, Lindsey Webb, Sharon R. Ghazarian, and Jonathan M. Ellen, “School-Based Mindfulness Instruction: An RCT,” *Pediatrics*, Vol. 137, No. 1, January 2016, p e20152532.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial reported insufficient information to assess attrition and baseline equivalence of the analytic sample, and it involved only one site and fewer than 350 students.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 300 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** 14 classrooms
- **Grade level:** 5–8 (middle school)
- **Sex/gender:** 51 percent female, 49 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 99 percent African American
- **SES:** 99 percent eligible for free/reduced-price lunch

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 2 schools located in Baltimore, Maryland
- **Community type:** Urban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Support staff (trained mindfulness instructors).
- **How much:** The classroom curriculum was delivered over 12 weeks.
- **Classroom curriculum:** The program consisted of three components: (1) didactic material related to mindfulness, meditation, yoga, and the mind-body connection; (2) experiential practice of various mindfulness meditations; and (3) group discussion focused on the application of mindfulness to everyday situations.

- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** None reported.
- **Implementation support:** Instructors met regularly to optimize program implementation.

**Comparison group:** “Attention control.”

- Healthy Topics program that covered age-appropriate topics, such as nutrition, exercise, body systems, adolescence, and puberty. This program was designed to control for the effects of a positive adult instructor, peer group experience, attention, and time.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Intrapersonal	Differential Emotions Scale	SS+	Less self-hostility	Post-intervention
Interpersonal	The Brief COPE	SS+	Less use of negative emotional coping	Post-intervention
Interpersonal	Children’s Response Style Questionnaire	SS+	Less use of rumination to cope with social situations	Post-intervention



## Study 3

A 2013 study documented in

- Dianna Quach, Kristen E. Jastrowski Mano, and Kristi Alexander, “A Randomized Controlled Trial Examining the Effect of Mindfulness Meditation on Working Memory Capacity in Adolescents,” *Journal of Adolescent Health*, Vol. 58, No. 5, May 2016, pp. 489–496.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial involved only one site and fewer than 350 students.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 118 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** 7–8 grade (middle school)
- **Sex/gender:** 62 percent female, 38 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 58 percent Spanish/Hispanic/Latino, 18 percent Asian or Pacific Islander, 4 percent Native American, 1 percent African American, 1 percent white, 7 percent biracial, and 11 percent other
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 1 school in southern California
- **Community type:** Not reported
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Students at the participant school were “predominately from minority households.”
- **SES:** About 80 percent of students were eligible for a free or reduced lunch.

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Two female instructors with extensive training in mindfulness meditation.
- **How much:** The classroom curriculum involved twice-weekly sessions (45 minutes each) for four weeks.

- **Classroom curriculum:** Each mindfulness meditation session consisted of (1) breathing techniques, (2) formal meditation, and (3) discussion. Participants learned new types of mindfulness meditation each week (Week 1, Breathing; Week 2, Being in the Body and Feelings; Week 3, Awareness and Leaves on a Stream; Week 4, Silent and Loving Kindness). Instructions on sitting posture, breathing, and wandering thoughts were repeated during each session. Each intervention session concluded with an instructor-led group discussion. Participants received a CD of meditation audio recordings to enable home practice. Participants were encouraged to practice meditation daily for 15–30 minutes and to record details of their practice in home practice logs.
- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** None reported.
- **Implementation support:** Instructors were provided written scripts to help guide each of the weekly mindfulness themes (e.g., Being in the Body Meditation).

**Comparison group:** “Wait-list control.”

- The comparison group attended regular physical education classes.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Intrapersonal	Automated Operation Span Task (AOSPAN)	SS+	Better working memory capacity	Post-intervention

## Olweus Bullying Prevention Program (OBPP)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Large sample, sites unclear
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** School climate and safety
- **School level:** Middle school
- **Setting:** Not reported
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority, low SES
- **Purpose:** Improve peer relations and promote a safe and positive school environment by fostering schoolwide awareness of bullying.
- **Implementers:** Teachers, counselors, administrators, support staff
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, changing the learning environment, applications outside the classroom, family/community involvement, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** <http://www.violencepreventionworks.org/public/index.page>
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

A 2003–2005 study documented in

- Nerissa S. Bauer, Paula Lozano, and Frederick P. Rivara, “The Effectiveness of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program in Public Middle Schools: A Controlled Trial,” *Journal of Adolescent Health*, Vol. 40, No. 3, March 2007, pp. 266–274.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- The authors reported insufficient information to assess baseline equivalence for the analytic sample, and the number of sites in this study is unclear.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 6,518 students (sites unclear)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** 6–8 (middle school)
- **Sex/gender:** 51 percent female, 49 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 35 percent white, 24 percent Asian, 16 percent African American, 7 percent Hispanic/Latino, 2 percent Native American, 1 percent other
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 10 schools in Seattle
- **Community type:** Not reported
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Median of 877 (range 617–1247) in SEL intervention schools and 714 (range 467–994) in comparison schools
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Median percentage of the student body eligible for free/reduced lunch was 45 percent (range 16–69 percent) in SEL intervention schools and 56 percent (36–71 percent) in comparison schools

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Teachers, administrators, counselors, and support staff.
- **How much:** Not reported.

- **Classroom curriculum:** Teachers taught skills to deal with bullying and foster empathy for others.
- **Changing the learning environment:** In the classroom, teachers held regular and consistent discussions of schoolwide rules and taught skills to deal with bullying and foster empathy for others.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** Prior to implementation, a survey on student attitudes and behaviors was administered and shared with the school. At the official implementation start date, schools were asked to demonstrate a commitment to bullying prevention, to introduce concepts and school rules, set a common language and expectation for student behavior, and raise enthusiasm. Based on results of the survey, schools were asked to revise protocols for addressing identified problem spots, hold regular meetings to discuss problematic issues, and identify a core group of people responsible for initial planning and oversight of implementation. Teachers were encouraged to feel comfortable in intervening in bullying incidents, either by actively stopping them or identifying and reporting them to administrators and counselors. In an effort to change student attitudes and perceptions, schools involved students in activities to raise awareness—particularly students identified as bystanders.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** Schools also engaged parents by setting expectations and following through on consequences of student behavior at school and engaged the community through public relations and fostering OBPP-inspired program development based in the community.
- **Professional development:** Each school underwent consultation by district trainers prior to implementation.
- **Implementation support:** School efforts were evaluated with respect to an “Olweus Standard,” as well as implementation fidelity of individual core components, to adequately capture teachers’ use of core components with the program’s intended regularity and consistency to remain involved with students.

**Comparison group:** “Less formal activities for bullying prevention.”

- Comparison schools tried implementing some activities but without regularity or within the context of a whole-school approach.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
School climate and safety	Student self-report	SS+	Greater perceptions that other students actively intervene in bullying incidents	After 1 year of implementation

## Open Circle (OC)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Small sample, multiple sites
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Interpersonal
- **School level:** Elementary school
- **Setting:** Urban, suburban
- **Sample:** None reported
- **Purpose:** Enhance the social skills of elementary school children by giving students the opportunity to learn and practice communication, self-control, and social problem-solving skills.
- **Implementers:** Teachers, administrators, counselors, support staff
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, changing the learning environment, family/community involvement, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** <https://www.open-circle.org/>
- **WWC:** There is no WWC assessment for this intervention (<https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/InterventionReport/346>).
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is included in the 2013 CASEL Guide—Preschool and Elementary School Edition.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

Study period not reported; documented in

- Beth A. Hennessey, “Promoting Social Competence in School-Aged Children: The Effects of the Open Circle Program,” *Journal of School Psychology*, Vol. 45, No. 3, June 2004, pp. 349–360.

### **Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This quasi-experimental study involved fewer than 350 students, and the statistically significant and positive results did not meet baseline equivalence requirements.

### **Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 154 students (2 sites)
- **Number of classrooms:** 8 classrooms
- **Grade level:** 4 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 44 percent female, 56 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 69 percent white, 16 percent African American, 10 percent Latino, 3 percent other, 1 percent Asian American
- **SES:** Not reported

### **Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 4 schools
- **Community type:** 2 schools from middle to upper-middle-class suburban areas and 2 schools from diverse urban areas
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

### **Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Teachers, administrators, specialists, and support staff.
- **How much:** Circle Time consisted of twice-weekly lessons in class throughout the school year (35 lessons total).

- **Classroom curriculum:** Lessons provided a context in which to discuss real issues, support a cooperative classroom environment, build self-esteem and positive relationships, and give students the skills needed to solve social problems. During these lessons, verbal cues encouraging class members to speak up, calm down, and adopt the “school listening look” came out of discussions of concepts and behaviors drawn from the children’s own experiences.
- **Changing the learning environment:** Students also developed agreed-on nonverbal signals that emphasized respectful communication.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** OC involved parents and other adults who are part of the school community (e.g., administrators, specialists, and support staff) in an effort to develop an alignment of approach and behavior.
- **Professional development:** None reported.
- **Implementation support:** Throughout the year, teachers received on-site consultation and a peer observation component encouraged teacher reflection on practice.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- Children in the comparison classrooms had no exposure to OC or any other systematic, curriculum-based approach to the development of social competence.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Interpersonal	Social Skills Rating System (SSRS) questionnaire: Social Skills	SS+	Better social skills	After 1 year of implementation
Interpersonal	Social Skills Rating System (SSRS) questionnaire: Problem Behaviors	SS+	Fewer problem behaviors	After 1 year of implementation



## Peacemakers (PM)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Large sample, single site
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Interpersonal, disciplinary
- **School level:** Elementary and middle school
- **Setting:** Urban
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority, low SES
- **Purpose:** Prevent school-based violence by addressing students' beliefs supporting the acceptability and utility of violent behavior and students' deficits in conflict-related psychosocial skills.
- **Implementers:** Teachers, counselors, administrators
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, changing the learning environment, applications outside the classroom, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** There is no dedicated website for this intervention.
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

Study period not reported; documented in

- Jeremy P. Shapiro, Joella D. Burgoon, Carolyn J. Welker, and Joseph B. Clough, “Evaluation of the Peacemakers Program: School-Based Violence Prevention for Students in Grades Four Through Eight,” *Psychology in the Schools*, Vol. 39, No. 1, January 2002, pp. 87–100.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This quasi-experimental study did not report sufficient information to assess baseline equivalence for the analytic sample and involved only one site.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 1,822 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** 4–8 (elementary and middle school)
- **Sex/gender:** 50 percent female, 50 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 88 percent African American, 8 percent white, 1 percent Hispanic, and 3 percent other
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 3 elementary schools and 3 middle schools from a large, Midwestern, public school system
- **Community type:** Urban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** 32 percent of students were below the poverty level; 80 percent of students received free/reduced-price school lunches.

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Teachers, school psychologists, school counselors, and administrators.
- **How much:** 17 lessons (45 minutes each) over the first semester of the school year.
- **Classroom curriculum:** The classroom-based curriculum included a series of stories, with accompanying writing exercises, written for the program by a children’s author. The first several sessions focused on violence-related attitudes, values, and self-

concept issues to increase the attractiveness of nonviolent behavior and strengthen student motivation to learn the psychosocial skills in the sessions to follow. Psychosocial skills included a structured anger management technique, unbiased social perceptions to reduce hostile attribution bias, healthy self-perception, avoiding conflicts before they begin, a structured problem-solving technique, assertive behavior, communication skills, specific conflict-resolution techniques, and resisting peer pressure. There were also a variety of classroom activities, including didactic instruction, discussion, use of the Socratic method, role-plays, handouts with graphic design, and experiential exercises.

- **Changing the learning environment:** Teachers prompted student use of the techniques, reinforced prosocial behavior, implemented a mechanism for peers to reinforce each other's positive behavior in writing, and posted program materials in classrooms.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** Teachers posted program materials in hallways. The intervention also included a remediation component for students who were referred for aggressive behavior, to supplement its primary prevention emphasis. School psychologists, counselors, and administrators interwove this material into their work with these students as they saw fit.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** Teachers received six hours of initial training and an additional two-hour training session one month after the intervention began.
- **Implementation support:** Project staff provided consultation and support on an occasional, as-needed basis. Fidelity of program implementation was assessed by means of a brief teacher-report questionnaire. A teacher's manual provided detailed lesson plans, language that teachers can use to explain the concepts to students, key words in the margins for use as lecture notes during the sessions, and responses to common student objections to the nonviolent behaviors taught by the curriculum. A counselor's manual guided school psychologists and counselors in using the program material with individual students referred for aggressive behavior.

**Comparison group:** "Business as usual."

- No additional details were reported.

### *Positive Results*

<b>Domain</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Result</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>	<b>Timing</b>
Interpersonal	Aggressive Behavior Checklist: student- and teacher-reported aggressive behavior	SS+	Less aggressive behavior	After 4 months of implementation
Discipline	Teacher-reported suspensions	SS+	Fewer suspensions for violent behavior	After 4 months of implementation
Discipline	Teacher-reported referrals to conflict mediation	SS+	Less involvement in conflict mediation service	After 4 months of implementation
Discipline	Teacher-reported disciplinary incidents for aggressive behavior	SS+	Fewer incidents involving aggressive behavior	After 4 months of implementation

## Playworks (PW)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier I
- **Size of evidence:** Large sample, multiple sites
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Intrapersonal, school climate and safety
- **School level:** Elementary school
- **Setting:** Urban
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority, low SES
- **Purpose:** Engage students in physical activity; foster social skills related to cooperation and conflict resolution; improve students' ability to focus on class work; decrease behavioral problems; and improve school climate.
- **Implementers:** Teachers, support staff
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, applications outside the classroom, and out-of-school time.
- **Intervention website:** <http://www.playworks.org/>
- **WWC:** Study 1 meets WWC standards without reservations (<https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Study/71974>).
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

A 2010–2012 study documented in

- Nicholas Beyler, Martha Bleeker, Susanne James-Burdumy, Jane Fortson, Rebecca A. London, Lisa Westrich, Katie Stokes-Guinan, and Sebastian Castrechini, *Findings from an Experimental Evaluation of Playworks: Effects on Play, Physical Activity, and Recess*, Princeton, N.J.: Mathematica Policy Research, 2013.
- Martha Bleeker, Susanne James-Burdumy, Nicholas Beyler, Allison Hedley Dodd, Rebecca A. London, Lisa Westrich, Katie Stokes-Guinan, and Sebastian Castrechini, *Findings from a Randomized Experiment of Playworks: Selected Results from Cohort 1*, Princeton, N.J.: Mathematica Policy Research, 2012.
- Jane Fortson, Susanne James-Burdumy, Martha Bleeker, Nicholas Beyler, Rebecca A. London, Lisa Westrich, Katie Stokes-Guinan, and Sebastian Castrechini, *Impact and Implementation Findings from an Experimental Evaluation of Playworks: Effects on School Climate, Academic Learning, Student Social Skills and Behavior*, Princeton, N.J.: Mathematica Policy Research, 2013.

**Evidence tier:** Tier I (Strong)

- This randomized controlled trial has low attrition.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 2,331 students (6 sites)
- **Number of classrooms:** 119 classrooms
- **Grade level:** 4–5 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 52 percent female, 48 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 76 percent racial/ethnic minority
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 29 schools from six cities across the United States
- **Community type:** Urban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Average of 488–556 students
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** 84 percent racial/ethnic minorities
- **SES:** 92 percent were Title I schools; 82 percent of students were from low-SES families.

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Support staff (full-time Playworks coaches), classroom teachers.
- **How much:** Playworks coaches were in the schools full-time, supporting students and acting as role models for teachers. Coaches were scheduled to support at least one recess per week.
- **Classroom curriculum:** Class Game Time involved a period in which the coach met with individual classes to lead games with the students, using games to foster teamwork and positive play while teaching students rules to games to play at recess.
- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** Organized Recess Activities involved coaches teaching conflict-resolution skills and fostering student play by encouraging involvement in organized, inclusive activities. The coach introduced a common set of rules to games and modeled conflict-resolution tools to reduce the number of conflicts that arose, enable youth to resolve their own disputes, and create an environment that supports positive play. Teachers were required to be present and were encouraged to play alongside their students at class game time. The Junior Coach Program provided students with an opportunity to develop leadership and conflict-resolution skills so they could act as role models and facilitators during recess.
- **Out-of-school time:** The intervention included an after-school program and sports league.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** None reported.
- **Implementation support:** None reported.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- Comparison schools were eligible to implement Playworks after one year.

### Positive Results

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Intrapersonal	Recess Behavior and Readiness for Class Scale	SS+	Better readiness for class	After 1 year of implementation
Intrapersonal	Effect of sports, game, and play on behavior in class	SS+	More on-task behavior in class following game play	After 1 year of implementation
Intrapersonal	Teacher self-report	SS+	Less difficulty transitioning to learning after recess	After 1 year of implementation
School climate and safety	Teacher self-report	SS+	Greater teacher-reported feelings of student safety at school	After 1 year of implementation
School climate and safety	Teacher self-report	SS+	Greater teacher-reported feelings of students safety/inclusion at recess	After 1 year of implementation
School climate and safety	Teacher self-report	SS+	Higher teacher perceptions of student ownership over their activities during recess	After 1 year of implementation
School climate and safety	Teacher self-report	SS+	Greater teacher perceptions that positive, encouraging language was used by students at school	After 1 year of implementation
School climate and safety	Student Bullying/Exclusion Scale	SS+	Less bullying and exclusion	After 1 year of implementation



## Positive Action (PA)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 4
- **Highest tier:** Tier I
- **Size of evidence:** Large sample, multiple sites
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Intrapersonal, interpersonal, academic achievement, academic attainment, disciplinary, civic attitudes and behaviors, school climate and safety
- **School level:** Elementary and middle school
- **Setting:** Urban and rural
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority, low SES
- **Purpose:** Promote character development, academic achievement, and social-emotional skills; reduce disruptive and problem behavior.
- **Implementers:** Teachers, administrators, counselors
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, changing the learning environment, applications outside the classroom, family/community involvement, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** <https://www.positiveaction.net/>
- **WWC:** Some analyses in Study 1 met WWC standards without reservations (<https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/study/81439>), Study 2 met WWC standards with reservations (<https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/EvidenceSnapshot/380>), and some analyses in Study 4 met WWC standards without reservations (<https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/study/81474>).
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is included in the 2013 CASEL Guide—Preschool and Elementary School Edition.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

A 2002–2007 study documented in

- Michael W. Beets, Brian R. Flay, Samuel Vuchinich, Frank J. Snyder, Alan Acock, Kin-Kit Li, Kate Burns, Isaac J. Washburn, and Joseph Durlak, “Use of a Social and Character Development Program to Prevent Substance Use, Violent Behaviors, and Sexual Activity Among Elementary-School Students in Hawaii,” *American Journal of Public Health*, Vol. 99, No. 8, August 2009, pp. 1438–1445.
- Frank Snyder, Brian Flay, Samuel Vuchinich, Alan Acock, Isaac Washburn, Michael Beets, and Kin-Kit Li, “Impact of a Social-Emotional and Character Development Program on School-Level Indicators of Academic Achievement, Absenteeism, and Disciplinary Outcomes: A Matched-Pair, Cluster-Randomized, Controlled Trial,” *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, Vol. 3, No. 1, December 2010, pp. 26–55.
- Frank J. Snyder, Samuel Vuchinich, Alan Acock, Isaac J. Washburn, and Brian R. Flay, “Improving Elementary School Quality Through the Use of a Social-Emotional and Character Development Program: A Matched-Pair, Cluster-Randomized, Controlled Trial in Hawai’i,” *Journal of School Health*, Vol. 82, No. 1, January 2012, pp. 11–20.
- Frank J. Snyder, Alan C. Acock, Samuel Vuchinich, Michael W. Beets, Isaac J. Washburn, and Brian R. Flay, “Preventing Negative Behaviors Among Elementary-School Students Through Enhancing Students’ Social-Emotional and Character Development,” *American Journal of Health Promotion*, Vol. 28, No. 1, September 2013, pp. 50–58.

### **Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial involved only one site. The school-level analyses on academic achievement, academic attainment, disciplinary outcomes, and school climate and safety officially meet WWC standards without reservations. The statistically significant positive effects on intrapersonal outcomes involved student-level analyses that included joiners and did not report sufficient information to assess student-level attrition or baseline equivalence of the analytic sample.

### **Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 1,784 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** 1–5 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 50 percent female, 50 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 91 percent racial/ethnic minority
- **SES:** Not reported

### Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:

- **Number/location of schools:** 20 schools located across Hawaii
- **Community type:** Urban, rural
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** K–5 or K–6
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Average total of 544 students
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Average of 85 percent of students identifying with a racial/ethnic minority group
- **SES:** Average of 57 percent of students receiving free/reduced-price lunch

### Intervention summary:

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Classroom teachers, school counselors, and school principals..
- **How much:** Positive Action was delivered for four years. The sequenced elementary curriculum consisted of 140 lessons per grade, per academic year, offered in 15–20 minutes by classroom teachers. When fully implemented, students were exposed to the program for a total of approximately 35 hours over a 35-week academic year.
- **Classroom curriculum:** The classroom curriculum utilized an interactive approach, whereby interaction between teacher and student was encouraged through the use of structured discussions and activities, and interaction between students was encouraged through structured or semistructured small-group activities, including playing games, playing roles, and practicing skills. Lessons covered six major units on topics related to self-concept (i.e., the relationship between thoughts, feelings, and actions), physical and intellectual actions (e.g., hygiene, nutrition, physical activity, avoiding harmful substances, decisionmaking skills, creative thinking), social/emotional actions for managing oneself responsibly (e.g., self-control, time management), getting along with others (e.g., empathy, altruism, respect, conflict resolution), being honest with yourself and others (e.g., self-honesty, integrity, self-appraisal), and continuous self-improvement (e.g., goal setting, problem solving, courage to try new things, persistence).
- **Changing the learning environment:** Values covered in the classroom curriculum were adopted as the code of conduct for the classroom and school.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** The school-climate kit consisted of materials to encourage and reinforce the program's six units, coordinating schoolwide implementation. A counselors' program, implemented by school counselors, specialized in developing positive actions with students at higher risk.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** Prior to the beginning of each academic year, teachers, administrators, and counselors attended PA training sessions conducted by the program developer. The training sessions lasted approximately 3–4 hours for the initial year, and 1–2 hours for each successive year. Booster sessions, conducted by the Hawaii-based project coordinator and lasting

approximately 30–50 minutes, were provided an average of once per academic year for each school.

