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Today’s Agenda

• **Rick Miller** – Background on SEL in the CORE Districts

• **Klint Kanopka** – New research showing that improvements in students’ SEL is related to subsequent improvements in other outcomes

• **Libby Pier** – Compilation of research showing that

• **Jennifer Peck** – What are systems and structures that could be built to advance this vision at scale?

• **Mai Xi Lee** – What can schools and districts do to support students when they re-enter?

• **Discussion** – Moderated questions for panelists from the audience
Logistical notes

• Please type your questions & comments into the Q&A box
  • You can vote on others’ entries, which will determine which questions get answered first

• Slides and links to resources can be found on the PACE event page:
  • https://edpolicyinca.org/events/pace-webinar-supporting-students-social-emotional-learning-force-recovery

• The video recording from this webinar will be posted online early next week
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CORE Districts

- Fresno Unified
- Garden Grove Unified
- Los Angeles Unified
- Long Beach Unified
- Oakland Unified
- Sacramento City Unified
- San Francisco Unified
- Santa Ana Unified

8 School Districts

>1 Million Students

~1,800 Schools

~56,700 Educators
How the CORE districts work together

• 2010 to 2013: District Partnerships
  • Standards Implementation
  • Building Relationships

• 2013 to 2016: CORE ESEA Waiver
  • Measuring More than Test Scores
  • Equity Driven Accountability – School Report Cards
  • Continuous Improvement Based Interventions (e.g., School Pairings)

• Current Work: Systems Improvements
  • Equity Driven Analytics - the CORE Data Collaborative
  • Testing our Theory of Improvement at the School Level and District Level
  • Networked Improvement Communities
2 Million Students

100,000+ Teachers

150+ School Districts

10 County Offices of Education

3,000+ Schools

Created by Districts for Districts
CORE is part of the national dialogue on including Social Emotional Skills in Multiple Measure approaches to school quality

We’re putting a flashlight on the social and emotional skills to help schools think about the role they play. We think school quality is not only about academic success but also about developing the whole child.

With almost half a million students surveyed across two years, CORE’s measures of social-emotional skills let us explore how to measure these essential skills at scale.
# Surveys of Students’ Social-Emotional Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SE Competency</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Growth Mindset</strong></td>
<td>The belief that one’s abilities can grow with effort. Students with a growth mindset see effort as necessary for success, embrace challenges, learn from criticism, and persist in the face of setbacks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Efficacy</strong></td>
<td>The belief in one’s own ability to succeed in achieving an outcome or reaching a goal. Self-efficacy reflects confidence in the ability to exert control over one’s own motivation, behavior, and environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Management</strong></td>
<td>The ability to regulate one’s emotions, thoughts, and behaviors effectively in different situations. This includes managing stress, delaying gratification, motivating oneself, and setting and working toward personal and academic goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Awareness</strong></td>
<td>The ability to take the perspective of and empathize with others from diverse backgrounds and cultures, to understand social and ethical norms for behavior, and to recognize family, school, and community resources and supports.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Background

- Social-emotional learning (SEL) skills are strongly predictive of educational and labor-market success (Farrington et al. 2012; Duckworth et al. 2007; Dweck 2006; Kautz et al. 2014; Deming 2017)

- Only one other study has assessed the relationship between changes in an SEL measure and changes in student outcomes (Duckworth, Tsukayama, & May, 2010)

- CORE districts provide natural place to look at relationship between changes in SEL and changes in academic and behavioral outcomes
Research Questions

- Are within student changes in self-reported social-emotional skills predictive of changes in academic outcomes for students?

- Do the relationships between SEL changes and changes in other student outcomes vary by student characteristics such as gender, race, economically disadvantaged status, and previous SEL level?
Sample

- 49,216 students
- Grades: 4-8
- Five districts:
  - Fresno
  - Long Beach
  - Los Angeles
  - San Francisco
  - Santa Ana
# Measures

**Independent Variables**

- Four self-report SEL scales  
  - Growth Mindset  
  - Social Awareness  
  - Self-efficacy  
  - Self-management  
- Measured yearly  
- Standardized within cohort-year

**Dependent Variables**

- Achievement tests  
  - SBAC Math  
  - SBAC ELA  
- Attendance Rate  
- Measured yearly  
- Standardized within cohort-year
Modeling Approach

- Cohort-year standardized variables
  - Looks at student changes relative to their peers
  - Controls for grade effects
- Individual fixed effects
  - Controls for student characteristics that do not vary with time
  - Link together observations for the same student over time
  - Provide estimates of within-student trends
All measures exhibit year-to-year change
SEL growth is associated with better outcomes
Lowest SEL students see most concurrent growth
Students see gains regardless of SBAC Math level
Takeaways

- Gains in SEL are positively associated with increases in achievement and attendance
  - Associations are largest for growth mindset and self-management
- Associations between SEL and math achievement vary across levels of SEL
  - Largest for the students with the lowest levels of SEL
  - SEL growth associated with SBAC Math growth regardless of SEL level
- Associations vary across levels of math achievement
  - All levels see an association between SEL gains and gains in SBAC Math
  - Different SEL constructs are more associated at different levels of SBAC Math
- Results for SBAC ELA and attendance rate closely mirror SBAC Math
- Associations between SEL and outcomes are consistent across subgroups
  - All groups see outcome growth alongside SEL growth
Thank you!
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Improving lives through learning
School & Classroom Effects on Students’ SEL Growth

Dr. Libby Pier
What is a growth model?
What is a Growth Model?

