

# **Teachers' Perceptions of SEL Evidence-Based Implementation in Schools**

**by  
Jennifer Diack**

Post-Graduate Certificate (Special Education), Queens University, 2018  
Bachelor in Education (Secondary Education), University of Alberta, 2011

Project Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of  
Master of Education

in the  
Educational Leadership Program  
Faculty of Education

© Jennifer Diack 2023  
SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY  
Summer 2023

Copyright in this work is held by the author. Please ensure that any reproduction  
or re-use is done in accordance with the relevant national copyright legislation.

## Declaration of Committee

**Name:** Jennifer Diack

**Degree:** Master of Education

**Title:** Teachers' Perceptions of SEL Evidence-Based Implementation in Schools

**Committee:** **Chair: Michelle Pidgeon**  
Associate Professor, Education

**Gillian Judson**  
Supervisor  
Assistant Professor, Education

**Michelle Nilson**  
Committee Member  
Associate Professor, Education

**Dan Laitsch**  
Examiner  
Associate Professor, Education

## Ethics Statement

The author, whose name appears on the title page of this work, has obtained, for the research described in this work, either:

- a. human research ethics approval from the Simon Fraser University Office of Research Ethics

or

- b. advance approval of the animal care protocol from the University Animal Care Committee of Simon Fraser University

or has conducted the research

- c. as a co-investigator, collaborator, or research assistant in a research project approved in advance.

A copy of the approval letter has been filed with the Theses Office of the University Library at the time of submission of this thesis or project.

The original application for approval and letter of approval are filed with the relevant offices. Inquiries may be directed to those authorities.

Simon Fraser University Library  
Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada

Update Spring 2016

## **Abstract**

Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) has become a way to understand human well-being through developing a healthy identity, managing emotions, building healthy relationships, and making responsible decisions. As a focus in schools, SEL can help students increase their social-emotional skills. Research has identified that there are multiple factors that contribute to effective implementation of SEL evidence-based programming in schools. The purpose of this study is to understand teachers' perceptions of SEL programming implementation in schools. Data collection involved interviews with four elementary K-7 educators in a large district in British Columbia, Canada. Data was examined using qualitative theme analysis. Findings were consistent with previous literature indicating that teachers perceive evidence-based SEL program implementation as important. Participants indicated that schools with supportive leaders and collaborative school cultures created environments suitable for implementing SEL. Suggestions for further study and practice are discussed.

**Keywords:** social and emotional learning (SEL); implementation; elementary schools; intervention; teacher

## **Dedication**

I would like to dedicate this work to all of my students, those who I have had the honour to teacher in the past, those who I teach in the present, and those I have yet to meet. May you always be curious, open to new ideas, and always lead with kindness.

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to acknowledge my privilege in being able to obtain my Masters in Educational Leadership and Administration from Simon Fraser University (SFU). I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr. Gillian Judson, for opening my mind and practice to new ways of understanding. I have learned so much from our time together. I am inspired to continuously question my current ways of knowing and what I can learn from others and the land we are situated on. I would also like to thank my family for encouraging me to pursue my passion for life-long learning. I am especially grateful to my husband, Mark, for always being my cheerleader and supporting me through both my challenges and successes.

# Table of Contents

Declaration of Committee.....	ii
Ethics Statement.....	iii
Abstract.....	iv
Dedication.....	v
Acknowledgements.....	vi
Table of Contents.....	vii
List of Tables.....	ix
List of Acronyms.....	x
<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Literature Review.....</b>	<b>2</b>
Explicit SEL Instruction in Practice.....	3
SEL in British Columbia.....	4
Implementation of SEL Programming.....	5
Teachers' Perceptions and Beliefs About SEL.....	6
Benefits for Implementing SEL.....	7
Promoters of SEL Implementation.....	7
Obstacles of SEL Implementation.....	8
<b>Methods.....</b>	<b>10</b>
The Research Questions.....	10
Researcher Role/Positionality.....	10
Research Site/Participants.....	11
Data Collection.....	11
Data Analysis.....	12
Limitations.....	15
Trustworthiness.....	15
<b>Findings.....</b>	<b>17</b>
Teachers' Motivations for Teaching SEL.....	17
Teachers' Perceptions and Beliefs Around SEL.....	17
Teacher SEL Implementation Practices.....	18
Facilitators to Implementing SEL.....	19
Barriers to Implementing SEL.....	20
<b>Discussion.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Conclusion.....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>References.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Appendix A. Interview Consent Form.....</b>	<b>30</b>

<b>Appendix B.</b>	<b>Interview Protocol.....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Appendix C.</b>	<b>TCPS 2: Core 2022 Completion Certificate.....</b>	<b>35</b>



## List of Tables

Table 1: Sample Codes for the Theme of Teacher SEL Implementation Practices ..... 14

## List of Acronyms

SEL	Social Emotional Learning
CASEL	Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning
RULER	Recognizing, Understanding, Labeling, Expressing, and Regulating Emotions

# Introduction

Society has evolved its understanding of what humans need to live healthy and enriching lives. In 1968, Dr. James Comer conceptualized the idea of “the whole child”, as a means to understand and acknowledge that as humans develop, there are more factors to consider in the evolution of child development beyond academic success (Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL), 2022c).

Reflecting this understanding, Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) is defined as:

An integral part of education and human development. SEL is the process through which all young people and adults acquire and apply the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to develop healthy identities, manage emotions and achieve personal and collective goals, feel and show empathy for others, establish and maintain supportive relationships, and make responsible and caring decisions. (CASEL, 2022a)

SEL is commonly used in schools as a means of supporting the development of student skill deficits in the area of social and emotional competencies. This is due to the notion that “SEL leads to beneficial outcomes related to: social and emotional skills; attitudes about self, school, and civic engagement; social behaviors; conduct problems; emotional distress; and academic performance” (CASEL, 2022e). Student skill-building as a part of social and emotional development can be looked at through a SEL framework which highlights the competency areas of self-awareness, self-management, responsible decision-making, relationship skills, and social awareness (CASEL, 2022a).

Studies over the past twenty years have indicated the benefits of SEL skills development. The explicit teaching of SEL skills has been linked to positive student outcomes including a greater sense of well-being, increased academic performance, as well as decreased levels of negative behaviours (Durlak et al., 2011; Greenburg et al., 2003; Guerra & Bradshaw, 2008; Rhoades et al., 2011). There are positive correlations between the social-emotional skill competency present in kindergarten, with that of multiple adult outcomes including education and employment, involvement in crime, engagement in substance use, and mental health (Jones et al., 2015). Given the evidence to support the long-term value of SEL, intentional SEL instruction for all children, as part of their education starting in elementary school, is needed to work on student social-emotional skill deficits.

Students can have deficits within the five SEL competency areas. This could take on a range of forms including externalizing behaviours such as bullying and aggression towards others, and internalizing behaviours such as depressive and anxious tendencies. The Canadian Mental Health Association (CMHA) reports that approximately one in seven, or 14%, of children and youth within British Columbia, experience mental health illness at some stage in their development. In addition, the CMHA reports that 50-70% of mental illnesses appear before the age of 18. SEL programming can focus a lot of its content on individual student competencies, which can aid in developing strategies to help manage negative internalizing and externalizing behaviours. However, this can be problematic for those students with exceptionalities, as they may require intensive wrap-around support from multiple sources. This would be more than one stand-alone program could offer. For these students, SEL programming may need to be a part of a wider network of support including targeted interventions with additional school support professionals such as a Child Care Worker or Counselor. Schonert-Reichl and Hymel (2007) explain that schools are a positive environment to build on skill deficits “because many of our students’ interpersonal interactions occur there, school provide adults with a unique and natural setting in which they can intervene to foster the development of social and emotional skills” (p.21).

One needs to consider the real-world application of SEL in schools and what it actually looks like in practice in the classroom and school environment (Barnes, 2019). To what extent do schools have success in teaching SEL in schools? Educators’ approaches to preventative SEL interventions and how they deliver the material can have an effect on student outcomes (Durlak & Dupre, 2008). In this research project, I study SEL in an educational context for this research study. The main aim of this study is to investigate teachers’ perceptions of SEL programming implementation in schools.