- **Implementation support:** The PA coordinator’s (principal’s) manual directed the use of such materials as posters, music, tokens, and certificates. It also included information on planning and conducting assemblies, creating a PA newsletter, and establishing a PA committee to create a schoolwide PA culture. Miniconferences were held each February to bring together five to six leaders and staff (e.g., principals, counselors, teachers) from each of the ten participating schools to share ideas and experiences and to get answers to any concerns regarding implementing the program. Three school-level implementation indicators were used: program exposure, classroom material usage, and schoolwide material usage.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- Comparison schools were asked not to make any substantial social-emotional and character development reforms, and they were offered the PA program on completion of the trial.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Intrapersonal	Student and teacher self-report	SS+	Better academic behaviors (e.g., setting goals, managing time)	Post-intervention
Academic achievement	Stanford Achievement Test, TerraNova, and Hawai’i Content and Performance Standards	Effect size: 1.18	Better performance in mathematics	Over the course of five years (4 years implementation and 1 year post-intervention)
Academic achievement	Stanford Achievement Test, TerraNova, and Hawai’i Content and Performance Standards	SS+	Better performance in reading	Over the course of five years (4 years implementation and 1 year post-intervention)
Academic attainment	Administrative data	SS+	Less absenteeism	Over the course of five years (4 years implementation and 1 year post-intervention)
Academic attainment	Administrative data	Effect size: 1.08	Fewer retentions	1 year post-intervention
Disciplinary outcomes	Administrative data	Effect size: 0.96	Fewer suspensions	Over 4 years of implementation
School climate and safety	State records from school quality survey	Effect size: 1.48	Greater student safety and well-being	1 year post-intervention

## Study 2

A 1993–1998 study documented in

- Brian R. Flay and Carol G. Allred, “Long-Term Effects of the Positive Action<sup>®</sup> Program,” *American Journal of Health Behavior*, Vol. 27, No. 1, May 2003, pp. S6–S21.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This quasi-experimental study officially meets WWC standards with reservations, although it involved only one site.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 1,470 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** 1–6 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** 52 percent racial/ethnic minority
- **SES:** 62 to 67 percent participated in the free or reduced-price lunch program.

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 36 schools located in the southeastern United States
- **Community type:** Urban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Classroom teachers, school counselors, and school principals.
- **How much:** The sequenced elementary-school curriculum involved 140 lessons per grade per academic year.
- **Classroom curriculum:** The classroom curriculum utilized an interactive approach, encouraging interaction between teacher and student through the use of structured discussions and activities and encouraging interaction between students through structured or semistructured small-group activities, including playing games, playing roles, and practicing skills. Lessons covered six major units on topics related to self-concept (i.e., the relationship of thoughts, feelings, and actions), physical and

intellectual actions (e.g., hygiene, nutrition, physical activity, avoiding harmful substances, decisionmaking skills, creative thinking), social/emotional actions for managing oneself responsibly (e.g., self-control, time management), getting along with others (e.g., empathy, altruism, respect, conflict resolution), being honest with yourself and others (e.g., self-honesty, integrity, self-appraisal), and continuous self-improvement (e.g., goal setting, problem solving, courage to try new things, persistence).

- **Changing the learning environment:** Values covered in the classroom curriculum were adopted as the code of conduct for the classroom and school.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** The school-climate kit consisted of materials to encourage and reinforce the six PA units, coordinating schoolwide implementation. A counselors' program, implemented by school counselors, specialized in developing positive actions with students at higher risk.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** Additional components included counselor, parent, and family classes; and community or coalition components.
- **Professional development:** None reported.
- **Implementation support:** Providers received intervention manuals and implementation materials.

**Comparison group:** "Business as usual."

- No additional details were reported.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Academic achievement	Elementary-School Florida Reading Test	Effect size: 1.29	Better performance in reading	After 4 years of implementation
Academic achievement	Florida Comprehensive Aptitude Test (FCAT)	Effect size: 0.28	Better overall performance (including reading and mathematics)	After 4 years of implementation
Disciplinary outcomes	School records	Effect size: 0.25	Fewer suspensions	After 4 years of implementation

### Study 3

A 2011–2014 study documented in

- Shenyang Guo, Qi Wu, Paul R. Smokowski, Martica Bacallao, Caroline B. R. Evans, and Katie L. Cotter, “A Longitudinal Evaluation of the Positive Action Program in a Low-Income, Racially Diverse, Rural County: Effects on Self-Esteem, School Hassles, Aggression, and Internalizing Symptoms,” *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, Vol. 44, No. 12, December 2015, pp. 2337–2358.
- Paul R. Smokowski, Shenyang Guo, Qi Wu, Caroline B. R. Evans, Katie L. Cotter, and Marticia L. Bacallao, “Evaluating Dosage Effects for the Positive Action Program: How Implementation Impacts Internalizing Symptoms, Aggression, School Hassles, and Self-Esteem,” *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, Vol. 86, No. 3, 2016, pp. 310–322.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This quasi-experimental study involved a confound (site) with the intervention.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 1,246 students (2 sites)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** 6–8 (middle school)
- **Sex/gender:** 52 percent female, 48 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 30 percent American Indian, 27 percent white, 23 percent African American, 12 percent mixed race/other, 8 percent Latino
- **SES:** 88 percent received free/reduced-price lunch

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** Multiple schools located in North Carolina
- **Community type:** Rural
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** 6–8
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** “Racially diverse county”
- **SES:** “Low-income county”

### Intervention summary:

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Classroom teachers, school counselors, and school principals.
- **How much:** The classroom curriculum involved brief lessons (approximately 15 minutes) for two or three days a week throughout the academic year.
- **Classroom curriculum:** Lessons covered six major units on topics related to self-concept (i.e., the relationship of thoughts, feelings, and actions), physical and intellectual actions (e.g., hygiene, nutrition, physical activity, avoiding harmful substances, decisionmaking skills, creative thinking), social/emotional actions for managing oneself responsibly (e.g., self-control, time management), getting along with others (e.g., empathy, altruism, respect, conflict resolution), being honest with yourself and others (e.g., self-honesty, integrity, self-appraisal), and continuous self-improvement (e.g., goal setting, problem solving, courage to try new things, persistence).
- **Changing the learning environment:** Each school's principal selected teachers to use Positive Action Climate Kit materials in classrooms to highlight Positive Action program themes.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** Each school's principal selected teachers and staff to use Positive Action Climate Kit materials in hallways, offices, and elsewhere to highlight Positive Action program themes. Counselors at each school received Positive Action Counselor Kits for additional counseling sessions with students and small groups.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** Each school's principal selected community members to use Positive Action Climate Kit materials to highlight Positive Action program themes. Counselors at each school received Positive Action Counselor Kits for additional counseling sessions with families.
- **Professional development:** The North Carolina Academic Center for Excellence in Youth Violence Prevention project (NC-ACE) provided training to all middle schools. During teacher training each fall, NC-ACE staff modeled the implementation of Positive Action lessons, showing teachers and counselors how to facilitate the program.
- **Implementation support:** NC-ACE provided supervision to all middle schools. NC-ACE staff sometimes assisted teachers in implementing Positive Action lessons to ensure consistency; the role of the NC-ACE staff was to ensure that teachers felt competent following the Positive Action program and to provide teachers with support as they learned how to implement the program. NC-ACE staff monitored progress for implementation fidelity and observed teachers and completed rating forms to document that teachers had attained adequate implementation skills. Teachers documented each lesson completed using weekly Implementation Logs provided by NC-ACE staff. These logs were collected by NC-ACE staff and entered into an Excel spreadsheet that allowed NC-ACE to closely monitor progress within and across the schools. Program dosage was assessed by the number of lessons taught and by the duration of lessons.

### Comparison group: "Business as usual."

- No additional details were reported.



### *Positive Results*

<b>Domain</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Result</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>	<b>Timing</b>
Intrapersonal	Rosenberg Self-Esteem scale	SS+	Greater self-esteem	Unclear
School climate and safety	School Hassles Scale	SS+	Less harassment at school	Unclear

## Study 4

A 2004–2010 study documented in

- Kin-Kit Li, Isaac Washburn, David L. DuBois, Samuel Vuchinich, Peter Ji, Vanessa Brechling, Joseph Day, Michael W. Beets, Alan C. Acock, Michael Berbaum, Frank Snyder, and Brian R. Flay, “Effects of the Positive Action Programme on Problem Behaviours in Elementary School Students: A Matched-Pair Randomised Control Trial in Chicago,” *Psychology & Health*, Vol. 26, No. 2, February 2011, pp. 187–204.
- Niloofar Bavarian, Kendra M. Lewis, David L. DuBois, Alan Acock, Samuel Vuchinich, Naida Silverthorn, and Brian R. Flay, “Using Social-Emotional and Character Development to Improve Academic Outcomes: A Matched-Pair, Cluster-Randomized Controlled Trial in Low-Income, Urban Schools,” *Journal of School Health*, Vol. 83, No. 11, November 2013, pp. 771–779.
- Kendra M. Lewis, David L. DuBois, Niloofar Bavarian, Alan Acock, Naida Silverthorn, Joseph Day, and Brian R. Flay, “Effects of Positive Action on the Emotional Health of Urban Youth: A Cluster-Randomized Trial,” *Journal of Adolescent Health*, Vol. 53, No. 6, December 2013, pp. 706–711.
- Kendra M. Lewis, Marc B. Schure, Niloofar Bavarian, David L. DuBois, Joseph Day, Peter Ji, Naida Silverthorn, Alan Acock, Samuel Vuchinich, and Brian R. Flay, “Problem Behavior and Urban, Low-Income Youth: A Randomized Controlled Trial of Positive Action in Chicago,” *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, Vol. 44, No. 6, June 2013, pp. 622–630.
- Kendra M. Lewis, Samuel Vuchinich, Peter Ji, David L. DuBois, Alan Acock, Niloofar Bavarian, Joseph Day, Naida Silverthorn, and Brian R. Flay, “Effects of the ‘Positive Action’ Program on Indicators of Positive Youth Development Among Urban Youth,” *Applied Developmental Science*, Vol. 20, No. 1, January 2016, pp. 16–28.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial involved only one site. The school-level analyses on academic attainment and disciplinary outcomes officially meet WWC standards without reservations. All other statistically significant positive effects involved student-level analyses that included joiners and did not report sufficient information to assess student-level attrition or baseline equivalence of the analytic sample.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 1,170 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** 3–8 (elementary and middle school)
- **Sex/gender:** 53 percent female, 47 percent male

- **Race/ethnicity:** 75 percent African American or Hispanic
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 14 schools located in Chicago
- **Community type:** Urban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** K–6 and K–8
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** 49 percent African American, 39 percent Hispanic
- **SES:** 75 percent of students were eligible for free or reduced-price lunch.

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Classroom teachers, school counselors, school principals, and other administrative staff.
- **How much:** The classroom curriculum consisted of more than 140 15-minute lessons, four days per week.
- **Classroom curriculum:** The curriculum focused on six units: Self-Concept, Positive Actions for Your Body and Mind, Managing Yourself Responsibly, Treating Others the Way You Like to be Treated, Telling Yourself the Truth, and Improving Yourself Continually. Students learned that self-improvement is a continual process and learned how to apply Positive Action in all areas of life. Lessons were scripted and used classroom discussion, role-play, games, songs, and activity sheets or text booklets.
- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** Additional components included sitewide climate development and conflict resolution.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** Additional components included counselor, parent, and family classes; and community or coalition components.
- **Professional development:** Teachers and staff were trained for approximately 4 hours in the first year and 2 hours in subsequent years.
- **Implementation support:** Teachers and staff attended multiple workshops to provide further training on the schoolwide components of the program and to share experiences and received support through individual consultation with a PA implementation coordinator. The implementation coordinator assessed the extent to which components were in place, identified potential obstacles to implementation quality, and provided technical support to help overcome obstacles and enhance fidelity. The research team also provided regular consultation with principals and other school administrators to

ensure that the PA curriculum and other components were implemented in adherence to PA guidelines.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- No additional details were reported.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Intrapersonal	Student self-report	SS+	Less disaffection with learning	After 6 years of implementation
Intrapersonal	Student self-report	SS+	Greater academic motivation	After 6 years of implementation
Intrapersonal	Social-Emotional and Character Development Scale	SS+	Better self-control	After 6 years of implementation
Intrapersonal	Student self-report	SS+	Better self-concept	After 6 years of implementation
Interpersonal	Social-Emotional and Character Development Scale	SS+	Better social-emotional skills	After 6 years of implementation
Interpersonal	Student self-report	SS+	Less support of aggression	After 6 years of implementation
Interpersonal	Student self-report	SS+	Fewer conduct problems	After 6 years of implementation
Interpersonal	Conventional Friends Scale	SS+	Less deviant peer affiliation	After 6 years of implementation
Interpersonal	Conventional Friends Scale	SS+	More prosocial peer affiliation	After 6 years of implementation
Interpersonal	Social-Emotional and Character Development Scale	SS+	More prosocial interactions	After 6 years of implementation
Interpersonal	Social Skills Problem Solving Measure	SS+	Less aggressive problem solving	After 6 years of implementation
Academic attainment	School records	SS+	Fewer absences	After 6 years of implementation
Disciplinary outcomes	School records	SS+	Fewer disciplinary referrals	After 6 years of implementation
Disciplinary outcomes	School records	SS+	Fewer suspensions	After 6 years of implementation
Civic attitudes and behaviors	Belief in Moral Order Scale	SS+	Less negative morality	After 6 years of implementation
Civic attitudes and behaviors	Social-Emotional and Character Development Scale	SS+	Greater honesty	After 6 years of implementation
School climate and safety	Aggression Scale and the Behavior and Assessment System for Children	SS+	Fewer bullying behaviors	After 3 and 6 years of implementation

## Preventing Relational Aggression in Schools Everyday (PRAISE)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Small sample, single site
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Interpersonal
- **School level:** Elementary school
- **Setting:** Urban
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority, low SES
- **Purpose:** Help students explore and practice the identification of feelings, signs of physiological arousal, calming strategies, interpreting intentions of others, and generating and evaluating alternative behaviors to enact.
- **Implementers:** Teachers, counselors
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** There is no dedicated website for this intervention.
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

Study period not reported; documented in

- Stephen S. Leff, Tracy Evian Waasdorp, Brooke Paskewich, Rebecca Lakin Gullan, Abbas F. Jawad, Julie Paquette MacEvoy, Betsy E. Feinberg, and Thomas J. Power, “The Preventing Relational Aggression in Schools Everyday Program: A Preliminary Evaluation of Acceptability and Impact,” *School Psychology Review*, Vol. 39, No. 4, December 2010, pp. 569–587.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial involved only one site and fewer than 350 students.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 290 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** 10 classrooms
- **Grade level:** 3–4 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 48 percent female, 52 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 74 percent African American, 9 percent biracial, 5 percent white, 12 percent other
- **SES:** Low SES

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 1 school
- **Community type:** Urban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Large school
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Counselors (three master’s-level research therapists), teachers (teacher partner).
- **How much:** 20 twice-weekly sessions (40 minutes each).
- **Classroom curriculum:** Comprehensive classroom-based intervention involving social-cognitive retraining, empathy building, perspective-taking skills, and responding as bystander of aggression.
- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.

- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** None reported.
- **Implementation support:** An integrity monitoring system included several procedural integrity items from each session (i.e., the three or four key content areas to cover) and process items (e.g., student enthusiasm in session, facilitator responsiveness to students and teachers, facilitators working well together, students' behavior).

**Comparison group:** "Business as usual."

- No additional details were reported.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Interpersonal	Knowledge of Anger Problem Solving	SS+	Better understanding of social problem-solving steps	Post-intervention

## Project WIN (Working Out Integrated Negotiations)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Small sample, single site
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Interpersonal
- **School level:** Middle school
- **Setting:** Urban
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority, low SES
- **Purpose:** Promote constructive conflict resolution by creating a cooperative environment, training students in negotiation strategies.
- **Implementers:** Counselors
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, changing the learning environment, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** There is no dedicated website for this intervention.
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.



## Study 1

A 2002–2003 study documented in

- Laura Roberts, Peter Yeomans, and Susan Ferro-Almeida, “Project WIN Evaluation Shows Decreased Violence and Improved Conflict Resolution Skills for Middle School Students,” *RMLE Online: Research in Middle Level Education*, Vol. 30, No. 8, January 2007, pp. 1–14.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial had a confound (classroom) with intervention assignment, involved only one site, and involved fewer than 350 students.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 34 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** 2 classrooms
- **Grade level:** 5 (middle school)
- **Sex/gender:** 64 percent female, 36 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 75 percent African American, 25 percent other
- **SES:** 78 percent received free/reduced-price lunch

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 1 school in Philadelphia
- **Community type:** Urban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** K–8
- **Total enrollment at schools:** 550 students
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** 78 percent African American, 20 percent white, 2 percent Hispanic
- **SES:** The school is located in one of the most economically disadvantaged school districts in Pennsylvania; 40 percent of the student body comes from families with incomes below the poverty line.

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Counselors (training degree in the Curriculum for Conflict Resolution and Peaceable Schools at Lesley College and a certificate from the Alternatives to Violence Program).
- **How much:** 17 sessions (45 minutes each).

- **Classroom curriculum:** Students participated in a series of value-clarification exercises in which guides for developing transforming power were used to teach students that they had access to transforming power and could develop it by adopting certain attitudes and values. The guides were “self-respect,” “caring for others,” “think before reacting,” “seek a nonviolent solution,” and “expect the best.” Students were actively engaged in the lessons through discussions, brainstorming, and role-playing. Negotiation strategies included (a) listening skills, (b) anger management, (c) using “I” messages to assert one’s feelings during a conflict, (d) expressing one’s needs in a conflict situation, and (e) generating solutions that meet one’s own needs and those of the opponent. The education team also taught students about “you” messages—blaming statements that tend to escalate a conflict. Counselors encouraged students to use “I” messages, rather than “you” messages, during conflict.
- **Changing the learning environment:** The intervention included a component designed to help students transform the climate of the classroom from a competitive to a more cooperative environment.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** None reported.
- **Implementation support:** To ensure fidelity to the curriculum, the principal investigator observed each class session and kept a written transcript of the activities. Providers received curriculum and lesson guides.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- No additional details were reported.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Interpersonal	Vignette-based interview	SS+	Better conflict resolution skills with classmates and friends	Post-intervention

## Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 4
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Large sample, multiple sites
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Intrapersonal, interpersonal, academic achievement
- **School level:** Elementary school
- **Setting:** Urban, suburban, and rural
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority, low SES
- **Purpose:** Promoting emotional and social competencies through the development and strengthening of skills in emotional literacy, positive peer relations, and social problem solving.
- **Implementers:** Teachers, administrators, support staff
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, changing the learning environment, applications outside the classroom, family/community involvement, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** <http://www.pathstraining.com/main/>
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is included in the 2013 CASEL Guide—Preschool and Elementary School Edition.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

Study period not reported; documented in

- Karen L. Bierman, John D. Coie, Kenneth A. Dodge, Mark T. Greenberg, John E. Lochman, Robert J. McMahon, and Ellen Pinderhughes, “The Effects of a Multiyear Universal Social-Emotional Learning Program: The Role of Student and School Characteristics,” *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, Vol. 78, No. 2, April 2010, pp. 156–168.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial reported insufficient information to assess student-level attrition and the baseline equivalence of the analytic sample.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 2,937 students (6 sites)
- **Number of classrooms:** 370 classrooms
- **Grade level:** 1–3 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 36 schools located in Nashville, Tennessee; Seattle, Washington; and central Pennsylvania.
- **Community type:** Urban, suburban, and rural
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** An average of 36 percent of students identified with a racial/ethnic minority group.
- **SES:** An average of 57 percent of students received free/reduced-price lunch.

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Classroom teachers, school principals, and PATHS coordinators..
- **How much:** The classroom curriculum was implemented across three academic years: 57 lessons in 1st grade, 46 lessons in 2nd grade, and 48 lessons in 3rd grade. Lessons were taught approximately two or three times per week, with each lesson lasting 20–30 minutes, from mid-September until May.

- **Classroom curriculum:** Approximately 40 percent of the lessons focused on skills related to understanding and communicating emotions, 30 percent on skills related to the increase of positive social behavior (e.g., social participation, prosocial behavior, communication skills), and 30 percent on self-control and other steps in social problem solving. Skill concepts were typically presented via direct instruction, discussion, modeling stories, or video presentations. Discussion and role-playing activities followed, giving children a chance to practice the skill and teachers a chance to monitor the level of understanding and skill each class attained. Although a standard script described each lesson, teachers were encouraged to adjust the level of presentation and amount of practice as dictated by the responsiveness and developmental level of each class.
- **Changing the learning environment:** Teachers were strongly encouraged to generalize their use of PATHS concepts across the school day. In particular, teachers were encouraged to help children identify their feelings; communicate clearly with others; use self-control strategies; and apply the three steps of problem solving as frustrations, challenges, and interpersonal problems occur at school. Each classroom had a mailbox in which students could submit problems or concerns, which were then discussed in problem-solving meetings.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** Teachers were also strongly encouraged to generalize their use of PATHS concepts to other school settings outside the classroom. PATHS coordinators consulted with principals and teachers on how to broaden the use of the PATHS program across the entire school (e.g., used on the playground, assemblies that modeled skills for the entire school, displays at open houses).
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** The curriculum generalized concepts to the home situation by including frequent parent updates on curriculum content and suggestions for ways parents could promote their children's growing competence. Regular homework activities were designed to help children engage their parents in cooperative activities, such as completing drawings or sharing stories related to curriculum components.
- **Professional development:** The intervention teachers in each grade attended a two-day training workshop. Teachers were paid for their extra preparation and consultation time (at rates of pay negotiated with each school district, according to its standards) or received continuing education credit for their participation.
- **Implementation support:** The intervention teachers in each grade received weekly consultation and observation from educational consultants who were intended to enhance the quality of implementation through modeling, coaching, and providing ongoing feedback regarding program delivery. Consultants also provided general feedback on classroom and behavior management. Teachers reported weekly to their assigned consultants on the lessons they had presented so that the amount of dosage could be assessed, and the consultants assessed fidelity through monthly ratings of quality of implementation based on their direct observation of teacher instruction.

**Comparison group:** "Business as usual."

- No additional details were reported.

### *Positive Results*

<b>Domain</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Result</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>	<b>Timing</b>
Intrapersonal	Cognitive Concentration subscale of the Teacher Observation of Classroom Adaptation—Revised	SS+	Better cognitive concentration	After 3 years of implementation
Interpersonal	Authority Acceptance subscale of the Teacher Observation of Classroom Adaptation—Revised	SS+	Better acceptance of authority	After 3 years of implementation
Interpersonal	Social Health Profile	SS+	Better social competence	After 3 years of implementation

## Study 2

A 2004–2008 study documented in

- David J. Schonfeld, Ryan E. Adams, Bridget K. Fredstrom, Roger P. Weissberg, Richard Gilman, Charlene Voyce, Ricarda Tomlin, and Dee Speese-Linehan, “Cluster-Randomized Trial Demonstrating Impact on Academic Achievement of Elementary Social-Emotional Learning,” *School Psychology Quarterly*, Vol. 30, No. 3, September 2015, pp. 406–420.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial involved only one site. The reported statistically significant result for reading performance did not meet attrition standards.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 1,394 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** 3–6 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 47 percent female, 53 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 54 percent African American, 36 percent Hispanic/Latino, 8 percent white, 2 percent other
- **SES:** 66 percent eligible for free/reduced-price lunch

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 24 schools located in large city in the northeastern United States
- **Community type:** Urban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** The district serves a predominantly minority population.
- **SES:** The district serves a population with a median household income of approximately \$36,000.

