An Examination of Frameworks for Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) Reflected in State K-12 Learning Standards

Given the large and growing number of SEL frameworks designed to meet different purposes and to work in different contexts, it is increasingly important to look both at specific frameworks in depth and to compare across frameworks. This is particularly so when choosing a framework to guide the selection of SEL strategies for implementation and/or assessment tools. In addition, once a framework is selected it should be aligned with other frameworks likely to be in use in a classroom, school, district, or broader context.

This series of three briefs examines three different efforts to compare frameworks. The first brief, about the Harvard Taxonomy Project, describes tools for comparing the words in different frameworks using a master thesaurus and interactive visualization tools. The second brief, by the American Institutes for Research (AIR), is based on AIR’s study of 136 different frameworks from a variety of fields. The final brief, by CASEL, compares the existing state SEL standards as frameworks designed to help guide practice in each state.

According to the first brief in the SEL Frameworks Introductory series, “a framework is simply a tool that helps organize ideas in order to provide a foundation for thinking, communicating, and acting.” Frameworks are important because they help to drive action. Action can include designing or aligning multiple efforts that support student social and emotional development and can also include policymaking, instructional strategies, and assessment. According to the AIR report Identifying, Defining, and Measuring Social and Emotional Competencies by Berg and her colleagues, the key purposes of frameworks in education are to:

1. Articulate what students should know and be able to do (i.e., learning standards/competencies).
2. Support evidence-based practice.
3. Inform decisions about how best to monitor student progress and implementation (i.e., measurement).
4. Connect practice to theory and research.
AIR identified and conducted reviews of SEL frameworks from different fields of study for their report. This yielded at least 136 different frameworks for SEL, many of which are likely to be operating currently within different departments, schools, and districts across the country.

As state education agencies (SEAs) have been working to develop policies and strategies to promote high-quality implementation of SEL programs and practices in districts and schools, many states have elected to create K-12 learning standards (often called “competencies,” “learning goals” or “benchmarks”). These standards are built on and reflect SEL frameworks. Despite the large number of SEL frameworks, however, a recent systematic review by Eklund and colleagues of state-level social and emotional standards found that many states use SEL frameworks based on the CASEL 5 framework.

Our goal in this brief is to examine the learning standards developed by states for SEL and the frameworks they reflect. The most recent scan of the CASEL State Scorecard Project found that the number of states with SEL learning standards increased dramatically in the last two years. At the end of 2018, 14 states had articulated K-12 standards for student social and emotional learning (SEL). We include those additional states that have released K-12 standards for SEL since the Eklund review was completed.

For this brief, we explored how these 14 states defined SEL. Specifically, we analyzed how each state’s K-12 learning standards aligned with the CASEL framework and addressed two critical aspects of SEL: development and equity considerations. In addition, we identified whether and how states make connections to other strategic priorities and approaches (e.g., academics, workforce readiness, mental health, and multitiered systems of support). For this brief, we also review the connections states make to other strategic priorities and the resources and guidance documents from states that have SEL standards. We should note that there are an additional 11 states that have developed resources and guidance documents (i.e., California, Massachusetts, Missouri, New Hampshire, Ohio, Colorado, Indiana, Kentucky, Nebraska, Oregon and Pennsylvania) and made strategic alignments, but have not decided to develop standards or in the process of developing standards. Finally, we examined the resources and guidance states provide to help districts and schools support SEL implementation.


To summarize, for each of the 14 sets of K-12 SEL state learning standards we considered the following five questions:

1. **What SEL framework** is the state using, and to what extent does it align with the CASEL framework for SEL?
2. Has the state articulated **developmental benchmarks** for SEL as part of its framework?
3. Has the state explicitly connected its framework to **equity** and/or culturally responsive classroom practice?
4. To what other strategic **priorities and approaches** does the state connect in its SEL learning standards and framework?
5. What kinds of **guidance** does the state provide to support implementation of its SEL learning standards and framework?

To conduct our review, we examined the publicly available learning standards and also reviewed other publicly available guidance documents found on state websites for all 14 states. In some cases, particularly when we were aware of them as part of our Collaborating States Initiative (CSI), we noted additional products under development by states.

Results from our review are summarized in Table 1 on page 4. The following sections begin with a description of the importance of each key question and then present and discuss our findings across the 14 sets of state SEL K-12 learning standards.

### SEL Frameworks Used by States

Our review found that 10 out of the 14 states (71.43%) use the CASEL 5 Core Competencies framework. This is consistent with Eklund’s finding that many states use the CASEL framework to define SEL. It is not surprising that states tend to use frameworks closely aligned with the CASEL framework, given that the CASEL framework is based on the theory and developmental research on social and emotional competencies.

Three of the states that use the CASEL framework (**Illinois, New York, and West Virginia**) combine dimensions of the five competencies to create three goal areas. Specifically, they combine self-awareness and self-management into an overarching goal focused on the individual, and social awareness and interpersonal skills into a second overarching goal focused on relationships.

Further, we found that three out of the four remaining states created state-specific frameworks that also closely align with the CASEL framework. That is, while four of the 14 states (28.57%) use a state-specific framework that does not directly align to the CASEL 5 core competencies, three of the frameworks in these states cover the five core competencies in slightly to very different ways. Specifically, three of the
### TABLE 1: COMPARISON OF 14 STATES THAT HAVE DEVELOPED K-12 SEL STANDARDS/COMPETENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Utilize CASEL SEL Framework</th>
<th>Developed State Specific SEL</th>
<th>Provides developmental benchmarks</th>
<th>Academic Integration</th>
<th>SEL framework also connects to/aligns with:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IL (2004)</td>
<td>✔**</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS (2012/2018)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME (2012)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI (2017)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN (2018)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV (2017)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ (2017)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY (2018)</td>
<td>✔**</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND (2018)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI (2017)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN (2017)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA (2016)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV (2012)</td>
<td>✔**</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI (2018)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*PreK aligned with K-12

**CASEL a5 competencies presented in three goals
four (Kansas, Washington, and Wisconsin) are fairly closely aligned with the CASEL framework though they at times use different language (e.g., Kansas organizes its competencies into character development, personal development, and social development) or include additional competencies (e.g., Washington adds additional specific competencies on self-efficacy and social engagement).

The Maine framework stands apart as unique in relation to the CASEL framework. Maine’s Guiding Principles reflect a state-specific framework organized around the following five competency domains:

1. Clear and effective communicator
2. Self-directed, lifelong learner
3. Creative and practical problem solver
4. Responsible and involved citizen
5. Integrative and informed thinker

Even in this case, on close analysis of the indicators, all five of the CASEL core competencies are reflected in the Maine framework.

In short, the CASEL 5 core competencies have been used to varying degrees by most if not all of the 14 states to guide the frameworks they use in their state K-12 learning standards. The exact language used by each state can be found in state-by-state descriptions contained in Appendix B.

Developmental Benchmarks

Multiple authors4 assert that standards, measures, and practice should all be developmental because SEL is developmental. For example, Denham’s brief in this series suggests that the CASEL framework is implicitly developmental. Although the CASEL framework does not define developmental benchmarks, the CASEL CSI recommends that developmental benchmarks (referred to as developmental indicators by some states) be an essential component of high-quality state learning standards.5 We encourage states that elect to develop SEL learning standards to also articulate developmental benchmarks.6 However, in their review of frameworks for SEL, Berg and her colleagues reported that fewer than one in ten frameworks they examined articulated competencies developmentally7. Given the dramatic increase in the number of state SEL learning standards in the past two years, we were interested in the current

---


6 Dusenbury, L., and Yoder, N., 2017a

7 Berg, Osher, Same, Nolan, Benson, & Jacobs, 2017
review to see how many state frameworks have articulated developmental benchmarks and for what age levels.

