THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

THE FUTURE OF SCHOOL-BASED
SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL LEARNING PROGRAMS

A FUTURE OF CHILDREN EVENT WITH REMARKS BY
SPECIAL OLYMPICS COMMITTEE PRESIDENT
TIMOTHY SHRIVER

Washington, D.C.

Wednesday, May 31, 2017

Welcome and introduction:

RON HASKINS
Cabot Chair in Economic Studies
Senior Fellow and Co-Director, Center on Children and Families
The Brookings Institution

Overview of volume:

STEPHANIE M. JONES
Marie and Max Kargman Professor in Human Development and Urban Education
Harvard Graduate School of Education

Overview of policy brief:

CLARK McKOWN
Executive Director
Rush NeuroBehavioral Center

Keynote speech:

TIMOTHY SHRIVER
President
Special Olympics Committee

Panel:

RON HASKINS
Cabot Chair in Economic Studies
Senior Fellow and Co-Director, Center on Children and Families
The Brookings Institution

EMILY DOOLITTLE
Team Lead for Social Behavioral Research
National Center for Education Research
Institute of Education Sciences
U.S. Department of Education

STEPHANIE M. JONES
Marie and Max Kargman Professor in Human Development and Urban Education
Harvard Graduate School of Education

CLARK McKOWN
Executive Director
Rush NeuroBehavioral Center

ROGER WEISSBERG
UIC and LAS Distinguished Professor of Psychology & Education
NoVo Foundation Endowed Chair in Social and Emotional Learning
University of Illinois

* * * * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. HASKINS: Good morning and welcome to Brookings. My name is Ron Haskins; I co-direct a Center here called the Center on Children and Families with Richard Reeves. It's a great pleasure to work with Richard. We're here to mark the 25th volume in the Future of Children that the Brookings-Princeton team has published. It's been a great pleasure. We're now on our 13th year and I think we published many good volumes, including this one. This volume contains nine splendid papers that address social and emotional learning, a relatively new but growing field in education.

Here's our plan for the morning. First we're going to begin with an overview of the entire volume, so things that we're not going to talk about later necessarily, but all the papers in the volume and -- because we want you to have a flavor of what's in the volume. And then we'll follow -- Stephanie Jones from Harvard, she is the Marie and Max Kargman professor in human development at Harvard. Did I say that right? Close? (Laughter) You know, close. You learn to be close is good enough for me. All right, so then when that's through we're going to hear about the policy brief. We always do a policy brief, 3000 words. Both the volume and the policy brief are available for you as is biographical information. So most of the introductions will be quite short. And the policy brief was written by Clark McKown, who also authored a chapter in the volume. And he's executive director of the Rush NeuroBehavioral Center in Skokie, Illinois, just outside Chicago. And as I said he was the author of the policy brief. The keynote speech by Dr. Timothy Shriver will follow, and I'll introduce Dr. Shriver at that time.

After some discussion with Clark and Tim and an opportunity for audience questions we'll turn to a panel discussion that will include in addition to Clark and Stephanie two new speakers, Emily Doolittle, who is the co-editor along with Stephanie of the volume and she's a team lead for social behavioral research at the famous and glorified Institute of Education Sciences that we all know and love, whose first director is here, Grover Whitehurst, and many of you probably know him. And then second, Roger Weissberg, who is the UIC and LAS distinguished professor of psychology and education at the University of Illinois. And we'll then conclude with a discussion with the audience and adjourn the event.

So, I now welcome Stephanie to the podium and we'll see if you actually have a PowerPoint. It will be very good if you do.

MS. JONES: It's right here. I do have a PowerPoint.

MR. HASKINS: Well, but the question is is it loaded. (Laughter)

MS. JONES: And here it is. I have a PowerPoint addiction I should say, which is why I have PowerPoint, a late breaking PowerPoint. So welcome. Thank you for coming today. We're really excited about this issue. Let's see if I can work the PowerPoint.

So my job is to introduce the issue and I thought I would do that by covering two major areas. And I'm not going to actually give you kind of a summary of each paper, I'm going to do something that I want to do, which is tell you what we had intended to do and a little bit about why, and then tell you what we did. And then highlight some things from the issue in general. And then you'll have to read the whole thing, which is our intention.

So in terms of highlights I'm going to focus on what is it, which is a question that we ask ourselves a great deal in this area. I'm going to summarize what we know about what works, and then I'm going to talk a little bit about what's next.

So before we begin, of course I want to thank everyone involved, in particular our funders, the Wallace Foundation, and of course the Future of Children and the Brookings Institution, without whom -- many -- some people in the room, many people not in the room, none of this would have happened, including a terrific authors' conference a year ago, all of the editorial work, and then of course putting on this event today. And I also want to thank all of the authors, some of whom are here, many of whom are not, the co-authors, the discussants, the reviewers, the research assistants. They are very important to this endeavor and frequently not thanked. So thank you to them.

So I'm going to start by talking about the moment we're in. And, as Clark says in his brief, the SEL project is nearing a critical moment. It's a little dramatic, but I think it's right. We have two decades at least of research on the topic, a great many effective approaches designed for schools, preschools, and out of school settings. A number of major initiatives, many led by CASEL, including their collaborating districts initiative, a collaborating states initiative, and we now have a national commission on social, emotional, and academic development.

As these headlines suggest, the worlds of practice and policy are responding. Every time I do the Google, which everybody should do, social and emotional learning, a whole host of new headlines and new things come up, some of them just last week. And this of course is a tiny, tiny

selection. So our intention at this pivotal moment was to design a volume for a broad audience that

provides a number of things, a clear view of definition and operationalization of what is meant by SEL,

and one that positions the field in a broader landscape, a concrete and distilled summary of evidence

from interventions in early education, elementary school, middle and high school, and out of school time

settings, or after school. And then we wanted to highlight connections between research and practice in

SEL and a number of key policy areas in education. So that's what we planned to do.

This is what we did. We have a paper in the issue by Mark Greenberg and a number of

co-authors that positions or locates SEL in the broader landscape of public health and education. We

have four papers that summarize the evidence from interventions across developmental periods and

across settings. And we have a number of papers, three, that link SEL to key policy areas, including

school discipline, teacher preparation and support, and standards assessment and accountability.

So we tried to provide a kind of a concrete, clear, distilled summary that captures the

boundaries of this field. And the boundaries really begin with how do we understand what it is and what it

means, and ends with how do we think about policies that make a difference for it, which is the goal of

this session today.

So, now to the highlights. I go to a lot of meetings like this and I sit in a room with a lot of

people and we talk about this field, and usually the first question in the room is okay, what is it, what are

we actually talking about. And often it's the last question in the meeting as well. So what we've tried to

do is not provide one definition, but to acknowledge a whole set of definitions that distill down to I think a

number of concrete elements. So the truth of the field is that a whole variety of disciplines have produced

a great many frameworks and organizational systems that describe and define social and emotional skills.

These frameworks describe this domain in terms of skills and competencies, but also other things, like

behaviors and attitudes and traits, strengths, and abilities.

So how do we define the boundaries of this area? I put in here two general definitions.

You can find a lot of general definitions and they kind of cohere around a number of key elements. Two I

like, one from this issue from Clark, social and emotional learning, or SEL, refers to the thinking skills,

behavioral skills, and regulatory skills needed to interact effectively with others and to make, form, and

deepen relationships. Another from the National Commission on Social, Emotional, and Academic

Development is when social, emotional, and academic development, which is what that seed stands for, goes well, children develop the skills to manage and take care of themselves, get along, and work well within their learning community, and three, engage in academic learning.

So those are great general definitions. What I spend a lot of time working on is trying to go underneath that and get a little concrete about what is actually meant, so what are the skills we'd like to see in children in settings over time. So what is it specifically? The domain includes a set of very concrete cognitive, emotional, and social skills that support learning, positive behavior, and high quality interactions. So these are sort of skills and competencies, things that you have and can do. And you can maybe read those, but in the cognitive area we have things like managing and shifting attention, controlling impulses, planning and goal setting, critical thinking. In the emotion area, we have things like emotion knowledge and expression, emotion and behavioral regulation, empathy. In the social category, we have things like understanding social cues, so being able to read and respond to the social environment, social perspective taking, sort of leaping into the shoes of another person and understanding a situation from their viewpoint, pro social, cooperative behavior, effective conflict resolution, social problem solving, and so on. What's often left out -- and I think this is where it gets a little complicated -- is that there's another set of factors that represent what I think Clark said, maybe 10 years ago, describes as the belief ecology, which I love -- I love that term -- and it represents a set of internal or maybe contextual guides that drive action based on the knowledge, skills and dispositions you have. So it may not actually be enough to have the skill, you have to be free, safe, and motivated to use it when it matters. And so these include things like beliefs, knowledge of self and identity, self efficacy, growth mindset, agency, self esteem, self knowledge. In the kind of character and values domain we have ethical performance, intellectual and civic values. Some call them virtues. And in the personality category we have things that we know well, like optimism, gratitude, openness, enthusiasm, and so on. These are the words that you hear embedded in this field when you look at the literature.

So moving from what is it to what works, there is a whole lot of evidence of different types now accumulated over 30 or 40 years, the majority of it in the last 2 decades. We have long-term correlational studies that link skills in early childhood to life outcomes 20 or 30 years later, even after accounting for all sorts of stuff in the middle. We have large multi program studies, we have trials of

specific interventions implemented in preschool settings, in elementary school, middle school, high school, and in after school context. Many of them, most of them, randomized trials. And then, of course, as the evidence accumulates we have a number of meta analyses and cost-benefit analyses.

What's the bottom line from all of this evidence? There is solid and accumulating evidence for the benefit of interventions implemented in preschool, elementary school, middle and high school, and in out of school time settings. The evidence in my view suggests some sort of common denominators of practice, of effective programs, that include adults who model and live the skills we expect in children, who make the skills quite explicit to children to make it very clear what the skills are, who give children opportunities to practice, fail, practice, and learn again in all interactions and settings. And I would say that the strongest evidence is for individual interventions, so interventions that are carefully designed around a particular target, so a particular outcome, that is aligned with a very specific set of practices, and then critically -- and this will come up later -- aligned with a set of measurement tools. Across those individual intervention studies there are meta analytic studies that aggregate the data and confirm what we know from those individual studies.