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Classroom teachers.
- **How much:** The classroom curriculum was implemented over four academic years: 45 lessons in 3rd grade, 42 lessons in 4th grade, 39 lessons in 5th grade, and 31–44 lessons in 6th grade.

- **Classroom curriculum:** The classroom curriculum covered four broad areas: Emotional Awareness and Understanding topics (teaching children to recognize emotions in themselves and others and to take the perspective of others to understand how their behaviors affect others), Self-Control (appropriate self-calming strategies and better ways to express negative emotions), Interpersonal Problem-Solving Skills (identify the problem, set goals, generate responses, and evaluate outcomes) and Developing Peer Relations and Enhancing Self-Esteem and Social Responsibility.
- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** Teachers received annual in-service training averaging 16 to 20 contact hours per year throughout the four-year project period. Group training sessions were usually held at the end of the summer, just prior to the start of the school year. These training sessions included instruction in background information and curriculum content, participation in curriculum activities, opportunities to practice teaching with peer feedback, and personal reflection.
- **Implementation support:** Teachers received annual in-classroom support and coaching sessions that consisted of either coteaching lessons with or modeling a veteran social development facilitator hired by the school system to oversee the project. The amount of support provided to teachers varied based on their need and receptiveness and ranged from monthly check-in visits to modeling or coteaching of lessons in the curriculum. Teachers also completed biweekly reports of how many PATHS lessons they taught.

**Comparison group:** “Active comparator.”

- Students attending comparison schools received the preexisting SEL curriculum; baseline interviews revealed that few, if any, of SEL lessons were actually being delivered.

*Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Academic achievement	State mastery test	SS+	Better performance in reading	After 2 years of implementation
Academic achievement	State mastery test	SS+	Better performance in writing	After 3 and 4 years of implementation
Academic achievement	State mastery test	SS+	Better performance in mathematics	After 2 years of implementation



### Study 3

Study period not reported; documented in

- Nathaniel R. Riggs, Mark T. Greenberg, Carol A. Kusché, and Mary Ann Pentz, “The Mediatlional Role of Neurocognition in the Behavioral Outcomes of a Social-Emotional Prevention Program in Elementary School Students: Effects of the PATHS Curriculum,” *Prevention Science*, Vol. 7, No. 1, March 2006, pp. 91–102.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial involved only one site and fewer than 350 students.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 318 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** 2–3 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 50 percent female, 50 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 55 percent white, 33 percent African American, 22 percent other
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 4 schools located in Seattle
- **Community type:** Not reported
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Classroom teachers
- **How much:** The PATHS lessons were taught approximately three times per week, with each lesson lasting 20–30 minutes. Teachers began to teach the lessons in early October and finished in early April.
- **Classroom curriculum:** The classroom curriculum aimed at reducing aggression and behavior problems by promoting the development of social-emotional competence in students.

- **Changing the learning environment:** In addition to the lessons, teachers utilized techniques to generalize skills learned during PATHS lessons in other contexts during the classroom day.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** Classroom teachers attended a three-day training workshop.
- **Implementation support:** Classroom teachers received weekly consultation and observation from project staff. Each teacher received a copy of the curriculum, which included detailed scripts and accompanying materials that focused on teaching skills related to self-control, the management and recognition of feelings, and interpersonal problem solving. Weekly consultations with each teacher were completed to enhance the quality of implementation through modeling, coaching, and providing ongoing feedback regarding program delivery. Fidelity was assessed through consultants' monthly ratings of quality of implementation.

**Comparison group:** "Business as usual."

- No additional details were reported.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Intrapersonal	Stroop Test	SS+	Better cognitive regulation	After 1 year of implementation
Interpersonal	Teacher Report Form of the Child Behavioral Checklist	SS+	Fewer problem behaviors	After 1 year of implementation

## Study 4

Study period not reported; documented in

- Hugh F. Crean and Deborah B. Johnson, “Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS) and Elementary School Aged Children’s Aggression: Results from a Cluster Randomized Trial,” *American Journal of Community Psychology*, Vol. 52, No. 1–2, September 2013, pp. 56–72.

### **Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial involved joiners in the analysis and reported insufficient information to assess the baseline equivalence of the analytic sample.

### **Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 779 students (3 sites)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** 3–5 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 57 percent female, 43 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 51 percent white, 38 percent African American, 10 percent other
- **SES:** 43 percent of students’ families met the federal government defined income to household size poverty ratio (2004 formula)

### **Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 14 schools located in the northeastern and Midwestern United States
- **Community type:** Urban and suburban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

### **Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Classroom teachers.
- **How much:** The classroom curriculum was taught approximately two or three times per week, with lessons lasting 20–30 minutes, from mid-September until early June.

- **Classroom curriculum:** The classroom curriculum involved three major units (readiness and self-control, feelings and relationships, and interpersonal problem solving) across five conceptual domains: (1) self-control; (2) emotional understanding; (3) positive self-esteem; (4) healthy relationships; and (5) interpersonal problem-solving skills.
- **Changing the learning environment:** Teachers led daily activities for promoting the acquisition and generalization of new knowledge and skills.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** Homework assignments, parent letters, and other informational packets were sent home periodically to facilitate parental involvement and encourage generalization to the home environment.
- **Professional development:** Teachers attended a 2-day training workshop. Teachers received continuing education credit or were paid for their attendance.
- **Implementation support:** Educational consultants provided teachers with biweekly consultations from October until June that were intended to enhance the quality of implementation through modeling, coaching, and provision of ongoing feedback regarding program delivery. Consultants also provided general feedback on classroom and behavior management. Teachers reported weekly to their assigned consultants on the lessons they had presented to assess dosage, while consultants assessed fidelity through monthly ratings of quality of implementation on the basis of direct observation of teacher instruction.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- No additional details were reported.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Interpersonal	Behavior Assessment Scale for Children–2	SS+	Fewer conduct problems	After 2 years of implementation
Interpersonal	Social Problem Solving Measure	SS+	Less aggressive social problem solving	After 2 years of implementation
Interpersonal	Home interview	SS+	Less hostile attribution bias	After 2 years of implementation
Interpersonal	Home interview	SS+	Less use of aggressive interpersonal negotiation strategies	After 2 years of implementation

## Promoting Positive Peer Relationships (P3R)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Large sample, single site
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** School climate and safety
- **School level:** Middle school
- **Setting:** Suburban
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority
- **Purpose:** Alter youth's developmental trajectories toward more-adaptive and healthier outcomes by raising awareness regarding bullying-related issues and promoting prosocial cognitive-behavioral habits.
- **Implementers:** Teachers
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** <http://www.storiesofus.com/>
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

Study period not reported; documented in

- Tyler L. Renshaw and Shane R. Jimerson, “Enhancing Student Attitudes via a Brief, Universal-Level Bullying Prevention Curriculum,” *School Mental Health*, Vol. 4, No. 2, June 2012, pp. 115–128.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This quasi-experimental study had a confound (grade level and provider) with intervention assignment and involved only one site.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 636 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** 24 classrooms
- **Grade level:** 7–8 (middle school)
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 1 school on the south-central coast of California
- **Community type:** Suburban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** 46 percent identified as white, 40 percent as Hispanic or Latino, 6 percent as Asian, 2 percent as African American, and 6 percent as multiple or other ethnicities
- **SES:** 31 percent of students qualified for free/reduced price lunch.

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Teachers (health teachers).
- **How much:** Five lessons (30–50 minutes each) over one to eight weeks.

- **Classroom curriculum:** All P3R lessons follow the same basic pedagogical format, consisting of a few core components: (a) viewing film segments portraying the initiation and development of bullying relationships for one male and one female victim within a middle-school context; (b) facilitating class discussions regarding these film segments—considering the students’ interpersonal relationship dynamics, identifying and working through related emotions, and employing group problem-solving strategies to develop positive behavioral solutions; and (c) providing psychoeducational information before, during, and after class activities to inform students of current school policy and of the supports available to assist them in handling bullying situations in a prosocial manner.
- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** Prior to implementation, the researcher met with the teacher, checked to see whether she was oriented to the correct section of the curriculum that would be administered during the present trimester, and answered any questions regarding procedures or content.
- **Implementation support:** The P3R Teacher’s Guide provided a standardized, semiscripted curriculum that served to structure each lesson implementation. For each lesson, this guide includes a bullet-pointed outline of the lesson’s core objectives, the materials needed to conduct the lesson, and a detailed overview of the various classroom activities to be carried out during the lesson. P3R Implementation Fidelity Checklists (P3R-IFC) assess teachers’ implementation fidelity of P3R and serve as a proxy for intervention feasibility.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- Comparison group participants were enrolled in alternative elective courses, none of which included curriculum related to social, emotional, or behavioral development in youth.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
School climate and safety	Bullying Attitudinal Scale	SS+	Greater prosocial attitudes towards bullying	Post-intervention
School climate and safety	Perceptions of School Bullying Supports Scale	SS+	Greater perceived school bullying supports	Post-intervention

## Quiet Time (QT)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Small sample, single site
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Intrapersonal
- **School level:** High school
- **Setting:** Urban
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority
- **Purpose:** Improve student well-being and academic achievement through quiet activity.
- **Implementers:** Teachers, support staff
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum.
- **Intervention website:** <https://www.davidlynchfoundation.org/schools.html>
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.



## Study 1

A 2012–2013 study documented in

- Staci Wendt, Jerry Hipps, Allan Abrams, Jamie Grant, Laurent Valosek, and Sanford Nidich, “Practicing Transcendental Meditation in High Schools: Relationship to Well-Being and Academic Achievement Among Students,” *Contemporary School Psychology*, Vol. 19, No. 4, December 2015, pp. 312–319.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This quasi-experimental study involved a confound (school) with the intervention, only one site, and fewer than 350 students.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 195 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** 9 (high school)
- **Sex/gender:** 46 percent female, 54 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 36 percent white, 31 percent Asian, 27 percent Hispanic/Latino, 16 percent Filipino, 15 percent African American, 5 percent Pacific Islander
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 2 schools on the West Coast
- **Community type:** Urban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Classroom teachers, Transcendental Meditation instructor.
- **How much:** The personal instruction session was 1 hour, and the three group meetings were 1 hour each.
- **Classroom curriculum:** Students learned a transcendental meditation technique through a seven-step course, which included a recruitment lecture, a preparatory lecture, a brief personal interview with the intervention provider, personal instruction on the

technique (about 1 hour), and three group meetings to provide additional knowledge about the practice and to discuss students' experiences. Treatment students were able to practice the technique during the designated Quiet Time program, which occurred in the mornings and later afternoons during the school week. Treatment students were also encouraged to practice transcendental meditation at home during the weekends.

- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** None reported.
- **Implementation support:** None reported.

**Comparison group:** Attention control.

- Students at the comparison high school were asked during their advisory class to participate in a research study on high school student moods, personalities, and school achievement.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Intrapersonal	The Resilience Scale	SS+	More resilience (emotional capability to cope with stress and adversity)	After 1 year of implementation

## Raising Healthy Children (RHC)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Large sample, sites unclear
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Intrapersonal, interpersonal
- **School level:** Elementary school
- **Setting:** Suburban
- **Sample:** None reported
- **Purpose:** Increase academic success; reduce adolescent antisocial behavior; and reduce chronic mental health problems by influencing developmentally appropriate risk and protective factors in the family, school, peer, and individual domains.
- **Implementers:** Teachers, support staff
- **Key intervention components:** Changing the learning environment, out-of-school time, family/community involvement, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** <http://www.sdr.org/rhcsurvey.asp>
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is included in the 2013 CASEL Guide—Preschool and Elementary School Edition.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

Study period not reported; documented in

- Richard F. Catalano, James J. Mazza, Tracy W. Harrachi, Robert D. Abbott, Kevin P. Haggerty, and Charles B. Fleming, “Raising Healthy Children Through Enhancing Social Development in Elementary School: Results After 1.5 Years,” *Journal of School Psychology*, Vol. 41, No. 2, April 2003, pp. 143–164.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- The number of sites for this randomized controlled trial was unclear, and the authors reported insufficient information to calculate effect sizes for the reported statistically significant analyses.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 938 students (number of sites unclear)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** 1–2 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 47 percent female, 53 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 82 percent white, 7 percent Pacific Island, 4 percent Latino, 3 percent African American, 3 percent Native American, 1 percent other
- **SES:** 38 percent qualified for public assistance and/or free/reduced lunch program.

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 10 schools in the Pacific Northwest
- **Community type:** Suburban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Teachers (classroom teachers), support staff (specialists with experience in providing services to parents and families).
- **How much:** RHC was delivered over 18 months.

- **Classroom curriculum:** None reported.
- **Changing the learning environment:** Teachers employed enhanced classroom management practices.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** Students with academic or behavioral problems were recommended by teachers or parents to attend summer camps and for in-home services.
- **Family/community involvement:** School-home coordinators (classroom teachers or specialists with experience in providing services to parents and families) provided parent training and involvement through various mechanisms, such as five-session parenting group workshops, selected topic workshops, and in-home problem-solving sessions. Topics for parent training included family management skills and helping children succeed in school. In addition, monthly newsletters were sent to reinforce and extend parenting content regarding the RHC intervention.
- **Professional development:** Teachers participated in a series of workshops for instructional improvement in classroom management. Workshops focused on instructional strategies shown to be effective in mainstream classrooms for reducing academic risks and early aggressive behaviors while enhancing protective factors among elementary students. Workshop topics included proactive classroom management, cooperative learning methods, strategies to enhance student motivation, student involvement and participation, reading strategies, and interpersonal and problem-solving skills.
- **Implementation support:** After each workshop, RHC project staff provided classroom coaching for teachers. After the first year of the project, teachers participated in monthly “booster” sessions to further reinforce RHC teaching strategies. Teachers were also provided a substitute for a half-day so they could observe other project teachers using RHC teaching strategies in their classrooms.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- No additional details were reported.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Intrapersonal	Teacher and parent self-reports	SS+	Greater commitment to school	After 18 months of implementation
Interpersonal	Teacher self-report	SS+	Better social competencies	After 18 months of implementation
Interpersonal	Teacher self-report	SS+	Fewer antisocial behaviors	After 18 months of implementation

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Small sample, single site
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Intrapersonal, interpersonal
- **School level:** Middle school
- **Setting:** Urban
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority, low SES
- **Purpose:** Improve school success by promoting self-regulatory abilities and decisionmaking capacities often impaired as a result of stress exposure.
- **Implementers:** Counselors, support staff
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** There is no dedicated website for this intervention.
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

Study period not reported; documented in

- Tamar Mendelson, S. Darius Tandon, Lindsey O'Brennan, Philip J. Leaf, and Nicholas S. Ialongo, "Moving Prevention into Schools: The Impact of a Trauma-Informed School-Based Intervention," *Journal of Adolescence*, Vol. 43, August 2015, pp. 142–147.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This quasi-experimental study did not report sufficient information to assess baseline equivalence and involved only one site and fewer than 350 students.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 49 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** 7–8 (middle school)
- **Sex/gender:** 63 percent female, 37 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 94 percent African American, 6 percent other
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 2 schools in Baltimore
- **Community type:** Urban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Schools served low-income communities.

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Counselors (mental health professionals), support staff (young adult community members from a local employment training program).
- **How much:** 45-minute sessions twice per week over six weeks.

- **Classroom curriculum:** The curriculum involved psychoeducation, emotion-regulation skills training, and social-skills training. Psychoeducation addressed the nature and effects of stress. Emotion-regulation skills were taught via mindfulness strategies, which encourage present-focused awareness through experiential practices, such as observing the breath, and included identifying emotions, responding thoughtfully rather than impulsively, and tolerating distress. Problem solving and communication skills, taught using cognitive behavioral therapy, helped participants make positive decisions and communicate effectively.
- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** Program facilitators received daylong training in how to implement the intervention.
- **Implementation support:** Program facilitators received weekly supervision from the research team.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- Students in the comparison group attended their standard resource-period activities (courses that were not part of the core academic curriculum, such as gym, art, and music).

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Intrapersonal	Social Competence Scale	SS+	Less dysregulation	Post-intervention
Interpersonal	Social Competence Scale	SS+	Better authority acceptance	Post-intervention
Interpersonal	Social Competence Scale	SS+	Better social competence	Post-intervention



## Ready to Learn (RTL)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Small sample, sites unclear
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Intrapersonal, interpersonal
- **School level:** Elementary school
- **Setting:** Suburban
- **Sample:** None reported
- **Purpose:** Increase social and academic performance in young children through prerequisite learning skills, school success, and effective teacher strategies.
- **Implementers:** Teachers
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, changing the learning environment, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** There is no dedicated website for this intervention.
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

Study period not reported; documented in

- Greg A. Brigman and Linda D. Webb, “Ready to Learn: Teaching Kindergarten Students School Success Skills,” *Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 96, No. 5, May 2003, pp. 286–292.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial involved fewer than 350 students, and the number of sites was not reported.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 260 students (sites unclear)
- **Number of classrooms:** 12 classrooms
- **Grade level:** K (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 3 schools in the metropolitan Atlanta area
- **Community type:** Suburban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Student bodies were predominantly white.
- **SES:** Student bodies were predominantly middle class.

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Teachers.
- **How much:** Daily, in class for 12 weeks.
- **Classroom curriculum:** Three key skills taught were (a) attending (paying attention, being on task, and following directions), (b) listening comprehension (understanding the main idea and knowing when and how to ask questions to clarify understanding), and (c) social skills (learning to be encouraging to self, to increase persistence, and to increase ability to work cooperatively).

- **Changing the learning environment:** Five teacher strategies in the RTL curriculum were (a) modeling-coaching-cuing, (b) peer reporting, (c) storytelling, (d) story retelling, and (e) the encouragement council.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** Teacher training in the use of the RTL curriculum totaled 16 hours across three workshops. In the initial full-day session, teachers received an understanding of the conceptual framework of RTL and a research base to support the skills and strategies used in the RTL curriculum. Teachers also received instruction on curriculum delivery and follow-up activities. Two half-day workshops were held in October and November to review skills and strategies.
- **Implementation support:** Teachers used a kit to guide implementation of the RTL curriculum, which contained the following materials: *Fuzzy and the Time of Great Change* storybook (includes five stories), teacher manual, parent newsletters, audio cassettes (one for each of the five stories), and six Fuzzy Caterpillar/Butterfly posters. The teacher manual included lesson plans, descriptions of the five teaching strategies to be used, and follow-up activities that reinforced targeted skills. The two half-day workshops held in October and November also involved discussion of progress and difficulties with implementation of the program.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- No additional details were reported.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Intrapersonal	Stanford Early School Achievement Test	SS+	Better listening comprehension	Post-intervention
Interpersonal	Comprehensive Teacher’s Rating Scale	SS+	Better student behavior	Post-intervention

## Real Lives (RL)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Small sample, sites unclear
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Civic attitudes and behavior
- **School level:** High school
- **Setting:** Urban, suburban
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority
- **Purpose:** Develop global empathy, identification, and interest in learning about other countries by providing students the opportunity to live simulated lives in other countries.
- **Implementers:** Teachers, support staff
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum.
- **Intervention website:** There is no dedicated website for this intervention.
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

Study period not reported; documented in

- Christine M. Bachen, Pedro F. Hernández-Ramos, and Chad Raphael, “Simulating REAL LIVES: Promoting Global Empathy and Interest in Learning Through Simulation Games,” *Simulation & Gaming*, Vol. 43, No. 4, August 2012, pp. 437–460.
- Christine M. Bachen, Pedro F. Hernández-Ramos, Chad Raphael, and Amanda Waldron, “Civic Play and Civic Gaps: Can Life Simulation Games Advance Educational Equity?” *Journal of Information Technology and Politics*, Vol. 12, 2015, pp. 378–395.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial reported insufficient information to assess differential attrition, involved fewer than 350 students, and did not report the number of sites.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 323 students (sites unclear)
- **Number of classrooms:** 12 classrooms
- **Grade level:** 9–10 (high school)
- **Sex/gender:** 77 percent female, 23 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 3 schools in Northern California
- **Community type:** Urban, suburban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** 50–77 percent of the student bodies in the participating schools identified with racial/ethnic minorities
- **SES:** 8–22 percent of students at participant schools were need-based school lunch program

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Teachers, support (researchers).
- **How much:** Three class periods (55 minutes each).

- **Classroom curriculum:** The simulation game allowed students to live the life of a person from a different country that is assigned by the game or chosen by the player. Students vicariously experienced what life could be like for a male or female in another country, including education, employment, marriage, having children, and confronting diseases and natural disasters. On the first day, researcher support staff briefly introduced the simulation game by showing how to create a character in the country selected, how to advance play by aging the character one year at a time, and how to create a practice character from the United States. On the second and third days, students were told to play a male character or a female character, as appropriate, from a list of countries selected by the teacher to correspond with the unit of study, varying the country each day.
- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** None reported.
- **Implementation support:** None reported.

**Comparison group:** “Attention control.”

- Students in comparison groups had to complete a PowerPoint presentation on another country.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Civic attitudes and behaviors	Student self-report	SS+	Greater global (ethnocultural) empathy	Post-intervention
Civic attitudes and behaviors	Student self-report	SS+	Greater interest in other countries	Post-intervention
Civic attitudes and behaviors	Student self-report	SS+	Greater interest in current events	3 weeks post-intervention

## Resolving Conflict Creatively Program (RCCP)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Large sample, multiple sites
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Interpersonal
- **School level:** Elementary school
- **Setting:** Urban
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority, low SES
- **Purpose:** Change the mental processes and interpersonal behavioral strategies that lead children to engage in aggression and violence by teaching constructive conflict-resolution strategies and promoting positive intergroup relations.
- **Implementers:** Teachers, administrators
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, changing the learning environment, applications outside the classroom, family/community involvement, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** <http://www.morningsidecenter.org/resolving-conflict-creatively-program>
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

A 1994–1996 study documented in

- J. Lawrence Aber, Joshua L. Brown, and Stephanie M. Jones, “Developmental Trajectories Toward Violence in Middle Childhood: Course, Demographic Differences, and Response to School-Based Intervention,” *Developmental Psychology*, Vol. 39, No. 2, March 2003, pp. 324–348.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This quasi-experimental study reported insufficient information to assess baseline equivalence of the analytic sample.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 11,160 students (4 sites)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** 1–6 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 48 percent female, 52 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 41 percent Hispanic, 40 percent Black, 14 percent white, 5 percent other
- **SES:** 86 percent were receiving free school lunches

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 15 schools in New York City
- **Community type:** Urban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Classroom teachers, school principals.
- **How much:** The classroom curriculum was delivered over two years. The number of lessons taught over the course of Year 1 ranged from 0 to 80, with children receiving an average of 13 lessons. In Year 2, the number of lessons given ranged from 0 to 115, with children receiving an average of 14 lessons.