In contrast to the review of frameworks by AIR, we found that 10 of the 14 (71.43%) state learning standards/frameworks we reviewed articulated developmental benchmarks for SEL, and three of the 14 states (New Jersey, Rhode Island and Washington) are in the process of creating developmental benchmarks. This finding stands in contrast to the review of frameworks in 14 fields of study by AIR and indicates that states are increasingly recognizing the importance of having an SEL framework that is developmental. We have observed that state teams create state-specific benchmarks that reflect their specific context and priorities, often drawing from benchmarks available from other states and districts and working with stakeholders across the state to develop them. We view the process of creating benchmarks as an opportunity for states to articulate competencies that may be more relevant and culturally responsive to their state. Most states recognize that districts and schools will, in turn, also adapt the competencies the state offers. Thus, benchmarks are likely to reflect local contexts and priorities, which we believe is a good thing.

All 10 of the states that articulated developmental benchmarks use grade bands (e.g., early elementary, late elementary, middle school, high school), rather than individual grade levels (e.g., K, 1, 2…). As can be seen in Table 2, most states have two bands for the elementary years, a middle school band, and one or two high school bands. There were slight variations across states in terms of how the grade bands were organized (e.g., separating early high school and later high school versus a single band for high school). In addition, two states (Tennessee and Wisconsin) identify competencies for adults. We also describe the grade bands defined by each state in Appendix B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2: ORGANIZATION OF DEVELOPMENTAL BANDS BY STATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infant/Toddler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organized by Beginner ➔ Advanced Beginner ➔ Strategic Learner ➔ Emerging Expert
Of the 10 states that articulated developmental benchmarks, we found that in five states (50%) those K-12 standards for SEL were also aligned with the state’s PreK standards for SEL. It may seem surprising that preschool standards would not automatically be aligned with K-12 standards within a state, but it is actually not uncommon for this to be the case. All 50 states have now articulated preschool standards for SEL (and have since 2015). However, preschool standards were traditionally developed by the department, office or agency within a state responsible for early childhood. As a result, K-12 standards are not automatically aligned with preschool standards. At CASEL we recommend that state teams developing learning standards for SEL include members from both early childhood and K-12 agencies/departments. Only Michigan has aligned state standards from infancy through grade 12.

Thus, compared to broader SEL frameworks in the field that too often (roughly 90% of the time) do not specify developmental benchmarks or directly address the developmental nature of social and emotional skills, over 70% of state K-12 learning standards do.

**Equity and Cultural Responsiveness**

An equity lens is important when developing SEL standards, particularly to ensure that the standards do not unintentionally reinforce implicit power and privilege inequities. Equal access, awareness of implicit bias, and responsiveness and sensitivity to culture are critical considerations for policymakers, and approaches to SEL can themselves be helpful in promoting equity. When students and adults themselves have social and emotional competencies, including self- and social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making, they are better equipped to be resilient in the face of adversity, and also better equipped to advocate for themselves and others. As indicated in a special issue brief on equity in this Measuring SEL Framework series, Robert Jagers and colleagues illustrate ways to revise and add to the CASEL framework to address issues of prejudice, privilege, and power explicitly and to promote self-determination, empowerment, and social justice. They define such equity-informed work as transformative SEL—“a process whereby students and teachers build strong, respectful relationships found on an appreciation of similarities and differences, learn to critically examine root causes of inequity, and develop collaborative solutions to community and societal problems.” Yet despite the importance of the above considerations in high-quality frameworks, Berg and her colleagues report that fewer than one in five frameworks (<20%) were rated as considering cultural and linguistic diversity.
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8 Dusenbury, Dermody, & Weissberg, 2018.
9 Dusenbury, L., and Yoder, 2017a.
12 Berg, Osher, Same, Nolan, Benson, & Jacobs, 2017
An increasing number of states now emphasize equity in SEL to ensure that educational experiences are culturally and linguistically appropriate and engaging to all. As Jagers asserts in his brief, “Racial/ethnic, class, and gender inequities are vexing problems that hamper individual student learning as well as our collective efforts to achieve the democratic ideals of U.S. society.”

We were particularly interested in this brief to examine whether and how states addressed equity, including cultural and linguistic diversity in their statewide SEL learning standards.

Although the AIR report found that fewer than one in five frameworks (<20%) considered cultural and linguistic diversity, our review found that more than 42% – six of the 14 states – explicitly connected their SEL framework to equity and/or cultural responsiveness. This was typically done by providing guidance to support equitable and culturally responsive teaching practices. We also found that states approach this work in different ways.

- For example, Washington integrated culturally responsive practices and equity throughout five online learning modules developed to support SEL statewide. In particular, see Washington SEL Online Education Module: Building Foundations and Strategies: Learning Segment 4: Integrating SEL Into Culturally Responsive Classrooms, which addresses an intentional approach to culturally responsive SEL in depth.

- In contrast, New York includes brief sections on equity and culturally responsive teaching in its guidance document Social Emotional Learning: Essential for Learning, Essential for Life (p. 10 and 29).

- Wisconsin convened an Equity Council to assist in developing the state’s ESSA plan, and the council opted to continue working on how to communicate about SEL and equity, how to help districts implement the SEL competencies equitably, and how agencies/groups can support districts in this work. Further, the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction collaborated with the Wisconsin Response to Intervention (RTI) Center and the Disproportionality Technical Assistance Network to create a Model to Inform Culturally Responsive Practice. It includes guidance on communicating the benefit of SEL for all students, how to implement SEL in ways that are culturally and linguistically responsive, and how to engage families and communities in culturally relevant ways.

- Minnesota submitted its SEL framework to the Great Lakes Equity Center for a culturally responsive review. The review led to the creation of the Great Lakes Equity Center Guidance for supporting equity in teaching practices. The guidance provides multiple recommendations to support SEL through a culturally responsive lens, such as basing curriculum on the cultural-linguistic realities of students and viewing those realities as assets, among others.

- Michigan also had a review of their SEL framework from the Great Lakes Equity Center. In addition, the state fosters equity by including sections on culture and equity, as well as reflective questions related to equity in its guide to SEL competencies and approach to SEL, Early Childhood to Grade 12.

13 Jagers, Rivas-Drake, & Borowski, 2018
14 Berg, Osher, Same, Nolan, Benson, & Jacobs, 2017
Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) Competencies and Indicators (p. 9).
Michigan also links to guidance and statements from the Great Lakes Equity Center in its tool for Connecting Social and Emotional Learning to Michigan’s School Improvement Framework.

Connections to Strategic Priorities and Approaches

We were also interested in exploring the extent to which states connected their state SEL standards/framework to other strategic priorities and approaches. In their review, Berg and her colleagues identified character, mental health (including trauma), and workforce (career readiness) development as key approaches often connected to SEL. In our experience in the CSI, we have found the following priorities and approaches are important drivers in many states as they develop frameworks for SEL:

- **Academic Integration.** SEL competencies are critical for successful engagement and execution in all learning. It is important to make these connections explicit to encourage educators to foster student SEL competencies that support academics.
- **Mental health and well-being** is foundational to social and emotional adjustment and competence. Trauma and other adverse childhood experiences (ACES) can negatively affect mental health as well as academic, social, and emotional development.
- **Whole child** is a coordinated approach to education and public health that works to ensure that each child will be “healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged.” We know from our work in the CSI that, thanks in part to ESSA, many states are organizing to reflect a whole child approach, as well as equity and cultural responsiveness, in their educational systems.
- **Workforce readiness, college and career readiness, and 21st-century skills** are closely aligned with SEL, because social and emotional skills (such as self-management, communication, goal setting, collaboration, and responsible decision-making) are all critical skills for success in college and career.
- **School climate and culture** refer to the quality as well as norms and values of the school environment. School climate and culture are associated with student and teacher social and emotional well-being.
- **Character education and development** is a process designed to promote citizenship, civic principles and values, and ethical behavior. It aligns with social and emotional development.
- **Multitiered systems of support (MTSS)** (formerly called response to intervention, or RTI) recognizes that academic and behavioral functioning are intertwined. MTSS is a systemic approach designed to identify and coordinate evidence-based interventions. MTSS can include positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS). SEL programs and approaches are often seen as an important component of universal approaches within MTSS, because they are designed to promote positive academic and behavioral outcomes in all students.