A couple of considerations that are quite important, the whole set of skills are development. So I' a development psychologist, I care deeply about human development, I see human development in everything I do. So an intervention that's designed for a five year old or even for a sixth grader isn't necessarily going to be the right intervention for a ninth grader or a twelfth grader. So we have to think about development and developmental contexts when we think about interventions.

The second important consideration is of course always, as with any educational intervention, implementation. So programs are most effective when they are implemented well. So thinking about the key contexts and supports for implementation is essential.

So, finally, what's next? I think that the next frontier for this field, building on this volume, is to think really carefully about this idea of integration. How do we weave social and emotional learning as a set of practices beliefs, targets, into the fabric of schools and schooling? This means thinking about core practices that are embedded in every day interactions. It also means linking to existing structures in schools, like discipline practices. And in the journal there's a paper on this by Anne Gregory. It's impossible to integrate practices without thinking about adults. So I think the next generation of this work

really focuses squarely on adults. Teachers, of course, through teacher training, pre service, in service. Teacher competencies, so teachers own social, emotional skills, competencies, and wellbeing, and the kinds of supports, ongoing supports that are embedded in settings that help teachers do their work the best they can.

And it's really not just teachers because SEL is in every interaction, it's in every social moment. And those don't just happen in classrooms, they happen in all the settings of a school. So it's really about all the school adults, those who run the lunchroom, those who monitor the halls, those who run the playground. Those are really important interactions that kids have that are very meaningful to their every day and future wellbeing.

And then, finally, it's really impossible to do any of this without thinking carefully about standards. So what are we aiming toward and then how do we track our progress in ways that are meaningful and inform practice directly. So not necessarily just for accountability purposes, but for reasons that drive into changes in what people do every day in schools and school settings.

And that takes us to Clark. Thank you. (Applause)

MR. McKOWN: Good morning. I'd like to try to walk the talk a little bit and do some perspective taking by understanding who you are a little bit better. So can I see a show of hands of people who are university based researchers or academic people? Show of hands of people who are in government currently? Show of hands of people who are otherwise involved in policy? Show of hands of people who are involved in --

MR. HASKINS: Those are all the advocates. (Laughter)

MR. McKOWN: Okay, all right. Okay. Journalists? Any journalists out there? Okay. Friends and family of our panelists? (Laughter) I knew it. And back there too. And anyone else I'm missing, any other roles I'm missing?

Interested people. Raise your hand if you're interested in this topic. (Laughter) About half the people out here are interested in what I'm about to say. That's great. Okay.

SPEAKER: How about teachers?

MR. McKOWN: Teachers. Any teachers or people involved in education? Thank you. Any others that I'm missing or neglecting or otherwise insulting? (Laughter) Yes, somebody raised her

hand. I don't know what you do though.

MR. HASKINS: Well, Clark, unfortunately your 10 minutes is up. (Laughter)

MR. McKOWN: All right, all right, all right. So I just want to start by setting a little bit of a context for some of my policy thoughts. You know, I think that the great contest of ideas that's at the heart of our democracy has become kind of a weaponized affair lately, you know. So that's the context for our conversation. Respectful disagreements and compromise seem to have been replaced by contempt and aggression far too often. So what does this have to do with what we're talking about today? Well, you know, I think social and emotional skills are critical, and Stephanie defined them beautifully. They are the skills in my view that are needed to interact effectively with others and to make and deepen relationships. There are things like perspective taking, social problem solving, self regulation, and the ability to meet disagreements, for example, with constructive strategies and problem solving. We want this for our children. We also want it in those who are entrusted with our government, and yet it seems to be a moment where public discourse is characterized by anything but social and emotional learning.

So this volume, this policy piece, this conversation we're having today in my view is about how to grow a generation ready to make a more perfect union, not just through their intellect, but through their ability to connect with others positively.

So my goal today is to outline some ideas for your consideration about how policy might support this project. And I want to start by just laying out a few assumptions that I'm working with. First is that social and emotional skills are consequential. The Future of Children volume reviews evidence to support the premise and here's what we know in brief. The better developed our children's social emotion skills the better they do in school and in life, the less likely they are to have mental health and substance abuse problems, and the better their economic and life prospects as adults.

A second assumption supported by the evidence is that the development of social emotion skills is influenced by what happens at home, what happens at school, what happens in the community, and what happens in peer groups. A third assumption is, and again supported by evidence, is that we know how to support and nurture social emotion skills through school based programming. Fourth, programs designed to teach social and emotional skills are consistent with broadly accepted

goals of schooling because they do a couple of things. They support academic outcomes and they

support constructive citizenship and democratic society. And, fifth, I'm assuming that federal, state, and

local policy can and should support the expansion of sensible and effective social and emotional learning

programming in schools.

So those are my assumptions. I think and hope they're uncontroversial. I don't really

know. If they are controversial then we need to talk about what assumptions we're working with. If not,

then we can talk about how we might build on those assumptions within policy to make things better for

children.

So let me summarize some of the important points in the policy brief I wrote, and I'm

going to summarize them in two ways. First, I'm going to say how I might envision things were I a policy

maker -- and if you hadn't guess by now I'm not -- but recognizing that reasonable people may disagree

with my vision. I'm also going to try to step back and state what I think the goal of each of these areas

might be that we can have a robust and constructive discussion, even if it's a disagreement about how to

get there and decide how we get to this goal.

So, really, in the spirit of problem solving I'm going to try to define four problem areas that

together we can solve. So, again, I'm trying in a small way to model SEL rather than just talk about it by

doing social problem solving. So in my view there are four policy directions that could set the state for

measurably improved social and emotional outcomes and all the benefits that come with it.

First, I would love to see comprehensive pre-K to high school social and emotion learning

standards that say what children should know and be able to do. Now, I realize that this goal comes with

a lot of challenges, what are the right standards, who sets them, at what level should they be set, local,

state, national, should schools be beholden to yet another set of standards? If we look at what happened

with the common core I think we can anticipate what sorts of challenges there might be to imposing

standards on school systems at any level.

The question then is what broad goal does the idea of social and emotional learning

standards serve. To me the problem is this, for educators to move towards common social and emotional

outcomes for their kids that we all agree are good it's helpful to have common expectations. And so I ask

you and everyone else who influences and cares about policy, how might we find a more perfect solution

than national standards to the problem of setting expectations that we can agree on, how might we set

clear and measurable expectations that are helpful rather than burdensome that provide guidance without

usurping local control, but that ultimately encourage as many educators as possible to work towards

constructive social and emotional ends. Now that's the question and I think standards is only one answer

to those questions.

So the Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning, CASEL, is already

doing outstanding work to help policy makers come to grips with this very question. So I think, you know,

it's not as if this is not happening, it's happening fairly vigorously. And I guess the question is how might

we accelerate these efforts to set common expectations by which we can all be moving towards the same

goal.

The second policy thing in my wish list is wanting us to offer incentives for schools and

districts to adopt and implement with fidelity evidence based social and emotional learning programs.

Now, I know, and I can see from some of the smiles on your faces, that there will be problems with this

too. (Laughter) You know, what programs qualify for these incentives, how do we know if the program is

sufficiently well implemented, who is going to monitor and certify the implementation of these programs,

what should the incentives be. All right, I get it, okay, I get it. But I would challenge those who are policy

makers and those who influence policy makers to consider what kinds of positive incentives might

plausibly be integrated into policy that would encourage the adoption of practices that we know work. I'm

not a policy maker. I bet everybody in this room has some good ideas about how that could happen.

Third, I'd love to see teacher training programs require coursework in social and emotional assessment,

curriculum, and instruction.

All right, I used the word require. So I know there are going to be problems with that. But

if we agreed that it's a good idea that our teaching workforce is able to assess and address children's

social and emotional development, then the question for policy makers is what policy context might

stimulate the adoption of more intensive social and emotion instruction in teacher training programs.

Great work is already underway in this area. Among others, Kim Schonert-Reichl at the

University of British Columbia, has done really path-breaking working to integrate social and emotional

learning training into teacher induction programs and has a lot of good thoughts about how that might be

done in a way that's positive for everybody.

All right, fourth and finally, although we know about what works we haven't got it all figured out, particularly as social and emotional learning goes to scale. So in my view, if we want to keep moving the needle on social and emotional learning we'll need a robust investment in continued research and development. In my opinion, the R&D in SEL should focus on four areas. First, we should figure out how to create efficient and scalable methods to nurture children's social and emotional development. We've made great progress in that area, but more progress could be made. Second, we should be looking at what kinds of organizational supports at the state, district, and school level are required for SEL programs to routinely take root. I think there is great variability in the extent to which programming actually is done in a rigorous way. So how can we stimulate that? Third, we should be looking at what kinds of systems for continuous improvement can be actually adopted at multiple levels so that it's not just a one and done, I'm adopting this program, but there's continuous reflection and building on the successes that schools are achieving. And, fourth, how might we improve our methods of measuring social and emotional skills in pre kindergarten through high school.

So are these the right priorities for R&D? I don't know, but the more important thing than whether these are the right priorities or not is that we invest in R&D to make this something that is continually improving. So I leave it to you hopefully to debate should we invest, and if so, what should we invest in.

I think there are already examples of this kind of investment going on. Look at the Institute of Education Sciences and the Funders Collaborative for Innovative Measurement. So, again, in this area as in the others there are examples of wonderful work, and so the question is how can we build on those success and make things even better.

So, finally, speaking of innovative measurement -- that sign says stop, but I'm going to just keep going for one minute (laughter) -- speaking of innovative measurement --

MR. HASKINS: You just lost a minute off your time --

MR. McKOWN: Sorry, Tim. I think there is a pressing need to develop ways to measure SEL. Most of us believe that educators would be at a serious disadvantage if they didn't have ways to assess reading and math skills, and government and industry have invested I don't know how much to

develop varied and rigorous instrumentation to measure academic outcomes for varied purposes. The PARCC Assessment alone, hundreds of millions of dollars were spent to develop that, and that was what was needed to develop it. By comparison, we've invested virtually nothing on SEL assessment and I think this is a big problem. At all levels of the educational enterprise, from monitoring student progress towards standards to monitoring a specific child's learning, without good assessment we're really flying blind, which places the whole endeavor, in my view, at profound risk. There's that dramatic streak again, I'm sorry, but it does. I think without good assessment, you know, FAD could reach in take the rug out from under us.