- **Classroom curriculum:** Classroom teachers gave lessons on the RCCP elementary school curriculum, which focused on key skills, such as active listening, assertiveness, negotiation, and problem solving. Skills were taught through role playing, interviewing, small group discussion, and brainstorming.
- **Changing the learning environment:** Additional features of the RCCP included peer mediation.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** Additional features of the RCCP included principals' training.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** Additional features of the RCCP included parent training.
- **Professional development:** Teachers received a 25-hour training course to introduce them to the ideas and skills of conflict resolution and to the RCCP curriculum. Topics addressed during training included active listening, assertiveness, affirmation (building self-esteem), anger management, mediation, celebrating differences, and standing up to bias.
- **Implementation support:** Each teacher received ten visits throughout the year by an RCCP staff developer, who coached the teacher in implementing the curriculum in his or her classroom. Coaching consisted of demonstration lessons, coplanning and cofacilitation of lessons, observations, and one-on-one conferences.

**Comparison group:** "Business as usual."

- No additional details were reported.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Interpersonal	Home interview	SS+	Less hostile attribution bias	Over 2 years of implementation
Interpersonal	Home interview	SS+	Less use of aggressive interpersonal negotiation strategies	Over 2 years of implementation
Interpersonal	Social Problem Solving Measure	SS+	Greater use of competent interpersonal negotiation strategies	Over 2 years of implementation
Interpersonal	Seattle Personality Inventory	SS+	Fewer conduct problems	Over 2 years of implementation
Interpersonal	Teacher checklist	SS+	Fewer aggressive behaviors	Over 2 years of implementation
Interpersonal	Social Competence Scale	SS+	More prosocial behaviors	Over 2 years of implementation

## Responding in Peaceful and Positive Ways (RIPP)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 3
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Large sample, multiple sites
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Interpersonal, disciplinary, school climate and safety
- **School level:** Middle school
- **Setting:** Urban, rural
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority, low SES
- **Purpose:** Reduce aggressive behavior and violence by providing students with conflict-resolution strategies and skills.
- **Implementers:** Support staff
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** There is no dedicated website for this intervention.
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is included in the *2015 CASEL Guide—Middle and High School Edition*.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

A 1997–1998 study documented in

- Albert D. Farrell, Aleta L. Meyer, Terri N. Sullivan, and Eva M. Kung, “Evaluation of the Responding in Peaceful and Positive Ways (RIPP) Seventh Grade Violence Prevention Curriculum,” *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, Vol. 12, No. 1, March 2003, pp. 101–120.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial reported insufficient information to assess attrition and baseline equivalence of the analytic sample and involved only one site.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 476 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** 21 classrooms
- **Grade level:** 7 (middle school)
- **Sex/gender:** 51 percent female, 49 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 97 percent African American, 3 percent other
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 2 schools located in Richmond, Virginia
- **Community type:** Urban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** The overall population in the area was 58 percent African American.
- **SES:** 44 percent of youth in the area lived in poverty

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Trained prevention specialists.
- **How much:** 12 weekly sessions.
- **Classroom curriculum:** The curriculum focused on skills represented by the acronym RSLV: **R**espect others (Listen to what they have to say), **S**peak clearly (How else can they understand what you mean?), **L**isten to yourself (What you want is important), and

Value the friendship (Isn't that what life is all about?). The curriculum involved use of experiential activities to demonstrate concepts.

- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** None reported.
- **Implementation support:** A manual and implementation fidelity checklists were used to facilitate the consistency of implementation.

**Comparison group:** "Business as usual."

- No additional details were reported.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Discipline	School data on violations of disciplinary code	SS+	Fewer disciplinary code violations related to violence	12 months post-intervention

## Study 2

Study period not reported; documented in

- Albert D. Farrell, Robert F. Valois, and Aleta L. Meyer, “Evaluation of the RIPP-6 Violence Prevention Program at a Rural Middle School,” *American Journal of Health Education*, Vol. 33, No. 3, June 2002, pp. 167–172.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This quasi-experimental study reported insufficient information to assess baseline equivalence of the analytic sample and involved only one site and fewer than 350 students.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 204 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** 6 (middle school)
- **Sex/gender:** 45 percent female, 55 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 61 percent white, 24 percent Hispanic/Latino, 7 percent African American
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 1 school in Florida
- **Community type:** Rural
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** “Ethnically diverse population”
- **SES:** “A high percentage of students from low-income migrant worker families”

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Trained prevention specialists.
- **How much:** The classroom curriculum was delivered twice a week throughout the second semester.
- **Classroom curriculum:** The curriculum involved experiential and didactic activities to instruct students in the use of a social-cognitive problem-solving model and specific skills for violence prevention.
- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.

- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** None reported.
- **Implementation support:** A manual was used to facilitate the consistency of implementation.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- No additional details were reported.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Interpersonal	Problem Behavior Frequency Scale	SS+	Less physical aggression	Post-intervention
School climate and safety	Peer Support for Nonviolence Scale	SS+	Greater peer support for prosocial behavior	Post-intervention
School climate and safety	Peer Provocation Scale	SS+	Less victimization and harassment	Post-intervention

### Study 3

A 1998–2000 study documented in

- Albert D. Farrell, Robert F. Valois, Aleta L. Meyer, and Ritchie P. Tidwell, “Impact of the RIPP Violence Prevention Program on Rural Middle School Students,” *Journal of Primary Prevention*, Vol. 24, No. 2, December 2003, pp. 143–167.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This quasi-experimental study reported insufficient information to assess baseline equivalence of the analytic sample.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 1,487 students (5 sites)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** 6–7 (middle school)
- **Sex/gender:** 50 percent female, 50 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 65 percent white, 22 percent Hispanic/Latino, 11 percent African American
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 8 schools in Heartland Consortium, Florida
- **Community type:** Rural
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** “Ethnically diverse student population”
- **SES:** Average of 66 percent of students were eligible for free/reduced-price lunch

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Trained prevention specialists.
- **How much:** The classroom curriculum was implemented over two academic years. The 6th grade curriculum involved 25 weekly sessions throughout the academic year, and the 7th grade curriculum involved 12 weekly sessions at the beginning of the academic year.
- **Classroom curriculum:** Students were instructed in the use of a social-cognitive problem-solving model and specific skills for violence prevention through experiential and didactic activities. The 6th grade curriculum focused on violence prevention

broadly, and the 7th grade curriculum focused on using conflict resolution skills in friendships.

- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** Providers received training following the guidelines detailed in the operations manual for RIPP and conducted by the program developer. Facilitators received four days of training for the 6th grade curriculum, two days of training for 7th grade curriculum, and five days of more-general training focused on facilitation skills, classroom management, experiential education, and nonviolence.
- **Implementation support:** A manual was used to facilitate the consistency of implementation. On-site supervision was provided by the project director and consisted of monthly individual supervisory observations and meetings and monthly group supervision meetings.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- No additional details were reported.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Interpersonal	Approval of Nonviolence Scale	SS+	Higher approval of nonviolent behavior	Immediately and 5 months post-intervention
Interpersonal	Approval of Violence Scale	SS+	Lower approval of violent behavior	Post-intervention
Interpersonal	Problem Situation Inventory	SS+	Greater use of nonviolent approaches to solving problems	5 months post-intervention
Interpersonal	Problem Behavior Frequency Scales	SS+	Fewer aggressive behaviors	5 months post-intervention
Interpersonal	Problem Behavior Frequency Scales	SS+	Fewer delinquent behaviors	Post-intervention
School climate and safety	Peer Provocation Scale from the Interpersonal Problem Situation Inventory for Urban Adolescents	SS+	Lower frequencies of peer provocations	Post-intervention



## Responsive Classroom (RC)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 2
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Large sample, multiple sites
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Interpersonal, academic achievement
- **School level:** Elementary school
- **Setting:** Urban
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority
- **Purpose:** Emphasize the teachers' central role in producing high-quality classroom environments and children's academic success.
- **Implementers:** Teachers, administrators
- **Key intervention components:** Changing the learning environment, applications outside the classroom, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** <https://www.responsiveclassroom.org/>
- **WWC:** Study 2 does not meet WWC standards (<https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Study/78774>).
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is included in the 2013 CASEL Guide—Preschool and Elementary School Edition.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

Study period not reported; documented in

- Sara E. Rimm-Kaufman, Xitao Fan, Yu-Jen Chiu, and Wenyi You, “The Contribution of the Responsive Classroom Approach on Children’s Academic Achievement: Results from a Three Year Longitudinal Study,” *Journal of School Psychology*, Vol. 45, No. 4, August 2007, pp. 401–421.
- Sara E. Rimm-Kaufman and Yu-Jen I. Chiu, “Promoting Social and Academic Competence in the Classroom: An Intervention Study Examining the Contribution of the Responsive Classroom Approach,” *Psychology in the Schools*, Vol. 44, No. 4, April 2007, pp. 397–413.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This quasi-experimental study reported insufficient information to assess baseline equivalence of the analytic sample and involved only one site.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 2,790 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** 2–4 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 50 percent female, 50 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 53 percent white, 22 percent African American, 21 percent Hispanic, 5 percent Asian
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 6 schools located in the northeastern United States
- **Community type:** Urban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** 54 percent of students were racial/ethnic minorities
- **SES:** 35 percent of students were eligible for free/reduced-price lunch

### Intervention summary:

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Teachers.
- **How much:** The practices to change the learning environment were implemented throughout the academic year for three academic years.
- **Classroom curriculum:** None reported.
- **Changing the learning environment:** The RC approach involved integrating social and academic learning and creating classroom environments that were productive and focused on learning. RC had seven essential principles to guide teachers' thinking and action: (1) equal emphasis on the social and academic curriculums; (2) focus on how children learn as much as on what they learn; (3) the view that social interaction facilitates cognitive growth; (4) emphasis on cooperation, assertion, responsibility, empathy, and self-control as critical social skills for children to learn; (5) focus on knowing the children individually, culturally, and developmentally; (6) emphasis on knowing the families of children; and (7) viewing the working relationships among adults at the schools as critically important. Specific RC practices included (1) Morning Meeting, a daily meeting to create a sense of classroom community, with time for sharing, games, and playful intellectual activity; (2) Rules and Logical Consequences, which established rules to prevent problems, with consequences for problem behaviors that followed logically from misdeeds, were developmentally and individually relevant to the child, and relied on a trusting and positive relationship between the teacher and the child for their effectiveness; and (3) a shift in teacher language, in which teachers learned to comment descriptively on children's effort and learning processes, not only products, as well as use encouragement rather than praise.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** Teachers were trained in the RC approach. The basic RC training (RC 1) occurred during a week during the summer months and included an introduction to the philosophy and basic practices of the RC approach. Teachers observed, practiced, and/or discussed key components of the RC approach. The advanced RC training occurred on five individual days across the school year and provided more depth about the philosophy and practices of the RC approach.
- **Implementation support:** Training was reinforced with consultation opportunities, in which trainers visited teachers' classrooms two to four times per year for observation and consultation. The Classroom Practices Measure assessed teachers' implementation of the RC approach.

### Comparison group: "Business as usual."

- No additional details were reported.

### *Positive Results*

<b>Domain</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Result</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>	<b>Timing</b>
Interpersonal	Social Skills Rating Scale	SS+	Greater assertion	After 1 year of implementation
Interpersonal	Social Competence and Adjustment Scale	SS+	More prosocial behavior with peers	After 1 year of implementation
Academic achievement	Degrees of Reading Power	SS+	Better performance in reading	1 year post-implementation
Academic achievement	CMT-Math	SS+	Better performance in mathematics	1 year post-implementation

## Study 2

A 2008–2010 study documented in

- Sara E. Rimm-Kaufman, Ross A. A. Larsen, Alison E. Baroody, Timothy W. Curby, Michelle Ko, Julia B. Thomas, Eileen G. Merritt, Tashia Abry, and Jamie DeCoster, “Efficacy of the *Responsive Classroom* Approach: Results from a 3-Year, Longitudinal Randomized Controlled Trial,” *American Educational Research Journal*, Vol. 51, No. 3, June 2014, pp. 567–603.
- Tashia Abry, Sara E. Rimm-Kaufman, Ross A. Larsen, and Alexis J. Brewer, “The Influence of Fidelity of Implementation on Teacher–Student Interaction Quality in the Context of a Randomized Controlled Trial of the Responsive Classroom Approach,” *Journal of School Psychology*, Vol. 51, No. 4, August 2013, pp. 437–453.
- Tashia Abry, Chris A. Hulleman, and Sara E. Rimm-Kaufman, “Using Indices of Fidelity to Intervention Core Components to Identify Program Active Ingredients,” *American Journal of Evaluation*, Vol. 36, No. 3, September 2015, pp. 320–338.
- Erin R. Ottmar, Sara E. Rimm-Kaufman, Ross A. Larsen, and Robert Q. Berry, “Mathematical Knowledge for Teaching, Standards-Based Mathematics Teaching Practices, and Student Achievement in the Context of the *Responsive Classroom Approach*,” *American Educational Research Journal*, Vol. 52, No. 4, 2015, pp. 787–821.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial officially does not meet WWC standards.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 2,904 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** 239 classrooms
- **Grade level:** 3–5 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 49 percent female, 51 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 41 percent white, 24 percent Asian American, 19 percent Hispanic American, 11 percent African American, 5 percent other
- **SES:** 32 percent free/reduced-price lunch

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 24 schools in the Mid-Atlantic region
- **Community type:** Not reported
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported

- **Total enrollment at schools:** Ranged of 289 to 986
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Average of 55 percent of students identifying with racial/ethnic minority groups
- **SES:** Average of 26 percent of students eligible for free/reduced-price lunch

#### **Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Classrooms teachers and school administrators.
- **How much:** The practices to change the learning environment were implemented throughout the academic year for three academic years.
- **Classroom curriculum:** None reported.
- **Changing the learning environment:** The RC approach involved integrating social and academic learning and creating classroom environments that were productive and focused on learning. RC had seven essential principles to guide teachers' thinking and action: (1) equal emphasis on the social and academic curriculums; (2) focus on how children learn as much as on what they learn; (3) the view that social interaction facilitates cognitive growth; (4) emphasis on cooperation, assertion, responsibility, empathy, and self-control as critical social skills for children to learn; (5) focus on knowing the children individually, culturally, and developmentally; (6) emphasis on knowing the families of children; and (7) viewing the working relationships among adults at the schools as critically important. Specific RC practices included (1) Morning Meeting, a daily meeting to create a sense of classroom community, with time for sharing, games, and playful intellectual activity; (2) Rules and Logical Consequences, which established rules to prevent problems, with consequences for problem behaviors that followed logically from misdeeds, were developmentally and individually relevant to the child, and relied on a trusting and positive relationship between the teacher and the child for their effectiveness; and (3) a shift in teacher language, in which teachers learned to comment descriptively on children's effort and learning processes, not only products, as well as use encouragement rather than praise.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** Each school received a full set of RC books for its library.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** Training involved two one-week workshops, each lasting 35 hours, delivered in two consecutive summers. School administrators received training and three sessions per year of administrator coaching led by NEFC consultants.

- **Implementation support:** Teachers received three days of school-based coaching and opportunities to engage in three RC workshops during each school year subsequent to training. Further, each teacher received RC manuals, two additional RC books, on-demand support (in person and via email) from coaches, and articles on the RC website. School administrators received three sessions per year of administrator coaching and met with consultants for a planning meeting in fall and spring. Classroom observations and teacher questionnaires to measure fidelity were conducted.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- No additional details were reported.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Academic achievement	Virginia Standard of Learning	SS+	Better performance in reading	Post-intervention
Academic achievement	Virginia Standard of Learning	SS+	Better performance in mathematics	Post-intervention

## RULER

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Small sample, sites unclear
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Intrapersonal, interpersonal
- **School level:** Elementary school
- **Setting:** Not reported
- **Sample:** None reported
- **Purpose:** Foster social, emotional, and academic competence by teaching children how to recognize emotions in themselves and in other people, understand the causes and consequences of a wide range of emotions, label emotions using a sophisticated vocabulary, express emotions in socially appropriate ways, and regulate emotions effectively.
- **Implementers:** Teachers
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** <http://ei.yale.edu/ruler/ruler-overview/>
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is included in the 2013 CASEL Guide—Preschool and Elementary School Edition.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.



## Study 1

Study period not reported; documented in

- Marc A. Brackett, Susan E. Rivers, Maria R. Reyes, and Peter Salovey, “Enhancing Academic Performance and Social and Emotional Competence with the RULER Feeling Words Curriculum,” *Learning & Individual Differences*, Vol. 22, No. 2, April 2012, pp. 218–224.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial involved confound (school) with intervention assignment and fewer than 350 students, with the number of sites unclear.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 273 students (sites unclear)
- **Number of classrooms:** 15 classrooms
- **Grade level:** 5–6 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 55 percent female, 45 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 3 schools in Long Island, New York
- **Community type:** Not reported
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** 59 percent white, 22 percent Hispanic, 10 percent Asian, 8 percent African American, and 1 percent unidentified
- **SES:** 7 percent of students were eligible for free lunches.

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Teachers.
- **How much:** The classroom curriculum was delivered for seven months and involved an average of 72 lessons.

- **Classroom curriculum:** The RULER curriculum had six steps: Teacher introduced the feeling word using a personalized connection (Step 1); students interpreted an abstract design using the feeling word (Step 2); students connected the feeling word to academic material or current events (Step 3); students discussed the feeling word with family members and wrote a short paragraph about the conversation (Step 4); the class discussed the feeling word and its relationship to the family discussions, academic material, or current events (Step 5); and, finally, students wrote a short essay using the feeling word (Step 6).
- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** Teachers participated in a 3-hour overview of emotional literacy. Teachers in classrooms assigned to use RULER also participated in a highly interactive training that lasted one-and-a-half days (approximately 9 hours). During the training, teachers observed sample lessons from the instructors and worked in small groups to practice the lessons. Each teacher then prepared an individual lesson to present to the training class. The trainers and teachers observed the lessons and offered feedback and suggestions for best practices.
- **Implementation support:** The trainers assisted the teachers in mapping out the integration of RULER across the academic year. Teachers in the RULER training also received a detailed, easy-to-follow teaching manual. The manual provided teaching plans and student worksheets for each lesson.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- Wait-list control group.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Intrapersonal	Behavioral Assessment System for Children	SS+	Fewer school problems (e.g., attention problems, learning problems)	After 7 months of implementation
Interpersonal	Behavioral Assessment System for Children	SS+	Better social adaptability (e.g., social skills, leadership, and study skills)	After 7 months of implementation

## School/Community Intervention (SCI)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Large sample, sites unclear
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Interpersonal, disciplinary
- **School level:** Middle school
- **Setting:** Urban
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority, low SES
- **Purpose:** Enhance growth of sense of self and cultural pride and the strength of family and community ties through a culturally tailored intervention targeting risk behaviors of violence, provoking behavior, substance use, school delinquency, and sexual practices.
- **Implementers:** Counselors
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, applications outside the classroom, family/community involvement, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** <http://www.advocatesforyouth.org/publications/publications-a-z/2112-aban-aya-youth-project>
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

A 1994–1998 study documented in

- Brian R. Flay, Sally Graumlich, Eisuke Segawa, James L. Burns, and Michelle Y. Holliday, “Effects of 2 Prevention Programs on High-Risk Behaviors Among African American Youth: A Randomized Trial,” *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine*, Vol. 158, No. 4, April 2004, pp. 377–384.

### **Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled included joiners, did not provide sufficient information to assess baseline equivalence of the analytic sample, and did not report the number of sites.

### **Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 1,153 students (sites unclear)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** 5–8 (middle school)
- **Sex/gender:** 50 percent female, 50 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** 77 percent received federally subsidized school lunches

### **Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 12 schools from metropolitan Chicago
- **Community type:** Participating schools were located in urban communities (nine schools were inner-city and three were near-suburban).
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** K–6 and K–8
- **Total enrollment at schools:** At least 500 students
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** 91 percent African American
- **SES:** Authors described schools as low SES.

### **Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Counselors (university-based health educators).
- **How much:** The classroom component consisted of 16 to 21 lessons per year, usually in social studies classes.
- **Classroom curriculum:** The classroom component of SCI was designed to teach cognitive-behavioral skills to build self-esteem and empathy; manage stress and anxiety; develop interpersonal relationships; resist peer pressure; and develop decisionmaking, problem-solving, conflict-resolution, and goal-setting skills. It was structured to teach application of these skills to avoid violence, provocative behavior, school delinquency, drug use, and unsafe sexual behaviors.
- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** The school staff and schoolwide youth support programs integrated skills into the school environment.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** The parent support program reinforced skills and promoted child-parent communication. The community program forged linkages among parents, schools, and local businesses. Each SCI school formed a local school task force consisting of school personnel, students, parents, community advocates, and project staff to implement the program components, propose changes in school policy, develop other school-community liaisons supportive of school-based efforts, and solicit community organizations to conduct activities to support the SCI efforts. A goal of these linkages was to “rebuild the village” and give all stakeholders a sense of ownership to promote sustainability of these efforts on completion of the project.
- **Professional development:** Two training sessions were held before each lesson, during which the health educators role-played each activity, and senior staff provided feedback. In addition, each year, the regular classroom teachers participated in a 4-hour workshop that provided an overview of program philosophy and curriculum content and that clarified support roles.
- **Implementation support:** Weekly debriefings were held to discuss issues that may have affected implementation. Senior staff also conducted observations to ensure fidelity and help target training needs.

### **Comparison group:** “Attention control.”

- Attention-placebo health enhancement curriculum targeting health-enhancing behaviors (nutrition, exercise, and health care) that was of length and intensity equal to the classroom component of SCI.

### *Positive Results*

<b>Domain</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Result</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>	<b>Timing</b>
Interpersonal	Student self-report	SS+	Less violent behavior	Over 4 years of implementation
Interpersonal	Student self-report	SS+	Less provoking behavior	Over 4 years of implementation
Disciplinary outcomes	Student self-report	SS+	Less school delinquency	Over 4 years of implementation

## School-to-Jobs (STJ)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Small sample, single site
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Intrapersonal, academic achievement, academic attainment
- **School level:** Middle school
- **Setting:** Urban
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority, low SES
- **Purpose:** Evoke positive selves (PSs) in students and strategies to attain them, forge links between PSs and strategies that are not otherwise automatic, inoculate students from misinterpreting failure and setbacks in attaining these PSs, and create a link between social identity and PSs.
- **Implementers:** Support staff
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, family/community involvement, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** There is no dedicated website for this intervention.
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

Study period not reported; documented in

- Daphna Oyserman, Deborah Bybee, and Kathy Terry, “Possible Selves and Academic Outcomes: How and When Possible Selves Impel Action,” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 91, No. 1, July 2006, pp. 188–204.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial involved only one site and fewer than 350 students. The authors reported insufficient information to calculate eligible effect sizes.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 264 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** 8 (middle school)
- **Sex/gender:** 53 percent female, 47 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 72 percent African American, 17 percent Latino, 11 percent white
- **SES:** 66 percent of students received free/reduced-price lunch.