---

15 For this review and the review of implementation guidance, we only include those states that have SEL standards; additional states connect their SEL efforts to other strategic priorities but are not referenced here.

16 Berg, Osher, Same, Nolan, Benson, & Jacobs, 2017
In our review, we explored whether and how states explicitly connected their SEL standards to each of these strategic priorities and approaches. We found that states often connected their SEL standards to multiple strategic priorities and approaches. States do this because they recognize that educators are already overwhelmed with initiatives and priorities to support students. In addition, they recognize that SEL underpins many of the other strategic efforts. When we support SEL competencies and skills, students have the tools and resources to engage more in academics, become more prepared for the workforce, and have tools and resources to support their emotional well-being. Based on our review, states have connected SEL to the following strategic priorities and approaches (recognizing that this is not an exhaustive list):

- **Academic Integration.** We found that 11 out of 14 states (including Illinois, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, North Dakota Rhode Island, Tennessee, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin) integrated their SEL standards with academics through multiple means—for example, crosswalks with academic standards, proposed legislation to align SEL standards with academic and health and fitness standards, instructional approaches, and making the case for why SEL competencies are critical for academic learning.

- **Mental health, trauma, and adverse childhood experiences (ACES).** We found that eight out of 14 states (including Illinois, Kansas, Michigan, New York, North Dakota Tennessee, Washington, and Wisconsin) connected their SEL standards to mental health, trauma, or ACES. In comparison, the AIR report by Berg and her colleagues found that just over 1 in 20 (6%) of SEL frameworks they studied connected to trauma.\(^\text{17}\)

- **Whole child.** Five out of 14 states (Illinois, Michigan, New York, and Tennessee, and Washington) explicitly connected their SEL standards to the whole child approach.

- **Workforce readiness, college and career readiness, and 21st-century skills.** Eleven out of the 14 states (Illinois, Kansas, Maine, Michigan, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, Tennessee, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin) explicitly connected their SEL standards to workforce readiness.

- **School climate and culture.** Twelve out of the 14 states (Illinois, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin) explicitly connected their SEL standards to school climate and culture.

- **Character education and development.** Only two of the 14 states (Kansas, New Jersey) explicitly connected their SEL standards to character development.

- **MTSS and PBIS.** Four of the 14 states (Kansas, New York, North Dakota, and Tennessee) explicitly connected their SEL standards to MTSS, and three (Kansas, New York, and Wisconsin) to PBIS.

- **Character education and development.** Only two of the 14 states (Kansas, New Jersey) explicitly connected their SEL standards to character development.

- **MTSS and PBIS.** Four of the 14 states (Kansas, New York, North Dakota, and Tennessee) explicitly connected their SEL standards to MTSS, and three (Kansas, New York, and Wisconsin) to PBIS.

\(^\text{17}\) Berg, Osher, Same, Nolan, Benson, & Jacobs, 2017
To summarize, looking across states at the most common priorities and approaches, we found that 11 (78.57%) connected their standards with academics, 11 (78.57%) connected their standards explicitly to career/workforce readiness and 12 states also connected to school climate and culture (though not the same 10 states). Eight states (57.14%) connected their standards explicitly to mental health and/or trauma. Five states (35.71%) connected their SEL standards to a whole child approach with four of 14 states also connecting to Multitiered Systems of Support (MTSS). Three states (21.43%) connected to Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (PBIS) and only two (14.29%) to character development. Kansas, New York, and Tennessee seem to be the most comprehensive in their efforts to connect to these strategic priorities and approaches.

Guidance to Support SEL Implementation

Given the critical need for supports throughout the implementation of SEL efforts, we examined how states were supporting implementation of the state learning standards for SEL. This includes whether they provide overall guidance on SEL implementation as well as supports for instructional practices, professional learning, and assessment in particular.

In our review of state websites (the most common way states create a clearinghouse of state-developed and other publicly available tools), we found that states support their frameworks in a variety of ways, offering a wide range of tools and resources (including tools and resources developed by external organizations like CASEL) designed to promote high-quality implementation. In many cases they have also developed their own state-specific tools and resources, such as those found in Illinois, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Tennessee, Washington, and Wisconsin.

Across the areas of implementation, we found that half of the states (seven of 14) had developed general guidance or tools to support implementation of SEL, including Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Tennessee, West Virginia, and Wisconsin. Nine of the 14 states (64.29%) provided guidance on teaching practices to support SEL including Illinois, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, Tennessee, and Wisconsin.

Nine of the 14 states (64.29%), including Illinois, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Washington and Wisconsin, provided guidance or other supports for professional learning. However, specific strategies states use to support professional learning vary. For example, Washington state has developed a series of five online professional learning modules, and Tennessee has published eight online professional learning tools (and three more are in development), while Minnesota offers broad guidance for developing professional learning offerings. Illinois offers professional learning opportunities (PLOs) for SEL through various partnerships, for example, ISBE’s partnership with regional offices of education (ROEs) and immediate service centers (ISCs), the Ed Leaders Network, and the University of Illinois, Classroom in Action website.

We found that seven states (50%), including Illinois, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, North Dakota, Tennessee, and Wisconsin, provide some level of guidance on assessment or measurement of student/school progress in social and emotional development or school or classroom SEL practices – although
the level of guidance varies from state to state. For example, Kansas has developed the Kansas tool for measuring social, emotional, and character growth. Kansas also offers using a “Likert scale” on their website as a way of measuring student growth (these tools are currently being revised to align with Kansas’ revised SECD standards). Minnesota provides detailed and thoughtful guidance for developing approaches to assessment. As noted below, Wisconsin provides a wide array of state-specific tools for measuring SEL and implementation on their website. Tennessee, on the other hand provides broad suggestions on what to look for in classroom practices that support student development.

In their systematic review, Eklund and her colleagues (2018) discuss the importance going forward for assessments aligned with SEL standards and frameworks, although from the perspective of the CSI, assessment of individual student social and emotional development needs to be approached very carefully. At this point we do not believe assessment measures are appropriate for use in universal screening or for accountability purposes. Interested readers should also refer to the Assessment guide and related guidance on the Measuring SEL website.

Conclusion

Our review of state learning standards revealed that most states use the CASEL framework (i.e., in 71% of the 14 states with learning standards), and all appear to include competencies from the CASEL 5 domains. A high percentage of states reviewed here (92.86%) have developed or are developing developmental benchmarks. Further, although attention to equity has been somewhat more limited (43% of states reviewed, currently), we see an increasing number of states moving in this direction. Through the CSI, we are aware that equity is a strong priority in many states. To promote and support educational equity, the CSI recommends that states and their working groups provide guidance for learning goals, teaching practices, and approaches that are culturally and linguistically appropriate and engaging for all. We expect the number of states that will produce guidance for equity and cultural responsiveness that incorporate elements of SEL to continue to rise.