So I'm going to stop even though I am so tempted to keep going. I'm going to stop and hand the podium over to Tim. Thank you very much. (Applause)

MR. HASKINS: Tim Shriver is a graduate of Yale, Catholic University, and University of Connecticut where he earned a Ph.D. in education. He taught for years in the New Haven public schools where he created the Social Development Project, one of the first efforts to integrate social and emotional development into school culture and classroom teaching. He also founded the Collaborate for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning, CASEL, which has already been referred to several times, and currently co-chairs the National Commission on Social, Emotional, and Academic Development at the Aspen Institute. It would not be an overstatement to say that Tim has played a central role in developing the field of social and emotional learning in education and society. For his day job, which I doubt takes more than 12-14 hours a day, he is the chairman of the Special Olympics, which now involves more than 170 nations, and since 2010, over 1 million children have been involved in the Special Olympics sports programs. In his spare time, Tim has started an ice cream company in Paul Newman style to raise money for charitable contributions.

Let me give you a small insight into his values. Go to the website of the Special Olympics. You will need a road map and at least 20 minutes or so to find a picture or any mention of Tim Shriver. To say that this is not the way most people in Washington bring themselves to public attention would be a serious understatement.

So as Tim comes to the podium pose this question to yourself, what kind of person does all of the work be eschews the public spotlight? Tim. (Applause)

MR. SHRIVER: Wow. Thank you, Ron. There are so many things I could say about that introduction, but I'll try to suspend those comments, except to say that it is a huge honor to be here on this stage and to be a part of this volume, I think not just because Clark and Stephanie's comments have captured so well the importance of the work, but also because this audience and this group of people is so critical to the future of this field.

I want to thank my mentor and one of the co-authors, one of the many co-authors in this volume, Roger Weissberg, who has been guiding me for -- I won't say how many years, but it's got a 3 in the first digit and it's a 2 digit number. And many of the other authors too who are my mentors, Mark Greenberg, Kim Schonert-Reichl, and Stephanie, more recently, a great leader in the field, and all the people who contributed. It's actually I would say an extraordinary volume. And I don't know how many of you have the time to read these volumes cover to cover, but this is an extraordinarily volume because, as I was saying earlier to Ron, there is this moment here where the question isn't how do we debate or dissect fine arguments, but how do we catalyze broad action. And Clark captured that I think quite well. We're at a moment of capturing broad action and this volume I think helps to move that in a very important and catalytic direction.

So my exercise - Clark mentioned we should practice social and emotional skills development -- my exercise to all of you would be to help me thank my wife of 31 years because today is our anniversary (applause), so Linda has come. How many people celebrate their anniversary at Brookings? That's the question. So I know all of you are scholars and you eschew mercantilist incentives and stuff like that, but if you think to yourself, how could I really make a big splash in my career, here it is, social and emotional learning in marriage. (Laughter) That is a huge book. So here's the exercise, what's the one skill you think you need in a marriage that comes under either Roger's rubric or Stephanie's rubric, or David Yeager's rubric, if you've read the volume. What's the one skill? And you can have five seconds since we're closing in on my time, five seconds to think of the one skill. Yes?

SPEAKER: Listening.

MR. SHRIVER: Listening. She has that. Yes, she does, yes. (Laughter)

SPEAKER: Good humor.

MR. SHRIVER: Good humor. Working on that.

MR. HASKINS: Learn how to say, yes, ma'am.

MR. SHRIVER: Yes, ma'am. That's a male skill that's very hard for men to learn.

Anyone else? Yes.

SPEAKER: Forgiveness.

MR. SHRIVER: Forgiveness, empathy, compassion. Very good, Linda, on that. Also, I would say good decision maker. If I had to go back 31 years I have to give myself some credit for her choices. (Laughter) But happy anniversary. I love you still, more, 31 years later.

I learned a new term in this volume, hostile attribution bias. I think that's also one to fight during marriage, hostile attribution bias. I never heard that term before.

SPEAKER: (off mic)?

MR. SHRIVER: I'm not going to answer that. I'm going to let somebody -- no -- well, I think it means you assume the worst in the other person. You attribute hostility even though you don't have the understanding. Now, you could say this is a room that has hostile attribution bias against the current administration. (Laughter) But, actually, it's an interesting question. Do we? Does a group like this have that? And how can we overcome it to the extent we do? Because no matter where we sit on the political spectrum, hostile attribution bias is, as Clark pointed out, a problem in the country not just in schools or not just amongst children.

My role today is I think to bring some of the practitioner perspective, maybe to take a step back quickly to see the big picture, maybe to recognize the bottom up nature of this movement, the way in which this is responding in some ways to the demands that are coming from teachers, from principals, from superintendents, and most importantly, from parents and students. It's to, I hope as Stephanie said earlier, push us toward catalytic action.

So I also have slides if they're around. I see Stephanie's. I could just do Stephanie's. Thank you. Okay. (Laughter) I don't know how to switch computers. Do you know?

MR. HASKINS: We have people back there working on it I'm pretty sure.

MR. SHRIVER: Okay. In the meantime --

MR. HASKINS: Here we go. A ha, thank you.

MR. SHRIVER: This is not deducted from my time, by the way.

MR. HASKINS: Oh, yes it is. (Laughter)

MR. SHRIVER: It's locked up. My wife is telling me to have everybody stretch. If you haven't had coffee, please stand up now. I'm not kidding. She wants everyone to stretch, I say yes, ma'am. You can see what it takes to get to 31 years. Stretch. You can applaud in sign language as though you want me to finish. Thank you. Is that okay? Yeah, okay. Are we rebooting? Should I get going?

MR. HASKINS: Yeah.

MR. SHRIVER: Okay. I think we're at a moment of extraordinary possibility. The slide I use sometimes with principals and teachers and superintendents centers on using a little clip from Hamilton. How many of you have seen Hamilton? Roger said you can't use it here because it's not scientific enough. But it's artistic enough. In that moment in the third or so act you see the young Alexander Hamilton, an immigrant, a poor man, a group of sort of unruly and unfinished young Americans who challenge themselves with the idea that they're not going to throw away their shot, that despite all of the adversity, all the uncertainty, the all the ambiguity, all of the overwhelming odds against them, that they're going to rise up, that they're not going to throw away their shot. I believe that right now in education we have such a moment. I think this moment intersects the fields of scholarship, public policy and practice. This volume captures that. This is not only though I would say a movement or an idea of scholars and educators, it's also a movement of healers and teachers, it's a movement for profits, it's a movement for people who are standing on the front lines and who see themselves as dreamers. The alternate language suggests not just professional occupation but deep emotional engagement. Many of us feel that children, schools, and I dare say even the culture itself is asking us to find another gear, asking us to reinvent ourselves in some ways, not just by what we do with kids, not just by skills and competencies -- there we go -- but by our hearts and souls invested in a new outcome. Archimedes -- it's not an outcome that will be driven by one white guy standing by himself in a place, but you'll be familiar with the idea of a moment at which, with a lever and a place to stand, you can move the world. I know it sounds grandiose, but I believe this is true.

My own journey here, very quickly, intersects with the field. I started out in compensatory education, after school programs, tutoring programs, mentoring programs. And I came to Jim Comber

about five years into my career and I asked him why am I failing so frequently, why are so many kids no

responding, what's the problem. He said, you're missing the point, you're missing the fundamental insight

around what education is. And he gave me this idea, that teaching and learning is a relationship. I bring

this to the fore because I think we will start to see in these ideas common ground that transcends the

differences of approach or position that we'll see in the volume. And I think that's important, not to

overlook the differences but to give us a pathway forward. Teaching and learning is a relationship, it is

fundamentally developmental.

Jim went on to do this exercise for me when I was 25 years old, he said what's the

difference between these two shapes to a child who is four or five or six years old. Is one more inherently

interesting, is one more powerful, is one more engaging? No, no difference in the shapes, except one. A

significant adult wants the child to learn the meaning of shape one and doesn't care about the child

learning the meaning of shape two. So the child is fundamentally incentivized, motivated. The

neuroscience is supporting this. I don't have time to go into it, but the neuroscience is supporting that

learning begins in a social context and is sustained by social relationships. Meaning making is driven by

the interaction between human beings, not by the fundamentally fascinating dimensions of the content

itself.

So if Jim gave me what I think was at least for me a transformative insight, Roger came

along -- well, sorry -- so teaching and learning is not -- this is the paradigm that's still operative. Now, we

can dismiss it and poo poo it and believe that it's way antiquated, but most of our educational practices

and policies operate on the idea that teaching and learning is a mechanical transfer of facts to a machine.

The facts are created in a laboratory, they're bound in a supply chain, they're distributed by trucks and

this kind of stuff, and they're handed to the end of the supply chain, which is the teacher, and the teacher

then hands the product to the consumer and bolts it onto their brain. That's the model that still exists.

Roger comes along and says not only is education development, but there are ways to promote

development, and introduces me and many educators, he and his colleagues, to the idea that we didn't

just have to recognize that development is education, as Stephanie pointed out, but that there were ways

to advance development in the social and emotional context.

So this framework sees many different manifestations. And David dismisses it a little bit

as skills instruction when you get to later adolescence. That early childhood article in here reinforces the power of these skills instructions when matched to developmental periods, as Stephanie pointed out, but the fundamental insight here for me was not only could we reshape the paradigm and the whole concept of what it meant to educate a child around relationships, but we could also have skills to actually move the ball forward.

Now, Jim adds one other important insight in this conversation, and that is that education used -- five minutes -- are you kidding me -- education used to be rooted in a broad culture where meaning making was assumed. So if we go back to traditional cultures almost no one had formal education, but everybody had rites of passage, everybody had a context for making meaning. Religion and ritual provided systems in which children could grow and understand their larger role in the world. Art and music provided creative energy in which children could learn and understand that their creative impulses could be exercised. Formal schooling comes along matching instruction in academic content into a cultural context. But 100 years later you see Dewey, Montessori, and others starting to fight to preserve the cultural context and social relationships as they become pulled out of schooling. And when you get to Sputnik and Nation at Risk and No Child Left Behind, the dialogue has almost completely decontextualized learning outside of culture at the same time that culture begins to collapse and meaning making collapses in the broader context.