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 3 schools in Detroit
- **Community type:** Urban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** STJ providers with previous experience.
- **How much:** STJ was provided twice weekly over a seven-week period in the first quarter of 8th grade (due to elective periods missed for school half days), with the two supplemental parent-youth STJ sessions provided the following evenings or weekend. Groups averaged 12 participants.



- **Classroom curriculum:** STJ involved several sessions. Session 1 focused on making academic possible selves (APSs) salient and relevant. Session 2 focused on adult PSs. In Session 3, students drew role models and negative forces— people or things that provide energy to work toward PSs and those that are draining or nay-saying. In Session 4, students drew time lines into the future, including forks in the road and obstacles. Session 5 introduced action goals, allowing students to practice articulating specific strategies to attain their APSs. Sessions 6 and 7 focused on PSs and strategies to attain them, building on previous sessions. Sessions 8 to 10 focused on decoupling difficulty and genuineness explicitly through work in smaller groups on everyday problems, social problems, academic problems, and the process of getting to high school graduation. Session 11 cemented the new metacognitive interpretations by having participants review and critique the sessions.
- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** Two follow-up sessions included parents or guardians and community members, with the goal of helping youth broker their APSs in the community outside school in ways that link APSs with social identities.
- **Professional development:** STJ providers received intensive structured training in the protocol (39.5 hours total).
- **Implementation support:** STJ providers received an intervention manual and included a detailed fidelity assessment protocol.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- Regular elective period.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Intrapersonal	Student self-report	SS+	Better academic mindsets (on-track, balanced, plausibility)	Post-intervention
Intrapersonal	Teacher self-report	SS+	More in-class initiative-taking behaviors	Post-intervention
Academic achievement	Essential Skills Attainment Test	SS+	Higher proportion of standardized tests passed	Post-intervention
Academic attainment	Student self-report and administrative data	SS+	Fewer absences	Post-intervention

## Second Step (SS)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 4
- **Highest tier:** Tier I
- **Size of evidence:** Large sample, multiple sites
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Intrapersonal, interpersonal, academic attainment
- **School level:** Elementary and middle school
- **Setting:** Urban, suburban, and rural
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority, low SES
- **Purpose:** Strengthen students' ability to learn, have empathy, manage emotions, and solve problems through a skills-focused curriculum.
- **Implementers:** Teachers
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** <http://www.secondstep.org/>
- **WWC:** Study 3 does not meet WWC standards (<https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/EvidenceSnapshot/623>).
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is included in the 2013 CASEL Guide—Preschool and Elementary School Edition.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

A 2012–2013 study documented in

- Sabrina Low, Clayton R. Cook, Keith Smolkowski, and Jodie Buntain-Ricklefs, “Promoting Social-Emotional Competence: An Evaluation of the Elementary Version of Second Step<sup>®</sup>,” *Journal of School Psychology*, Vol. 53, No. 6, December 2015, pp. 463–477.

**Evidence tier:** Tier I (Strong)

- This randomized controlled trial has low attrition.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 7,300 students (6 sites)
- **Number of classrooms:** 321 classrooms
- **Grade level:** K–2 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** 57 percent racial/ethnic minority
- **SES:** 64 percent received free/reduced-price lunch

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 61 schools located in Arizona and Washington state
- **Community type:** Urban and rural
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** “Ethnically diverse schools”
- **SES:** Not reported

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Teachers.
- **How much:** Total of 22 weekly lessons (25–40 minutes each) implemented during normal classroom activities.
- **Classroom curriculum:** Lessons were organized across four units: (a) Skills for Learning, (b) Empathy, (c) Emotion Management, and (d) Problem Solving. These four units covered a range of skills and behaviors, such as being respectful learners, planning to learn, identifying others’ feelings, showing compassion, making friends, and managing disappointment.

Program materials included scripted, teacher-friendly lesson cards; posters that outlined learned skills; videos that illustrated particular skills; brain-builder games designed to increase retention and use of skills.

- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** Teachers received a four-hour training in the SS curriculum and proactive classroom management.
- **Implementation support:** To support the integrity of implementation, monthly tips and reminders were developed and disseminated to teachers. Teachers were asked to complete weekly self-report ratings of implementation (via computer survey on Datstat) to record adherence to the curriculum, engagement, and dosage.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- Wait-list control.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Intrapersonal	Strengths Difficulties Questionnaire	SS+	Less inattentiveness from hyperactivity	Post-intervention
Intrapersonal	Devereux Student Strengths Assessment	SS+	Better skills for learning	Post-intervention
Interpersonal	Strengths Difficulties Questionnaire	SS+	Fewer conduct problems	Post-intervention

## Study 2

A 2000–2003 study documented in

- William P. Neace, and Marco A. Munoz, “Pushing the Boundaries of Education: Evaluating the “Impact of Second Step<sup>®</sup>—A Violence Prevention Curriculum” with Psychosocial and Non-Cognitive Measures,” *Child & Youth Services*, Vol. 33, No. 1, January 2012, pp. 46–69.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This quasi-experimental study reported insufficient information to assess baseline equivalence of the analytic sample and involved only one site.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 4,265 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** 1 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 48 percent female, 52 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 54 percent racial/ethnic minority
- **SES:** 53 percent low SES

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 12 schools
- **Community type:** Urban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Teachers.
- **How much:** The classroom curriculum was implemented for two academic years.
- **Classroom curriculum:** Lessons were organized across four units: (a) Skills for Learning, (b) Empathy, (c) Emotion Management, and (d) Problem Solving. These four units covered a range of skills and behaviors, such as being respectful

learners, planning to learn, identifying others' feelings, showing compassion, making friends, and managing disappointment. Program materials included scripted, teacher-friendly lesson cards; posters that outlined learned skills; videos that illustrated particular skills; brain-builder games designed to increase retention and use of skills.

- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** Teachers were trained extensively in administering the program by qualified trainers.
- **Implementation support:** Coverage, dosage, and fidelity were assessed to record implementation.

**Comparison group:** "Business as usual."

- No additional details were reported.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Academic attainment	Administrative data	SS+	Fewer unexcused absences	After 5 months of implementation

### Study 3

Study period not reported; documented in

- Karin S. Frey, Susan Bobbitt Nolen, Leihua Van Schoiack Edstrom, and Miriam K. Hirschstein, “Effects of a School-Based Social-Emotional Competence Program: Linking Children’s Goals, Attributions, and Behavior,” *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, Vol. 26, No. 2, April 2005, pp. 171–200.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial officially does not meet WWC standards.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 1,253 students (5 sites)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** 2–5 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 48 percent female, 52 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 15 schools from three cities in western Washington
- **Community type:** Urban and suburban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** K–5 and K–6
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** 52–89 percent white
- **SES:** 20–75 percent of students received free/reduced-price lunch.

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Teachers.
- **How much:** The classroom curriculum involved one or two weekly sessions (25–40 minutes each) for two academic years.
- **Classroom curriculum:** Lessons were organized across four units: (a) Skills for Learning, (b) Empathy, (c) Emotion Management, and (d) Problem Solving. These four units covered a range of skills and behaviors, such as being respectful learners, planning to learn, identifying others’ feelings, showing compassion, making friends, and managing disappointment.

Program materials included scripted, teacher-friendly lesson cards; posters that outlined learned skills; videos that illustrated particular skills; brain-builder games designed to increase retention and use of skills.

- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** Teachers participated in an initial two-day training to introduce them to program content, practice teaching lessons, and exchange ideas regarding modeling and support of skills throughout the school day.
- **Implementation support:** Program consultants met with teachers twice monthly to discuss and document program implementation.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- Comparison schools received program materials, teacher training, and substitute teachers during training for classrooms that were not in the study.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Interpersonal	School Social Behavior Scale	SS+	Less antisocial behaviors	Over 2 years of implementation
Interpersonal	School Social Behavior Scale	SS+	More socially competent behaviors	Over 2 years of implementation



## Study 4

A 2010–2013 study documented in

- Dorothy L. Espelage, Sabrina Low, Joshua R. Polanin, and Eric C. Brown, “The Impact of a Middle School Program to Reduce Aggression, Victimization, and Sexual Violence,” *Journal of Adolescent Health*, Vol. 53, No. 2, August 2013, pp. 180–186.
- Dorothy L. Espelage, Sabrina Low, Joshua R. Polanin, and Eric C. Brown, “Clinical Trial of Second Step<sup>®</sup> Middle-School Program: Impact on Aggression & Victimization,” *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, Vol. 37, No. 1, 2015, pp. 52-63.
- Dorothy L. Espelage, Sabrina Low, Mark J. Van Ryzin, and Joshua R. Polanin, “Clinical Trial of Second Step Middle School Program: Impact on Bullying, Cyberbullying, Homophobic Teasing, and Sexual Harassment Perpetration,” *School Psychology Review*, Vol. 44, No. 4, 2015, pp. 464-479.
- Joshua R. Polanin and Dorothy L. Espelage, “Using a Meta-Analytic Technique to Assess the Relationship Between Treatment Intensity and Program Effects in a Cluster-Randomized Trial,” *Journal of Behavioral Education*, Vol. 24, No. 1, March 2015, pp. 133–151.

**Evidence tier:** Tier I (Strong)

- This randomized controlled trial had low attrition.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 4,040 students (at least 2 sites)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** 6–8 (middle school)
- **Sex/gender:** 48 percent female, 52 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 78 percent racial/ethnic minority
- **SES:** 74 percent eligible for free/reduced-price lunch

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 36 schools across both Illinois and Kansas
- **Community type:** Not reported
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported

- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Teachers.
- **How much:** The classroom curriculum involved 15 lessons at 6th grade and 13 lessons each at 7th and 8th grade. The lessons were delivered in one 50-minute or two 25-minute classroom sessions, taught weekly or semiweekly throughout the school year.
- **Classroom curriculum:** The curriculum included content related to bullying, problem-solving skills, emotion management, and empathy. Lessons were highly interactive, incorporating small-group discussions and activities, dyadic exercises, whole-class instruction, and individual work. Lessons were structured and supported through an accompanying DVD that contained rich media content, including topic-focused interviews with students and video demonstrations of skills.
- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** Teachers received a 4-hour training before implementation that covered program curriculum, its delivery, and an introduction to child developmental stages related to the skills taught.
- **Implementation support:** Teachers completed online implementation logs after completing each lesson, which assessed the teacher's perceptions of student engagement and what components of the lesson they completed.

**Comparison group:** "Business as usual."

- Comparison schools were provided one copy of an alternative bullying program, although only one school adopted this program and for only one year of the project.

*Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Interpersonal	University of Illinois Fighting Scale	SS+	Less physical aggression	After 1 year of implementation

## Skills for Growing (SFG)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Large sample, single site
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Interpersonal, disciplinary, school climate and safety
- **School level:** Elementary school
- **Setting:** Urban
- **Sample:** Low SES
- **Purpose:** Help elementary-age children increase a broad range of social and emotional skills, such as self-management, social awareness, interpersonal relationships, and social problem-solving skills, and promote a safe and supportive school climate.
- **Implementers:** Teachers, counselors, administrators
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, applications outside the classroom, out-of-school time, family/community involvement, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** <https://www.lions-quest.org/elementary-social-and-emotional-learning/>
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

A 2012–2015 study documented in

- Yael Kidron, Mark Garibaldi, Emily Anderson, and David Osher, *Lions Quest Skills for Growing: Implementation and Outcome Study in Wood County, West Virginia*, final report, Oak Brook, Ill.: American Institutes for Research, 2015.

### **Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- The statistically significant results reported in this quasi-experimental study did not include a cluster correction, and the study involved only one site.

### **Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 474 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** 3–5 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 53 percent female, 47 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

### **Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 19 schools in Wood County Schools (Parkersburg area and its nearby towns in west-central West Virginia)
- **Community type:** Urban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** 68–91 percent of students were white.
- **SES:** 68–93 percent of students were from economically disadvantaged families.

### **Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Teachers, guidance counselors, school principals.
- **How much:** The program comprised 31–34 lessons organized into five units. The majority of schools selected an implementation schedule of 33 weeks per school year (one session per week). Some core lessons required two class periods,

but most were taught in 25–30 minutes.

- **Classroom curriculum:** SFG involved explicit, hands-on, sequenced, and age-appropriate SEL lesson plans for classroom instruction. Each lesson was divided into four phases of learning: discovering (explicit instruction defining the concepts addressed during the lesson), connecting (individual work applying the concepts of the lesson), practicing (students role-playing using the learned skills), and applying (students applying skills to a new situation). Each lesson plan came with clearly articulated learning objectives, detailed instructions, and student materials. Lessons were organized into five units: Building a School Community, Growing as a Group, Making Positive Decisions, Growing up Drug-Free, and Celebrating You and Me.
- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** In addition to classroom instruction, SFG included resources for schoolwide processes.
- **Out-of-school time:** In addition to classroom instruction, SFG included resources for service learning.
- **Family/community involvement:** In addition to classroom instruction, SFG included resources for collaboration with families and the larger community.
- **Professional development:** Introductory teacher training lasted one to two days and focused on the sequence and scope of the program, classroom management techniques, and planning for implementation. Additionally, the program encouraged schools to train administrators and community members so that these partners were also involved in the development of students' social and emotional skills.
- **Implementation support:** Throughout the school year, teachers could also participate in refresher training and workshops on strategies for effective implementation. SFG included detailed lesson plans for teachers and resources for the school leadership team and educators who wished to involve parents as partners. SFG featured a broad set of materials, including detailed lesson plans for teachers, *Together Times* student magazine, resources for expanded learning (e.g., bullying prevention, service learning), and resources for the school leadership team and for educators who wished to involve parents as partners.

**Comparison group:** “Active comparator.”

- This group included eight schools that planned to implement Lions Quest, were invited to participate in all Lions Quest training events, and received all curriculum materials, yet failed to implement Lions Quest (used less than 20 percent of the Lions Quest lesson plans).

### *Positive Results*

<b>Domain</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Result</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>	<b>Timing</b>
Interpersonal	Social Competence Survey	SS+	Better relationship skills	After 2 years of implementation
Disciplinary outcomes	School records	SS+	Fewer instances of minimally disruptive behavior	After 2 and 3 years of implementation
School climate and safety	Conditions for Learning Survey	SS+	Higher perceptions of school as safe and respectful climate	After 2 years of implementation

## Social Aggression Prevention Program (SAPP)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Small sample, single site
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Interpersonal
- **School level:** Elementary school
- **Setting:** Urban
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority
- **Purpose:** Decrease girls' perpetration of social aggression and increase their prosocial, behavior and social problem-solving skills.
- **Implementers:** Counselors
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** There is no dedicated website for this intervention.
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

A 2001–2002 study documented in

- E. Cappella and R. Weinstein, “The Prevention of Social Aggression Among Girls,” *Social Development*, Vol. 15, No. 3, August 2006, pp. 434–462.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial involved only one site and fewer than 350 students.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 134 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** 4–6 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 100 percent female
- **Race/ethnicity:** 26 percent white, 25 percent African American, 24 percent Latino, 19 percent Asian American, 6 percent other
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 6 schools in Northern California
- **Community type:** Urban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Average of 476 students
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** The schools were located in an “ethnically diverse school district.”
- **SES:** 37 percent of students were eligible for free/reduced-price lunch.

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Counselors (female graduate students in clinical psychology and women with experience in counseling elementary-age children).
- **How much:** Each small group consisted of four to seven girls and one group leader. The groups met weekly for ten weeks in 40-minute sessions during school hours outside the classroom.



- **Classroom curriculum:** Key components included (1) universal involvement of fifth-grade girls in small groups; (2) a ten-session manualized and flexible curriculum imparting essential content while allowing group leaders to respond to social aggression within the group, and (3) an emphasis on the varied roles of peers within conflicts. SAPP providers used discussion, role-playing, modeling, games, and collaboration to (1) increase student's knowledge of social aggression; (2) build emotional understanding of themselves and others; (3) promote positive communication and behavior; (4) provide opportunities to observe, model, and practice social skills; and (5) teach social problem solving.
- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** SAPP providers attended an initial three-hour training.
- **Implementation support:** SAPP providers received group supervision with the lead researcher weekly throughout the ten-week program to discuss implementation issues. A manual allowed communication of key competencies across all SAPP groups. Program implementation was monitored with weekly session summaries and a self-report survey.

**Comparison group:** "Attention control."

- Small-group reading club matching SAPP in structure and time but not including content related to peer relationships or conflict.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Interpersonal	Social aggression problem-solving scenarios	Effect size: 0.35	Better social problem solving skills	2–4 weeks post-intervention

## Social Development Curriculum (SDC)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Large sample, sites unclear
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Interpersonal
- **School level:** Middle school
- **Setting:** Urban
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority, low SES
- **Purpose:** Enhance growth of sense of self and cultural pride and strengthen family and community ties through a culturally tailored intervention targeting risk behaviors of violence, provoking behavior, substance use, school delinquency, and sexual practices.
- **Implementers:** Counselors
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** <http://www.advocatesforyouth.org/publications/publications-a-z/2112-aban-aya-youth-project>
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

A 1994–1998 study documented in

- Brian R. Flay, Sally Graumlich, Eisuke Segawa, James L. Burns, and Michelle Y. Holliday, “Effects of 2 Prevention Programs on High-Risk Behaviors Among African American Youth: A Randomized Trial,” *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine*, Vol. 158, No. 4, April 2004, pp. 377–384.

### **Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial included joiners, did not provide sufficient information to assess baseline equivalence of the analytic sample, and did not report the number of sites.

### **Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 1,153 students (sites unclear)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** 5–8 (middle school)
- **Sex/gender:** 50 percent female, 50 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** 77 percent received federally subsidized school lunches

### **Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 12 schools from metropolitan Chicago
- **Community type:** Participating schools were located in urban communities (9 schools were inner-city and 3 were near-suburban).
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** K–6 and K–8
- **Total enrollment at schools:** At least 500 students at each school
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** 91 percent African American
- **SES:** Authors described schools as low SES.

### Intervention summary:

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Counselors (university-based health educators).
- **How much:** SDC was classroom based and consisted of 16 to 21 lessons per year, usually in social studies classes.
- **Classroom curriculum:** SDC was designed to teach cognitive-behavioral skills to build self-esteem and empathy, manage stress and anxiety, develop interpersonal relationships, resist peer pressure, and develop decisionmaking, problem-solving, conflict-resolution, and goal-setting skills. It was structured to teach application of these skills to avoid violence, provocative behavior, school delinquency, drug use, and unsafe sexual behaviors.
- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** Two training sessions were held before each lesson, during which the health educators role-played each activity, and senior staff provided feedback. In addition, each year, the regular classroom teachers received a 4-hour workshop to provide an overview of program philosophy and curriculum content and clarification of support roles.
- **Implementation support:** Weekly debriefings were held to discuss issues that may have affected implementation. Senior staff also conducted observations to ensure fidelity and help target training needs.

### Comparison group: “Attention control.”

- Attention-placebo health enhancement curriculum targeting health-enhancing behaviors (nutrition, exercise, and health care) that was of equal length and intensity.

### Positive Results

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Interpersonal	Student self-report	SS+	Violent behavior increased less than comparison students	Over 4 years of implementation

## Social Skills Improvement System Classwide Intervention Program (SSIS-CIP)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier I
- **Size of evidence:** Large sample, multiple sites
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Intrapersonal, interpersonal, school climate and safety
- **School level:** Elementary school
- **Setting:** Urban, rural
- **Sample:** None reported
- **Purpose:** Facilitate the development of students' prosocial skills and reduce problem behaviors in the classroom using instructional strategies.
- **Implementers:** Teachers
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** <http://www.pearsonclinical.com/education/RelatedInfo/ssis-overview.html>
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

Study period not reported; documented in

- James Clyde DiPerna, Puiwa Lei, Jillian Bellinger, and Weiyi Cheng, “Efficacy of the Social Skills Improvement System Classwide Intervention Program (SSIS-CIP) Primary Version,” *School Psychology Quarterly*, Vol. 30, No. 1, March 2015, pp. 123–141.
- James Clyde DiPerna, Puiwa Lei, Jillian Bellinger, and Weiyi Cheng, “Effects of a Universal Positive Classroom Behavior Program on Student Learning,” *Psychology in the Schools*, Vol. 53, No. 2, February 2016, pp. 189–203.

**Evidence tier:** Tier I (Strong)

- This randomized controlled trial had low attrition.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 494 students (2 sites)
- **Number of classrooms:** 39 classrooms
- **Grade level:** 2 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 54 percent female, 46 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 73 percent white, 18 percent African American, 5 percent Hispanic or Latino, 2 percent Asian, 2 percent other
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 6 schools in the Mid-Atlantic region
- **Community type:** Four participating schools were located in urban communities and two in rural communities.
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Teachers.
- **How much:** Thirty 20–25 minute lessons (three per week for 12 weeks).
- **Classroom curriculum:** Instructional units focused on ten key classroom social behaviors that teachers have identified as

important for classroom success (e.g., following directions, asking for help, ignoring distractions). Each unit focused on a single skill and included three scripted lessons, brief video vignettes, and practice exercises. Each lesson relied on six instructional strategies (describe, model, role-play, practice, monitor progress, and generalize) to help children learn the target skill for that unit.

- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** Teachers attended a one-day workshop prior to implementation. During the first half of the workshop, the facilitator provided a detailed overview of the SSIS-CIP curricular materials, including lesson plans, student booklets, and video vignettes. During the second half, teachers then practiced teaching each lesson from the first SSIS-CIP unit in small groups. As teachers practiced, the workshop facilitator provided structured feedback regarding fidelity of role-playing lessons. In addition, teachers had the opportunity to ask questions about curricular implementation.
- **Implementation support:** Teachers were provided the SSIS-CIP Instructor's Handbook and completed weekly standardized checklists indicating the level of implementation of the five core components. In addition to teachers' self-report of fidelity, independent observers completed direct observations for approximately 20 percent of the SSIS-CIP lessons taught by each teacher, using a structured report form that corresponded to the specific instructional objectives/sequence for the observed lesson.

**Comparison group:** "Business as usual."

- No additional details were reported.