In the spirit of breaking down professional divisions, it was gratifying in this review to see how many states connect their standards to other relevant priorities, including mental health and workforce readiness. All but one state provided explicit guidance for implementation in at least one or more of critical areas, including to support SEL across contexts and ways of including academics.

There has been tremendous momentum in state work in SEL in the past few years. Based on our work with the CASEL CSI and the momentum we have witnessed in our most recent state scan, we anticipate that in the next few years many more states are likely to adopt statewide SEL frameworks and learning standards as part of competencies and guidance they develop. In the process, states are learning from and taking advantage of, the work already completed in other states. Indeed, in the CSI we find that working groups typically begin their work by reviewing SEL frameworks and standards developed by other states – which is part of the CSI recommended process.

---
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This is an exciting time for state work to advance SEL, one we believe has the potential to transform the way students are educated in this country and help ensure that all students are fully equipped – socially, emotionally, and academically – for success in school and in life. In coming years, we expect many more states will develop policies and learning standards that promote SEL practices and the development of SEL in students. Future states will have the advantage of states like the 14 reviewed in this brief and the others that are developing alignment and implementation guidance. These states are truly leading the nation.
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The Measuring SEL Series of Frameworks Briefs

The Establishing Practical Social-Emotional Competence Assessments of Preschool to High School Students project as guided by the Assessment Work Group (AWG) is dedicated to helping advance the effective use of data to inspire practice in SEL. In deciding how the AWG could best contribute to advancing the field and complement rather than compete with other efforts underway to address the challenges of multiple frameworks and inconsistent use of language, the AWG Frameworks Subgroup, led by Stephanie Jones and Roger Weissberg, developed four series of briefs designed for practitioners. Each series and each brief in the series is designed to help advance how people think about the issues and make reasonable choices that work best for them and their context. We hope they provide a set of “building blocks” that systems and practitioners can use to advance and improve their SEL efforts. Learn more at https://measuringsel.casel.org

Introductory Series
These briefs are about what frameworks are, how they are useful, the challenges and opportunities they present in practice, and defining criteria that are helpful when considering what frameworks to use.

Comparative Series
These briefs explore efforts underway to categorize and align ways of thinking about comparing unique frameworks. The briefs also describe tools available to aid systems and practitioners in their selection and use of a framework.

Special Issues Series
These briefs identify critical issues that frameworks must address or that influence how they are used that are important to consider when selecting and using frameworks, such as equity and SEL, and developmental considerations.

Descriptive Series
These briefs each describe an individual framework currently in use. They are intended to illustrate how frameworks can be analyzed and help practitioners learn to evaluate frameworks on the types of criteria that matter most in their settings. (The briefs are not an endorsement of these frameworks.)
The Collaborating States Initiative (CSI)

In 2016, CASEL launched the Collaborating States Initiative (CSI) to help state education agencies create statewide conditions that will encourage and equip educators to promote integrated, equity-focused, academic, social, and emotional learning (SEL). In the past two years, the CSI team and its partners have scaled state-level SEL work, starting with eight states and now connected to more than 25 states, which collectively serve more than 11,500 school districts, 58,000 schools, and 30 million students. The goal of the CSI is to support SEA staff move beyond compliance-driven policies to develop flexible policies, tools, and guidelines that encourage districts and schools to create customized conditions to support every student’s development. Leaders in these states share CASEL's commitment to help ensure that preschool to high school students are fully prepared—academically, socially, and emotionally—to succeed in school, at work, and in life.

As part of the CSI, state teams – with support from CASEL and national experts and organizations – engage in a community of practice to learn and grow state-level SEL policies and practices. States share resources and findings from state-specific research, disseminate information on best practices and evidence-based tools, and collaborate on problems of practice. Through this community of practice, states develop a vision for their SEL work, identify strategies to build adult capacity to support student SEL, integrate and align policies and practices, and create systems that support the needs of all learners.

CSI states develop customized SEL plans and activities based on each state’s unique context. Some are developing guidelines or professional learning to support student SEL. Others are articulating learning standards for student SEL. Some are strategically integrating SEL into existing programs and priorities, including academics. Still others are using a combination of these strategies. All are committed to creating statewide conditions where educators are effectively equipped and encouraged to support their students’ social and emotional development.

Going forward, CASEL seeks to advance implementation across our partner states, deepen understanding of how they can best support districts, and strengthen communication about SEL among all 50 states.

For more: [https://casel.org/collaborative-state-initiative/](https://casel.org/collaborative-state-initiative/)

CASEL would like to acknowledge and thank all of the state teams we work with – including all those who reviewed and contributed directly to this manuscript. Support for the Collaborating States Initiative is provided in part by Pure Edge, Inc. and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. The views expressed here do not necessarily reflect the views of the foundations. We are deeply grateful for their support and collaboration.
### ILLINOIS

#### GENERAL

The first state to adopt learning standards for SEL. The framework of the Illinois Social/Emotional Standards (2004) organizes the five core competencies of the CASEL framework into three goals:

1. Develop self-awareness and self-management skills to achieve school and life success,
2. Use social-awareness and interpersonal skills to establish and maintain positive relationships, and
3. Demonstrate decision-making skills and responsible behaviors in personal, school, and community contexts.

#### DEVELOPMENTAL BENCHMARKS

The Illinois SEL Standards provide developmental benchmarks by the following grade bands:

- Early elementary K-3
- Late elementary 4-5
- Middle/junior high 6-8
- Early high school 9-10
- Late high school 11-12

Since 2013, the Illinois SEL standards have been fully aligned with the state’s Early Learning and Development Standards (which include the state’s preschool standards).

#### EQUITY

N/A

#### ALIGNMENT TO OTHER PRIORITIES

The Illinois SEL standards explicitly connect to:

- **Academic Integration**: Guidance includes Collaborative Classroom Kits that provide strategies to support SEL within classrooms. The kits can be found at [http://www.ilclassroomsinaction.org/sel.html](http://www.ilclassroomsinaction.org/sel.html)
- **Workforce Readiness**: The Workforce Readiness Task Force is working with ISBE to align the SEL standards with workforce readiness.
- **Mental Health**: The standards were developed in response to the Illinois Children’s Mental Health Act. Instructional supports for the Illinois SEL Standards are found at [http://www.ilclassroomsinaction.org/instructional-supports.html](http://www.ilclassroomsinaction.org/instructional-supports.html) and include resources to support trauma.
- **Climate**: Guidance for instructional support of the Illinois SEL standards is found under the domain of Climate
- **Whole Child**: The SEL standards and instructional supports are presented within the context of Whole Child more broadly.

#### GUIDANCE TO SUPPORT IMPLEMENTATION

The Illinois SEL standards support practice through a wide variety of resources available in Illinois Classrooms in Action. These resources are found within the domain of “Classroom and Climate” ([http://www.ilclassroomsinaction.org/instructional-supports.html](http://www.ilclassroomsinaction.org/instructional-supports.html)), under instructional support for SEL ([http://www.ilclassroomsinaction.org/sel.html](http://www.ilclassroomsinaction.org/sel.html)), and include:

- Detailed performance descriptors by grade (Grades 1-5; Grades 6-12) that may be used to develop classroom strategies and activities.
- Teaching strategies (“Social emotional learning standards strategies”) organized by grade band.
- A recorded webinar on 10 teaching strategies to support SEL is available.
- Positive culture posters that can be downloaded from the website are designed to support integration of self-management within the framework of positive culture and climate.
- Classroom collaboration kits ([http://www.ilclassroomsinaction.org/classroom-collaboration.html](http://www.ilclassroomsinaction.org/classroom-collaboration.html)) designed to support a classroom environment that supports student collaboration.