## **Literature Review**

Below is a brief overview of the literature on social-emotional learning program implementation. I highlight the role that teachers and schools play in the implementation of SEL.

## Explicit SEL Instruction in Practice

CASEL outlines ten indicators of schoolwide SEL, also interpreted as ways in which SEL tools are fully incorporated into a school. These indicators include: (a) explicit SEL instruction, (b) SEL integrated with academic instruction, (c) youth voice and engagement, (d) supportive school and classroom climates, (e) focus on adult SEL competency building, (f) supportive discipline, (g) a continuum of integrated supports, (h) authentic family partnerships, (i) aligned community partnerships, and (j) systems for continuous improvement (CASEL, 2022b). Defining the areas in which SEL is implemented in schools provides opportunity for staff to focus on the areas that are most pertinent to their school and students' needs. One of the ten indicators of SEL in schools is the incorporation of explicit SEL instruction (CASEL, 2022b). This indicator complements the BC Ministry of Education's goal of capacity building for students, as a method for negative mental health prevention (Province of British Columbia, 2022b).

Explicit SEL instruction allows for students to learn the specific social and emotional skills they need in the structured environment of the classroom. These skills are based on the five SEL competency areas of self-awareness, self-management, responsible decision-making, relationship skills, and social awareness (CASEL, 2022a). Teachers delivering the material are on hand to support and scaffold instruction so that students can develop the essential social-emotional skills they need to be successful.

SEL interventions for the purpose of explicit SEL instruction in the school and classroom can be delivered in a variety of ways. There are many different SEL instructional programs, ranging from those with limited empirical research to those programs that are promoted as a result of more rigorous evidence-based research. Some of these programs include Recognizing Understanding Labeling Expressing Regulating Emotions (R.U.L.E.R.) (Yale Centre for Emotional Intelligence, 2022), Mind-Up (MindUP, 2022), Second Step (Committee for Children, 2022), and Open Circle (Wellesley Centers for Women, 2022). These programs vary in their use from district to district and even school to school. Noted in several meta-analyses, the best practice for SEL instructional programs is the S.A.F.E. method. It is guideline to ensure that the program needs to be sequenced, active, focused, and explicit, known as the SAFE method (Domitrovich et al., 2017; Durlak et al., 2011; Taylor et al. 2017).

Since educators have autonomy in the programs and resources that they use in their classrooms, SEL programming can take on different forms, depending on the classroom, school, or district that one is in. When teachers establish programming and interventions for use in their classrooms, they focus on developing positive student outcomes (Egan et al., 2019). This is true for SEL classroom interventions as well. Specifically, evidence-based interventions with clear, step-by-step instructions are seen as advantageous for teachers implementing SEL programming. Teachers report that the step-by-step nature of many SEL interventions allows them to use the resource within their own classrooms with relative ease (Egan et al., 2019; Voith et al., 2020).

There are times when explicit SEL instruction needs to be supplemented with additional support from outside sources by professionals different from the classroom teacher. Some behaviours and conflicts will arise despite preventative efforts in explicit SEL instruction and it may need to be addressed in a different manner. This can be for reasons including students with a particular mental health diagnosis, students with complex exceptionalities, as well as a failure to meet the needs of every individual student's unique circumstances. There have been studies that demonstrate that explicit SEL programs can be used with other interventions to provide a dynamic approach to more intricate needs at the school level, including behaviour prevention and management. These additional measures include a combination of social-emotional programming such as Mind-Up or Second Step, positive behaviour interventions and supports (PBIS), and restorative practices (Freiberg et al., 2020; Gregory et al. 2021; Charlton et al., 2021). In looking at these three areas, SEL aims to deliver skill development in the five SEL competency levels at a baseline level, but may also be used in smaller groups for more targeted interventions as well (Cook et al., 2015; Gregory et al., 2021). Providing support using a multi-faceted approach assures that all learners' needs are accounted for.

## **SEL in British Columbia**

The BC Ministry of Education's current curriculum incorporates core competency areas for student growth. These include the core competencies of communication (focusing on communication and collaboration skills), personal and social awareness (focusing on personal awareness and responsibility), positive personal and cultural identity, and social awareness and responsibility (Province of British Columbia, 2022a). These core

competencies complement the CASEL SEL framework's competency areas of self-awareness, self-management, responsible decision-making, relationship skills, and social awareness (CASEL, 2022a). To continue to enrich the connection between CASEL's SEL framework and the BC Ministry of Education's five core competencies, the BC Ministry of Education released their *Mental Health in Schools Strategy*, which outlines the need for compassionate systems leadership, capacity building, and mental health in the classroom (Province of British Columbia, 2022b). The capacity building domain provides a three-pronged approach which has a "focus on social emotional learning, mental health literacy and trauma-informed practice" (Province of British Columbia, 2022b) which aims to benefit students' mental health. Through this initiative, SEL is a priority practice to provide a more holistic approach to students.

## **Implementation of SEL Programming**

Implementation of SEL evidence-based programming has benefits for children in the classroom. Durlak et al. (2011) conducted a prominent meta-analysis of 213 school-based SEL programs which supported the conclusion that compared to the control samples, when provided with SEL interventions, students demonstrated enhanced social-emotional skills and positive classroom and prosocial behaviours. Further to this finding, in a meta-analysis of 82 school-based K-12 SEL interventions, Taylor et al. (2017) also found that incorporating the development of SEL skills was shown to promote positive outcomes for student well-being including specific competency skills, prosocial behaviours, and increased academic performance. This allows for students to be more connected to their peers, as well as their teachers. Creating caring classroom communities allows for students to flourish in the best way possible. For the context of this study, I will be focusing on SEL evidence-based programs. CASEL distinguishes evidence-based programming from other instructional resources by explaining that "Evidence-based SEL programs are grounded in research and principles of child and adolescent development, and are scientifically evaluated and shown to produce positive student outcomes" (2022d). In schools where evidence-based programming is used, students can have increased success in areas such as academic performance, and decreased levels of emotional distress and negative externalized behaviours (CASEL, 2022d; Durlak et al., 2011). The area of focus for

this section is exploring the factors that contribute to the implementation of SEL evidence-based programs.

## **Teachers' Perceptions and Beliefs About SEL**

Research indicates that teacher competence in social-emotional learning and their beliefs in SEL play a role in the implementation practices of the interventions they facilitate. Teachers preferring less-structured and frequent, non-evidence-based interventions demonstrated lower levels of mental health literacy, as well as decreased confidence in program effectiveness (Domitrovich et al., 2015; Egan et al., 2019). Teachers' beliefs about social-emotional learning and their competence within it, play a role in the quality of programming (Brackett et al., 2012; Collie et al., 2012). It is likely, for example, that teachers who are well-versed in the foundations of SEL and value the importance of SEL programming in classrooms may be more invested in the outcomes or success of the programs (Collie et al., 2012). As a result of the above negative or neutral perceptions of SEL, intentional SEL teaching can become more arduous for teachers to implement, resulting in lower implementation levels and decreased chances of the program being successfully maintained (Domitrovich et al., 2015; Voith et al., 2020). In addition to teachers' feelings about and competence in SEL, they also need to be motivated to implement the intervention effectively.

The teachers that implement SEL programs and are not invested in SEL implementation have been seen to deliver low-quality interventions to students. Low-quality implementation of SEL programming is associated with more negative student outcomes (Reyes et al., 2012). School staff need to be collectively invested in the use of SEL interventions in order for the programs being used to yield positive results and decrease negative student outcomes such as emotional distress and conduct issues (Evans et al., 2015; Mas-Esposito et al., 2022; Reyes et al., 2012). Through increased teacher buy-in and knowledge acquisition in the area of SEL, staff can find value in and contribute to the development of SEL capacity building in themselves and for their students. While outside the scope of this study, understanding the link between low quality implementation of SEL programming and negative student outcomes highlights the need to better understand teacher learning and motivation.