- A statistical approach for measuring the effect that a school (or classroom) has on students’ academic growth from one year to the next.

- We can apply this statistical methodology to measure the effect a school (or classroom) has on students’ growth in SEL from one year to the next.
How a Growth Model Works

**Step 1**
After SEL survey is complete, EA **collects and scales student data** from CORE and **determines average growth** for each construct and grade level, as well as demographic adjustments.

**Step 2**
Each student gets a **customized statistical prediction** based on his or her characteristics.

- **+35** Average growth for students with similar prior SEL scale score
- **+2** Adjustment for student-level characteristics
- **-5** Adjustment for school-level characteristics

___

**Note**: Specific numbers on this slide for adjustments are for illustrative purposes.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Year SEL Scale Score</th>
<th>Current Year Predicted SEL Scale Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Predicted Score</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**During the year**

- **+32** points
How a Growth Model Works

Step 3

- Determine whether each student exceeded or did not meet prediction, and by how much.

Prior Year SEL Scale Score

Current Year SEL Scale Score

Prior Year SEL Scale Score

Current Year SEL Scale Score

- Student Exceeded Prediction by 5 Scale Score Points

- Student Did Not Meet Prediction by 4 Scale Score Points

Predicted Score

Actual Score
How a Growth Model Works

Step 4

- **On average**, did a school’s (or classroom’s) students tend to exceed or not meet their predictions, and by how much?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School A</th>
<th>School B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Average +3.25 Scale Score Points)</td>
<td>(Average -1.25 Scale Score Points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average SEL Growth</td>
<td>Below Average SEL Growth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Students exceeded or exceeded predictions:
  - School A: +8, +2, +7, +4
  - School B: -4, -7, +4, -3

- Students did not meet or met predictions:
  - School A: +7, -6, +6, -3
  - School B: -2, +5, -6, +3
How a Growth Model Works

Step 5

- Growth result is converted to a common scale (0-6 scale shown as an example)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School C</th>
<th>School D</th>
<th>School E</th>
<th>School F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>+8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Growth result is converted to a common scale (0-6 scale shown as an example)
School Effects
Results

- SEL school effects vary as much as school effects on SBAC scores
Results

- Correlations are mostly positive and significant, but generally low
- Evidence that school effects capture true contributions
- Much of the school effect in one year is unrelated to the school effect in the next year

Correlations of School Growth Measures Across Years

- Stability Correlation
- Noise-Corrected
- Standard
Classroom Effects
Results

- How “big” or “small” are classroom effects on students’ SEL growth?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>School Level</th>
<th>Classroom Level</th>
<th>Student Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>0.02 (7%)</td>
<td>0.05 (17%)</td>
<td>0.21 (77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>0.01 (4%)</td>
<td>0.03 (10%)</td>
<td>0.24 (86%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Mindset</td>
<td>0.02 (3%)</td>
<td>0.07 (9%)</td>
<td>0.69 (88%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>0.02 (2%)</td>
<td>0.05 (6%)</td>
<td>0.77 (92%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Management</td>
<td>0.01 (1%)</td>
<td>0.04 (5%)</td>
<td>0.74 (94%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Awareness</td>
<td>0.02 (2%)</td>
<td>0.05 (5%)</td>
<td>0.82 (93%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do classrooms with high SEL growth also have high academic growth?

Weighted Correlations Between Classroom Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Social Awareness</th>
<th>Self-Management</th>
<th>Self-Efficacy</th>
<th>Growth Mindset</th>
<th>ELA</th>
<th>Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Awareness</td>
<td>0.07 (0.02)</td>
<td>0.11 (0.02)</td>
<td>0.27 (0.03)</td>
<td>0.43 (0.02)</td>
<td>0.5 (0.02)</td>
<td>1 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Management</td>
<td>0.04 (0.02)</td>
<td>0.09 (0.02)</td>
<td>0.15 (0.03)</td>
<td>0.52 (0.02)</td>
<td>1 (0)</td>
<td>0.5 (0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>0 (0.02)</td>
<td>0 (0.02)</td>
<td>0.26 (0.03)</td>
<td>1 (0)</td>
<td>0.52 (0.02)</td>
<td>0.43 (0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Mindset</td>
<td>0.17 (0.02)</td>
<td>0.2 (0.02)</td>
<td>1 (0)</td>
<td>0.26 (0.03)</td>
<td>0.15 (0.03)</td>
<td>0.27 (0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>0.62 (0.01)</td>
<td>1 (0)</td>
<td>0.2 (0.02)</td>
<td>0 (0.02)</td>
<td>0.09 (0.02)</td>
<td>0.11 (0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>1 (0)</td>
<td>0.62 (0.02)</td>
<td>0.17 (0.02)</td>
<td>0 (0.02)</td>
<td>0.04 (0.02)</td>
<td>0.07 (0.02)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion
Conclusions

- Schools and classrooms affect students’ growth in SEL from one year to the next
- Classrooms have a larger impact on SEL growth than schools
- Schools’ impacts are not that stable from one year to the next
- These measures are not ready to be used for any sort of high-stakes accountability
- But they could be useful for identifying:
  - Consistently high- or low-growth SEL schools → for continuous improvement
  - Consistently high- or low-growth SEL classrooms → for professional development and learning
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Discussion