Performance descriptors by grade band (Grades 1-5; Grades 6-12) may be used by teachers to monitor their students’ skill development within their classroom. In addition, Illinois offers professional learning opportunities (PLOs) for SEL through various partnerships, for example, ISBE’s partnership with regional offices of education (ROEs) and immediate service centers (ISCs), the Ed Leaders Network, and the University of Illinois, Classroom in Action website.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRAMEWORKS BRIEFS</th>
<th>COMPARATIVE SERIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Kansas

#### General

In 2012, Kansas was the second state in the country to adopt learning standards for SEL, and the first to also integrate character development with SEL. The Kansas Social-Emotional Character Development Revised Standards were posted in 2018.

The Kansas Social, Emotional, Character Development Standards use a state-specific framework that organizes the five core SEL competencies in the CASEL framework into three domains:

- Character development (including responsible decision-making and problem solving)
- Personal development (including self-awareness and self-management)
- Social development (including social awareness and interpersonal skills).

#### Developmental Benchmarks

The Kansas Social, Emotional, Character Development Standards provide developmental benchmarks by grade bands: K-2, 3-5, 6-8, 9-12; they do not explicitly align with preschool standards.

#### Equity

N/A

#### Alignment to Other Priorities

The Kansas State Standards connect to academic integration through instructional practices, college and career readiness, and character development. The Kansas standards also are aligned with and designed to support PBIS, MTSS, and Mental Health and Trauma-Sensitive Schools. The Kansas standards align to school climate and culture through their core beliefs, for example, one core belief states “SECD skills are best learned in a respectful, safe, and civil school environment where adults are caring role models.” The SECD standards are specifically referenced in their Kansas Education Systems Accreditation process under the Relationships and Responsive Culture rubric. Documents can be found on their website: [https://www.ksde.org/Agency/Division-of-Learning-Services/Career-Standards-and-Assessment-Services/Content-Area-M-Z/School-Counseling/Social-Emotional-Character-Development-Standards-Assessment-and-Instruction](https://www.ksde.org/Agency/Division-of-Learning-Services/Career-Standards-and-Assessment-Services/Content-Area-M-Z/School-Counseling/Social-Emotional-Character-Development-Standards-Assessment-and-Instruction)

#### Guidance to Support Implementation

Guidance to support implementation of the Kansas standards is provided. There are a wide variety of additional tools and resources including guidance on SEL implementation and professional development ([Social Emotional Learning District Implementation and Professional Development Guidance (Minnesota Dept. of Education)](https://www.ksde.org/Portals/0/CSAS/Content%20Area%20(M-Z)/School%20Counseling/Soc_Emot_Char_Dev/Measuring%20SECD%20Student%20Growth%20Measure.pdf?ver=2015-02-24-121600-343)), as well as likert scales for measuring student growth ([https://www.ksde.org/Portals/0/CSAS/Content%20Area%20(M-Z)/School%20Counseling/Soc_Emot_Char_Dev/Likert%20Scale%20for%20SECD%20Student%20Growth%20Measure.pdf?ver=2015-02-24-121600-343](https://www.ksde.org/Portals/0/CSAS/Content%20Area%20(M-Z)/School%20Counseling/Soc_Emot_Char_Dev/Likert%20Scale%20for%20SECD%20Student%20Growth%20Measure.pdf?ver=2015-02-24-121600-343)). These resources are in the process of being updated to align with the revised SECD standards.
**Maine Guiding Principles (2015)** are designed to provide a common vision for student success in college and career. They are the result of competency-based diploma legislation (2011) requiring that students become proficient in these guiding principles, a requirement that takes effect in 2018. The Maine Guiding Principles reflect a state-specific framework organized around the following five competency domains:

- Clear and effective communicator
- Self-directed, lifelong learner
- Creative and practical problem solver
- Responsible and involved citizen
- Integrative and informed thinker

The Maine Guiding Principles are not directly aligned with the state’s preschool standards. However, it is interesting to note that the state also has also articulated SEL standards separately for early education through 3rd grade: [https://drive.google.com/file/d/172ySeQncwNqGghT4E1SBISQsN9oULO3n/view](https://drive.google.com/file/d/172ySeQncwNqGghT4E1SBISQsN9oULO3n/view) -- using a different structure. Because this separate state framework is for K-3, it did not meet our inclusion criteria for the current analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL</th>
<th>The Maine Guiding Principles provide a unique developmental framework. Rather than grades or grade bands. Development is structured into a sequence: beginner, advanced beginner, strategic learner, emerging expert. In the CSI, we have found many state working groups struggle with identifying benchmarks, even by grade band. As a result, other state teams that have seen the Maine developmental framework often find it appealing because it does not attempt to articulate when students might be expected to have achieved a competency, by grade band.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENTAL BENCHMARKS</td>
<td>The Maine Guiding Principles connect explicitly to college and career readiness, setting a vision specifically for “student success in careers and college.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUITY</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALIGNMENT TO OTHER PRIORITIES</td>
<td>Maine states in its guidelines that it plans to develop rubrics and other resources to support educational practice. For now the Guiding Principles serve as a critical first step in the process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MICHIGAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL</th>
<th>The <a href="https://www.michigan.gov/documents/DEPSOE_1230101006397_14.pdf">Michigan Department of Education Early Childhood to Grade 12 Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) Competencies and Indicators</a> align directly with the CASEL 5 competencies (self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision making).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENTAL BENCHMARKS</td>
<td>The competencies provide developmental/grade level benchmarks: Infant to toddler, Prek, K-2, 3-5, 6-8, 9-10, 11-12, and are aligned preschool through high school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUITY</td>
<td>The introduction to the Michigan competencies and indicators includes a section (on page 8) on cultural connections, emphasizing that student competence will vary depending on culture. The document indicates that the state plans to develop guidelines to support culturally sensitive instruction of &quot;the broadest possible spectrum of students.&quot; The introduction also includes a section (on page 9) on equity that provides a definition of educational equity, and also suggests six questions to consider to ensure implementation of SEL that supports educational equity, including &quot;Do all students have access to quality SEL instruction that is culturally responsive?,&quot; &quot;Are students’ experiences, social and emotional strengths, and needs recognized and valued?,” and “How will SEL instruction be monitored to ensure positive outcomes for all students...?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALIGNMENT TO OTHER PRIORITIES</td>
<td>The Michigan Competencies are found on the Michigan Department of Education Mental Health page, and explicitly connect to academic standards (through crosswalk between SEL and academic standards, found in Appendix A of the Connecting SEL document), mental health/trauma and whole child as stated in their introduction to the competencies: &quot;In combination with the Michigan Health Education Standards, SEL competencies help support a well-rounded education that teaches to the whole child.&quot; The competencies also connect to special education, as well as college and career readiness, equity, climate (with a free-standing section on climate), Whole Child, out-of-school time, and school improvement. The Michigan Department of Education also provides a framework for school and district improvement planning, along with diagnostic tools that align with school climate and SEL. The competencies also connect to the state’s strategic plan goals and objectives: Connection to MDE’s Top 10 in 10 Strategic Plan. Michigan's SEL Competencies link to 4 of the 7 Strategic Goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUIDANCE TO SUPPORT IMPLEMENTATION</td>
<td>Specific guidance documents to support the Michigan SEL competencies include: <a href="https://www.michigan.gov/documents/DEPSOE_1230101006397_14.pdf">Connecting Social and Emotional Learning to Michigan’s School Improvement Framework</a>. There is a strong emphasis in Michigan on school improvement planning, and the working group that developed the competencies also developed the document linked above to help schools embed SEL into their school improvement framework process and then into their school improvement plans. The Michigan SEL competencies document also links to available teacher and school climate guidance resources, including teaching practices and Michigan Department of Education resources to support positive classroom environments and school climate. The competency document also discusses professional learning opportunities available at the Michigan Department of Education to support school mental health strategies and SEL, and are currently developing five online modules. Further, to support teaching practices designed to promote social and emotional development in students, the competency document links to the ten teaching practices as well as teacher observation rubrics identified by the GTL Center (gtlcenter.org/technical-assistance/professional-learningmodules/social-and-emotional-learning-daily-life-classrooms ).&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MINNESOTA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRAMEWORKS BRIEFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MINNESOTA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GENERAL