## **Benefits for Implementing SEL**

Teachers incorporate programs into their repertoire when those programs benefit students. When teachers are looking for programs to fit their students' SEL needs, they are motivated to look for and implement interventions that aid students across the five SEL competency areas. These include the competency areas of self-awareness, self-management, responsible decision-making, relationship skills, and social awareness (CASEL, 2022a). Along with the five competencies, teachers look for programs that engage students. SEL interventions can reduce negative behaviour in schools and in classrooms. A reduction in negative behaviour can increase student engagement. Engagement can be defined as how well students are able to focus on tasks in the classroom, the level of student voice and choice present within classroom decision making, as well as how actively students participate in group discussions (CASEL, 2019). Another benefit is that when evidence-based SEL interventions lead to increased student engagement, the overall school climate is positively impacted (Cipriano et al., 2019; Shechtman & Yaman, 2012; Top et al., 2016).

There has been research studying the effect that SEL interventions have on negative behaviours. Espelage et al. (2015) concluded that when teachers implemented SEL programming in the classroom, direct evidence in reduction of bullying behaviours was not found, but evidence in the reduction of other contributing delinquent behaviours were. These behaviours included cheating on tests, being suspended from school, and stealing. This finding supports the idea that behaviours that are observed as more externalized, have had a noted decrease in prevalence when SEL programming is implemented.

## **Promoters of SEL Implementation**

In order to alleviate the chances of interventions failing due to various obstacles around implementation, schools can invest in strategies to aid in the success of SEL interventions and help to build staff SEL capacity. When teachers are trained in the foundations of SEL and have choice in which program they use, they can make informed implementation decisions as to which SEL programs aligns best with the needs of their students. If interventions are adopted at a district level and prescribed for use in schools without community input, implementation may be resisted due to the program seen as

just another trend (Evans et al., 2015). Staff training, including comprehensive professional development workshops, have been found to aid in building staff capacity in the delivery of SEL interventions (Evans et al., 2015; Kaye et al., 2022; Reyes et al., 2012). When staff develop competency in the subject matter and understand the theory behind the interventions they are using, they can be more effective in implementing SEL interventions. This, in turn, leads to more positive student outcomes as a result.

SEL implementation has also been integrated into a larger intervention network within schools, including the BC Ministry of Education released their *Mental Health in Schools Strategy*. Research points to the need for more intricate, interconnected systems of support that go beyond just one intervention. This extended network of support aids in instances of complex student needs and intervention (Charlton et al., 2021; Freiberg et al., 2020; Gregory et al. 2021; Hart et al., 2009; Lewis et al., 2021). One well-noted method is the Response-to-Intervention (RTI) framework which prioritizes the level of support given to students based on their specific needs (Hart et al. 2009; Lewis et al., 2021). Creating multiple ways that students' areas of growth can be addressed, focuses on what is best for students and moves towards more effective implementation of programming.

## **Obstacles of SEL Implementation**

Selection of a SEL evidence-based program allows for schools to implement interventions that fit the needs of their learners. However, the way in which the program is implemented influences the effectiveness of the intervention. Challenges with implementation efforts have been shown to have a negative influence on student outcomes associated with the intervention used (Egan et al., 2019; Durlak et al., 2011). Depending on the environment and specific conditions within which the intervention is run, the desired outcomes for programming could be affected. Teachers have cited obstacles to the implementation of SEL interventions including the duration required for the program to run, intervention unsuitability, and insufficient access to the materials and resources needed to implement (Egan et al., 2019; Long et al., 2016; Voith et al., 2020). Teachers also have to consider how they will incorporate SEL programming into their teaching schedules, which can make time allotted to deliver the intervention an issue. In addition, the specific intervention may not be available to certain schools, as

factors such as district and school budgeting restraints could play a role in which interventions are available to be used.

As teachers implement their SEL programming, tracking student SEL skill progress can be a challenge. The method used to collect and analyze data on student growth can influence how effective the intervention actually is. For example, analyzing data through solely student reports or only teacher reports exclusively, can lead to inaccurate depictions of the overall effect of the intervention on desired outcomes (Lewis et al., 2021; Shechtman and Yaman, 2012; and Voith et al., 2020). Therefore, the connection between the efficacy and effectiveness comes into consideration.

Efficacy refers to the program's intended effect under ideal conditions, and effectiveness refers to how well the program performs under real life conditions (Barnes, 2019; Durlak et al., 2011; McCallops, 2019). Positive and negative student outcomes have been linked to differences between the efficacy and effectiveness in intervention delivery which can be attributed to a number of factors including access to professional development, time constraints, teachers' own stress levels and well-being, as well as access to approved evidence-based resources (Barnes, 2019; Domitrovich, 2015; Durlak & Dupre, 2008). For example, when looking at a number of research studies using a specific intervention, such as Second Step, these studies demonstrated that there were no noticeable differences in behavioural outcomes in the sample and control groups who did not use the intervention (Cook et al., 2018; Top et al., 2016). This repeated finding suggests that there may be differences in program efficacy and effectiveness with SEL program interventions that teachers are implementing. When considering how well SEL interventions work, the efficacy and effectiveness of programming needs to be taken into consideration, but is not the focus of this study.

Determining the effect that an intervention has on student outcomes can involve examining factors beyond teacher competence. A consideration for schools and educators is whether the SEL intervention has an effect on students internalizing and applying core SEL skills or if it is solely showing positive correlations with increased knowledge of social-emotional skill content. There are differences between students being able to state what the correct method for dealing with a challenging situation is, but if they do not know how to apply that knowledge into practice, the intervention could potentially not lend itself to positive student growth (Hart et al., 2009).

## **Methods**

For my current study, I followed a qualitative approach through an interview format.

### **The Research Questions**

The implementation of the SEL interventions by teachers can have an effect on student SEL skill development. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to understand teachers' perceptions of SEL programming implementation in schools. Particularly, this study is guided by the following research questions:

1. What are teachers' perceptions of SEL?
2. What are teachers' perceptions of their motivations for teaching SEL skills in their classrooms?
3. What conditions do teachers who implement evidence-based SEL interventions believe could be a facilitator to deliver effective SEL programming?
4. What conditions do teachers who implement evidence-based SEL interventions believe could be a barrier to staff in delivering effective SEL programming?

### **Researcher Role/Positionality**

My role as a researcher includes identifying my positionality in the area of SEL, within the context of this research. I am an experienced upper-intermediate teacher currently working in a large school district within the Lower Mainland, in British Columbia, Canada. I understand that my foundational understandings in SEL emerge from my own work as a SEL leader in my own school. This role includes promoting capacity building in SEL, through a variety of in-school approaches including lunch and learns and the modeling of current evidence-based SEL programs. This knowledge and understanding in the foundations of SEL emerged from my participation in my district SEL leader program, where I received comprehensive district professional development on the foundations of SEL, within the context of the CASEL framework. As my district designed the SEL leader program to promote the use of SEL in school, I wondered why SEL, especially the use of evidence-based SEL programming, was not a more prevalent practice in schools.

## **Research Site/Participants**

Participants in this study were elementary school classroom teachers working in one K - 7 school within a large school district in the lower mainland, in British Columbia, Canada. I recruited teachers in my school through the use of my district email directory (convenience sampling). I was able to interview four participants in total. Inclusion criteria for this study include: (a) elementary school teacher, teaching grades K – 7 in my school, and (b) self-reported familiarity with the foundations of SEL, as outlined on CASEL’s website (<https://casel.org/fundamentals-of-sel/>). Participants included one primary (Grade 1) and three intermediate (Grade 4 and Grade 5) teachers, allowing for perspectives across multiple grades. Exclusion criteria included non-enrolling teachers, teachers with no knowledge of SEL or no experience employing SEL within their practice, as well as school administrators. This study focuses on the beliefs and perceptions of those teachers who are engaging in SEL work directly in classrooms with K-7 students specifically, as this is my area of experience with SEL work.

## **Data Collection**

I contacted participants initially via district email to participate in an information session about the research study. Following expression of interest in response to the district email, I invited participants by email to participate in an interview. My interviews were semi-structured in design, approximately 45 minutes in duration, and were audio recorded. I conducted the interviews at the school site and the selection of a meeting time was chosen in a way that was conducive to each participant and myself. I offered participants to meet remotely via Microsoft Teams in the event that they did not feel comfortable meeting in person, however no participants chose this option. I gave teachers a \$10.00 gift card as a token of appreciation for the teachers who completed the interview portion of the study, as a of appreciation for their time taken participating in the study.