So as children lose cultural norms, lose religious and meaning making norms, lose boundaries and parameters that the culture used to provide, the school doesn't provide it either and children -- what do we find -- to me the primary diagnosis of the problem, disengagement. No meaning. They don't care. The dates of the Civil War don't matter to them. How do punctuate a sentence has no meaning. The periodic table is irrelevant, it doesn't matter to me. That's what kids are saying to us. Not because it doesn't matter but because we haven't shown them the relationships, the interior desire, the desire to dream, to matter, to belong, to fit in, doesn't connect with them, to the academic content that we have disembodied and made meaningless in many ways.

Why is this volume important? I've got to go so fast now it's not even funny. This is just fun. I put this up for my wife so she'd remember. This is neuroscience by the way. And I mean it's a summary of a lot of neuroscience, and I don't know neuroscience, but I can understand this. If you need

evidence to support the idea that this is important, I think that's probably the best picture I've seen so far. So let me just say one quick thing about this graph. This volume, if you read it closely, might lead you to believe that there's a difference and a difference of opinion between people who believe that we ought to teach things like problem solving and people who believe we ought to focus on teachers who teach it, and people who believe we ought to focus on context and mindsets, and people who believe we ought to focus on community based organizations, discipline practices, and teacher education, as though those were distinguishable in the work of promoting and education that is relational. They're not. There are no either/ors in that sentence. None. I am fully convinced -- and this is, I would say, as a practitioner who tried to do the integrative work, I spent as much time with parents using problem solving posters that Roger provided as we did with teachers, more than we did with kids 25 years ago. Linked school instruction in problem solving to primary mental health team projects where we could teach kids help seeking so they could access, but we didn't have the language, tier 2 and tier 3 resources 30 years ago. There are no either/ors. We have falsely broken the field into silos. If there's one message I hope comes through the whole volume is that the silos should be broken down.

So here's my little tribute to this challenge. This first framework here at the top is what we used to describe when we were talking about primary prevention. That there is all this policy talk, and this is something not addressed in your brief as I see it, but there is policy that does force siloing in schools. It's bad policy. It focuses on symptom related reactive strategies that schools are not good at implementing instead of focusing on development. Now, you can see in the bottom box, if you just looked right on top of Clark's head as though he were wearing a nice top hat, you see the new framework is the coordinated Weissberg-Jones consensus. I'm introducing this, okay. So Roger says it's easier for scholars to share a toothbrush than to agree on conceptual work (laughter), but I'm putting down my stake in the ground right now that a Weissberg-Jones -- Stephanie teases out the distinctions between their frameworks -- and I won't go into all the details there -- but for the practitioners, honestly speaking, we don't care. Sorry to say, we don't really care. We just want it to be right, evidence based, and clear. So figuring out the distinctions is a critical scholarly task, but it has to get done quickly. We can't afford to have 15-20 scholars coming at educators from multiple directions. Why? Because they become powerless to act. They cannot make those distinctions. If the scholarly community doesn't make them

we undermine our capacity to make a difference for kids.

So here's just a quick example, this can be done. This is just one elementary school in Chicago. They've taken Roger's framework, self awareness, self management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision making, and they have sorted all of their social and emotional learning interventions into the five competency areas. Nothing fancy, no Ph.D.s involved, no public policy needed to force it, no requirements and mandates to demand it, just competent school based educators who are de-siloing this work and trying to promote a developmental framework. And there are other examples of this. And then I'm going to wrap up. Don't even show me the sign. (Laughter)

This is the Massachusetts State standards that refers to the idea that mathematics instruction should be social and emotional learning driven, that self-awareness and self-management and relationship skills and decision making can be taught in math, so we can teach the skills explicitly and we can infuse them. Do we have to choose? Of course not. It's not education of you choose. So this is current, this is 2017. Here's the Aspen Institute framework that shows the complexity of this. Here are the influencers in the world of education. Now, picture yourself as one of those heads in the middle. That's a teacher, for the most part. You see parents and children there. Those are the multiple levels of influence and power over what goes on in a school. I'm sorry to say there is no shortcut to the explicit work necessary to de-silo that entire fan of people and get them to reverse their personal, ideological agendas and help them focus in a coordinated way across all those different boxes on development. Not time to go into it all. Here's the Illinois standards, here's CASEL's new framework that attempts to support district level leaders and principals in the de-siloing project. You can look at the website. Again, obviously no time to go into it now.

Here's my final point. We're living in a very uncertain time. The country is unstable when it comes to common purpose, if you ask me at least. We're searching for new frameworks. I believe that our key issues point towards this moment of opportunity for schools. Keep in mind, this country has been led by schools in the past. Between 1910 and 1950 we multiplied the number of people going to high school in this country five times. Only 10 percent of Americans went to high school in 1910, over 70 percent graduated high school by 1970. That shift in the way in which we conceptualize schooling did as much to advance the economic interests of this country as, in my view, almost any other shift. Almost

unnoticed. Schools can be the center piece of a new paradigm. The country's exhausted by the policy discussions we have now, teachers are asking for this. More than 90 percent believe they need more and their students need more support for social and emotional learning. The data is in this volume. Stephanie referenced it. I didn't obviously go through it. There's a broad cultural shift too. When we were kids most of us -- all the books in the world were at the Library of Congress. Today they're in your pocket, right. So kids don't need us the way they used to need us. They need us much more for inspiration than they do for information.

The last part is the part this journal is about I believe. We have a lot of new entrants in this field, we have the chance to align them. We have the chance to align them, but it is not certain that we will succeed. The success of this field, however, hinges on whether or not we do. This is edge research. We are on the radar across the country, one of the reasons why this journal is so important. We are also on the radar for businesses. We have some new bedfellows. What businesses are telling us, whether you talk to Google or whether you talk to the business round table, teamwork, communication, respect, dependability, integrity, initiative, these are the new skills for the 21st century.

We have a purple movement; also this is from Stephanie's recent article where she went through the naming challenges. But I circled this in red and blue so you can see that some of this language will appeal more to people who come at this more conservatively, whereas other language will appeal to people who come at this from more progressive points of view, but we don't have to pick. There is common ground here, which I think an enormously important issue.

So to me the summary point is this, it's education is development or we're practicing malpractice. We don't have that terminology in education, but as far as I'm concerned, as a practitioner, looking at the research for almost 30 years, it's no longer an open question. Either we shift toward a developmental framework or we are guilty of malpractice.

In closing, just let me say that I think we have to change the narrative. I think this volume does a lot towards doing that. I think we have to go from information to inspiration, from tests to development, from a focus on schools as those schools were disembodied institutions to a focus on schools and families and communities. This is not just a rhetorical challenge, but it's also a scientific challenge and it's a policy challenge.

We have a lot of advocates to change the conversation. Here's one that most people know, maybe it's because it's of "Happy," but here's the point, we're no longer just talking to ourselves, the culture is talking to us. This is Pharrell Williams. You have to choose what side you're on. I'm choosing listen to the language, empathy, I'm choosing inclusion. He is articulating a vision for what school can become. Divisiveness does work. But we have to choose what side we're on. But we could also get our inspiration from our own students. This is a 10 year old in Chicago, Melanie Garcia. Here's what she wrote in preparation for her presentation to the school board on social and emotional learning. Just because I'm sensitive, I'm not dramatic, I'm not fragile, I'm not weak, I'm emotionally intelligent. Ten years old, ten years old, already there. Just because I'm smart I'm not lonely, I'm not a loser, I'm not awkward, I'm not a nerd. Listen to the culture talking to her. Listen to the culture talking to her and listen to her standing up to the culture. I'm intelligent. Just because I'm 10 I'm not immature. This is the school talking to her. I'm not helpless, I'm not worthless, I'm young, now what. Just because I'm a girl I'm not just worried about my looks, I'm not bad at sports, I'm not weak, I am me. You have a child who has shaped an identity that is resilient, that is strong, that is driven by an internal compass, that is embedded in a social context, that is eager to learn. This child will learn. No labels necessary. We don't have to go to at risk or minority or low income or Chicago or urban or violent neighborhood, or whatever labels you want to use. This is a competent child ready to learn and eager for us to make the school a place where she wants and will fit in.

David Brooks' piece last week, some of you may have seen it on paradigms in the culture, closes by saying that libertarianism, globalization, multiculturalism, America first, mercantilist, talented. He goes through these paradigms and he closes by saying in the community where talent and education are valued as the new unifying force in the country the poor boy or girl are enmeshed in care and cultivation. Everything is designed to arouse energy and propel social mobility. Arouse energy and propel social mobility. I think if those were our measures of success we would be able to fulfill what this volume invites us to do, which is to advance the research practice and policy to a point where we're using education to move the country.

Thank you. Sorry for going over. (Applause)

MR. HASKINS: John Brism, a great friend of mine, he was senior advisor to President

Bush and still is an adviser to many politicians and is also an advisor to me, he calls me about every week and tells me what I should do next. So far I've done most of it. I say yes, ma'am. He told me that I should invite you to come talk here. I have never met you, never heard you speak, but I trust John and I thought he said he'll bring the place down. (Laughter)

MR. SHRIVER: Run over time is what he'll do.

MR. HASKINS: I wanted to handicap you as much as possible by giving you a time limit, but you ignored that, so.

MR. SHRIVER: Sorry.

MR. HASKINS: That was great. That was really -- that was good. We ought to hear a speech like that at least twice a year to rev us up a little bit. I feel a little bit revved up. Nonetheless, let's head back to issues here because there are several things that I think we should talk about.

First of all, I want to know -- you told us about Jim Comber. I want to think about you at 23 or 24, whatever you were, when you got this idea about social and emotional learning because clearly you've had this throughout your career. I'm not familiar with anybody who has been so persistent at something over such a long period of time in so many ways and had the opportunity, had many important commissions and all that, including now the Aspen Commission. What gave you the idea, what was it that caused you to think we're doing this wrong, we need to focus on social and emotional learning?