The Minnesota framework, entitled SEL Framework: 5 Competencies (2018), aligns directly with the CASEL 5 core competencies (i.e., relationship skills, self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and responsible decision-making). The competencies were developed in Minnesota to support the anti-bullying Safe and Supportive Schools Act, which was signed into law in Minnesota in 2014. SEL is viewed as an important strategy for supporting positive school climate and for preventing bullying, and a working group was organized in 2015.

Minnesota SEL Framework: 5 Competencies (2018) can be found in the links, below:
- [Relationship Skills Competency](#)
- [Self-Awareness Competency](#)
- [Self-Management Competency](#)
- [Social Awareness Competency](#)
- [Responsible Decision-Making Competency](#)

### DEVELOPMENTAL BENCHMARKS

The Minnesota competencies provide developmental benchmarks for grade bands: K-3, 4-5, 6-8, 9-12. They are not directly aligned with Minnesota preschool standards.

### EQUITY

On the state website where the SEL competencies are posted, a statement on "Ensuring Effective SEL implementation" explains that the "Great Lakes Equity Center (GLEC) was asked to review the SEL guidance and competencies." In addition, the state webpage links to guidance designed to support culturally responsive implementation of SEL from the Great Lakes Equity Center SEL Implementation Guidance.

### ALIGNMENT TO OTHER PRIORITIES

The Minnesota Competencies explicitly connect to academic standards (through crosswalk between SEL and academic standards), school climate/culture, and fall under the school climate work of the state. They also connect to bullying, and there is a strong emphasis on equity and culture. The Minnesota SEL framework was submitted for cultural review by the Great Lakes Equity Center.

### GUIDANCE TO SUPPORT IMPLEMENTATION

To support successful implementation of the competencies, the working group also developed an extensive array of state specific implementation guidance (including for implementation and professional development), guidance for use in special education, and assessment guidance. The implementation guidance emphasizes systemic school and district SEL informed by the CASEL District Theory of Action that includes activities for developing a vision, needs and resource assessment, professional learning, evidence-based programming, integrating SEL across other programs and school priorities, and continuous improvement. Assessment guidance discusses purpose and types of SEL assessment, including assessment of outcomes versus process. The implementation guidance also includes resources to support teaching practices, self-assessment, district implementation, communication, etc.
### NEVADA

| **GENERAL** | The [Nevada Statewide Social and Emotional Competencies](#) (2017) build on SEL standards developed by Washoe School district in Nevada. The Washoe SEL competencies were developed as part of Washoe’s participation in the CASEL Collaborating Districts Initiative. The Nevada Statewide Social and Emotional Competencies are directly aligned with CASEL’s 5 Core competencies (self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making). |
| **DEVELOPMENTAL BENCHMARKS** | Nevada’s statewide competencies do not yet provide developmental or grade level benchmarks, nor are they aligned with Nevada’s preschool standards. |
| **EQUITY** | N/A |
| **ALIGNMENT TO OTHER PRIORITIES** | The Nevada SEL competencies are also framed in terms of success on the job and career readiness. |
| **GUIDANCE TO SUPPORT IMPLEMENTATION** | N/A |
The New Jersey Department of Education works to promote social and emotional learning by fostering the healthy development of young people and positive school climate. The New Jersey SEL Competencies and Sub-Competencies (2017) are directly aligned with the CASEL 5 Core Competencies (self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making).

The state is in the process of developing student learning objectives (their term for developmental benchmarks) and resources to align the preschool standards to the SEL competencies and sub-competencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRAMEWORKS BRIEFS</th>
<th>NEW JERSEY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **GENERAL**       | The New Jersey Department of Education works to promote social and emotional learning by fostering the healthy development of young people and positive school climate. The New Jersey SEL Competencies and Sub-Competencies (2017) are directly aligned with the CASEL 5 Core Competencies (self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making).

The state is in the process of developing student learning objectives (their term for developmental benchmarks) and resources to align the preschool standards to the SEL competencies and sub-competencies. |
| **DEVELOPMENTAL BENCHMARKS** | N/A |
| **EQUITY** | N/A |
| **ALIGNMENT TO OTHER PRIORITIES** | The New Jersey competencies align with the CASEL 5 competencies (Self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making). The frameworks also connect to career ready practices, character development, and school climate.

"New Jersey Student Learning Standards For Comprehensive Health and Physical Education" ([https://www.state.nj.us/education/cccs/2014/chpe/standards.pdf](https://www.state.nj.us/education/cccs/2014/chpe/standards.pdf)) include standards for student social and emotional development. |
| **GUIDANCE TO SUPPORT IMPLEMENTATION** | New Jersey links to high-quality, external resources to support implementation, including SEL lesson plans and activities available from Edutopia, the American Federation of Teachers, Playworks, and Project BASIC. The state also links to an SEL toolkit developed by Act for Youth and an SEL resource finder from the University of British Columbia, as well as additional resources providing information and research on SEL. In addition, there are external resources for families. The New Jersey website also connects to the National Schools of Character website. |
### NEW YORK

| GENERAL | The NY State Social Emotional Learning Benchmarks (2018) align with the CASEL 5 competencies presented in three goals:  
|         | • Develop self-awareness and self-management skills essential to success in school and in life.  
|         | • Use social awareness and interpersonal skills to establish and maintain positive relationships.  
|         | • Demonstrate ethical decision-making skills and responsible behaviors in personal, school, and community contexts. |
| DEVELOPMENTAL BENCHMARKS | The developmental benchmarks are organized by grade bands: early elementary (K-3), late elementary (4-5), middle school (6-8), early high school (9-10), and late high school (11-12) levels. The New York team worked with the Office of Early Learning as well the NYS Pyramid Model Partnership and NYS Council on Children and Families to align the preschool competencies with the K-12 benchmarks. The format is different, but the developmental expectations are aligned. |
| EQUITY | The New York State Guidance includes a section in the introduction on equity and SEL (page 10) that discusses implicit bias, culturally responsive teaching practices, and the emphasis on equity in the state ESSA plan. It also links to separate state guidance for teaching English language learners. |
| ALIGNMENT TO OTHER PRIORITIES | The New York State SEL Benchmarks explicitly connect academic integration, to college and career readiness and school climate/culture. The School Climate and Student Engagement Workgroup of the New York State Safe Schools Task Force articulated the benchmarks “to enable students to take full advantage of educational opportunities throughout their school experience in grades K-12 and, equally important, to prepare them for college and/or career.” In addition, the NY State resources to support implementation of the benchmarks connect to PBIS, MTSS, 21st-century learning, equity, mental health, school climate and whole child frameworks. Many of these connections are noted in the guidance document (http://www.p12.nysed.gov/sss/documents/SELEssentialforLearningandLife.pdf) |
| GUIDANCE TO SUPPORT IMPLEMENTATION | The state has developed a strong and extensive guidance document (http://www.p12.nysed.gov/sss/documents/SELEssentialforLearningandLife.pdf) to support systemic, whole school implementation of SEL. It includes support for discipline approaches that aligns with SEL, as well as supports for instruction, supports for professional development, and connections to Afterschool, Summer School and Community School Programs. The guidance also connects to resources to support positive school and classroom climate and has a section on SEL and equity. At the time of this publication, New York is in the process of developing assessment guidance for their districts and schools. |
## NORTH DAKOTA