In order to develop the interview items, I reviewed the literature of research and pertinent theories around SEL implementation in schools, including review of benefits for incorporating SEL into the classroom (Egan et al., 2019; Evans et. al., 2015; Mas-Esposito et al., 2022; Reyes et al., 2012; Voith et al., 2020), teachers’ perceptions and beliefs about SEL (Brackett et al., 2012; Collie et al., 2012; Domitrovich et al., 2015;

Egan et al., 2019; Voith et al., 2020), as well as how teacher capacity building facilitates the success of SEL intervention implementation (Evans et al., 2015; Kaye et al., 2022; Reyes et al., 2012). From these above theories, a priori themes that emerged from the literature include: (a) motivations for incorporating SEL into the classroom (b) teachers' perceptions and beliefs about SEL, (c) barriers to SEL implementation, and (d) facilitators to SEL implementation including what schools can do to promote this.

My study was conducted at one site and involved four participants. I conducted interviews that ranged from 20 - 40 minutes in duration. I then gave participants an informed consent form before the interview began. The interview protocol was in a semi-structured format with seven items (see Appendix B). Items one, two, and three ask participants what their perceptions of SEL are, what motivates them to incorporate SEL programming into their classroom, as well as what it means for them to have an effective SEL program, respectively. These items relate to question one and two of the research study and are supported by the themes of teacher prioritization of desired student outcomes through SEL interventions (Egan et al., 2019; Voith et al., 2020), and teachers' social emotional competence and beliefs about SEL (Brackett et al., 2012; Collie et al., 2012; Domitrovich et al., 2015; Egan et al., 2019; Voith et al., 2020). Items three through seven ask the participants about what effective SEL programming means to them, how closely participants follow the intended scope and sequence in programming as set out by the program authors, as well as the participants' perceived barriers and facilitators to SEL implementation. These items relate to question two and three of the research study and are supported by the themes of teacher motivation and buy-in (Evans et al., 2015; Mas-Esposito et al., 2022; Reyes et al., 2012), as well as the role that teacher capacity building plays in facilitating the success of SEL intervention implementation (Evans et al., 2015; Kaye et al., 2022; Reyes et al., 2012).

## **Data Analysis**

For this study, I kept field notes that were taken throughout each interview. Transcription of the audio recordings was completed through the use of the program, Otter.ai. I edited the transcriptions to ensure that they were accurate by emailing participants copies of the transcription to verify accuracy. After I downloaded the transcription from Otter.ai, I permanently deleted the audio and transcription from Otter.ai. The endpoint of my research was attained when the four interviews were fully completed. I completed this

through a linear approach in which I kept reflexive journaling notes and field notes to analyze the data and draw out main points of the data through thematic analysis. I used a combination of inductive and deductive analysis. I used inductive strategies by breaking data into smaller segments according to distinct ideas and coding those distinctions into emerging themes. This allowed for me to fit the data into new categories that surfaced inductively and that may not be fitting into the a priori themes that are listed above. To aid in an inductive theme analysis, I used Quirkos.com (Quirkos 2.5.2), a qualitative analysis software, to cut, sort, and code the data into categories. I then combined these categories to create more generalized sub-themes, then to their subsequent themes. My coding techniques included searching for keywords, looking for repetition, as well as looking for similarities and differences in participant responses (Ryan and Bernard, 2003; Thomas, 2006). I kept a codebook to document main ideas and themes as they emerged when reading through the interview transcriptions. I maintained a codebook on a regular basis with columns for the date the code was entered, the code label, as well as an explanation for the reasoning the specific code is being used. For example, participant transcript data was coded with the categories of explicit teaching, programs, ease of use, evidence-based, non-evidence based, and positive outcomes (see Table 1). These categories were all categorized under the theme of implementation, as all of these codes refer to an aspect of SEL program implementation practices. From there, this theme fit into the a priori theme of teacher SEL implementation practices. In addition, I used a research journal as a way to track any changes and/or new themes that arose through the data collection process. This also acted as a way to track any changes within coding.

**Table 1: Sample Codes for the Theme of Teacher SEL Implementation Practices**

Code or Theme	Data Supporting Code or Theme	Researcher's Interpretive Summary
EXPLICIT TEACHING	" I think, yeah, it needs to be explicitly taught, it needs to be practiced throughout the day. And I just want the kids to have these strategies to carry through life..." (Kira)	Participant reference to EXPLICIT TEACHING will be linked to IMPLEMENTATION based on responses regarding program use in the classroom.
PROGRAMS	" And then yeah, with Second Step, I've been doing one a week"(Kira)	Participant reference to PROGRAMS will be linked to mentions of any SEL programs that participants mention using in the classroom.
EASE [OF USE]	"Okay, so the kids love... They like Second Step. And it's easy, and it's accessible. And it's entertaining" (Sasha)	Reference to the EASE OF USE of SEL programming, which then relates to the sub-theme of IMPLEMENTATION. Across all participants, ease of use in SEL programming was important.
EVIDENCE-BASED	"Yeah. So it's neat when they when they come that I'm like, and it's okay that it does that. Remember, it's there to protect us. But we have to just we don't want to stay there. We don't want to stay. We wouldn't want our heart to stay beating that fast for very long. We want to try to calm our bodies down. So it's, it's neat, but I think for me using those programs that holds me accountable that I'm doing the right thing" (Kira)	EVIDENCE-BASED relates to the participant discussing a SEL evidence-based program and/or mention how evidence-based programming relates to their ideas and practice of SEL.
NON-EVIDENCE BASED	"I kind of do I put a bit of zones in and I with the emotions just so that because it's referred to a lot like the red zone and the green zone and when you're sad, the you know" (Kira)	NON-EVIDENCE BASED relates to the participant discussing non-evidence based SEL programming or strategies that they use in their classrooms.
POSTIVE OUTCOMES	"Better vocabulary, a bit more better able to express and articulate their emotions, problems, ... anything to do with social emotional learning, just having a higher vocabulary. So behavior and vocabulary and communication skills" (Alex)	POSTIVE OUTCOMES relates to the participant mentioning any positive student outcomes that arise out of SEL program implementation.

Through a thematic analysis approach, the aim of this study was to understand the beliefs and perceptions of teachers currently implementing evidence-based SEL intervention programs. I analyzed the data through themes that arose from the interview data, as well as from a priori themes outlined in the study design section, as part of an



inductive analysis approach. Again, the a priori themes included: (a) motivations for incorporating SEL into the classroom (b) teacher perceptions and beliefs about SEL, (c) teacher cited barriers to SEL implementation, and (d) facilitators to SEL implementation including what schools can do to promote this. I applied these themes to the data by labeling and categorized participant responses from the interview responses. This allowed me to determine participant perceptions of SEL, and how competent they felt with the foundations of SEL and its implementation of evidence-based programming. The responses I gathered from participants about the barriers and facilitators present in SEL implementation can help guide further research into what schools and teachers can do to implement SEL more effectively.

Before finalizing research study analysis results, I contacted participants and provided them with a summary of my analysis of their interviews for their review and confirmation. I also included an invitation to talk about the information that had been collected and analyzed. None of the participants offered feedback or revisions on the analysis of the data.

## **Limitations**

Due to time and resource constraints, I was able to interview only four participants. Another limitation is that the study was limited to those participants in this one district because district size, funding, and resource allocation are all factors that can also play a role in how well an intervention can be implemented. There may be more variance in the data if the interview were opened up to multiple districts. However, due to timing and resource constraints, the study will be solely conducted in one district.

## **Trustworthiness**

I asked participants to complete an initial consent form before commencing the interview. Once the participants consented to an interview, I contacted them separately to schedule and complete the interview. I informed participants that their participation in the study was voluntary. They had the right to refuse to participate in the study at any time without negative consequence.

I incorporated the use of reflexive journaling before and after interviews to help account for my own feelings and biases going into and coming out of each of the interviews. In defining my own assumptions, I was able to more carefully interrogate the data to ensure I was not simply finding what I already believed in the data.