MR. SHRIVER: Well, certainly a huge number of people who influenced me, I mentioned Roger and Jim as two of the most important, educators I was with. I think in the end of the day, you know -- we were in Cleveland a few weeks ago and one of the teachers said -- I asked one of the teachers how do you convince other teachers and she started to answer the question, she said, you know, most kids want to do good, but sometimes they don't know how. I was working with kids who I fundamentally -- at that age in my life I was just crazy about them. I was so excited about who they were, about what they could do, about their energy, their authenticity, even the anger excited me. But I could see they didn't -- I couldn't reach them. I didn't know how to help them. They would do things that were enormously meaningful and powerful and inspiring and then they would do things that were so self destructive. I mean not that they didn't have the right, not that they didn't have the demand, not that the culture wasn't to blame, but they were sacrificing themselves.

So, for me I didn't go into education because I was fascinated by Shakespeare or the Civil War or the periodic table or punctuation. I mean some people -- when you ask teachers they say I went into education because I loved English or I loved poetry or I loved mathematics. I'm a math teacher. I've loved math my entire life. I went into education because I thought it was the most powerful institution to help children grow and develop positively, I guess is the word I'd use. So nothing else worked honestly. I could work 80 hours a week, I could spend my weekends in housing projects, on street corners, guiding kids to colleges. Whatever it took. I mean I worked really hard, not because I was sacrificing, because I loved it, and nothing else worked other than when I finally started to think developmentally and I finally started to have the tools to help the kids. And all of a sudden there was belonging, and all of a sudden there was connection, and all of a sudden there was attachment, and all of a sudden there was possibility. It's not easy, and certainly we made huge numbers of mistakes. But, you know, another teacher said to me that the principal, you know, in Cleveland -- and I'll stop -- she said well, you know, I didn't like the social and emotional learning stuff until I was driving my six year old home one day and we went past McDonalds and she said I want to stop and I said no, and she started screaming and yelling, and I mean -- I want French fries, I want French fries. And then all of a sudden -- this is the principal talking -- the car when silent. And I looked around and I thought, my god, my kid's stick or throwing up or something's wrong in the back, and my daughter had her arms up like this and she was -- had her head down. And I turned and said what are you doing, and she said I'm doing turtle. And she said what's turtle? And she said turtle is when we calm down and try to breathe deeply and think through what's going on and not act angry and not act mad. So the principal said, as soon as I saw my kid turtle I decided I was in favor of this. (Laughter) That's what happened to me. I saw a lot of kids in a manner of speaking turtle, and all of the sudden I thought, wow, we have tools here that could make us into educators not into people who are largely managing a supply chain that was producing very negative outcomes.

          MR. HASKINS: So I've been here 17 years and I have never heard anybody answer a serious question by a reference to a turtle.

          MR. SHRIVER: Well, invite me back, I have many more. This is a field full of fun things that children do.

MR. HASKINS: All right. Now, so the next question is -- this is from Clark, here's what we need, we need standards, we need incentives to adopt evidence based programs, we need teacher training, which we have not talked enough about, we need research and development, and we need assessment. Are you happy with what's happened in the intervening 30 years or so? Do you think -- clearly we're moving in the right direction, but are you satisfied with the progress, do you think we really need to juice it up?

MR. SHRIVER: Well, I would never have guessed that we would be here, honestly. I thought the arc of change would be longer. So I'm pretty wildly excited by the attention this field has garnered, is garnering. Mostly, I mean, yes, in a room like this, but mostly because we have dozens, hundreds of principals, superintendents calling into CASEL every week, probably to you too, Stephanie, and many of the other scholars, calling in every week saying we need more, we want more, we need this. So the demand is what's most exciting. I think that has outstretched my expectations.

Do we have problems with assessment? Yes. Do we have the need for standards and a role for standards? We need greater clarity. Roger will solve both of those problems. I'm not just saying that, he will, with a large group of collaborators. Do we need better standards of practice? Yes, but I think we're actually much better than we think sometimes. For the educator to understand we need scope and sequence, we need alternative discipline strategies, we need parent engagement. That's a big menu. And if we can just help educators get there I think we're in good shape.

I don't think this is going to come from the federal level, I think it's going to come from the state or local level. I think the big decision makers in education right now are superintendents. That's my own view. Other people are important, don't get me wrong, but I think the real decision makers will be superintendents. So equipping them with change management I think will be really important. Kim's article about ed prep, about teacher prep, the rates of education -- you know, if we think that education is child development and you read her piece on the state of child development training for pre service educators, it's a joke. I mean I was trained as a teacher, I was trained as an administrator. I have a sixth year in administration, a Ph.D. My training in child development was a joke. And I was trained at reasonably prominent academic institutions. But anyway, it's a joke. If we actually think that the teacher is a child development specialist, which is the way I think we ought to get to -- she did the analysis of

teacher prep programs by skill, you know, by Roger's framework of self management, social awareness, decision making skills, relationship skills, and so on. The highest rated -- the one that had the most prevalence was 13 percent and the least prevalence was 1 percent, meaning 1 percent of teacher prep programs had training in that -- I can't remember what the order was, but 13, 9, 7, 6, 1. So that means that teachers are entering the workforce, at least in one of those dimensions -- maybe it's self management -- with 1 percent of them having adequate training. I mean that's -- I don't mean to be indicting schools of education, but I guess I am.

MR. HASKINS: But you should.

MR. SHRIVER: I guess I just did. It's not so much an indictment as a challenge. This is in some ways new, so it's not like we have to lash them, I think we just have to invite them, and that's what Kim's piece I think does.

MR. HASKINS: Clark.

MR. McKOWN: Yeah, you know, first of all I just want to get something off my chest because I'll be distracted if I don't. When I was sitting right there I didn't realize my giant head was blocking the screen, so I apologize to all of you whose experience was negatively impacted by my head. (Laughter)

Now I can focus.

SPEAKER: Forgiveness, forgiveness.

MR. McKOWN: Yes, practice forgiveness, please.

SPEAKER: Be the turtle. (Laughter)

MR. McKOWN: I would turtle if it weren't too embarrassing right now. Okay, so I guess the arc, it is really exciting and I've not been on the arc of this SEL movement as long as many folks in the room, but it does feel like there's a real opportunity and a moment here. And I guess the question I am a little fixated on is how to keep that momentum, keep the arc going up rather than have it, you know, wane. And I don't know the answer to that, there have been a lot of educational movements that have kind of come and gone, but I do think there are a few things that seem to me to be really important. One is to bring people of different belief systems and orientations and political persuasions together as part of what we're doing. Can't be just a movement for one group or one subset. And I think CASEL and other

groups do a great job of creating a big tent. So really bringing people together to be part of the conversation is super important.

A second piece that seems to me to be really important is continuing to demonstrate the benefits to individuals and society of doing this right, but at the same time not overpromising. You know there are a lot of educational movements and other movement that for a lot of reasons make big promises that they can't fulfill, which I think is the death knell. I think SEL can do a lot of things and it should be part of our world. It can't do everything. Let's just be candid about what it does and doesn't do.

And then the third thing that is -- I don't know how to manage this part, but as SEL or any other movement goes broader than it has been, how do we accommodate the natural requirement that a movement evolve and change while not losing its core? You know, I think that that's a -- I don't know how to do that, but I think that's something for us all to keep our eyes on. Maybe it will change names over the next 20 years. I don't really know. But as long as we're keeping our eyes on the prize, personally I don't care what we call it as long as it continues to move forward.

So these are some of things that keep me up at night when I'm not overly fixated on test development, which is what I do for my day job.

MR. HASKINS: So, audience, let me implore you to ask questions and not make statements. People are here to hear the folks that we've invited to the event and we've already demonstrated they are fairly high quality. So let's listen primarily to them, but this is your chance to shape the discussion a little bit. Right there on your right, behind you. Behind you.

MR. GILBERT: Hi, I'm Dan Gilbert with the After School Alliance. So when you view the formal education within a kind of child development paradigm, how do you account for all of the external factors and all of the experiences the child outside what happens within the school? How can the school react to that and help build off of that? Obviously in the after school field this is something we think about a lot, but I just wanted some of your perspectives on that.

MR. HASKINS: Good question. Thank you. That's a good example for everybody to follow.

MR. SHRIVER: So here's what I would say. I would say schools are really the second most powerful institutions in the life of a child. Obviously we all spend a lot of time in schools, much more

than we do in any other institution, after the family obviously. So the family is by far the most important. The second most important, it's a distant second to the family, but it's still the second. So here's what we have in schools, we have professionals, we have a large workforce, we have buildings, we have institutions, we have patterns, we have attendance, we have participation, we have in some ways a broadly inclusive environment. In some ways. Now, there's some adversity in communities between schools and communities and families, which again Jim highlighted in his research. But it's a long way of saying I think schools can be a hub for a more integrated approach. If they see their mission as promoting the development of the child in the child's content and ecology, not promoting the development of the child's brain in a disembodied ecology. Once you open the ecology to development you see that the boys and girls club or the church basement or the community center or the sports team, or the arts program, are all nested dimensions of development that require a need, a common vocabulary. So to me the big challenge that schools can help a community based organization and families with is building a common vocabulary so that -- and we laugh about the turtle, but it's a big deal. It's a huge deal when a seven year old has generalized a skill from the classroom to the back seat of her mother's car. And if that child has reinforcement for that exact skill, not now a new stress management skill, but turtle, when she goes to the girls club or goes to swim practice or wherever else she goes, she has a chance to internalize the capacity to manage her stress throughout her life. If she gets bifurcated messages and everybody is competing using different language, I think we're up against it.

So it's a long way of saying people accuse me of being overly school focused, but I'm not overly school focused because I'm wedded to schools as the answer, it's just that schools are the most nested institution that can help pollinate the answer into other institutions.

MR. HASKINS: Clark?

MR. McKOWN: I agree. (Laughter)

MR. HASKINS: That's a great answer. Okay. Now, the lady that I ripped the mic out of your hand, right in front of that gentleman.

MR. SHRIVER: And, by the way, the piece in the journal, in this journal I think makes basically that same argument.