### Positive Results

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Intrapersonal	Academic Competence Evaluation Scales	Effect size: 0.33	Greater academic motivation	Post-intervention
Intrapersonal	Academic Competence Evaluation Scales	SS+	Higher levels of academic engagement	Post-intervention
Intrapersonal	Teacher self-report	SS+	Better academic responsibility	Post-intervention
Intrapersonal	Teacher self-report	SS+	Better classroom engagement	Post-intervention
Intrapersonal	Teacher self-report	SS+	Better self-control	Post-intervention
Interpersonal	Teacher self-report	Effect size: 0.38	Better empathy	Post-intervention
Interpersonal	Teacher self-report	Effect size: 0.37	Better social skills	Post-intervention
Interpersonal	Teacher self-report	Effect size: 0.29	Better cooperation	Post-intervention
Interpersonal	Teacher self-report	SS+	Better communication	Post-intervention
School climate and safety	Cooperative Learning Observation Code for Kids (CLOCK)	Effect size: 0.27	Less disruptive classroom climate	Post-intervention



## Steps to Respect (STR)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 2
- **Highest tier:** Tier I
- **Size of evidence:** Large sample, multiple sites
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Interpersonal, school climate and safety
- **School level:** Elementary school
- **Setting:** Urban, suburban, rural
- **Sample:** Low SES
- **Purpose:** Decrease school bullying problems by (a) increasing staff awareness and responsiveness, (b) fostering socially responsible beliefs, and (c) teaching social-emotional skills to counter bullying and promote healthy relationships.
- **Implementers:** Teachers, counselors, administrators, support staff
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, applications outside the classroom, family/community involvement, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** <http://www.cfchildren.org/resources/previous-programs/>
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is included in the 2013 CASEL Guide—Preschool and Elementary School Edition.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

A 2000–2002 study documented in

- Karin S. Frey, Miriam K. Hirschstein, Jennie L. Snell, Leihua Van Schoiack Edstrom, Elizabeth P. MacKenzie, and Carole J. Broderick, “Reducing Playground Bullying and Supporting Beliefs: An Experimental Trial of the Steps to Respect Program,” *Developmental Psychology*, Vol. 41, No. 3, May 2005, pp. 479–490.
- Karin S. Frey, Susan Bobbitt Nolen, Leihua Van Schoiack Edstrom, and Miriam K. Hirschstein, “Effects of a School-Based Social-Emotional Competence Program: Linking Children’s Goals, Attributions, and Behavior,” *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, Vol. 26, No. 2, April 2005, pp. 171–200.
- Sabrina Low, Karin S. Frey, and Callie J. Brockman, “Gossip on the Playground: Changes Associated with Universal Intervention, Retaliation Beliefs, and Supportive Friends,” *School Psychology Review*, Vol. 39, No. 4, December 2010, pp. 536–551.

**Evidence tier:** Tier I (Strong)

- This randomized controlled trial has low attrition.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 1,126 students (2 sites)
- **Number of classrooms:** 72 classrooms
- **Grade level:** 3–6 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 49 percent female, 51 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 70 percent white, 13 percent Asian American, 9 percent African American, 7 percent Hispanic American, 1 percent Native American
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 6 schools located in the Pacific Northwest
- **Community type:** Suburban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported

- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** 21–60 percent of students were identified as low SES.

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Classroom teachers, school counselors, administrators.
- **How much:** The classroom curriculum involved two to three lessons each week (1 hour of lessons per week) each semester over the course of three semesters.
- **Classroom curriculum:** The classroom curriculum involved skill- and literature-based lessons. Level 1 was taught at 3rd or 4th grade, Level 2 at 4th or 5th grade, and Level 3 at 5th or 6th grade. Ten semiscripted skill lessons focused on social-emotional skills for positive peer relations; emotion management; and recognizing, refusing, and reporting bullying behavior. Topics included joining groups, distinguishing reporting from tattling, and being a responsible bystander. Instructional strategies included direct instruction, large- and small-group discussions, skills practice, and games. On completion of skill lessons, teachers implemented a grade-appropriate literature unit, based on existing children’s books, which provided further opportunities to explore bullying-related themes.
- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** The school adopted antibullying policies and procedures.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** Administrators informed parents about the intervention and the school’s antibullying policy and procedures. Take-home letters for parents, provided throughout the classroom curriculum, outlined key concepts and skills and described activities to support their use at home.
- **Professional development:** A training manual provided a core instructional session for all school staff and two in-depth training sessions for counselors, administrators, and teachers. All staff received an overview of program goals and key features of program content (e.g., a definition of bullying, a model for responding to bullying reports). Teachers, counselors, and administrators received additional training in how to coach students involved in bullying. Teachers completed an orientation to classroom materials and instructional strategies.
- **Implementation support:** A program guide provided an overview of curricular content, goals, and research foundations, as well as a blueprint for developing schoolwide policy and procedures. Teachers ratings and bimonthly ratings of classrooms by program consultants provided information on intervention implementation.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- Comparison schools received Steps to Respect training and materials after 1 year of study participation.

### Positive Results

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Interpersonal	Playground observation	SS+	More agreeable social interactions	After 6 months of implementation
Interpersonal	Playground observation	SS+	Fewer argumentative social interactions	After 6 and 18 months of implementation
Interpersonal	Playground observation	SS+	Less nonbullying aggression	After 18 months of implementation
Interpersonal	Student Experience Survey	SS+	Less difficulty responding assertively	After 18 months of implementation
School climate and safety	Student Experience Survey	SS+	Less acceptance of bullying and aggression	After 6 months of implementation
School climate and safety	Student Experience Survey	SS+	Greater support for prosocial bystander behaviors	After 6 months of implementation
School climate and safety	Student Experience Survey	SS+	Less bullying encouragement	After 18 months of implementation
School climate and safety	Student Experience Survey	SS+	Fewer experiences as a target of bullying	After 18 months of implementation
School climate and safety	Playground observation	SS+	Less bullying	After 6 and 18 months of implementation
School climate and safety	Playground observation	SS+	Less exclusionary gossip	After 6 months of implementation
School climate and safety	Student Experience Survey	SS+	Greater perceived adult staff responsiveness to bullying	After 6 months of implementation

## Study 2

A 2008–2009 study documented in

- Eric C. Brown, Sabrina Low, Brian H. Smith, and Kevin P. Haggerty, “Outcomes from a School-Randomized Controlled Trial of Steps to Respect: A Bullying Prevention Program,” *School Psychology Review*, Vol. 40, No. 3, September 2011, pp. 423–433.
- Sabina Low and Mark Van Ryzin, “The Moderating Effects of School Climate on Bullying Prevention Efforts,” *School Psychology Quarterly*, Vol. 29, No. 3, September 2014, pp. 306–319.

### **Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial broke randomization and reported insufficient information to assess baseline equivalence of the analytic sample.

### **Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 2,940 students (3 sites)
- **Number of classrooms:** 128 classrooms
- **Grade level:** 3–5 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 49 percent female, 51 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 52 percent white, 35 percent other or mixed race, 7 percent African American, 6 percent Asian American
- **SES:** Not reported

### **Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 33 schools from three geographic areas in north-central California
- **Community type:** 25 percent of participating schools were located in rural communities, 60 percent in suburban communities, and 15 percent in urban communities.
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Average of 479 students
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Average of 40 percent of students receiving free/reduced-price lunch

### **Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Classroom teachers, school counselors, administrators, support staff.

- **How much:** The classroom curriculum involved two to three lessons each week (1 hour of lessons per week) each semester over the course of three semesters.
- **Classroom curriculum:** The classroom curriculum focused on social-emotional skills for positive peer relations; emotion management; and recognizing, refusing, and reporting of bullying behavior. Lesson topics included joining groups, distinguishing reporting from tattling, and being a responsible bystander. Instructional strategies included direct instruction, large- and small-group discussions, skill practice, and games. On completion of skill lessons, teachers implemented a grade-appropriate literature unit, based on existing children's books, which provided further opportunities to explore bullying-related themes.
- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** The school adopted antibullying policies and procedures.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** A scripted informational overview for parents was sent home with students. Take-home letters for parents, provided throughout the classroom curriculum, outlined key concepts and skills and described activities to support their use at home. Administrators informed parents about the program and the school's antibullying policy and procedures.
- **Professional development:** All participating teachers and staff participated in an on-site, one-day training. As part of this training, all staff in the school received a 3-hour overview of program goals and key features of program content. Teachers, counselors, and administrators received an additional 1.5-hour training in how to coach students involved in bullying. Third-through 6th-grade teachers also received a 2-hour overview of classroom materials and lesson-specific instructional strategies.
- **Implementation support:** Teachers completed an online program implementation log at the end of every week in which a classroom lesson was supposed to be completed.

**Comparison group:** "Business as usual."

- Wait-list control.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Interpersonal	Teacher Assessment of Student Behavior	SS+	Better social competency	After 18 months of implementation
School climate and safety	Teacher Assessment of Student Behavior	SS+	Less physical bullying	After 18 months of implementation
School climate and safety	Student survey and School Environment Survey	SS+	Greater student and staff responsiveness to bullying	After 18 months of implementation

School climate and safety	Student survey and School Environment Survey	SS+	Decreased bullying victimization and problems	After 18 months of implementation
School climate and safety	Student survey and School Environment Survey	SS+	Improved school climate among students	After 18 months of implementation
School climate and safety	Colorado Trust's Bullying Prevention Initiative Student Survey	SS+	More positive bystander behavior	After 18 months of implementation

## Strong Kids (SK)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Small sample, single site
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Intrapersonal, interpersonal
- **School level:** Elementary school
- **Setting:** Not reported
- **Sample:** None reported
- **Purpose:** Produce social and emotional competency gains and resiliency by teaching social, emotional, and mental health skills to students.
- **Implementers:** Teachers
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, changing the learning environment, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** <http://strongkids.uoregon.edu/strongkids.html>
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.



## Study 1

Study period not reported; documented in

- Jason E. Harlacher and Kenneth W. Merrell, “Social and Emotional Learning as a Universal Level of Student Support: Evaluating the Follow-Up Effect of Strong Kids on Social and Emotional Outcomes,” *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, Vol. 26, No. 3, July 2010, pp. 212–229.

### **Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial reported insufficient information to assess whether a confound (school) with intervention assignment was present; the reported statistically significant analyses did not involve a cluster correction; and the trial involved only one site and fewer than 350 students.

### **Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 108 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** 4 classrooms
- **Grade level:** 3–4 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 54 percent female, 46 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 79 percent white, 10 percent Hispanic, 3 percent Native American, 2 percent Asian American, 2 percent African American, 4 percent other
- **SES:** Not reported

### **Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 3 schools in the Pacific Northwest
- **Community type:** Not reported
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

### **Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Teachers.
- **How much:** 12 weekly lessons (45 minutes each) during the fall semester (September to December) and one booster session in

January. Regarding changing the learning environment, the teachers averaged two precorrections and four praise statements per week.

- **Classroom curriculum:** Curriculum topics covered emotion identification, anger management, thinking errors, and problem solving. Each lesson consisted of teacher-led instruction and modeling of the skill, opportunities to practice with feedback, and review of previous lessons.
- **Changing the learning environment:** To promote generalization outside the lessons for the SEL skills being taught, the teachers provided precorrection (i.e., reminders to use the skills throughout the day, such as reminding students to use stress-reducing skills before taking a test or to manage their anger while playing competitive games at recess) and verbal praise for the specific skills taught each week. Two posters that illustrated some of the skills (e.g., anger management cycle and common thinking errors) the students learned were also displayed in the classrooms to promote generalization.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** Teachers attended a 1-hour training session and spent 15–20 minutes per week planning each lesson.
- **Implementation support:** Teachers received a curriculum manual.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- No additional details were reported.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Intrapersonal	Social-Emotional Assets and Resiliency Scales-Child Self-Report Version	SS+	Increased self-perceived social-emotional competencies, assets, and resilience	Immediately and 2 months post-intervention
Interpersonal	School Social Behavior Scales	SS+	Better social functioning	Immediately and 2 months post-intervention
Interpersonal	Coping Scale	SS+	Better coping skills	Immediately and 2 months post-intervention

## Student Success Skills (SSS)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 2
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Large sample, multiple sites
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Intrapersonal, interpersonal, academic achievement, school climate and safety
- **School level:** Elementary and middle school
- **Setting:** Suburban
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority, low SES
- **Purpose:** Increase student outcomes through promotion of cognitive, social, and self-management skills.
- **Implementers:** Teachers, counselors
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, changing the learning environment, professional development, implementation support
- **Intervention website:** <http://studentsuccessskills.com/>
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is included in the *2015 CASEL Guide—Middle and High School Edition*.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

Study period not reported; documented in

- Matthew E. Lemberger, James P. Selig, Hannah Bowers, and Jennifer E. Rogers, “Effects of the Student Success Skills Program on Executive Functioning Skills, Feelings of Connectedness, and Academic Achievement in a Predominantly Hispanic, Low-Income Middle School District,” *Journal of Counseling & Development*, Vol. 93, No. 1, January 2015, pp. 25–37.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial involved only one site and fewer than 350 students.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 193 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** 11 classrooms
- **Grade level:** 7 (middle school)
- **Sex/gender:** 57 percent female, 43 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 66 percent Hispanic, 20 percent white, 8 percent other, 4 percent Native American, 2 percent African American, and 1 percent Asian American
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 1 school located in the southwestern United States
- **Community type:** Suburban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** 7–8
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** “Predominantly Hispanic school district”
- **SES:** 81 percent of students in the participating district participated in the free-and-reduced-price lunch program.

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** School counselors, classroom teachers.
- **How much:** A weekly 1-hour lesson for five weeks at the beginning of the school year, followed by three booster sessions (occurring approximately one month apart) during the second half of the school year.

- **Classroom curriculum:** Students were taught to look for patterns and make connections between their daily habits (e.g., nutrition, exercise, rest, fun, social support). Next, students learned and practiced new skills and strategies they could apply to their current school experiences. These new skills were organized into five categories: (a) cognitive factors, such as memory and learning strategies; (b) attitudinal skills, such as building healthy optimism and self-efficacy; (c) self-regulatory and metacognitive skills, such as managing attention, anxiety, motivation, and anger; (d) behavioral strategies, such as goal setting, progress monitoring, and selecting healthy activities; and (e) social skills, such as creating a caring, supportive, and encouraging classroom environment. To close each classroom guidance lesson, students were provided with an opportunity to reflect and share improvements they made toward designated mastery goals during the previous week. Students were then challenged to identify specific target areas for improvement and related behaviors for the current week.
- **Changing the learning environment:** The school counselor provided consultation pertaining to the skills embedded in each SSS lesson to all teachers (e.g., English, math, social studies, and science) for each intervention week. The consultation activities included providing each classroom teacher with the content of the SSS skills introduced that week and support in how such skills might be implemented.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** The lead researcher provided training to each school counselor in the participating district during the preceding summer.
- **Implementation support:** Providers received developmentally appropriate structured program manuals.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- The comparison classrooms were given the intervention upon completion of the initial phase of the study.

### *Positive Results*

<b>Domain</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Result</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>	<b>Timing</b>
Intrapersonal	Behavior Rating Inventory of Executive Function–Self Report	Effect size: 0.42	Better emotional control	Post-intervention
Intrapersonal	Behavior Rating Inventory of Executive Function–Self Report	Effect sizes: 0.31 to 0.51	Better cognitive regulation (shift, planning, organization, and task completion)	Post-intervention
Intrapersonal	Behavior Rating Inventory of Executive Function–Self Report	Effect size: 0.35	Better self-awareness	Post-intervention
Academic achievement	Discovery Education Assessments	Effect size: 0.79	Better performance in mathematics	Post-intervention
Academic achievement	Discovery Education Assessments	Effect size: 0.65	Better performance in reading	Post-intervention
School climate and safety	Child and Adolescent Social Support Scale	Effect size: 0.43	Increased perceptions of classmate support	Post-intervention

## Study 2

A 2010–2011 study documented in

- Melissa Mariani, Linda Webb, Elizabeth Villares, and Greg Brigman, “Effect of Participation in Student Success Skills on Prosocial and Bullying Behavior,” *Professional Counselor*, Vol. 5, No. 3, 2015, pp. 341–353.

### **Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This quasi-experimental study reported insufficient information to assess baseline equivalence of the analytic sample and involved only one site and fewer than 350 students.

### **Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 336 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** 21 classrooms
- **Grade level:** 5 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 54 percent female, 46 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 66 percent white, 15 percent African American, 13 percent Latino/a, 4 percent multiracial, 2 percent Asian, 1 percent Native American.
- **SES:** 38 percent received free/reduced-price lunch.

### **Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 5 schools in central Florida
- **Community type:** Suburban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

### **Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** School counselors, classroom teachers.
- **How much:** A weekly 45-minute lesson for five weeks at the beginning of the school year, followed by three booster sessions (occurring approximately one month apart) during the second half of the school year.

- **Classroom curriculum:** The classroom program focused on three key categories of skills needed to grow, perform, and achieve: (a) cognitive and metacognitive skills, such as goal setting, progress monitoring, and memory skills; (b) social skills, such as interpersonal, social problem solving, listening, and teamwork skills; and (c) self-management skills, such as managing attention, motivation, and anger. A total of 20 strategies were introduced and reinforced using a highly engaging “tell-show-do” format known to increase levels of student engagement and motivation. Each lesson followed a structured beginning, middle, and end sequence clearly detailed in the manual.
- **Changing the learning environment:** Classroom teachers cued students to use the skills taught throughout the day.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** School counselors received one-day training in the manualized use of the SSS classroom guidance program.
- **Implementation support:** Providers received developmentally appropriate structured program manuals.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- Wait-list control.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Interpersonal	Peer Relations Questionnaire	SS+	More prosocial behaviors	Post-intervention
School climate and safety	Peer Relations Questionnaire	SS+	Fewer bullying behaviors at school	Post-intervention
School climate and safety	My Class Inventory—Short Form—Revised	SS+	Higher satisfaction with classroom climate	Post-intervention



## Success for Kids (SFK)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Large sample, multiple sites
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Intrapersonal, interpersonal, disciplinary, civic attitudes and behavior
- **School level:** Elementary and middle school
- **Setting:** Not reported
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority, low SES
- **Purpose:** Empower kids to lead happy and productive lives by providing them with a sense of purpose and the recognition that they have the power to impact the course and direction of their lives.
- **Implementers:** Teachers, support staff
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, out-of-school time, professional development, implementation support
- **Intervention website:** <https://www.sfk.org/>
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

A 2006–2007 study documented in

- Nicole Maestas and Sarah J. Gaillot, *An Outcome Evaluation of the Success for Kids Program*, Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND Corporation, TR-575-1-SFK, 2010.

### **Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial broke randomization and reported insufficient information to assess baseline equivalence of the analytic sample.

### **Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 737 students (3 sites)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** Not reported (ages ranged from 6 to 14 years)
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** 2 to 82 percent racial/ethnic minority
- **SES:** Median family income of \$18,506 to \$56,297

### **Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 19 schools in southeast Florida (Miami-Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach counties)
- **Community type:** Not reported
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

### **Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Teachers (SFK teachers), support staff (facilitators who were tasked with helping the children relate course principles to actual situations in their lives).
- **How much:** Ten 90-minute lessons typically run over a ten-week period.
- **Classroom curriculum:** The level I SFK program, titled “The Game of Life,” used structured games and activities to teach

such concepts as cause and effect, how to control reactive behaviors, the value of sharing with others, and the importance of making an effort. Through its curriculum, the program aims to increase prosocial behaviors and reduce antisocial and problem behaviors. Children were taught that they can “win the game” and achieve their potential when they follow the “rules”—making an effort, caring for others, and making responsible choices. Teaching methods included stories, puppets, music, performance, and hands-on activities in an attempt to address auditory, kinesthetic, and visual learning styles.

- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** The SFK course was delivered as an after-school program.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** SFK teachers underwent a three-month, formal SFK training program, which included an overview of the course’s mission and goals, its key concepts and theory, and lesson-by-lesson instruction of all activities, games, and pedagogical techniques. New SFK teachers were asked to prepare and deliver key lessons for a group of their peers and the lead teacher for constructive review and feedback. SFK facilitators received a three-hour training course that included an overview of the course’s mission and goals, the key concepts of the program, a brief lesson-by-lesson overview of the content and major activities, and a child-abuse–prevention video. The training included demonstration of selected activities from the curriculum and exercises in which an experienced facilitator led a team of new facilitators through an activity as he or she would in the classroom.
- **Implementation support:** New teachers first served as facilitators for the local lead teacher, gradually taking on more and more of the classroom delivery. Once a new teacher had his or her own class, the lead teacher held regular meetings to go over upcoming lessons and issues in the classroom and to identify additional training needs. Weekly meetings were used to further practice upcoming lessons, discuss the intent of lesson activities, assign facilitator responsibilities in the upcoming class, and identify new training needs.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- Wait-list control.

## Positive Results

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Intrapersonal	Behavior Assessment System for Children, Second Edition (BASC-2)	SS+	Less hyperactivity	Post-intervention
Intrapersonal	Behavior Assessment System for Children, Second Edition (BASC-2)	SS+	Greater self-esteem	Post-intervention
Intrapersonal	Behavior Assessment System for Children, Second Edition (BASC-2)	SS+	Better study skills	Post-intervention
Interpersonal	Behavior Assessment System for Children, Second Edition (BASC-2)	SS+	Better functional communication	Immediately and 12 weeks post-intervention
Interpersonal	Behavior Assessment System for Children, Second Edition (BASC-2)	SS+	Better adaptability and adaptive skills	Immediately and 12 weeks post-intervention
Interpersonal	Behavior Assessment System for Children, Second Edition (BASC-2)	SS+	Better social skills	Post-intervention
Interpersonal	Behavior Assessment System for Children, Second Edition (BASC-2)	SS+	Fewer externalizing problems	Post-intervention
Interpersonal	Behavior Assessment System for Children, Second Edition (BASC-2)	SS+	Fewer behavioral problems	Immediately and 12 weeks post-intervention
Disciplinary outcomes	Behavior Assessment System for Children, Second Edition (BASC-2)	SS+	Fewer school problems	Immediately and 12 weeks post-intervention
Civic attitudes and behavior	Behavior Assessment System for Children, Second Edition (BASC-2)	SS+	Better leadership competencies	Immediately and 12 weeks post-intervention

## Taekwondo (TKD)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Small sample, single site
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Intrapersonal
- **School level:** Middle school
- **Setting:** Not reported
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority, low SES
- **Purpose:** Improve cognitive function through a Taekwondo approach that emphasizes self-control, respect, integrity, perseverance, goal-setting, focus, planning, and problem solving.
- **Implementers:** Teachers
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum.
- **Intervention website:** There is no dedicated website for this intervention.
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

Study period not reported; documented in

- Kimberley D. Lakes, Tracy Bryars, Swetha Sirisinahal, Nimrah Salim, Sara Arastoo, Natasha Emmerson, Daniel Kang, Lois Shim, Doug Wong, and Chang Jin Kang, “The Healthy for Life Taekwondo Pilot Study: A Preliminary Evaluation of Effects on Executive Function and BMI, Feasibility, and Acceptability,” *Mental Health and Physical Activity*, Vol. 6, No. 3, October 2013, pp. 181–188.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This study involved a confound (class) with the intervention, only one site, and fewer than 350 students.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 46 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** 2 classrooms
- **Grade level:** 7–8 (middle school)
- **Sex/gender:** 50 percent female, 50 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 46 percent Hispanic/Latino, 44 percent Asian American, 9 percent white, and 1 percent African American
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 1 school in Southern California
- **Community type:** Not reported
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** 7–8
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Over 600 students
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** “Low-income middle school”

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Teachers (contracted and experienced Taekwondo instructors who had earned a fifth degree black belt).
- **How much:** Each student at the participating school participated in daily physical education (i.e., five classes per week, each approximately 40–45 minutes in length). Taekwondo was implemented in two of the five sessions across the week for one

academic year.