To build trust between myself as researcher and my participants, their confidentiality was respected. I anonymized all participants by using a unique pseudonym when I analyzed the data. I did not identify and participants by name in any reports of the completed study. All interview responses and data I collected in this study will remain completely confidential. I have stored the data on a password-protected computer, with files encrypted with a password. I will destroy the data after 7 years have passed.

I recorded and transcribed interview audio using a professional transcription software, Otter.ai, to transcribe interview conversations. This is a US-based company, with information being subject to the specific laws of the United States and other foreign countries. For this study, once I transcribed the audio recordings and downloaded the file, I permanently deleted the audio and transcription from the Otter.ai account. Otter.ai does not have access to user transcripts or audio recordings without the user's explicit consent. Before the interview, I gave participants the choice to opt-out of the use of this software for their recording. Otter.ai consent language and wording were used from an outside source and written permission was given from the original author to use in this study (Hafferty, 2020). In this way, I was able to ensure that through all steps of the process, participants felt comfortable knowing that all their information was kept confidential.

Once I transcribed each participants' interview, I emailed them a copy of the transcription with a review-by date, so that the participant could review the transcription for accuracy. When I asked participants for their feedback, this demonstrated that I valued their input throughout the entire research process. I was able to provide ongoing transparency in all steps of my research process to make the participants feel comfortable.

## Findings

Upon analysis of the four interviews, several themes arose from the data. The main themes for this study included the a priori themes of: (a) motivations for incorporating SEL into the classroom (b) teacher perceptions and beliefs about SEL, (c) teacher cited barriers to SEL implementation, and (d) facilitators to SEL implementation including what schools can do to promote this. Additionally, teacher SEL implementation practices was another theme that stemmed from the data, beyond the a priori themes.

### Teachers' Motivations for Teaching SEL

Firstly, teachers were motivated to teach SEL in their classrooms due to the needs of the students that they have observed in their classrooms. Kira and Sasha taught in Grade 1 and a 3/4 split, respectively. They both noted that their students required support in being able to label emotions and self-regulate. Older students, as shared with Reena, who taught in Grade 5, needed to work on being accountable for themselves, with an understanding that they are more socially aware. Additional student needs, as noted by teachers, included anxiety and lack of movement. Sasha, who has skills in neurodiversity, commented on students that have complex needs, saying:

I think we have like a really broad variety of kids coming from very different homes where like, the degree of which their social emotional needs are recognized and labeled, explained, can be really small or really big. So when we all come together, it's such like a[n] unlevel playing field, where it was like that emotional social abilities, right? And then looking at kids who are like neurotypical. So obviously, you know, my background, I am always thinking about, like, the neurodiverse kids who have that extra challenge on top of it.

### Teachers' Perceptions and Beliefs Around SEL

In terms of teacher background knowledge in the area of SEL, participants cited that SEL is important to them and their practice. When asked about what their perceptions of SEL were, Kira stated, "I think it's important. I think it needs to be taught...I've been teaching for 20 years. And I think it's more and more important, as I've noticed, there's more need for the strategies, and the [student] emotions are not as regulated. In addition, as noted by Alex, "My perceptions of social emotional learning? Well, I feel that

it is a vital, and is probably the most important thing that we should be teaching...The more we teach [SEL], the better". When I asked participants about their motivations for teaching SEL, they expressed that they valued using programs that are based on peer-reviewed research and evidence-based practices. For example, Alex spoke to the benefit of using evidence-based SEL programs in that "it carries more authority". Sasha discussed the importance of using the program Second Step, by saying the following:

Well, I see the harm and things that aren't evidence-based for sure... I think that it's fine to incorporate experiences that aren't necessarily evidence-based...but I think you should ...but I think you should have a foundation where there's some sort of proof that what you're doing is actually going to be meaningful. And then it's that possibility of causing harm that I really want to avoid.

Additionally, Sasha shared that their beliefs in peer-edited research and evidence-based practices were due to their own exposure of these practices in graduate level coursework.

## **Teacher SEL Implementation Practices**

Across the four interviews, participants spoke extensively about their implementation practices using evidence-based SEL programs with their students. Within this, participants elaborated on the evidence-based SEL programs they chose to implement in their classrooms, implementation frequency, as well as personal thoughts on the effectiveness of the programs they used. All participants cited that they use the Second Step program, as their current evidence-based SEL program of choice. Another point of interest was that three out of four participants cited that they had used the Mind-Up program before changing to Second Step. All participants discussed the importance of using evidence-based programming, with Alex noting,

Why wouldn't I take advantage of researchers who have put all their thoughts into this, because if I just use my own ideas, I'm going to miss things. Also, I think it carries more authority when they see a pre-packaged program".

Additionally, Sasha echoed this sentiment by commenting that "If we can centre it in one program that we know has actual results. It's good". Participants also mentioned that they liked how Second Step is "easy to use" and sequential because the program "shows what you've already done ... it ticks off itself" (Alex).

In terms of implementation frequency, all participants reported that they implement the program an average of one lesson per week, which aligns with the suggested delivery of programming on Second Step's website, [www.secondstep.org](http://www.secondstep.org). In addition to one formal Second Step lesson a week, participants noted that they also provided supplemental lessons and activities with materials such as picture books and writing exercises. Other non-evidence-based activities and resources that were utilized by teachers included the Zones of Regulation (Kuypers, 2023) program, breathing exercises, and teacher created activities.

Only one participant noted actively engaging parents with their implementation of SEL programming. Kira discussed how they share with parents what strategies have been covered in the current week's lessons in their class. This information was then sent home in a biweekly email to parents. Lastly, participants were asked how they know that their SEL programming is effective. All participants stated that they could see the program having a positive effect on students when they could see their students implementing the strategies. Alex emphasized this point saying that students are "having an increased vocabulary" and there is "change in behaviour, feelings, or attitude". Reena elaborated that they have observed positive outcomes in their students by explaining:

They can tell me lots of things about how to regulate themselves. They can name lots of emotions, when they're not feeling them. They can name emotions afterward. They can tell me about different situations that we've discussed and what should happen in those situations. They can't always do it in, in the moment".

## **Facilitators to Implementing SEL**

Teacher responses produced information regarding conditions that would be potential facilitators to support teachers in evidence-based SEL program implementation. In terms of feeling supported, all participants, who report to the same administrator, cited that having a supportive leader made a difference in the success of implementation in SEL programming. This included having a leader who could ask questions to their staff, such as "What do you need?" (Kira), asking open-ended questions to teachers, as well as having an administrator who is a "hands-on leader" (Alex). Participants cited that having district endorsement of SEL also contributed to being supported in implementation. Examples of district endorsement included promoting inquiry-projects and workshops, as noted by Kira. All participants cited that having access to technology was imperative to

implementation of Second Step specifically. All participants utilized the latest online version of the Second Step program. Lastly, participants discussed that having funding support for resources was important. When discussing whole-school support, Kira mentioned that SEL should be

A part of the school culture”. I think having somebody talk about [SEL] at staff meetings and being part of the culture of the school. I mean, I don't think it's new anymore. But yeah, it's definitely helpful. I know. At my last school, we did a two-year inquiry project.

Specific to school culture, all participants cited having the ability to collaborate with other staff in the building regarding SEL was important to them. This ranged from having a SEL leader in the school and room to discuss SEL at staff meetings (Kira), hosting SEL lunch and learns (Sasha), team teaching (Alex), and creating SEL whole-school goals (Reena). In addition, Kira discussed that having TTOC funds to allow teachers to collaborate was helpful and in the event that TTOC coverage was not available, having an administrator open to covering class was beneficial for staff. In addition to collaboration, Kira, Sasha, and Reena noted that having a common language as a school and having the “whole staff being on the same page” (Alex) in relation to SEL, was important.