MS. LEE: Thank you. My name is Lisa Lee and I'm with President Obama's Bioethics

Commission, which is winding down right now. But I wanted to ask a question, and before I do that I want to preface with we -- the last project that that commission did was called Bioethics for Every Generation and it was an analysis over probably their entire tenure of eight years looking at our cultural context, deliberative dialogue, and ethics education. And a large part of what they did was talk to educators who do SEL and how we prepare scientists, medical providers, healthcare providers, and technology professionals to have an integrated sense of what they're doing, why they're doing it, the ethical decision making involved. And we looked at a lot of these kinds of programs that really looked at across the lifespan how do we build good scientists. So there is a group, certainly that we dealt with, that is looking at this from the other end, not just from schools up but from technology, science, and medical professionals backward. And I wonder, your talked about the big tent, so I wonder if there are ways or if you can talk about ways you envision preparing this from the professional side, actually the desire and the asking for these kinds of kids to be graduate from high school and college and the education side. How do we pair industry, which you mentioned a little bit about, Tim, but the industry desire to have graduates who have these kinds of skills with schools that so desperately need support in this area?

MR. HASKINS: Go ahead.

MR. SHRIVER: I mean I think the answer is simple, we build a new alliance where business and industry and science and technology -- I mean Laszlo Bock from Google is on the Aspen Commission, he's bringing the voice of Google, and that's a hot name and all of that kind of stuff, but it's actually a substantive message. So even in technology, which people think of in the most technical terms, right, even they share the same language, technology, that's the place where you really have to have your scientific skills honed. Yes, it's true, but if we can get Google to begin saying we need innovation, we need creativity, we need teamwork, we need collaboration, we need good problem solving, as much as we need coding, then we begin to have the necessary coalition to actually sustain, to Clark's point, this change rather than let it be a fad, or even worse, let it be a low quality -- or where quality is dissipated and you get a push back. So I think having a new coalition frankly that's not just people like us, but new partners, you in the room, is really an exciting development.

MR. HASKINS: One more question from this side. We'll take the lady right on the aisle here.

QUESTIONER: Thank you. My name Shilma Part; I'm a parent advocate, part of the Inclusive Prosperity Coalition. Excuse my voice and excuse my being late. And I hope this is not a recap, but these are questions that I really want to engage you guys in, three quick ones.

One, do you feel that the superintendent's role is as critical and at a place like Washington, D.C., which we're not a state and how much you know about our system and who are our critical players?

Another one is what is your approach to SEL for children with developmental disabilities and how are they integrated in such a process?

And, three, what method of engagement do you adopt for parents to get into the language and the big umbrella and the tent, especially culturally diverse parents?

So for you, kind of all of that. Thank you.

MR. SHRIVER: Okay. Twenty minutes? (Laughter)

MR. HASKINS: Other than that --

MR. SHRIVER: I mean they're great questions, great questions. I'll try to go really quickly. Clark, unless you want to?

MR. McKOWN: Why don't you get started?

MR. SHRIVER: Superintendents is important in Washington just like they are everywhere else. I think obviously Washington has a unique governance structure where the superintendent doesn't have quite as much power as he or she might in some other districts. But still, the sustaining fabric in the ecosystem of schools tends to be the way in which a superintendent tries to do the integration. If the superintendent silos, the whole system silos. If the superintendent has a different drug abuse and a different health educator and a different violence prevention and a different truancy person and a different social and emotional person, different character person, different ethics person, different grid person, which some do, and they literally have those different people, then you're hopeless, you can never create a system. So the superintendent is still to me a -- not -- you know, of course principals are important and of course for the average child the only person that matters is the teacher, so I don't mean to be undermining, but I think the superintendent is still important.

Secondly, developmental disabilities. So obviously that's in some ways my day job. I

think this is a huge, huge powerful force for inclusion. Not for inclusion -- one of my mentors, Mo Elia, said inclusion was always shaped as a handshake, but we only focused on one side of the hand. A child with special needs reaching out, reaching out, reaching out. This work allows us to create the other side of the handshake, to teach children inclusion, empathy, compassion, grit, and to allow the child with special needs all of the sudden to have his or her own shining moment, because they tend to be much better at empathy, they tend to be much better at trust, they tend to be much better at inclusion than their non disabled peers.

Last point, parents cultural competence. Huge issue. I go back to Jim Comber, the nesting of parents, particularly parents from communities that have felt adversarial relationships to schools and mainstream institutions, the nesting of them in the decision making structures of the school, is essential, not optional, essential, if any of this is to succeed.

That's as quick as I can do those three.

MR. HASKINS: That's very good.

MR. McKOWN: I'll just add a couple of things. One is -- and stating the obvious -- without a champion within any district at a very high level for social and emotional programming it's an uphill battle. That's my experience. I think it's borne out by probably the evidence too. So I assume that's as true in Washington, D.C. as it is anyplace.

The second piece, the kids with special needs. So I'm a child clinical psychologist for my day job and work with a lot of kids with various special needs. It seems like the way that a child intersects with the social and emotional movement in the special needs community will depend on their special need also. You know, it's very different to have a physical disability than to have an intellectual disability than to have an autism spectrum disorder than to have ADHD than to be depressed or anxious. All those things are -- it's as heterogeneous as people. But I guess one thing I would say for sure is that in my experience with kids with special needs they benefit as much as anybody, perhaps more from the social and emotional learning skills that we know how to teach, and I believe that regardless of the nature of the disability those skills can be taught to any child and that they should be taught to any child. And I think that helps with the two-sided handshake then, right?

MR. SHRIVER: Yes.

MR. McKOWN: And you've got both the kids in the general ed population knowing how to empathize and reach out and the kids in the special ed population knowing how to empathize and reach out too. There's just more bridge building possible I believe.

MR. SHRIVER: And you have a good superintendent in D.C. Antwan Wilson is one of our collaborators and a really talented fresh face in this field.

MR. McKOWN: And you can teach us how to -- the third part of your question was about common language for parents, right? And maybe you could teach us how we ought to be talking to the various constituents in the SEL world so that there is a common vocabulary that parents and the rest of us are speaking.

MR. HASKINS: All right. Please join me in thanking Tim for coming today and spending his morning here. (Applause) Let me wish a happy anniversary to your wife as well. All right. So now we have three more people coming up here. I will be you a nickel if Tim had left this room would be half empty now. (Laughter) So thank you for staying. We get our audience.

SPEAKER: Will the PowerPoints be on line?

MR. HASKINS: Yes.

SPEAKER: In particular Tim's.

MR. HASKINS: They certainly will. In fact the whole thing will be on line.

SPEAKER: Thanks.

MR. HASKINS: We're going to cut out the last eight minutes of Tim's talk because he went over the time limit (laughter), but other than that –

(Recess)

All right. So welcome members. What a great panel. I've already introduced Emily Doolittle, who's from the Institute of Education Sciences, and Roger Weissberg from the University of Illinois, but neither has had a chance to talk and we try to give everybody a chance to talk. So, go ahead.

MS. DOOLITTLE: Okay, I'll take it away. Well, first of all I'm really excited to see all of you here and I'm really proud of this particular issue. So in the work I do at the Institution of Education Sciences in our National Center for Education Research, I really watched an amazing transformation over the past nine years that I've been in this role. So I oversee a portfolio of work that looks from

kindergarten through 12th grade what are the right social skills, behaviors, and attitudes to have in place

so that we have a positive environment for academic learning. And when I first started in this role in

2008, just a little bit of context here, so we support fields initiated research through the National Center for

Education Research. So researchers out there come to us with their good ideas about how we can

support evidence based practices in schools. What I've seen since 2008 is an explosion in this work. We

are attracting a lot of really talented researchers who have some really good ideas about how to improve

these practices in school settings. But the flip side of this is, and I think this is what we're hearing here,

it's also a need out there in the practice world. So teachers want this, they want support around this,

schools are interested in this. And what's really interesting to me is to do good education research you

have to be in the schools doing your studies, doing your experiments, collecting data. That can be

intrusive, that can be disruptive. I don't see the schools viewing this as disruptive or intrusive. They want

to be part of this work. We're supporting a lot of research in this area and so this kind of moment that I

think the journal issue captures around the momentum, the excitement, the interest, the diverse

perspectives, I'm seeing that at play in the smaller grant portfolio though IES. And I think this is it. I mean

I think we're at a really exciting time. We've taken stock and now let's use the lever, let's kind of get the

ball rolling and do it an organized way.

        Roger?

        MR. HASKINS: You have eight minutes. She didn't her whole time.

        MS. DOOLITTLE: Yeah, I gave you a little extra there. (Laughter)

        MR. WEISSBERG: Because I need 15. My daytime job is I'm a professor at the

University of Illinois at Chicago, but I've also been connected with CASEL for 23 years. I'm the chief

knowledge officer of CASEL and Tim and I have collaborated on a lot of things over the decades,

decades.

        I'm always inspired by Tim, but I want to take exception to one thing he said. First of all,

my wife and I have been married for 36 years and we celebrated our anniversary on Sunday by going to

Hamilton. (Laughter) So your first comment about Hamilton not being important -- it's critically important.

        MR. HASKINS: And now you're in debt, right?

        MR. WEISSBERG: Recently a lot of people have said to me what's the reason for the

growing interest in social and emotional learning. And I think about things in three ways. One is we really

have a commitment to rigorous science and creating a scientific foundation for the field. Second, we care

about evidence based practice and policy and we want to work towards a constructive public policy. So

in terms of this special issue I really want to express to Stephanie and Emily my admiration. We don't

have all the answers in the field and one thing we always have to do is invite rigorous review, new

thinking in this special issue. I teach a course in social and emotional learning actually at the University.

This will be one of the source documents where we will be requiring students to read some of the work.

So it's a very important contribution and I appreciate being invited here to talk about Clark's policy piece.

You know, and Clark has already said it, but I'll offer a couple of comments about his four

areas of coordinated policy framework. One is -- and I'm going to quote from his article, which I think is

compelling and raises a lot of points. And I'm doing this because I agree with all of his recommendations

in part two. He said we should develop standards and implementation guidelines that specify the SEL

skills children should know and be able to demonstrate, and describe how to enhance those

competencies. And I know that there's blow back about standards now, but I will say 15 years ago when

we brought together superintendents from across the country and said how do we make SEL an essential

part of education. They said you have to specify what children should know and be able to do to, to be

able to demonstrate. And we work with collaborative districts, we work with 21 districts across the country

now. Always there is some focus on kid's competencies and they may stay away from standards now as

a term, but they're talking about needing some direction, some specificity about what kids should know

and be able to do. And all 50 states have preschool standards now in social and emotional development

and there are 7 states who have preschool through third grade standards, and 4 states who have pre-k to

12 standards. So one of the things we need to do is look at standards frameworks that are being

developed and have the best developmentalists, the best researchers, the best practitioners come

together and do a good job in that area.