| GENERAL | The North Dakota (2018) NDMTSS Social Emotional Learning Goals align directly with the CASEL 5 competencies (self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills and responsible decision making). The development of the North Dakota (ND) MTSS Social Emotional Learning Goals was lead by three of the eight state’s Regional Education Associations, and included representation by the state department of education. |
|-----------------------------------------------|
| DEVELOPMENTAL BENCHMARKS | Developmental benchmarks are organized by grade bands: K - 2, 3 - 5, 6 - 8, and 9 – 12. The North Dakota Goals are not directly aligned with preschool standards for SEL. |
| EQUITY | N/A |
| ALIGNMENT TO OTHER PRIORITIES | The competencies are aligned with North Dakota Content Standards. The competencies reflect a strong MTSS orientation, as they were developed by the Regional Education Associations responsible for the expansion of the state’s NDMTSS framework. They also connect to mental health and trauma as SEL has been declared one of the five Trauma-Informed Practices for Schools (TIPS) in ND also addressing school climate frameworks. At the time of this publication, North Dakota was aligning their SEL related work to whole child, equity, MTSS, and trauma-informed practices work, specifically through establishing equitable learning environments. |
| GUIDANCE TO SUPPORT IMPLEMENTATION | The state offers the competencies in two user-friendly formats and also provides SEL Student-Friendly Scales that can be used as a rubric to plan and monitor student progress in developing competencies by grade band. The competencies and resources can be found [here](#). At the time of this publication, North Dakota was in the process of developing professional learning on SEL. |
### RHODE ISLAND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRAMEWORKS BRIEFS</th>
<th>COMPARATIVE SERIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL</td>
<td>The Rhode Island SEL standards (2017) are based on the Oakland CA standards, which were developed as part of Oakland’s participation in the CASEL CDI. The Rhode Island standards align directly with the CASEL 5 competencies of self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENTAL BENCHMARKS</td>
<td>Developmental benchmarks are not yet provided, but we are aware that the Rhode Island team is working to develop them, as part of their goals in the CASEL CSI. Further, we are aware that as part of creating those developmental indicators The Rhode Island team also plans to align those indicators, preschool through adulthood.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| EQUITY | In their review of standards from other states and districts, the Rhode Island state working group observed that some addressed equity, and some did not. The Rhode Island team wanted to make sure equity was addressed in their standards. The team made a list of features that were priorities, such as aligning with the CASEL competencies, skills for adulthood, ease of use for staff, and addressing cultural and linguistic concerns and competencies. The Rhode Island state working group appreciated the strong equity lens and emphasis on cultural inclusivity they found reflected in the Oakland standards for SEL. Based on extensive discussion about the language in the standards around equity, the team modified the Oakland’s standards. For example, as a result, the Rhode Island Standards include:  
- Social Awareness (3B): Individual seeks to understand and demonstrates respect for individuals, including those with diverse backgrounds, cultures, abilities, languages and identities.  
- Relationship Skills (4A): Individual uses communication and interpersonal skills to interact effectively with others, including those with diverse backgrounds, cultures, abilities, languages and identities.  
Further, going forward it is also expected that introductory documents will reflect these modifications, as those are developed. |
| ALIGNMENT TO OTHER PRIORITIES | Rhode Island connects to academic integration by noting the connection between SEL and academics, as well as teaching practices that support SEL competencies and academic learning. These documents can be found on their website (http://www.ride.ri.gov/StudentsFamilies/HealthSafety/SocialEmotionalLearning.aspx#31941085-what-is-the-connection-between-sel-and-academics). Rhode Island also includes SEL on SurveyWorks, their state school climate/culture survey. |
| GUIDANCE TO SUPPORT IMPLEMENTATION | Rhode Island has supported an SEL community of practice for years, and has a listserv to keep educators informed about new developments in SEL. In addition, the state’s SEL website connects to a number of resources to support teaching, including CASEL tools for integrating SEL into practice, teacher stories about their experience with SEL, and available workshops to support SEL. |

---

### TENNESSEE

#### GENERAL

The Tennessee Social and Personal Competencies (SPC, 2017) align with the CASEL 5 competencies (self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making).

#### DEVELOPMENTAL BENCHMARKS

The Tennessee Social and Personal Competencies (their term for SEL) are organized into developmental grade bands, and one of the only competencies that go to adulthood: K–2, 3–5, 6–8, 9–12, and adult, and they align fairly closely with the state's preschool standards, [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1RbpzIXHegqCzxQrTDAQf9qQ9T4qO/view](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1RbpzIXHegqCzxQrTDAQf9qQ9T4qO/view), with the exception that the Tennessee preschool standards do not include responsible decision-making as the fifth core competency, which some might argue makes sense from a developmental perspective.

#### EQUITY

The Tennessee toolkit includes a prompt for administrators to consider equity and culture as they support SPC implementation: Describe how you address the cultural and linguistic differences in language between you and your students and among your students. What do you do if socio-economic, linguistic or cultural language differences lead to confusion or misunderstanding?"

In addition, in the toolkit they provide discussion prompts for administrators and teachers to discuss SPC. Questions encourage reflection on equity and culture, for example, "how do you [the teacher] regularly incorporate student interests and cultural heritage" in their teaching practices.

#### ALIGNMENT TO OTHER PRIORITIES

The Tennessee Social and Personal Competencies explicitly connect to academic integration (through noting the importance of these skills for academics) college/career readiness and mental health/trauma. Specifically, the competencies are linked to state initiatives for post-secondary life for students and trauma informed care. In addition, the competencies align with MTSS, equity, school climate and whole child. The competencies are presented as an optional component of a multitiered system of supports. Finally, practices that support SPC are aligned with their teacher evaluation system, so that teachers can connect SPC practices with practices that are encouraged in their observations. Many of these connections can be found in the K-12 Social and Personal Competency Resource Guide ([https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/education/safety/safe_sch/SPC_Resource_Guide.pdf](https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/education/safety/safe_sch/SPC_Resource_Guide.pdf))

#### GUIDANCE TO SUPPORT IMPLEMENTATION

In 2015 Tennessee released a toolkit, *Incorporating Social and Personal Competencies Into Classroom Instruction and Educator Effectiveness*, that also connects to a variety of external resources to support implementation, including the CASEL Guides for selecting evidence-based SEL programs. The toolkit is organized around and specifically designed to support 10 teaching practices that promote student social and emotional development. In addition, the Tennessee toolkit offers guidance for beginning to assess student progress including through opportunities for self-reflection.

In terms of professional learning, the Tennessee Department of Education collaborated with the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders and the Appalachia Regional Comprehensive Center to develop online modules aligned with each of the 10 practices in the toolkit and designed to inform teaching practices that would support student development of social and personal competencies. The modules are also designed to support adult reflection on the competencies, including own's own social and personal development as an adult. The modules are presented in recorded presentations as well as guides, PowerPoints and handouts for facilitators, depending on the format.

The working group is now creating developmental indicators (their term from developmental benchmarks), but developmental indicators are not yet available, nor are is the framework aligned with preschool standards.