## **Barriers to Implementing SEL**

In addition to conditions that could act as potential facilitators to SEL evidence-based program implementation, participants discussed potential barriers to implementation. Firstly, participants cited that teacher mental health had potential to affect whether a SEL program could be successfully implemented. Three out of four participants stated that teachers feel “stressed” and “overwhelmed” with their current teaching responsibilities in the classroom. As a result, teachers may feel that it is difficult to “make time” and schedule SEL instruction into their week. Sasha also added that one's own mental health and their “ability to connect with their own emotions” could be a potential barrier to teaching SEL effectively. Another important factor that arose in participant responses was the idea that teachers who have a lack of foundational knowledge in SEL, could cause one to “feel hesitant to try something new” (Alex). Lastly, participants cited that an inability to access funding could also be a potential barrier. All participants stated how access to technology, specifically projectors, was necessary for the implementation of

online programs, specifically Second Step. Sasha noted that at their previous school, staff had to share projectors, which could limit access to teachers being able to use the program when needed. Following the need for technology, Kira noted how TTOCs do not have access to the program, as their school did not provide laptops or other appropriate technology to sign in and connect to the classroom projectors. Lastly, when discussing contributions to school culture, participants noted that administration support was key to success of a program. Therefore, in the absence of administrative support, SEL programming implementation success could be affected.

In addition to identifying potential barriers to evidence-based SEL implementation, participants suggested several areas for improvement. To enhance collaboration between staff, Alex suggested that partnering with another class and teachers taking turns delivering lessons while the other teacher observed could open up dialogue in relation to teaching practice in SEL. Next, to maximize effectiveness in programming and streamlining SEL instruction into an existing schedule, Reena reiterated why as a teacher you need to “know your kids”, including their level of skills and what programs would be best for them. This comment articulates that certain programs will work better than others based on student suitability. Lastly, Sasha suggested incorporating supplemental and targeted instruction by non-enrolling staff such as a Child and Youth Care Worker. This support could aid in wrap-around support for students with greater emotional and social needs.

## **Discussion**

Throughout the interviews, participants showed that they have a real commitment to the work of incorporating evidence-based SEL instruction into their classrooms. All participants stated that they use the Second Step program. Participants’ perceptions of SEL evidence-based program implementation supports the literature across multiple areas. Participants found that evidence-based SEL programming was user-friendly by being sequential in nature and easy to implement. This finding is supported by prior research indicating teachers prefer the step-by-step nature and ease of use of SEL programming in classrooms (Egan et al., 2019; Voith et al., 2020). Secondly, all of the participants noted that they follow the Second Step program’s suggested scope and sequence. The participant’s engagement with SEL programming supports the literature,

as best practice for SEL program implementation needs to be sequenced, active, focused, and explicit (Domitrovich et al., 2017; Durlak et al., 2011; Taylor et al. 2017). In addition to the use of an evidence-based SEL program, teachers noted that they supplemented their SEL evidence-based programming with other non-evidence-based resources, supporting the notion that teachers use a combination of resources to support SEL skill development (Charlton et al., 2021; Freiberg et al., 2020; Gregory et al. 2021).

Continuing to express their willingness to use evidence-based SEL programming, participants expressed how having a program that helps students to learn key SEL competency skills was important. This dedication to student skill development links to the understanding that teachers implement programs into their classrooms when they have a benefit for their students (Cipriano et al., 2019; Shechtman & Yaman, 2012; Top et al., 2016). As participants shared their motivations for teaching SEL, the interaction between teachers' perceptions of SEL and their competence to implement it in their classrooms was highlighted. Having this positive regard for SEL instruction and confidence to implement evidence-based SEL programming in the classroom plays a role in programming success (Brackett et al., 2012; Collie et al., 2012). In addition, the relationship between teacher stress and SEL programming effectiveness was significant among all participants. Particularly, when participants believed that when teacher stress and feelings of overwhelm are high, teachers are less likely try a new program and integrate it into their existing schedules. This link between teacher stress levels and willingness to engage in a new program is supported by prior research. Teacher mental health or state of mind can affect the quality and overall delivery of SEL implementation (Domitrovich et al., 2015; Voith et al., 2020).

Following discussion highlighting motivations for teaching SEL, participants discussed what has helped them to implement SEL effectively. They also noted potential conditions that could act as facilitators to implementation. Participants highlighted the importance for staff to have capacity building opportunities. All participants found capacity building valuable. This finding is consistent with previous research outlining that meaningful professional development workshops help teachers deliver SEL effectively (Reyes et al., 2012; Evans et al., 2015; Kaye et al., 2022). Building on the need for professional development opportunities, one participant explained that their own post-secondary graduate courses helped them to understand the importance of peer-reviewed evidence-based programs and interventions. Without this exposure in



undergraduate teacher training or graduate course work, teachers who are already in the field without this knowledge should have benefit access to those meaningful professional development opportunities through district or school-based workshops. To assist in these efforts, participants highlighted how having a supportive and flexible administrator was beneficial. Additionally, being able to open opportunities to non-enrolling staff as well could assist with the idea of wrap-around support using SEL programming. Participants also noted that have a school culture that fostered collaboration and having support in coverage to engage with their colleagues in the work was important.

Participants were confident in their implementation abilities and were open to discussing opportunities for growth. Participants had a strong sense of what barriers there could be to SEL implementation. These results are supported by the literature demonstrating that teachers' SEL intervention implementation can be affected by teacher stress, finding time in their schedules to deliver programming, as well as having access to resources (Egan et al., 2019; Long et al., 2016; Voith et al., 2020). In this research study, participants noted that resources include the program itself, as well as generalized access to technology, particularly laptops and projectors, to implement their programs effectively. In addition, as noted by Sasha, neurodiverse students need more targeted interventions for SEL skill development. This is an important finding, which is consistent with the literature in that there is a need for more comprehensive networks for complex student support (Charlton et al., 2021; Freiberg et al., 2020; Gregory et al., 2021; Hart et al., 2009; Lewis et al., 2021). Additionally, this finding corroborates research indicating that SEL programming can be used in smaller groups for more targeted interventions (Cook et al., 2015; Gregory et al., 2021).

## **Conclusion**

This study researched teachers' perceptions of evidence-based SEL program implementation in schools. Participant responses and experiences align with previous literature regarding evidence-based SEL program implementation in schools. These findings are important and highlight that using SEL evidence-based programming in schools is beneficial. Student SEL competency development is successful when the necessary conditions are in place.

The findings highlight several recommendations for educational policy and practice. Participants noted the importance of having a supportive administrator and a positive school culture when implementing a new SEL program. Having leadership that promotes and models SEL initiatives communicates to staff that SEL is a priority practice. One suggestion is for leaders to have SEL be a focus of a schoolwide learning goal, so that all staff can participate in SEL in an effort to foster joint determination (Fullan, 2019). Other methods could involve opening up opportunities for staff to collaborate on SEL implementation throughout the school year, including during staff meetings and providing coverage to staff to meet together. In looking at participant suggestions to address barriers, support for SEL implementation requires access to actual SEL evidence-based programs, which requires funding from the district and/or school site. As participants elaborated, funding support extends to staff access to appropriate technology, such as laptops and projectors. In order to promote continuity of programming, school sites could ensure that TTOCs have access to SEL programming, whether the program is in a traditional hard copy form or if they need to have access to a user account online. In the case of an online program like Second Step, schools could provide laptops for TTOCs to connect to the program online, along with log-in information. Lastly, participants noted that schools need to have access to additional supports beyond evidence-based SEL programming, in an effort to address the neurodiversity of certain students. With the promotion of mental health initiatives within the province, having schools build SEL programming into their multi-disciplinary targeted intervention plans could be beneficial for students if these programs are used in tandem with one another. In addition, having non-enrolling staff, participate in the implementation efforts of SEL for these students in an alternate setting could provide more opportunities for SEL support.

In considering areas for further research, there could be additional qualitative study to explore the perceptions of teachers who do not use evidence-based SEL programs in their classrooms. In this, findings could shed light on what these teachers' understandings of SEL are, as well as what the differences in perceptions of SEL implementation are between those who use SEL programming regularly and those who do not. This can assist school districts, as well as teacher training programs, to prepare both experienced teachers and teachers-in-training to receive the foundational skills they need to understand and implement evidence-based SEL programs in schools.