Then Clark also says the best policies will give school districts incentives to adopt and

rigorously implement effective SEL programs. At CASEL we don't have our own program, but we do do

consumer report guides. We identify the best programs that are out there in terms of the research base,

in terms of the implementation supports that are provided, in terms of the design of programs. So I offer

that just as a service if we're going to support or incentivize, and we can think of different ways to do that quality SEL programs. We need to find out which programs are out there.

Clark emphasizes pre service and in service professional development. And Kim, who contributed a section to this issue, also has done a major national review of work and teachers in colleges of education.

And then, finally, he talks about research and development and identifies key areas, one being to create rigorous, scalable, useful SEL assessment systems. And we have a work group, Stephanie and Clark are both members of that work group as well as other practitioners and researchers, to advance work in this field. So CASEL works in collaboration with the National Commission on Social and Emotional Development. We have a collaborating states initiative. We're working now with 19 states on creating policies and supports for SEL. We work with 21 districts. We do programs reviews and we have this work group, assessment work group, as some of the things that we're involved with. We collaborate with John Bridgeland and the Civic Enterprises and Peter Hart Associates. There was a major report in 2013 where teachers said we need to do this work. Tim referred to that. They're about to come out with a major report on administrators and principals views, and principals are incredibly positive at seeing the importance of doing this work in their schools. There's no question that this is something that educators recognize the need for, but the question is how do we do it well.

I would say while Clark's recommendations are great there are a couple of things that could have been done more. It won't be done necessarily in that paper, but for the field. At the federal level, you know, ESSA is going on now and we can talk about Title I, Title II, Title IV(A), career and technical education. There are reviews that have been done. RAND is about to come out with a review, learning policy institutes came out with reviews thinking about links between ESSA and SEL programming. And I think that that is something we have to think actively about. We've done with Chris Andgail a review of ESSA state plans and pointing out the way states can advance their plans to focus on social and emotional learning. We need training and technical assistance centers.

Clark talked about teachers, Tim talked about superintendents. There is also a need to work with boards of education and principals, especially. So there is amazing interest in this work, there's great progress being made. If we want to educate kids who are knowledgeable, responsible, and caring,

contributing citizens, who are good family members, good workers, productive workers, good citizens, and academically successful, this needs to be a core part of education. And the question is how to do it well and advance the (inaudible).

MR. HASKINS: Great. Thank you very much for that. In the policy brief Clark said something that really got my attention as a former teacher and a person surely interested in public education. He said that SEL is at a critical moment, and then he said either advances or -- then he used the very technical term -- fizzles. Fizzles. So if you're really confronted with fizzling what are the steps you have to take to make sure that doesn't happen? We all know in education it seems like there's a fad a month and they come and go. So what can you do to make sure, what are the crucial steps that have to take place over let's say the next year or five years in order to make sure SEL continues to advance?

MR. WEISSBERG: Well, I wouldn't use the term fizzle ever. I that pendulums shift back and forth and I think --

MR. McKOWN: Sometimes they catch fire and fizzle though. (Laughter)

MR. WEISSBERG: When I taught at Yale, Seymour Sarason was -- I had a William T. Grant Faculty Scholar Award and Seymour Sarason and I would go out to lunch. He was my mentor. And he said there had been 8 million fads in the schools, what are you doing to have SEL not be 8 million and 1.

MR. HASKINS: I've never talked to the gentleman, sorry to say.

MR. WEISSBERG: And so this is an important question and I think the research base has to continue. I think we have to take on an attitude of continuous improvement. I think there needs to be connections with research practice and policy moving forward. I think assessment is critical. Clark makes very compelling cases for that all the time.

But I think if I were to step back and say one thing about the principal report that's going to come out, everybody is supportive of SEL right now, the overwhelming majority of educators are, but there's a lot of different thoughts about what it is and how to do it well. And I think we have to -- you know, you think about something like Title II, and professional learning for teachers, administrators, and other school leaders. Well, how do you makes sure that colleges of education, as well as in service training is going to be done well so people can implement the programs effectively because ultimately the

commitment to the field is going to happen when things are done in sensible ways and kids benefit and show growth. And we have to work to make that happen.

Stephanie.

MS. JONES: So I have 1000 things to say about everything that's been said. (Laughter) I'm going to practice self-regulation, everybody.

MR. HASKINS: But you're going to cut it to 15 minutes.

MS. JONES: But I'm going to keep it to just the rest of the time we have today.

(Laughter)

So I worry about the fizzle a great deal. And my graduate mentor was Ed Zigler, a good friend of Seymour Sarason, and he said to me repeatedly, Stephanie, watch out for the quick fix. Don't line up with the silver bullet mentality. And I think that this field can gravitate in that direction. And I think we really have to be wary and be careful and kind of return to core ideas, the core ideas that you laid out, and just be cautious because the quick fix never works. It reveals itself time and time again as something that is not the answer. The work is hard, not impossible, but it takes time and commitment and effort. So beware the quick fix. And if you, again, spend a lot of time on Google, clearly if you Google social and emotional learning there's a lot out there that is not grounded in evidence, that is not linked to these kind of core ideas, and we should be cautious about that. So that's one thing I would say this is important in offsetting the fizzle.

I think the other thing is complicated to do and we're trying to do it, which is to really be clear about what we mean. What are we talking about when we talk about social and emotional learning? How can we make sure that we are both inclusive and have lots of perspectives in the tent, but precise. What do we expect children to be able to do and can we see it in their behavior. And if we get concrete about those things then we can share the information with those who are working with kids and who can see it in their behavior. And that's not an easy project, but it's not impossible. I mean state standards systems are those things. That's a version of that. So we have to be really clear and precise about what we mean.

I think the other thing is, it's kind of on the research side, it's kind of on the practice side -- of course they go together -- is to think about a new generation of approaches and I'm really interested in

what is common to effective programs. So there are lots of programs and there have been lots of studies of them and many of them are effective and fantastic. If you really look inside them we have a form of a guide that builds on what CASEL has done that does that, looks deep inside evidence based programs and say what is common across these. Are those practices that we can integrate through teacher preparation or other means into the fabric of schooling and therefore instantiate them in the place in a different way than tends to happen with a program, which you say program and you think extra? You say strategy or practice, you think embedded and integrated. And I'm really curious about what those are and do they work when you try them on their own. So turtle is a great example. That child in that example understood the idea. They didn't just understand the turtle concept, they understood what was inside of it. That's a core strategy.

There are 10 or 15 programs that have evidence behind them that have a version of that, the chilly hug, the turtle, there's a whole bunch of them. And that's a common denominator of practice that one could spread. And because it might be simpler to enact, adaptable to local contexts, it might happen more and with more fidelity. So I'm really curious about this idea of integration and how we capitalize on what we learned about programs to get to strategies.

MR. HASKINS: Emily, you want to add anything?

MS. DOOLITTLE: I would just add the following, I mean I don't think it's going to fizzle. We're not fizzling. I like the pendulum idea and I do think that we kind of run the risk of we've hit the side of SEL -- we don't want it to slip back. And I do feel that, to reiterate Stephanie's plan, it's about the language. So what is the name, what is the it? And I think the measurement piece -- that's why I'm really glad we have the measurement papers, the policy paper here, I think that's the really critical piece that's going to unite all of these different components in a meaningful way.

So that's all I would add. I don't think we're going to fizzle, which I think is the good news. I think as we had said in the issue in introducing it, we wanted to take this moment to sort of put the stake in the ground and say here's where we are, here's what we're talking about, and now how do we move this forward. Because there's a lot out there and I want to make sure we don't run that risk of kind of slipping back.

MR. HASKINS: Clark?

MR. McKOWN: As I was listening to my colleagues I thought of Mad Men. Has anybody seen the series Mad Men?

SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. McKOWN: All right. I just started binge watching it so most of my thoughts are influenced by Don Draper. (Laughter) I will say if what we want to do is market an idea and create positive momentum behind it, I wonder if we are missing somebody at the table, which is -- and I'm saying this not facetiously -- somebody Don Draperesque from an ad agency who could create the 30 second Super Bowl spot that would amplify our message. You know, I know it's -- maybe that's a crazy idea, but we're not -- like the future of children is not going to land at the breakfast table of every family in the United States, you know. We speak well to some people and other people go, what are you talking about. So how might we enlist communications experts to increase the ubiquity and positive feeling around this movement so that it can accelerate?

MR. HASKINS: Okay. I'd like to draw the panel's attention to a problem that I see. In other areas of social policy teen pregnancy prevention, home visiting, employment training, the Obama administration set a clear path that I think is promising and may in the long run deliver. They require to get federal grant money that you be using and evidence based program, and they define it pretty precisely. And then they require continuous evaluation. This is a whole strategy of -- we build this field by -- you used the term best programs that are presumably evidence based, and you try to get people to use those as a way to make sure that they actually have impacts.

Here's what we found in virtually every field, you can find evidence based programs and they are great, they really produce impacts, but then when you try to scale them up and you have it at five places or a hundred places, or in many cases, if they're going to have a big impact on a country, a thousand places. They don't work, they don't scale up very well. Are you afraid that that's going to happen on this field, and what would you do to prevent it?

MR. WEISSBERG: Well, let me make it a little worse than you've just portrayed it. (Laughter) I think that going back to the '70s there was some work that says when you try to scale to new places the programs don't seem to have as much impact. Or even if you stay in the same place over time with the churn, with the transitions, even in the same place where the program stared, sometimes the

impact can dissipate. So this is a big challenge for the field. I can say that the way that CASEL has

approached some of this, and we had an I3 grant to support some of this work too, is there needs to be a

systems level support, ongoing support for implementation in quality ways. So what's the school wide

perspective, what's the central office in district perspective, what's the state perspective? So with some of

the scaling up it's not just the program in isolation that needs to be going to a bunch of different sites,

there's also this service delivery aspect of things, the systemic supports that need to be in place so that

there is ongoing reflection and continuous improvement to programming over time. So this tends I think

to be dynamic in how it needs to be approached and systemic rather than just thinking about so we have

the program model and we'll try to get it in as many sites as possible.

    MR. HASKINS: Stephanie?