The report by the benchmarks group recommends: “To implement SEL effectively and equitably schools will need to (1) start by evaluating and building school and classroom environments that are conducive to SEL; (2) incorporate principles of universal design for learning when adapting SEL curricula to their unique climate; (3) emphasize equity in the selection and implementation of curriculum; and (4) take a holistic approach, understanding that each person (child and adult) will start at different places and progress in different ways along an SEL continuum.”

In the document, they also mention that “… effective implementation of SEL requires intentional work on improving the climate and culture of the education system. Equity needs to be a lens and focus of the implementation of SEL throughout the process.”

The framework proposed by the Washington Benchmarks Working Group is designed to support continual adaptation to ensure that SEL approaches will be equitable for all students regardless of culture or background.

In addition, to support teaching practices that reflect equity, Washington integrated culturally responsive practices and equity throughout five online learning modules they developed to support SEL statewide (described below, under “Supports for Implementation”).

The Washington State Social Emotional Learning Standards and Benchmarks align with academic integration, college and career readiness, equity and cultural responsiveness, mental health and trauma (ACES), whole child approach, and school climate. They do this in both their report, Addressing Social Emotional Learning in Washington’s K-12 Public Schools (http://www.k12.wa.us/Workgroups/SELB-Meetings/SELBWorkgroup2016Report.pdf), on their website, and in their online modules (see below).

The state made a decision early on to develop online professional learning modules to support educator awareness and understanding of SEL (http://www.k12.wa.us/StudentSupport/SEL/OnlineModule.aspx). The modules are structured into five distinct segments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GUIDANCE TO SUPPORT IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Segment 1: Introduction to SEL</td>
<td>Learning Segment 2: Embedding SEL Schoolwide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Segment 3: Creating a Professional Culture Based on SEL</td>
<td>Learning Segment 4: Integrating SEL into Culturally Responsive Classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Segment 5: Identifying and Selecting Evidence-Based Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALIGNMENT TO OTHER PRIORITIES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Washington State Social Emotional Learning Standards and Benchmarks align with academic integration, college and career readiness, equity and cultural responsiveness, mental health and trauma (ACES), whole child approach, and school climate. They do this in both their report, Addressing Social Emotional Learning in Washington’s K-12 Public Schools (<a href="http://www.k12.wa.us/Workgroups/SELB-Meetings/SELBWorkgroup2016Report.pdf">http://www.k12.wa.us/Workgroups/SELB-Meetings/SELBWorkgroup2016Report.pdf</a>), on their website, and in their online modules (see below).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### WEST VIRGINIA

| GENERAL |
|-----------------|------------------------------------------------|
| The West Virginia School and Community Social Skills Standards (2012) ([Section 2](#), School and Community Social Skills Standards) are organized into 3 standards that align with the CASEL 5 core competencies: |
| · Standard 1: Self-awareness and Self-management |
| · Standard 2: Social-awareness and Interpersonal Skills |
| · Standard 3: Decision-making Skills and Responsible Behaviors |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPMENTAL BENCHMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developmental benchmarks are provided and align from preschool through high school in the following grade bands: PreK-1, 2-4, 5-8, 9-12.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQUITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALIGNMENT TO OTHER PRIORITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The state connects to academic integration (through crosswalks with academic standards), college and career in crosswalks with <a href="#">21st-Century Learning: Crosswalk for 21st-Century Content Standards and Objectives</a> for West Virginia Schools. The West Virginia standards explicitly connect to school climate/culture as they were created under Policy 4373 “Expected Behavior in Safe and Supportive Schools.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GUIDANCE TO SUPPORT IMPLEMENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia provides crosswalks of the standards with Wellness And Health Education; Social Studies; Guidance and Counseling; Learning Skills and Technology Tools; Early Learning Standards Framework; Health Education; Physical Education; PreK-K.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alignment documents can be found here:
- [Self-Awareness and Self-Management](#)
- [Social-Awareness and Interpersonal Skills](#)
- [Decision-Making and Responsible Behaviors](#)
- [Next Gen CSO’S Crosswalk PREK-1](#) (Courtesy of Monongalia County Schools)
- [Next Gen CSO’S Crosswalk 2-4](#) (Courtesy of Monongalia County Schools)
- [Next Gen CSO’S Crosswalk 5-8](#) (Courtesy of Monongalia County Schools)
- [Next Gen CSO’S Crosswalk 9-12](#) (Courtesy of Monongalia County Schools)
| **GENERAL** | The Wisconsin PreK-Adult Social and Emotional Learning Competencies (2018) reflect a state specific framework that covers the CASEL 5 core competencies within the following overarching structure:  
• Emotional Development (Self Awareness, Self-Management, Focus Attention, Social Awareness)  
• Self-Concept (Self Awareness, Self-Management)  
• Social Competence (Social Awareness, Relationship Skills, Decision-making) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEVELOPMENTAL BENCHMARKS</strong></td>
<td>The competencies are organized developmentally into grade bands. Wisconsin is one of the only states that currently mentions adulthood. The grade bands are PreK-5, 1st-3rd, 4th-5th, 6th-8th, 9th-10th, 11th-adult, including PreK, so they are determined by us to be aligned from PK through high school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **EQUITY** | Wisconsin’s state superintendent convened an Equity Council to assist with developing the state’s ESSA plan. The council opted to continue working on how to communicate about SEL and equity, how to help districts implement the SEL competencies equitably, and how agencies/groups can support districts in this work. The council includes legislators, advocacy groups, parent and family groups, and higher education representatives.  

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction collaborated with the Wisconsin RTL Center and the Disproportionality Technical Assistance Network to create a Model to Inform Culturally Responsive Practice (https://dpi.wi.gov/rti/equity), which includes guidance on communicating the benefit of SEL for all students, and how to implement in ways that are culturally and linguistically responsive, how to engage families and communities in culturally relevant ways.  

On its website, Wisconsin includes Minnesota Great Lakes Equity Center SEL Implementation Guidance.  

The website also links to CASEL’s 2018 February 5, 2018 webinar with Rob Jagers to share some of the ways in which CASEL is advancing work on equity and social and emotional learning (SEL). |
| **ALIGNMENT TO OTHER PRIORITIES** | The Wisconsin PreK-Adult Social and Emotional Learning Competencies connect to academic integration, college and career readiness, equity, mental health, school climate, and PBIS, including in the resources provided. Much of this can be found in their Wisconsin Social and Emotional Competencies (https://dpi.wi.gov/sites/default/files/imce/sspw/SEL-Competencies-Guide-web.pdf). |
| **GUIDANCE TO SUPPORT IMPLEMENTATION** | Wisconsin has developed resources to support implementation on its website. Some of the tools and resources include:  
• Wisconsin invited nationally available SEL programs (including BARR, PATHs, Positive Action, Responsive Classroom, School Connect, and Second Step) to create crosswalks to indicate how their program aligned with the Wisconsin SEL framework. See Wisconsin SEL Competencies Alignment with Evidence-based Programs.  
• In terms of professional learning, Wisconsin hosts meetings and webinars to support implementation of SEL statewide.  
• Wisconsin shares Social and Emotional Learning District Case Studies on its SEL website, to provide examples of how districts are supporting SEL across the state (including Mequon-Thiensville School District; Adams-Friendship School District; and Milwaukee Public Schools)  
• In terms of state-specific guidance on assessment, Wisconsin links to state-specific scales that are designed to also assess quality of implementation by grade band. (See Gauge and Prioritize Implementation of SEL competencies)  
• Wisconsin connects to an extensive array of high-quality, external resources to support high-quality implementation of the state framework. |