## References

- Barnes, T. N. (2019). Changing the landscape of social emotional learning in urban schools: what are we currently focusing on and where do we go from here? *The Urban Review*, 51(4), 599–637. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-019-00534-1>
- Canadian Mental Health Association. (2014). *Mental illnesses in children and youth*. <https://cmha.bc.ca/documents/mental-illnesses-in-children-and-youth-2/>
- Charlton, C. T., Moulton, S., Sabey, C. V., & West, R. (2021). A systematic review of the effects of schoolwide intervention programs on student and teacher perceptions of school climate. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 23(3), 185–200. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098300720940168>
- Cipriano, C., Barnes, T. N., Rivers, S. E., & Brackett, M. (2019). Exploring changes in student engagement through the RULER Approach: An examination of students at risk of academic failure. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR)*, 24(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10824669.2018.1524767>
- Collaborative for Academic, Social and Emotional Learning (CASEL). (2019). *Indicators of SEL Walkthrough Protocol*. <https://schoolguide.casel.org/resource/indicators-of-schoolwide-sel-walkthrough-protocol/>
- Collaborative for Collaborative for Academic, Social and Emotional Learning (CASEL). (2021, October 1). *CASEL's SEL Framework*. <https://casel.org/casel-sel-framework-11-2020/>
- Collaborative for Academic, Social and Emotional Learning (CASEL). (2022a). *Fundamentals of SEL*. <https://casel.org/fundamentals-of-sel/>
- Collaborative for Academic, Social and Emotional Learning (CASEL). (2022b). *Indicators of Schoolwide SEL*. <https://schoolguide.casel.org/what-is-sel/indicators-of-schoolwide-sel/>
- Collaborative for Academic, Social and Emotional Learning (CASEL). (2022c). *Our History*. <https://casel.org/about-us/our-history/>
- Collaborative for Academic, Social and Emotional Learning (CASEL). (2022d). *Adopt an evidence-based program for sel*. <https://schoolguide.casel.org/focus-area-3/school/adopt-an-evidence-based-program-for-sel/>
- Collaborative for Academic, Social and Emotional Learning (CASEL). (2022e). *What does the research say?* <https://casel.org/fundamentals-of-sel/what-does-the-research-say/>

- Collie, R. J., Shapka, J. D., & Perry, N. E. (2012). School climate and social-emotional learning: Predicting teacher stress, job satisfaction, and teaching efficacy. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 104*(4), 1189–1204. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029356>
- Committee for Children (CFC). (2022). *Second Step Middle School*. <https://www.secondstep.org/middle-school-curriculum>
- Cook, C. R., Frye, M., Slemrod, T., Lyon, A. R., Renshaw, T. L., & Zhang, Y. (2015). An integrated approach to universal prevention: independent and combined effects of PBIS and SEL on youths' mental health. *School Psychology Quarterly, 30*(2), 166–183. <https://doi.org/10.1037/spq0000102>
- Cook, C. R., Low, S., Buntain-Ricklefs, J., Whitaker, K., Pullmann, M. D., & Lally, J. (2018). Evaluation of second step on early elementary students' academic outcomes: A randomized controlled trial. *School Psychology Quarterly, 33*(4), 561–572. <https://doi.org/10.1037/spq00002>
- Domitrovich, C. E., Pas, E. T., Bradshaw, C. P., Becker, K. D., Keperling, J. P., Embry, D. D., & Jalongo, N. (2015). Individual and school organizational factors that influence implementation of the pax good behavior game intervention. *Prevention Science, 16*(8), 1064–1074. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-015-0557-8>
- Durlak, J. A., & DuPre, E. P. (2008). Implementation matters: A review of research on the influence of implementation on program outcomes and the factors affecting implementation. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 41*(3/4), 327–350. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-008-9165-0>
- Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., & Schellinger, K. B. (2011). The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: A meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions. *Child Development, 82*(1), 405–432. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01564.x>
- Egan, T. E., Wymbys, F. A., Owens, J. S., Evans, S. W., Hustus, C., & Allan, D. M. (2019). Elementary school teachers' preferences for school-based interventions for students with emotional and behavioral problems. *Psychology in the Schools, 56*(10), 1633–1653. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.22294>
- Espelage, D. L., Low, S., Van Ryzin, M. J., & Polanin, J. R. (2015). Clinical Trial of Second Step middle school program: Impact on bullying, cyberbullying, homophobic teasing, and sexual harassment perpetration. *School Psychology Review, 44*(4), 464–479. <http://proxy.lib.sfu.ca/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ1141602&site=ehost-live>
- Evans, R., Murphy, S., & Scourfield, J. (2015). Implementation of a school-based social and emotional learning intervention: Understanding diffusion processes within complex systems. *Prevention Science, 16*(5), 754–764. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-015-0552-0>

- Freiberg, H. J., Oviatt, D., & Naveira, E. (2020). Classroom management meta-review continuation of research-based programs for preventing and solving discipline problems. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR)*, 25(4), 319–337. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10824669.2020.1757454>
- Fullan, M. (2019). *Nuance: Why some leaders succeed and others fail*. Corwin.
- Greenberg, M. T., Weissberg, R. P., O'Brien, M. U., Zins, J. E., Fredericks, L., Resnik, H., & Elias, M. J. (2003). Enhancing school-based prevention and youth development through coordinated social, emotional, and academic learning. *American Psychologist*, 58(6–7), 466–474. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.58.6-7.466>
- Gregory, A., Osher, D., Bear, G. G., Jagers, R. J., & Sprague, J. R. (2021). Good intentions are not enough: Centering equity in school discipline reform. *School Psychology Review*, 50(2–3), 206–220. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2372966X.2020.1861911>
- Guerra, N. G., & Bradshaw, C. P. (2008). Linking the prevention of problem behaviors and positive youth development: Core competencies for positive youth development and risk prevention. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, 2008(122), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cd.225>
- Hafferty, C. (2020, October 27). *Automated transcription for qualitative research: Ethical, privacy, and security considerations*. <https://caitlinhafferty.blogspot.com/2020/10/ethics-of-auto-transcription.html>
- Hart, S. R., Dowdy, E., Eklund, K., Renshaw, T. L., Jimerson, S. R., Jones, C., & Earhart, J., Jr. (2009). A controlled study assessing the effects of the impulse control and problem-solving unit of the “Second Step Curriculum.” *California School Psychologist*, 14, 105–110. <http://proxy.lib.sfu.ca/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ878367&site=ehost-live>
- Jones, D. E., Greenberg, M., & Crowley, M. (2015). Early social-emotional functioning and public health: The relationship between kindergarten social competence and future wellness. *American Journal of Public Health*, 105(11), 2283–2290. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2015.302630>
- Kaye, A. J., Pejic, V., Moffa, K., Jordan, M., Dennerly, K. M., & DeMaso, D. R. (2022). Using professional development workshops to support school professionals’ capacities to promote students’ social, emotional, and behavioral health. *Psychology in the Schools*, 59(4), 866–880. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.22652>
- Kupyers, L. (2023). *The zones of regulation*. <https://zonesofregulation.com/index.html>

- Lewis, K. M., Holloway, S. D., Bavarian, N., Silverthorn, N., DuBois, D. L., Flay, B. R., & Siebert, C. F. (2021). Effects of positive action in elementary school on student behavioral and social-emotional outcomes. *Elementary School Journal*, 121(4), 635–655. <https://doi.org/10.1086/714065>
- Long, A. C. J., Hagermoser Sanetti, L. M., Collier-Meek, M. A., Gallucci, J., Altschaeffl, M., & Kratochwill, T. R. (2016). An exploratory investigation of teachers' intervention planning and perceived implementation barriers. *Journal of School Psychology*, 55, 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2015.12.002>
- Mas-Expósito, L., Virginia Krieger, Amador-Campos, J. A., Casañas, R., Albertí, M., & Lalucat-Jo, L. (2022). Implementation of Whole School Restorative Approaches to Promote Positive Youth Development: Review of Relevant Literature and Practice Guidelines. *Education Sciences*, 12(3), 187–187. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci12030187>
- McCallops, K., Barnes, T. N., Berte, I., Fenniman, J., Jones, I., Navon, R., & Nelson, M. (2019). Incorporating culturally responsive pedagogy within social-emotional learning interventions in urban schools: An international systematic review. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 94, 11–28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2019.02.007>
- MindUP. (2022). *MindUp for Educators and Schools*. <https://mindup.org/mindup-for-schools/>
- Province of British Columbia. (2022-a). *Core competencies*. B.C. Ministry of Education. <https://curriculum.gov.bc.ca/competencies>
- Province of British Columbia. (2022-b). *Mental health in schools strategy*. B.C. Ministry of Education. <https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/erase/documents/mental-health-wellness/mhis-strategy.pdf>
- Quirkos 2.5.2 [Computer Software]. (2023). Retrieved from <https://www.quirkos.com>
- Reyes, M. R., Brackett, M. A., Rivers, S. E., Elbertson, N. A., & Salovey, P. (2012). The interaction effects of program training, dosage, and implementation quality on targeted student outcomes for the RULER approach to social and emotional learning. *School Psychology Review*, 41(1), 82–99. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02796015.2012.12087377>
- Rhoades, B. L., Warren, H. K., Domitrovich, C. E., & Greenberg, M. T. (2011). Examining the link between preschool social–emotional competence and first grade academic achievement: The role of attention skills. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 26(2), 182–191. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2010.07.003>
- Ryan, G.W., & Bernard, H.R. (2003). Techniques to identify themes. *Field Methods*, 15(1), 85–109. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X02239569>