    MS. JONES: Again, I have so many things to say about this. So just as a researcher

let's just be clear about what we mean by evidence based programs, the things that end up on a list. It

means it's been tried once usually, so in one study. It could be tried in lots of places, but there is one

study. And, you know, one of the core principles of the scientific enterprise is replication. So we haven't

on the research and development side, we haven't invested in replication to the degree that we should,

certainly, so that we would know what it takes to do a particular program that is effective, in my study in

New York City, for example, to do it well in South Carolina, right, or Columbus, or something like that. So

we need to invest in building the evidence base in a different way. When we say evidence based

programs we have to be really careful in defining what we're talking about.

    I think the second thing on the research agenda is there are few, if any, studies that say

okay, we know that this program as a block works, but what makes it work, what are the core

mechanisms that account for the links we might see between some form of implementation and some set

of outcomes? What's the core idea? And the core idea is what gets replicated. It's not necessarily the

turtle, because the turtle might not make sense in every context, but the core idea behind the turtle is

what accounts for the link between an implementation of something and an outcome we see. So that's

what gets replicated. So a science of mechanism, a science of process, is needed to be effective in the

scaling enterprise.

    A third thing is I think that we've spent a lot of time thinking through scientists, the kind of

core theories of change that underlie programs or approaches. They're preschool, elementary school,

and all these settings. So we specify a really detailed theory of change and then we use that as a guide

to doing our one evaluation. And what we hadn't really thought about, and this builds on Roger's point, is

what's the theory of change for the scaling proposition. So let's take a particular program or approach, it's

got let's say two studies -- there are a few SEL interventions that have many studies behind them, so it's

not that in this field every approach has only one study, there are a few that have multiple studies.

Caveat. But what is the scaling theory of action for a particular approach or set of approaches. What do

we need to put in place and then understand and track to make sure that the scaling idea works?

So I think there's more to be put into the endeavor before we can ask the question of

whether or not scaling works or doesn't work. And that I would say is true for the vast majority of

educational interventions. It's not just SEL, it's reading interventions, it's literacy interventions, it's math

interventions. It's all of them.

MR. HASKINS: Clark?

MR. McKOWN: I agree completely and would just and amplify a theme, which is there's

a whole field of implementation science. I'm not an implementation scientist, so I'm sure to butcher what

it does, but I'm pretty sure implementation science is about how one takes effective programs and

practices that have been demonstrated in a highly controlled, randomized control trial and scales them in

other settings. What conditions need to be present, how do you promote those conditions so that when

you spread the seeds they actually take root? I'm looking at my implementation scientist friend back

there and hoping she's nodding yes.

So that's part of the reason why in my remarks I thought at least some of the R&D

support we ought to be focusing as the field moves forward is really the explicit study of implementation

science and scaling. What conditions need to be present to support effective implementation of SEL

programs that are broad scale and how do we promote those conditions.

MR. HASKINS: All right, audience. So this time good questions, short from the audience

and short answers if possible from the panel so we can get to as many questions as possible.

So someone come trotting up here, and on the right, two in, the lady with her hand up.

Good, thank you.

QUESTIONER: Hi, I want to go for that 30 second ad. Let's see, increasing social and emotional learning decreases healthcare costs. I think one of the things that you all have not mentioned is health. Recently I attended a showing of a movie called "Resilience," which talks about the adverse childhood experiences, the ACEs, and how they impact someone's health.

My name is Mindy. I have -- whatever you call it -- it's call for Chi for Health and Wellness; I'm a Qigong instructor. So when you talk about the turtle that resonates with me. You know, we need to be talking about health in all of this because kids who don't know how to acknowledge their own feelings, how to recognize where on my body do I feel angry, you know, what does your face look like when it's angry, what does my face look like when it's angry, how do I let go of that anger in appropriate ways. We talk about adults and the big variable about scaling these programs is the individual. I mean a program can be really successful in Baltimore, Maryland and take it to someplace else and who's teaching that program and are parents supporting or not supporting --

MR. HASKINS: Well, let's go back to the panel now because we're trying to get in a bunch of questions.

QUESTIONER: Okay.

MR. HASKINS: So, is she right? Should SEL apply to health? Go ahead.

MS. DOOLITTLE: Absolutely, yeah. And I just want to say on the issue on the -- especially the paper on the teachers' piece really does highlight that point very nicely. And I think you're absolutely right that what we're talking about is when these sort of break down, these social skills, attitudes, and the emotional understandings, that does have direct impacts on health and wellbeing.

MR. HASKINS: Were you referring to paper in the volume?

MS. DOOLTTLE: Yes. I'm sorry, yes.

MR. HASKINS: Which one?

MS. DOOLITTLE: Kimberly Schonert-Reichl's paper.

MR. HASKINS: Okay, good, good. Okay. Go ahead.

MS. JONES: There's also a kind of a new neuroscience, stress, the brain, and behavior, that is informing practices in primarily what is described as sort of trauma sensitive practices or trauma sensitive learning. But it's really -- if you look at it, it's very much the same as SEL. So absolutely the

links are there, the practices are similar, and we should make the case more explicitly. Yeah, I agree.

MR. HASKINS: By the way in a previous volume we wrote a policy brief, Ross Thompson did, on stress and what you just referred to as neurological science. And I think some of you might like it. It's on our website. It's the best short treatment, it's less than 3000 words of what this is all about and what the science is behind it.

Sorry, go ahead.

MR. McKOWN: That's okay. I would just say I agree in principle and I'm delighted that you took a crack at the 30 second Super Bowl slot. That's awesome. I want to hear everybody's ideas. But I would just say the one cautionary note is if that's going to be our 30 second Super Bowl slot let's make sure the evidence supports the idea that these programs and practices have health benefits. I think they probably do, they certainly have mental health benefits. But here's where, you know, let's always have in the back of our minds not to over promise.

SPEAKER: But --

MR. HASKINS: Go ahead, quickly.

SPEAKER: The field of SEL began with problem prevention in things like substance abuse. And a certain point people said well what are the common ingredients and very often they were social and emotional competencies of kids. Mark Greenberg wanted the papers and the handbook talks about the public health approach to this work. And also Robert Wood Johnson is supporting a lot of work right now to create a culture of health and we're trying to think through issues of how does social and emotional wellness fit into that culture of health. So I think there's a lot to be done in that area.

MR. HASKINS: Next question. Come on up, front row here. Thank you.

MR. McCROY: Chris McCroy, Union Baptist Church, Baltimore. So my question is about the marketing, the scaling of things, because if you look at say development goal for education what you're talking about is almost the hottest topic bar none internationally. But they use a different language. So how do you connect 27 years of talking mainly to America, if I understand correctly, with this huge international demand?

MR. McKOWN: Well, I don't know is really the answer. But I do know that, for example, the Organization for Economic Cooperation Development is seeking to follow a whole cohort of children

around the world to understand, among other things, their social and emotional development and how it

relates to their academic and life outcomes. They don't necessarily use the term social and emotional

learning, but clearly there's a common worldwide interest. And I think your question is mine, how do we

link those efforts so that we're all singing from the same page, or at least communicating with one

another.

MS. JONES: The OECD has a framework, like many of us do, and it aligns quite closely

with the CASEL framework, with other frameworks. And I think that they have actually begun to talk

about social and emotional learning as social and emotional learning, social and emotional learning. So I

think there is more alignment going on than we might think. And people here were working on their

various projects and back and forth.

MR. HASKINS: Roger.

MR. WEISSBERG: I just wrote a forward to a book called, "Social and Emotional

Learning in Australia and the Asia Pacific," which will be coming out soon. And I also think that there's a

lot of work now going on actually in Africa, Asia, India -- I'm going to give a talk in Bangalore in July. And

they call it social and emotional learning.

MR. HASKINS: Next question. Right here on the -- on your left right there. Right there,

stop, give it to that lady. Yes.

QUESTIONER: Quickly, for high schools --

MR. HASKINS: What's your name?

QUESTIONER: -- are there programs that have been integrated into high schools and

scaled up? And secondly, is there a way to do this incrementally because often times you can't get the

support that you need to do it broadly?

MR. WEISSBERG: Well, I could say a couple of things. You know, at a certain point

CASEL when we've done our reviews separated out preschool, elementary, middle, and high school. The

work at the high schools is underdeveloped at this point I think. There are programs in our guide, like

expeditionary learning, which is scaling up, encasing history in ourselves is a program that has scaled up

a bit. Then there are approaches like project based learning. Some of the work done in actually charter

school and private schools around the country have interesting high school models as well, but the work

being done I think at high school is less well developed than with the younger kids.

MR. HASKINS: One more question. All the way over here on the side.

MR. FISHMAN: My name is Sheldon Fishman; I'm co-founder of Parents' Coalition. I have a nasty question. Are you concerned about snake oil salesman in this industry, and in particular national corporations getting a half million dollar no bid contracts in this area?

MR. HASKINS: Good question.

MR. WEISSBERG: Well, the answer is yes. One of the reasons that we do reviews of programs is to look at the evidence base, the program design. And early on, and I think it still exists, trying to introduce standards, which actually have increased in rigor over the years as more work has been done in this field. Sometimes people get really mad at you when you do that and we're trying to maintain the integrity at the highest level we can to advance the work with quality.

MR. McKOWN: I share that concern about snake oil and I don't know what the answer is. I think you out there in the audience know better how decisions get made by purchasers and school districts. I think we ought to consider co-opting strategies used by very successful and honorable education companies. You know, Pearson is huge and they're very successful at selling to school districts. And I don't think the purchasers are looking much at the evidence, though I think what they sell is probably very high quality. So how might we use those same strategies to get inroads to communicate what the evidence is that supports the programs that we're promoting, right, that we sell the evidence and the decision maker decides for themselves.

So I think there's a lot to be learned from not snake oil salesman, but from the private sector about how to engage with school districts to sell what's important to us, which I think is evidence based programs that are really going to move the needle for kids.

MR. HASKINS: So, what a great event. We had wonderful people. It's a good journal. If you read it I think you'll really learn something. And we have a huge audience here. It's very nice to see such a big audience. And we also have an even bigger audience -- I think the biggest one we've ever had for any event that my center sponsored on the web.

So please join me in thanking the panel and come back soon. (Applause)

* * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

Carleton J. Anderson, III

(Signature and Seal on File)

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2020