- **Classroom curriculum:** Students practiced traditional Taekwondo techniques (e.g., stances, blocks, strikes, and kicks) and *poomse* (forms) in a physically active setting with a focus on mindful practice. The environment was structured to emphasize respect, including bowing to the instructor and to fellow students and reporting to class in a traditional uniform, which was provided to participants at no cost. Training was scaffolded (i.e., progressive) and provided opportunities for mastery experiences and recognition of accomplishment.
- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** None reported.
- **Implementation support:** None reported.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- Standard physical education class.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Intrapersonal	Strengths and Weaknesses of ADHD and Normal Behavior (SWAN)	SS+	Better behavioral control	After 1 year of implementation

## Take the Lead (TTL)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Small sample, single site
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** School climate and safety
- **School level:** Middle school
- **Setting:** Suburban
- **Sample:** None reported
- **Purpose:** Increase the social competencies of students on a broad spectrum of social skills including, self-awareness, self-management, social-awareness, relationship skills, decisionmaking, problem solving, and leadership.
- **Implementers:** Teachers
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, family/community involvement, professional development.
- **Intervention website:** There is no dedicated website for this intervention.
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.



## Study 1

A 2009–2010 study documented in

- Meg Domino, “Measuring the Impact of an Alternative Approach to School Bullying,” *Journal of School Health*, Vol. 83, No. 6, June 2013, pp. 430–437.

### **Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial involved only one site and fewer than 350 students.

### **Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 323 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** 32 classrooms
- **Grade level:** 7 (middle school)
- **Sex/gender:** 53 percent female, 47 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 93 percent white, 3 percent Asian, 2 percent Latino/Hispanic, and 1 percent African American
- **SES:** Not reported

### **Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 1 school in southwestern Connecticut
- **Community type:** Suburban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** “The sample was drawn from a predominantly white suburban town.”
- **SES:** Not reported

### **Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Classroom teachers.
- **How much:** 16 weekly lessons (45 minutes each) over one semester during a regular class period.
- **Classroom curriculum:** Each lesson in the curriculum included a knowledge, skill, and application component providing participants the opportunity to apply practiced behaviors to real-world situations.
- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.

- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** An educational workshop was offered to all parents by TTL trainers. A parent information letter, designed to keep parents apprised of ongoing lesson goals and activities, was sent home at the beginning of each new segment.
- **Professional development:** Classroom teachers were trained by trainers for a minimum of 6 hours.
- **Implementation support:** None reported.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- Wait-list control.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
School climate and safety	Peer Relations Questionnaire	Effect size: 0.80	Less bullying	Post-intervention
School climate and safety	Peer Relations Questionnaire	Effect size: 0.47	Less victimization	Post-intervention

## Talking with TJ (TWTJ)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Small sample, single site
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Intrapersonal
- **School level:** Elementary school
- **Setting:** Urban
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority, low SES
- **Purpose:** Promote social and emotional competence in elementary school aged children through a video-based series focusing on attention, planning, problem solving, and teamwork skills.
- **Implementers:** Teachers, support staff
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, changing the learning environment, family/community involvement, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** <http://www.rci.rutgers.edu/~melias/tj.html>
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

A 1999 study documented in

- Janean E'guya Dilworth, Kathariya Mokruue, and Maurice J. Elias, "The Efficacy of a Video-Based Teamwork-Building Series with Urban Elementary School Students: A Pilot Investigation," *Journal of School Psychology*, Vol. 40, No. 4, August 2002, pp. 329–346.

### **Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This quasi-experimental study reported insufficient information to assess baseline equivalence of the analytic sample and involved only one site and fewer than 350 students.

### **Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 208 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** 6 classrooms
- **Grade level:** 3 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 49 percent female, 51 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 80 percent African American, 13 percent white, 3 percent other, and 4 percent not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

### **Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 6 schools in central New Jersey
- **Community type:** Urban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** The schools were located in a community beset by "high rates of poverty."

### **Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Teachers, and trained undergraduate and graduate student facilitators.
- **How much:** Twice-weekly sessions for five weeks. There were one 30-minute introductory session, three units involving lessons lasting approximately 45–60 minutes (approximately two per week), and one 60-minute closing celebration.

- **Classroom curriculum:** During the first session, the intervention leaders introduced the program with a 5-minute video preview and decorated the classroom with TJ-related posters. Subsequent units began with a video story and the introduction of a new “Power Phrase” designed to help the children understand the main ideas of the unit. During the second unit lesson, students completed follow-up activities and received TJ comic books to read in class and to take home to share with their parents. Each session included related group activities and Talk Time. At the end of each unit, students signed the teamwork tip poster to indicate their willingness to use teamwork skills and to join TJ’s Team. The final TJ session was dedicated to reviewing the previous TJ lessons, celebration, and planning for generalization. Generalization activities included reviewing the TJ videos, cooperative-learning groups, working with physical education teachers to engage the students in teamwork-oriented games, and teamwork-building “field day” activities.
- **Changing the learning environment:** In addition to the twice-weekly TJ lessons, teachers were provided a list of social and emotional learning skill-building exercises and encouraged to develop their own means of infusing the teamwork-building skills into classroom and playground activities; teachers were instructed to include a minimum of one additional TWTJ activity per week in conjunction with the formal lessons. Teachers incorporated Talk Times into daily activities, using them as a means of facilitating group problem solving. “TJ’s Teamwork Tips” posters were prominently displayed in each classroom to cue students to the main messages of the units throughout the school day.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** During the second unit lesson, students received comic books to take home to share with their parents.
- **Professional development:** Undergraduate and graduate student facilitators were trained during the weeks prior to pretesting via individual and group viewings of the videos, reviewing the intervention, and practice sessions.
- **Implementation support:** Facilitators met prior to each unit to review the upcoming lessons and exercises.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- Wait-list control.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Intrapersonal	Piers–Harris Children’s Self-Concept Scale	SS+	Healthier self-concept	Post-intervention

## Too Good for Violence (TGFV)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Large sample, single site
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Intrapersonal, interpersonal
- **School level:** Elementary school
- **Setting:** Urban, suburban, rural
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority, low SES
- **Purpose:** Develop students' conflict resolution skills, anger management skills, respect for self and others, and effective communication skills.
- **Implementers:** Teachers, support staff
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, changing the learning environment, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** <http://www.toogoodprograms.org/>
- **WWC:** Study 1 met WWC standards without reservations (<https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/InterventionReport/518>).
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is included in the 2013 CASEL Guide—Preschool and Elementary School Edition.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

Study period not reported; documented in

- Tina P. Bacon, *The Effects of the Too Good for Violence Prevention Program on Student Behaviors and Protective Factors*, Tampa, Fla.: Mendez Foundation, 2003.
- Bruce W. Hall and Tina P. Bacon, “Building a Foundation Against Violence: Impact of a School-Based Prevention Program on Elementary Students,” *Journal of School Violence*, Vol. 4, No. 4, 2005, pp. 63–83.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial involved only one site.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 999 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** 3 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 48 percent female, 52 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 44 percent white, 36 percent Hispanic, 13 percent African American, 5 percent multiracial, 2 percent Asian, and 1 percent American Indian
- **SES:** 54 percent received free/reduced-price lunches.

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 10 schools in Florida
- **Community type:** Urban, suburban, rural
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Classroom teachers, off-site educators.
- **How much:** Seven weekly lessons (40–50 minutes each) during the first quarter of the school year.
- **Classroom curriculum:** Lessons focused on developing students’ conflict resolution skills, anger management skills, respect

for self and others, and effective communication skills.

- **Changing the learning environment:** Teachers used instructional strategies that emphasized cooperative learning activities, role-play situations, and skill-building methods, such as modeling, practicing, reinforcing, providing feedback, and promoting generalization of skills to other contexts.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** None reported.
- **Implementation support:** The Teacher Evaluation of Program Implementation Survey Questionnaire gauged treatment fidelity and quality.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- Comparison schools were asked to refrain from delivering any major prevention curriculum or program until the fourth quarter.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Intrapersonal	Student Protective Factors Survey Questionnaire (SPFSQ)	SS+	Better emotional competency skills	Immediately and 20 weeks post-intervention
Interpersonal	Teacher Checklist of Student Behaviors (TCSB)	SS+	Better personal and social skills	Immediately and 20 weeks post-intervention
Interpersonal	Teacher Checklist of Student Behaviors (TCSB)	Effect size: 0.42	More prosocial behaviors	Immediately and 20 weeks post-intervention
Interpersonal	Teacher Checklist of Student Behaviors (TCSB)	SS+	Less inappropriate social behavior	Immediately and 20 weeks post-intervention
Interpersonal	Teacher Checklist of Student Behaviors (TCSB)	Effect size: 0.47–0.49	Better overall social adaptability	Immediately and 20 weeks post-intervention
Interpersonal	Student Protective Factors Survey Questionnaire (SPFSQ)	SS+	Better communication skills	Immediately and 20 weeks post-intervention
Interpersonal	Student Protective Factors Survey Questionnaire (SPFSQ)	SS+	Better social and resistance skills	Immediately and 20 weeks post-intervention



## Tools for Getting Along (TFGA)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 2
- **Highest tier:** Tier I
- **Size of evidence:** Large sample, multiple sites
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Intrapersonal, interpersonal
- **School level:** Elementary school
- **Setting:** Not reported
- **Sample:** Low SES
- **Purpose:** Reduce the developmental risk for serious emotional or behavioral problems among upper elementary grade students through a social problem-solving, universally delivered curriculum.
- **Implementers:** Teachers, counselors
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** <https://education.ufl.edu/behavior-management-resource-guide/tools-for-getting-along-curriculum/>
- **WWC:** Some analyses in Study 1 met WWC standards without reservations (<https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Study/75526>).
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

Study period not reported; documented in

- Ann P. Daunic, Stephen W. Smith, Cynthia W. Garvan, Brian R. Barber, Mallory K. Becker, Christine D. Peters, Gregory G. Taylor, Christopher L. Van Loan, Wei Li, and Arlene H. Naranjo, “Reducing Developmental Risk For Emotional/Behavioral Problems: A Randomized Controlled Trial Examining the Tools for Getting Along Curriculum,” *Journal of School Psychology*, Vol. 50, No. 2, April 2012, pp. 149–166.
- Stephen W. Smith, Ann P. Daunic, Brian R. Barber, Burak Aydin, Christopher L. Van Loan, and Gregory G. Taylor, “Preventing Risk for Significant Behavior Problems Through a Cognitive-Behavioral Intervention: Effects of the Tools for Getting Along Curriculum at One-Year Follow-Up,” *Journal of Primary Prevention*, Vol. 35, No. 5, October 2014, pp. 371–387.

**Evidence tier:** Tier I (Strong)

- This randomized controlled trial had low attrition at post-intervention.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 1,341 students (at least 2 sites)
- **Number of classrooms:** 87 classrooms
- **Grade level:** 4–5 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 51 percent female, 49 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 54 percent white, 35 percent African American, 7 percent Hispanic, and 4 percent other
- **SES:** 65–90 percent of students qualified for free/reduced-price lunch.

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 14 schools in North Central Florida
- **Community type:** Not reported
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** 60 percent or more of students qualified for free/reduced-price lunch.

### Intervention summary:

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Teachers, guidance counselors.
- **How much:** 1–2 lessons per week (21 lessons total in core curriculum), followed by six booster sessions.
- **Classroom curriculum:** TFGA lessons focused on a step-by-step problem-solving strategy to use in emotionally charged social situations. Five strategically placed role-play lessons provided practice opportunities. Instructional strategies included cognitive modeling, role-playing, small group activities, and explicit application of strategies to real-life scenarios.
- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** Teachers and guidance counselors were trained in cognitive–behavioral intervention strategies and TFGA implementation for 10 hours over two days.
- **Implementation support:** The TFGA Curriculum Checks, TFGA Teacher Questionnaire, and classroom observations were also used to assess implementation fidelity. The research team also conducted follow-up meetings at each school midyear (i.e., January) to reorient teachers to TFGA goals, answer questions about implementation issues, and solicit feedback about lesson delivery and student responsiveness.

### Comparison group: “Business as usual.”

- Wait-list control.

### Positive Results

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Intrapersonal	Anger Expression Scale for Children (AESC)	SS+	Lower levels of trait anger	1 year post-intervention
Intrapersonal	Anger Expression Scale for Children (AESC)	SS+	Better anger control	1 year post-intervention
Interpersonal	Social Problem-Solving Inventory-Revised	SS+	Improved rational problem-solving style	Post-intervention
Interpersonal	Social Problem-Solving Inventory-Revised	SS+	Improved orientation toward problem solving	Post-intervention

## Study 2

Study period not reported; documented in

- Stephen W. Smith, Ann P. Daunic, Burak Aydin, Christopher L. Van Loan, and Gregory G. Taylor, “Effect of Tools for Getting Along on Student Risk for Emotional and Behavioral Problems in Upper Elementary Classrooms: A Replication Study,” *School Psychology Review*, Vol. 45, No. 1, March 2016, pp. 73–92.

**Evidence tier:** Tier I (Strong)

- This randomized controlled trial had low attrition.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 2,777 students (at least 2 sites)
- **Number of classrooms:** 135 classrooms
- **Grade level:** 4–5 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 51 percent female, 49 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 30 percent African American, 70 percent white or other
- **SES:** 81 percent qualified for free/reduced-price lunch.

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 20 schools located in North Central Florida
- **Community type:** Not reported
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** 55 percent or more of the student body at participant schools qualified for free or reduced-price lunch.

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Teachers, guidance counselors.
- **How much:** 1–2 lessons per week (21 lessons total in core curriculum), followed by six booster sessions.
- **Classroom curriculum:** TFGA lessons focused on a step-by-step problem-solving strategy to use in emotionally charged social situations. Five strategically placed role-play lessons provided practice opportunities. Instructional strategies included cognitive modeling, role-playing, small-group activities, and explicit application of strategies to real-life scenarios.

- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** Teachers and guidance counselors were trained in in cognitive–behavioral intervention strategies and TFGA implementation for 10 hours over two days.
- **Implementation support:** The TFGA Curriculum Checks, TFGA Teacher Questionnaire, and classroom observations were also used to assess implementation fidelity. The research team also conducted follow-up meetings at each school midyear (i.e., January) to reorient teachers to TFGA goals, answer questions about implementation issues, and solicit feedback about lesson delivery and student responsiveness.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- Wait-list control.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Interpersonal	Social Problem-Solving Inventory—Revised	SS+	Better social problem solving	Post-intervention

## Tools of the Mind (TOTM)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Large sample, multiple sites
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Intrapersonal, academic achievement
- **School level:** Elementary school
- **Setting:** Not reported
- **Sample:** Low SES
- **Purpose:** Support memory and learning and promote social-emotional and cognitive development through the use of specific tactics focusing on executive functions and organized shared cooperative activities.
- **Implementers:** Teachers, support staff
- **Key intervention components:** Changing the learning environment, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** <http://toolsofthemind.org/>
- **WWC:** Study 1 did not meet WWC standards (<https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Study/79591>).
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is included in the *2013 CASEL Guide—Preschool and Elementary School Edition*.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

Study period not reported; documented in

- Clancy Blair and C. Cybele Raver, “Closing the Achievement Gap Through Modification of Neurocognitive and Neuroendocrine Function: Results from a Cluster Randomized Controlled Trial of an Innovative Approach to the Education of Children in Kindergarten,” *PLoS ONE*, Vol. 9, No. 11, November 12, 2014.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial includes joiners in the reported analyses and did not report sufficient information to assess baseline equivalence of the analytic sample.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 759 students (12 sites)
- **Number of classrooms:** 79 classrooms
- **Grade level:** K (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 29 schools
- **Community type:** Not reported
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** 5–92 percent of students at participant schools were eligible for free/reduced-price lunch.

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Teachers, teaching assistants.
- **How much:** Tools of the Mind was implemented for the entire academic year.
- **Classroom curriculum:** None reported.

- **Changing the learning environment:** Teachers organized and managed instruction for students to build self-regulation skills through purposeful interactions with classmates. Teachers also engaged in daily dynamic assessment of children's development in core areas and provided individualized instruction. Students met with teachers to create and follow weekly individual learning plans and to set and review weekly individual learning goals. In these conferences, students talked through both correct and incorrect answers to foster the ability to reflect on and correct mistakes.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** Teachers and teaching assistants were trained in a two-year professional development cycle. In Year 1, teachers had four workshops spread across the year, with a total of five days of training. Year 2 had 3 training workshops spread across the year, with three days of training.
- **Implementation support:** Each school had a coach that provided in-classroom coaching once every other week during Year 1 and then once a month in Year 2. There were self-reflection forms for the teacher to complete to assist the teacher in thinking about the implementation of different activities and to help the teacher reach better fidelity.

**Comparison group:** "Business as usual."

- Comparison classrooms used a combination of commercial literacy and mathematics curricula following state standards for the development of science and social studies curricula. Teachers in comparison classrooms continued with district professional development as ordinarily scheduled through the school.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Intrapersonal	Backward Digit Span Task	SS+	Better working memory	After 1 year of implementation
Intrapersonal	Computer-administered executive function tasks	SS+	Better cognitive flexibility	After 1 year of implementation
Intrapersonal	Computer-administered executive function tasks	SS+	Better inhibitory control	After 1 year of implementation
Academic achievement	Applied Problems from Woodcock Johnson III	SS+	Better performance in mathematics	After 1 year of implementation
Academic achievement	Letter-Word subtest of Woodcock Johnson III	SS+	Better performance in reading	7 months post-interention
Academic achievement	Expressive One Word Picture Vocabulary Test	SS+	Better performance in vocabulary	7 months post-interention



## Urban Improv (UI)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Small sample, single site
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Intrapersonal, interpersonal
- **School level:** Elementary school
- **Setting:** Urban
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority
- **Purpose:** Enhance students' real-life ability to solve problems in a nonviolent manner by providing them with interactive opportunities to rehearse youth conflict scenarios.
- **Implementers:** Support staff
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum.
- **Intervention website:** <http://urbanimprov.org/>
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

Study period not reported; documented in

- Cassandra Kisiel, Margaret Blaustein, Joseph Spinazzola, Caren S. Schmidt, Marla Zucker, and Bessel van der Kolk, “Evaluation of a Theater-Based Youth Violence Prevention Program for Elementary School Children,” *Journal of School Violence*, Vol. 5, No. 2, June 2006, pp. 19–36.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This quasi-experimental study reported insufficient information to assess baseline equivalence of the analytic sample and involved only one site and fewer than 350 students.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 140 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** 8 classrooms
- **Grade level:** 4 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 48 percent female, 52 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 45 percent African American, 28 percent Hispanic, 13 percent biracial, 6 percent Asian, 6 percent other, 2 percent white, and 1 percent Native American
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 5 schools in Boston
- **Community type:** Urban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Director and four actors, all of whom have extensive training in improvisational theater, expressive arts, and youth education.
- **How much:** Nine weekly sessions (75 minutes each).

- **Classroom curriculum:** UI used structured theater improvisation to improve decisionmaking, problem solving, leadership, cooperation, assertiveness, and impulse-control and values clarification. Its interactive program design enabled children to proactively practice options to a variety of complex social situations that are often the precursors of violence. The UI curriculum addressed the following themes: friendship, self-esteem, imagination, peer pressure, fairness, violence and conflict resolution, sharing, and family. Each session began with an original song on the topic of the week and was followed by a prepared scene that related to the particular theme. At a critical point in the initial scene, the director froze the action and invited a student to replace one of the actors. This process allowed students to make the pivotal decisions affecting the outcome of the scene, take control of the drama, and imagine different alternatives to social or violent scenarios. Subsequently, students were divided into groups, each creating and performing their own scene on the same topic. Sessions ended with group discussion of the choices made and the consequences that followed, which provided a forum for both clarifying values and processing personal experiences and reactions. UI takes place during the school day in a local theater space, to which students are bussed and accompanied by their teacher.
- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** None reported.
- **Implementation support:** None reported.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- No additional details were reported.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Intrapersonal	Social Skills Rating System–Elementary Level	SS+	Less hyperactive inattentiveness	Post-intervention
Intrapersonal	Social Skills Rating System–Elementary Level	SS+	Greater self-control	Post-intervention
Interpersonal	Social Skills Rating System–Elementary Level	SS+	Less externalizing behavior	Post-intervention
Interpersonal	Social Skills Rating System–Elementary Level	SS+	More cooperative prosocial behaviors	Post-intervention

## Violence Prevention Project (VPP)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Large sample, single site
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Intrapersonal, interpersonal
- **School level:** High school
- **Setting:** Urban
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority, low SES
- **Purpose:** Improve students' conflict-related attitudes and behaviors through skill-building exercises.
- **Implementers:** Teachers, administrators, support staff
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** <http://tlpnyc.com/our-programs/youth-development/conflict-resolution-model-program/>
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

A 2005–2009 study documented in

- Amanda C. Thompkins, Lisa M. Chauveron, Ofer Harel, and Daniel F. Perkins, “Optimizing Violence Prevention Programs: An Examination of Program Effectiveness Among Urban High School Students,” *Journal of School Health*, Vol. 84, No. 7, July 2014, pp. 435–443.

### **Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This quasi-experimental study reported insufficient information to assess baseline equivalence of the analytic sample, and it involved only one site.

### **Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 1,112 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** 9–10 (high school)
- **Sex/gender:** 54 percent female, 46 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 42 percent Latino, 41 percent African American, 14 percent other, 9 percent white, and 4 percent Asian
- **SES:** Not reported

### **Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 13 schools in New York City
- **Community type:** Urban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** At least 60 percent of students were from families at or below the poverty line.

### **Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Teachers, administrators, and baccalaureate-degree level or higher facilitators whose ethnic and sex composition mirrored the student diversity common in participating schools.
- **How much:** Twelve 45-minute sessions over one semester.

- **Classroom curriculum:** Program content used skill-building exercises to improve students' conflict-related attitudes and behaviors. Content was delivered using a core component framework that built in opportunities for lesson selection and adaptation and was taught using role-playing, games, and project-based learning. Facilitators were required to use a standard introductory lesson but could select the remaining lessons from a bank as long as they met the required number of lessons for each component. Objectives for the Self-Concept lessons included having students identify positive personal and academic traits about themselves. Objectives for the Group Dynamics lessons included setting classroom norms around conflict. Lesson objectives in the "Vision and Imagination" component included having students imagine their future careers and set incremental goals to track their progress. Lesson objectives from the Conflict Management component included demonstrating effective listening and communication skills in a conflict. Each unit concluded with an arts-based final project, spanning 1–2 classes, which let students immediately apply their skills by working collectively. Lesson selection was based on facilitator, principal, and teacher assessment of class functioning, sociocultural relevancy, special needs, and school-specific issues. These assessments took place before beginning the unit, but lesson selection could be modified during the unit in response to emergent needs.
- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** There were two planning sessions with teachers and school principals before implementation. Facilitators attended annual mandatory 30-hour training with three levels —beginning, refresher, and advanced—which was supplemented with optional booster sessions throughout the year.
- **Implementation support:** Facilitators received curriculum manuals, sample lesson videos, and other program materials, as well as ongoing support and supervision from program managers, who provided or facilitated weekly check-ins, regular staff meetings, observations, and paperwork review. Syllabi were examined for alignment with required elements in the core component structure (e.g., to ensure that facilitators taught between four and six lessons from the conflict management component).