- Schonert-Reichl, K.A., & Hymel, S. (2007). Educating the heart as well as the mind: social and emotional learning for school and life success. *Education Canada*, 47(2), 20-25. <https://web-p-ebSCOhost.com.proxy.lib.sfu.ca/ehost/detail/detail?vid=1&sid=77abcf8d-aa8c-445b-9f69-915affd035dd%40redis&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#AN=507973289&db=eue>
- Shechtman, Z., & Abu Yaman, M. (2012). SEL as a component of a literature class to improve relationships, behavior, motivation, and content knowledge. *American Educational Research Journal*, 49(3), 546–567. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831212441359>
- Taylor, R. D., Oberle, E., Durlak, J. A., & Weissberg, R. P. (2017). Promoting positive youth development through school-based social and emotional learning interventions: A meta-analysis of follow-up effects. *Child Development*, 88(4), 1156–1171. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12864>
- Thomas, D.R. (2006). A general inductive approach for analyzing qualitative evaluation data. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 27(2), 237-246. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214005283748>
- Wellesley Centers for Women. (2022). *About Open Circle*. <https://www.open-circle.org/about-us/overview>
- Yale Center for Emotional Intelligence. (2022). *What is RULER?* <https://www.rulerapproach.org/about/what-is-ruler/>

# Appendix A.

## Interview Consent Form

### Interview Consent Form

#### Teachers' Perceptions of SEL Evidence-Based Intervention Implementation in Surrey Schools

Thank you for considering participating in an interview about Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) implementation in schools. Before you decide whether to participate, please take time to review the following information. If you have any questions or need additional information, please ask. If, after reviewing this information, you are still interested in participating, then we will go forward with the interview.

I, Jennifer Diack, am conducting this interview as part of a research project exploring perspectives of elementary school classroom teachers using SEL programs. I am a classroom teacher in Surrey School District and this project is a requirement for the Masters in Educational Leadership program at SFU. This research is being supervised by Gillian Judson, Assistant Professor at the SFU Faculty of Education. I will write up the results of this research in the form of a research report, and I will present share them in the form of a public presentation at SFU during the summer of 2023.

The purpose of this research is to learn more about teachers' perceptions of SEL evidence-based implementation in classrooms. If you choose to participate, I will arrange a 45-60 minute interview to explore your perspective on the implementation of SEL evidence-based programming. We will abide by the latest provincial health guidelines in relation to the COVID19 pandemic, and depending on your preference, we can meet in person at a mutually agreed upon location or by video-conference, Monday - Friday, with availability starting at 3:00pm onwards on the following dates [09/02/2023 - 10/03/2023].

During this interview, I will ask you to talk about your perceptions of SEL, your motivations for including SEL in your teaching practice, how you implement your program of choice, as well as identifying conditions that act as facilitators and barriers to SEL implementation efforts. You may choose not to answer any of my questions, and



you may also end the interview at any point during the scheduled time. Your decision to participate (or not) will not be shared with anyone. Participant data can be withdrawn any time during the interview and up until April 1, 2023, which is when the writing of the final research paper will take place. There are no negative consequences for withdrawing your participation, and I will erase/destroy any information already collected from you.

There are no anticipated risks to you by participating in this research. There is the potential for this research study to provide further insight into how teachers perceive SEL programming implementation in schools.

The interview will be recorded. Any information you share during your interview will remain confidential. I will ask you to choose a pseudonym for use in the research study. I will transcribe the interview using professional transcription software, Otter.ai, using that pseudonym, and the resulting transcript will not include any information that could be traced back to you. Audio-recordings, transcripts, and other information related to this research study will be uploaded and kept on a password protected personal computer, on SFU OneDrive. The list matching participant information and pseudonyms will be stored on a separate file on SFU OneDrive. Only myself and the supervisor will have access to the data.

In reporting on my findings from this project, I will continue to keep your identity and participation confidential, as all identifiers will be removed. In addition to producing the final report and presentation required of my M.Ed. program, I will be sharing my findings with my school district.

Once I complete all of my MEd degree requirements, I will destroy the audio recordings, and I will keep the anonymized transcripts for no more than seven years after the completion of the project.

I can be reached at xxxxxxx or ###-###-####. If you would like to talk to my faculty supervisor, you can reach Dr. Gillian Judson at xxxxxxx

As a token of appreciation for giving time to complete this study, interview participants will be given a \$10 Starbucks card at the end of the interview.

If you have any concerns about your rights as a research participant and/or your experiences while participating in this study, please contact the Director, SFU Office of Research Ethics at [dore@sfu.ca](mailto:dore@sfu.ca) or #####

Signing this consent form indicates that:

- You agree to participate in this research and to having the interview audio-recorded.
- You understand that you are free to stop participating in this research project at any time.
- You have not waived any rights to legal recourse in the event of research-related harm.

---

Signature of Participant

Date (MM/DD/YYYY)

---

Printed Name of Participant

# Appendix B.

## Interview Protocol

Thank you for taking the time to speak with me today. As a reminder, we are conducting a study to examine your thoughts and perceptions of Social Emotional Learning (SEL) programming implementation in schools and classrooms.

We can stop at any time and your participation is completely voluntary. If you need anything explained more clearly as we are going through the questions, please don't hesitate to ask.

Before we get started, I will review the components of this study and have you sign if you agree to participate in the interview.

[Go through the consent form. Read over the "Informed Consent" section with participant and have them sign indicating their full consent of all components of the study].

Do you have any questions before we get started?

### Interview Guide Questions

1. What are your perceptions of SEL and how it is used in schools?

For these next questions, I will be referring to evidence-based SEL programs. The Collaborative for Academic, Social and Emotional Learning (CASEL) distinguishes evidence-based programming from other interventions by explaining that "Evidence-based SEL programs are grounded in research and principles of child and adolescent development, and are scientifically evaluated and shown to produce positive student outcomes".

This includes, but is not limited to, programs such as Second Step, MindUp, Recognizing Understanding Labeling Expressing Regulating Emotions (RULER), and Open Circle.

2. What motivates you to incorporate evidence-based SEL programs into your classroom?
3. What do you consider to be evidence of a SEL program working?

4. When you are using your evidence-based SEL program of choice, how closely do you follow the lessons and activities that are provided? What about the overall sequence of lessons?
5. What conditions do you think could be potential facilitators (ie. things that help to deliver) to staff delivering effective evidence-based SEL programs?
6. What (if any) barriers have you faced in trying to implement evidence-based SEL programming?
7. Thinking back to the barriers that you mentioned, how can these barriers be addressed? What would help teachers to move implementation forward?

### **Debriefing**

I am so grateful that you shared your thoughts with us. This interview will be transcribed and you will be contacted to verify that the information collected is an accurate representation of your responses. We will analyze what you shared with us, along with other participants to look for themes and commonalities to help us better understand advanced educational needs in our field.

As a reminder, if you have any questions, concerns or you would like to receive a copy of the results of the findings, you can contact Jennifer Diack at xxxxxxxxxx.

## Appendix C.

### TCPS 2: Core 2022 Completion Certificate