**Comparison group:** "Business as usual."

- No additional details were reported.

### *Positive Results*

<b>Domain</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Result</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>	<b>Timing</b>
Intrapersonal	Student self-report	SS+	Better academic self-concept	Post-intervention
Interpersonal	Interpersonal problem-solving analysis	SS+	Less use of verbal aggression as a conflict resolution strategy	Post-intervention
Interpersonal	Interpersonal problem-solving analysis	SS+	Less use of antisocial behavior as a conflict resolution strategy	Post-intervention
Interpersonal	Interpersonal problem-solving analysis	SS+	Less use of immature avoidance as a conflict resolution strategy	Post-intervention

## We Have Skills (WHS)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier I
- **Size of evidence:** Large sample, multiple sites
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Interpersonal
- **School level:** Elementary school
- **Setting:** Not reported
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority, low SES
- **Purpose:** Use a social skills program to address the needs of students who begin school with weak or limited social skills, as well as the needs of teachers who lack the time, training, and expertise to provide instruction in social skills.
- **Implementers:** Teachers
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, changing the learning environment, family/community involvement, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** <https://www.irised.com/products/we-have-skills>
- **WWC:** Study 1 met WWC standards without reservations (<https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Study/79958>).
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.



## Study 1

Study period not reported; documented in

- Brion Marquez, Jessie Marquez, Claudia G. Vincent, Jordan Pennefather, Jeffery R. Sprague, Keith Smolkowski, and Pamela Yeaton, “The Iterative Development and Initial Evaluation of We Have Skills! An Innovative Approach to Teaching Social Skills to Elementary Students,” *Education and Treatment of Children*, Vol. 37, No. 1, February 2014, pp. 137–161.

**Evidence tier:** Tier I (Strong)

- The reported findings officially meet WWC standards without reservations.

### **Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 1,661 students (at least 4 sites)
- **Number of classrooms:** 83 classrooms
- **Grade level:** K–3 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

### **Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 17 schools in the Pacific Northwest (California, Oregon, and Washington)
- **Community type:** Not reported
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** An average of 42 percent of students were white, 29 percent Latino, 12 percent Asian/Pacific Islander, 7 percent African American, 8 percent multiracial, and 1 percent American Indian/Alaskan.
- **SES:** An average of 61 percent of students were eligible for free or reduced-price lunch.

### **Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Teachers.
- **How much:** Teachers led one lesson a week for eight weeks.
- **Classroom curriculum:** Weekly activities included two core components: a five- to ten-minute discussion using discussion questions from the lesson plan and a five-minute video lesson. In addition, teachers were encouraged to use practice activities,

such as songs (average of 30 seconds per skill), picture cards (2–4 minutes per skill), and role plays (1–5 minutes). Video instruction was supplemented with guided practice through role-playing and printed learning materials, such as fillable booklets, coloring pages, cards for complimenting others and expressing feelings (such as remorse), and posters.

- **Changing the learning environment:** Reinforcement activities included asking students to complete the tally sheets and handing out skill tickets, happy notices, and certificates.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** Skill booklets were a take-home activity for students to complete with their parents (approximately 5 minutes per skill).
- **Professional development:** Teachers attended an in-service training presented by project staff. The training demonstrated how to access the online Elementary Social Behavior Assessment (ESBA) to collect student data, enter their students into the online system, and complete the ESBA for each student, followed by an hour-long training on implementing WHS.
- **Implementation support:** WHS teachers received three separate, functional tools (referred to as “modules”). Module 1 delivered student instructional materials. Module 2 offered an online tool for assessing student social behavior in response to instruction. Module 3 provided professional development materials covering delivery of the instruction and more-intensive forms of student support.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- Wait-list control.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Interpersonal	Elementary Social Behavior Assessment	Effect size: 0.27	Better social skills	Post-intervention

# Yoga

---

## Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 7
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Large sample, multiple sites
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** Intrapersonal, academic attainment, disciplinary
- **School level:** Elementary, middle, and high school
- **Setting:** Urban, rural
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority, low SES
- **Purpose:** Improve aspects of functioning associated with self-regulation, including responses to stress, mood, and social-emotional development, thereby promoting more-positive developmental trajectories.
- **Implementers:** Teachers, support staff
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, changing the learning environment, out-of-school time, professional development, and implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** <http://www.yogaed.com/>
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

Study period not reported; documented in

- Laura Feagans Gould, Jacinda K. Dariotis, Tamar Mendelson, and Mark T. Greenberg, “A School-Based Mindfulness Intervention for Urban Youth: Exploring Moderators of Intervention Effects,” *Journal of Community Psychology*, Vol. 40, No. 8, November 2012, pp. 968–982.
- Tamar Mendelson, Mark T. Greenberg, Jacinda K. Dariotis, Laura F Gould, Brittany L. Rhoades, and Philip J. Leaf, “Feasibility and Preliminary Outcomes of a School-Based Mindfulness Intervention for Urban Youth,” *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, Vol. 38, No. 7, October 2010, pp. 985–994.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial involved only one site and fewer than 350 students, and the statistically significant result did not account for clustering.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 97 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** 4–5 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 61 percent female, 39 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 84 percent African American, 4 percent Latino, 4 percent white, 7 percent mixed-raced or other, and 1 percent did not report
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 4 schools
- **Community type:** Urban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Average of 88 percent of students receiving free/reduced-price lunch

### Intervention summary:

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Instructors.
- **How much:** The classroom curriculum was delivered four days per week (45-minute sessions) for 12 weeks.
- **Classroom curriculum:** The classroom curriculum involved yoga-based physical activity, breathing techniques, and guided mindfulness practices. In each session, youth were taught yoga-inspired postures and movement series, including bending, stretching, and fluid movement. Poses were selected to enhance muscle tone and flexibility, and students were taught the health benefits of the poses. Students also practiced breathing, starting with beginner exercises and gradually moving to more advanced ones. These exercises trained the youths to use their breath to center and calm themselves. At the end of each class, youth lay on their backs with their eyes closed while the instructors guided them through a mindfulness practice, which involved attending to a specific focus for several minutes, such as paying attention to each breath or sending out positive energy to others. The movement, breathing, and mindfulness components of the class were each designed to enhance the youths' capacities for sustained attention, promoting greater awareness of cognitive, physiologic, and bodily states and how to regulate those states. In addition, each class session included a brief period of discussion prior to the guided mindfulness practice, in which instructors offered didactic information about such topics as identifying stressors, using mindfulness techniques to respond to stress, cultivating positive relationships with others, and keeping one's mind and body healthy. This information was often woven into the subsequent guided mindfulness practice (e.g., using the breath to create calm if something stressful has happened). Students were encouraged to practice these skills outside class.
- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** None reported.
- **Implementation support:** None reported.

### Comparison group: "Business as usual."

- Wait-list control.

### Positive Results

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Intrapersonal	Responses to stress questionnaire	SS+	Improved stress management	Post-intervention

## Study 2

Study period not reported; documented in

- Laura Santangelo White, “Reducing Stress in School-Age Girls Through Mindful Yoga,” *Journal of Pediatric Health Care*, Vol. 26, No. 1, February 2012, pp. 45–56.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial involved confounds (school and provider) with the intervention, only one site, and fewer than 350 students.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 190 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** 4–5 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 100 percent female, 0 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 2 schools
- **Community type:** Not reported
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

### Intervention summary:

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Instructors.
- **How much:** The classroom curriculum involved 1 hour each week for eight weeks and 10 minutes of daily homework.
- **Classroom curriculum:** The classroom curriculum was tailored developmentally to participants. Considerations included (a) shorter sessions, (b) more repetition, (c) concrete experiences, (d) greater movement, (e) emphasis on safety, and (f) balance between new experiences and repetition. The group sessions were based on direct, concrete experience with greater explanations of techniques and translation to daily life.
- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** The classes met immediately after school in the same room at the same time and were led by the same interventionist and research assistants.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** None reported.
- **Implementation support:** Fidelity was maintained through the use of (a) an intervention manual, (b) a journal kept by the interventionist, (c) an intervention checklist monitored by research assistants, (d) written instructions, (e) homework with pictures and audio instructions, and (f) feedback during the sessions.

### Comparison group: “Business as usual.”

- Wait-list control.

### Positive Results

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Intrapersonal	The Schoolagers! Coping Strategies Inventory	SS+	Improved coping skills	Post-intervention

### Study 3

Study period not reported; documented in

- Jennifer L. Frank, Kimberly Kohler, Adam Peal, and Bidyut Bose, “Effectiveness of a School-Based Yoga Program on Adolescent Mental Health and School Performance: Findings from a Randomized Controlled Trial,” *Mindfulness*, Vol. 8, No. 3, June 2017, pp. 1–10.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial involved only one site and fewer than 350 students.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 159 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** Not reported
- **Grade level:** 6 and 9 (middle school)
- **Sex/gender:** 47 percent female, 53 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 54 percent Latino, 22 percent mixed racial background, 17 percent African American, 6 percent white, 1 percent Asian
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 1 school located in an inner-city area of California
- **Community type:** Urban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** “Diverse middle school”
- **SES:** “High-poverty catchment area”

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Experienced yoga instructors.
- **How much:** The classroom curriculum involved sessions (30 minutes each) three or four days per week during the first semester of the school year.



- **Classroom curriculum:** The classroom curriculum provided students with instruction and applied experience in using yoga postures, breathing techniques, and centering meditation to reduce stress and promote social-emotional health and physical wellness. Lessons were divided into four units focusing on stress management, body and emotional awareness, self-regulation, and building healthy relationships. Each lesson was designed to teach specific skills connected to the overarching unit theme and followed a predictable instructional sequence consistent with best practices in student pedagogy.
- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** None reported.
- **Implementation support:** Instructors participated in regular supervision meetings with program developers, during which anticipatory questions and implementation challenges were discussed. Implementation was monitored through the completion of implementation checklists.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- No additional details were reported.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Intrapersonal	School Engagement Scale	Effect size: 0.45	Greater school engagement	Post-intervention
Intrapersonal	Responses to Stress Questionnaire	Effect size: 0.14	Better stress management	Post-intervention
Academic attainment	School records	Effect size: 0.86	Fewer unexcused absences	Post-intervention
Disciplinary outcome	School records	Effect size: 0.33	Fewer detentions	Post-intervention

## Study 4

Study period not reported; documented in

- Dessa Bergen-Cico, Rachel Razza, and Amy Timmins, “Fostering Self-Regulation Through Curriculum Infusion of Mindful Yoga: A Pilot Study of Efficacy and Feasibility,” *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, Vol. 24, No. 11, November 2015, pp. 3448–3461.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This study involved a confound (provider) with the intervention, only one site, and fewer than 350 students.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 144 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** 8 classrooms
- **Grade level:** 6 (middle school)
- **Sex/gender:** 51 percent female, 49 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 58 percent white, 33 percent Asian, and 10 percent other
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 1 school in the greater Boston area
- **Community type:** Not reported
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Classroom teacher (who also engaged in her own mindful yoga practice on a regular basis).
- **How much:** The teacher led yoga practices three times per week for 4 minutes at the beginning of each English Language Arts class throughout the academic year.
- **Classroom curriculum:** None reported.

- **Changing the learning environment:** The classroom teacher integrated yoga practices into the regular class routine. The teacher began the class with a standing yoga practice (focusing on a single pose each week), followed by a brief mindful meditation.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** None reported.
- **Implementation support:** The teacher used the YogaKids Tools for Schools ToolBox, which included different pose cards with instructions for each pose, the objective promoted by each pose (e.g., “Focus and Concentration” and “Strength and Confidence”), and strategies for integrating yoga into the school curriculum. The teacher also kept a weekly log to record implementation, including comments regarding her impression of how the practices were going and any challenges with respect to the standard curriculum.

**Comparison group:** “Active comparator.”

- Students in the active control classes were exposed to some basic didactic elements of mindfulness in the form of class discussions that focused on awareness of one’s thoughts, awareness of wandering mind, and paying attention to where one’s attention is in the present moment. These discussions were minimal (i.e., a few times over the course of the year) and were included in an effort to account for the potential influence of providing information about mindful awareness in contrast to the regular practice of mindful yoga and meditation.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Intrapersonal	Adolescent Self-Regulatory Inventory	SS+	Better self-regulation	Post-intervention

## Study 5

A 2008 study documented in

- Sat Bir S. Khalsa, Lynn Hickey-Schultz, Deborah Cohen, Naomi Steiner, and Stephen Cope, “Evaluation of the Mental Health Benefits of Yoga in a Secondary School: A Preliminary Randomized Controlled Trial,” *The Journal of Behavioral Health Services & Research*, Vol. 39, No. 1, January 2012, pp. 80–90.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial had high attrition, did not report sufficient information to assess baseline equivalence of the analytic sample, and involved only one site and fewer than 350 students.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 121 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** 7 classes
- **Grade level:** 11–12 (high school)
- **Sex/gender:** 42 percent female, 58 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 1 school in Massachusetts
- **Community type:** Rural
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Average of 90 percent of students self-identifying as white
- **SES:** Average of 17 percent of students from low-SES families

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Trained yoga instructors.
- **How much:** The classroom curriculum involved two to three yoga sessions per week for 11 weeks, during which either 23, 25, 31, or 32 sessions were held (depending on the class). Yoga sessions were 30 minutes (three classes) or 40 minutes (one class) long.

- **Classroom curriculum:** The yoga program included simple yoga postures, breathing exercises, visualization, games, and development and training in mindfulness, self-awareness, and a yoga-based psychological and philosophical attitude. Typical sessions were structured to include a 5-minute initial relaxation, a 5-minute warm-up, 15 minutes of yoga poses, and a 5-minute closing relaxation (times were extended for the 40-minute sessions). Breathing techniques were incorporated during the initial relaxation and throughout the sessions. Each of the sessions had a theme or talking point that the instructor discussed during the session, including the following: yoga philosophy and methodology (postures, breathing, relaxation, meditation, awareness), nonviolence, mind-body interactions and awareness, body systems, stress management, emotional intelligence, self-talk and critical voice, contentment, discipline, decisionmaking, values and principles, commitment, and acceptance.
- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** Each of the yoga instructors underwent a formal training course.
- **Implementation support:** None reported.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- Physical education classes as usual.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Intrapersonal	Behavior Assessment Survey for Children Version 2 (BASC-2)	SS+	Better anger control	Post-intervention
Intrapersonal	The Resilience Scale	SS+	Better resilience	Post-intervention

## Study 6

A 2009 study documented in

- Jessica J. Noggle, Naomi J. Steiner, Takuya Minami, and Sat Bir S. Khalsa, “Benefits of Yoga for Psychosocial Well-Being in a US High School Curriculum: A Preliminary Randomized Controlled Trial,” *Journal of Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics*, Vol. 33, No. 3, April 2012, pp. 193–201.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial involved a confound (class) with intervention, only one site, and fewer than 350 students.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 51 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** 3 classrooms
- **Grade level:** 11–12 (high school)
- **Sex/gender:** 57 percent female, 43 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 1 school in Massachusetts
- **Community type:** Rural
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** 9–12
- **Total enrollment at schools:** 625 students
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** 92 percent white, 4 percent Hispanic, 2 percent African American, 1 percent multiracial, and 1 percent Asian
- **SES:** Average of 16 percent of students from low-SES families

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Trained yoga instructors, yoga teaching assistants, and classroom teachers (physical education instructors).
- **How much:** The classroom curriculum was delivered two to three times per week (alternating weekly due to the school schedule) over ten weeks (28 yoga sessions total).

- **Classroom curriculum:** The yoga program included four key elements of classical yoga: physical exercises and postures, breathing exercises, deep relaxation, and meditation techniques. The overall emphasis was on self-inquiry and emotion regulation through instruction to breathe, relax, feel, watch, and allow. Postures were taught as breath-coordinated movements, and breathing was considered the central tool for cultivating nonjudgmental, compassionate self-awareness. The majority of yoga postures were simple and adaptable for all physical fitness levels. Physically demanding techniques were eventually introduced as optional variations of the standard poses toward the end of the program, based on students' progress. Typical sessions were structured to include a 5-minute initial relaxation, a 5-minute warm-up, 15 minutes of yoga poses, and a 5-minute closing relaxation (times were extended for the 40-minute sessions). Breathing techniques were incorporated during the initial relaxation and throughout the sessions. Each of the sessions had a theme or talking point that the instructor discussed during the session, including the following: yoga philosophy and methodology (postures, breathing, relaxation, meditation, awareness), nonviolence, mind-body interactions and awareness, body systems, stress management, emotional intelligence, self-talk and critical voice, contentment, discipline, decisionmaking, values and principles, commitment, and acceptance.
- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** None reported.
- **Implementation support:** None reported.

**Comparison group:** "Business as usual."

- Physical education classes as usual.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Intrapersonal	The Profile of Mood States-Short Form	SS+	Better emotional regulation	Post-intervention

## Study 7

Study period not reported; documented in

- Leslie A. Daly, Sara C. Haden, Marshall Hagins, Nicholas Papouchis, and Paul Michael Ramirez, “Yoga and Emotion Regulation in High School Students: A Randomized Controlled Trial,” *Evidence-Based Complementary and Alternative Medicine*, August 2015, pp. 1–8.

**Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial involved a confound (class) with intervention, only one site, and fewer than 350 students.

**Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 38 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** 2 classrooms
- **Grade level:** Not reported (high school)
- **Sex/gender:** 38 percent female, 62 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 87 percent African American
- **SES:** 11 percent low SES

**Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 1 school in New York City
- **Community type:** Urban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported
- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Trained yoga instructors.
- **How much:** The classroom curriculum involved classes (40 minutes each) three times per week for 16 weeks (42 sessions total).
- **Classroom curriculum:** Each session included postures, breathing, relaxation, and guided meditation techniques in a supportive and noncompetitive environment. Sessions began with a structured routine that transitioned the students into yoga,



followed by a rigorous 15–30-minute sequence of postures, then relaxation time, and ending with a closing ritual that emphasized carrying principles of the yoga practice into the rest of the day.

- **Changing the learning environment:** None reported.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** None reported.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** None reported.
- **Implementation support:** The yoga class was observed three times to ensure consistency.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- Physical education classes as usual.

### *Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
Intrapersonal	Emotion Regulation Index for Children and Adolescents	SS+	Better emotional regulation	Post-intervention

## Youth Matters (YM)

---

### Snapshot of Evidence

- **Studies:** 1
- **Highest tier:** Tier III
- **Size of evidence:** Large sample, single site
- **Outcome domains with positive results:** School climate and safety
- **School level:** Elementary school
- **Setting:** Urban
- **Sample:** Racial/ethnic minority
- **Purpose:** Promote the healthy development of young people by encouraging positive relationships between students and school adults and promoting safe and healthy norms throughout the school community.
- **Implementers:** Support staff
- **Key intervention components:** Classroom curriculum, changing the learning environment, applications outside the classroom, professional development, implementation support.
- **Intervention website:** There is no dedicated website for this intervention.
- **WWC:** There is no WWC entry for this intervention.
- **CASEL Guides:** This intervention is not included in either of the CASEL Guides.
- **Navigating SEL:** This intervention is not included in the Navigating SEL list of programs.

## Study 1

A 2003–2005 study documented in

- Jeffery M. Jenson and William A. Dieterich, “Effects of a Skills-Based Prevention Program on Bullying and Bully Victimization Among Elementary School Children,” *Prevention Science*, Vol. 8, No. 8, December 2007, pp. 285–296.
- Jeffery M. Jenson., William A. Dieterich, Daniel Brisson, Kimberly A. Bender, and Anne Powell, “Preventing Childhood Bullying: Findings and Lessons from the Denver Public Schools Trial,” *Research on Social Work Practice*, Vol. 20, No. 5, February 4, 2010, pp. 509–517.
- Jeffery M. Jenson, Daniel Brisson, Kimberly A. Bender, and Anne P. Williford, “Effects of the Youth Matters Prevention Program on Patterns of Bullying and Victimization in Elementary and Middle School,” *Social Work Research*, Vol. 37, No. 4, December 2013, pp. 361–372.

### **Evidence tier:** Tier III (Promising)

- This randomized controlled trial reported insufficient information to assess student attrition in the full randomized sample and to assess baseline equivalence of the analytic sample and involved only one site.

### **Characteristics of the students included in the study:**

- **Sample size:** 1,126 students (1 site)
- **Number of classrooms:** 66 classrooms
- **Grade level:** 4–5 (elementary school)
- **Sex/gender:** 51 percent female, 49 percent male
- **Race/ethnicity:** 59 percent Latino/a; 15 percent African American; 15 percent American Indian, Asian American, or mixed race/ethnicity; and 9 percent white
- **SES:** Not reported

### **Characteristics of the schools where the study took place:**

- **Number/location of schools:** 28 schools in Denver
- **Community type:** Urban
- **Grade levels served in the schools:** Not reported
- **Total enrollment at schools:** Not reported

- **Sex/gender:** Not reported
- **Race/ethnicity:** Not reported
- **SES:** Not reported

**Intervention summary:**

- **Staff who delivered the intervention:** Educational specialists.
- **How much:** One ten-session module (90 minutes per session) per semester for four semesters.
- **Classroom curriculum:** The curriculum consisted of a series of instructional modules addressing issues and skills important to students and their school community. Each module included a 30- to 40-page story designed to help schools meet academic standards in both health education and language arts. The substantive content of each story was directly linked to skills taught in the curriculum modules.
- **Changing the learning environment:** To address systemic issues associated with bullying, some modules concluded with the development of classroom projects that demonstrate the adverse consequences of bullying and aggression to students.
- **Applications outside the classroom:** To address systemic issues associated with bullying, some modules concluded with the development of schoolwide projects that demonstrate the adverse consequences of bullying and aggression to students.
- **Out-of-school time:** None reported.
- **Family/community involvement:** None reported.
- **Professional development:** Specialists received 16 hours of initial training in the curriculum.
- **Implementation support:** Specialists received ongoing training to ensure fidelity of program materials and instructional approaches.

**Comparison group:** “Business as usual.”

- No additional details were reported.

*Positive Results*

Domain	Measure	Result	Interpretation	Timing
School climate and safety	Revised Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire	SS+	Less victimization at school	After 2 years of implementation