



Merrell's Strong Kids—Grades 3–5

A Social & Emotional Learning Curriculum
Second Edition

by

Dianna Carrizales-Engelmann, Ph.D.
University of Oregon
Eugene

Laura L. Feuerborn, Ph.D.
University of Washington, Tacoma

Barbara A. Gueldner, Ph.D.
Successful Kids Today
Steamboat Springs, Colorado

and

Oanh K. Tran, Ph.D.
California State University
Hayward

· P A U L · H ·
BROOKES
PUBLISHING CO.®

Baltimore • London • Sydney

Contents

About the Downloadable Material	vii
About the Authors	xi
Foreword <i>Hill M. Walker</i>	xiii
Acknowledgments	xv
Section I Introduction and Overview	
Chapter 1 About <i>Strong Kids</i>	3
Chapter 2 Preparing Your Lessons and Your Students	17
Chapter 3 Overview of the Lessons	27
Chapter 4 What's New: Updates to <i>Strong Kids</i> and <i>Strong Teens</i>	33
Section II The <i>Strong Kids</i>—Grades 3–5 Curriculum	
Lesson 1 About <i>Strong Kids</i> : Emotional Strength Training	45
Lesson 2 Understanding Your Emotions 1	61
Lesson 3 Understanding Your Emotions 2	75
Lesson 4 Understanding Other People's Emotions	89
Lesson 5 Dealing with Anger	103
Lesson 6 Clear Thinking 1	119
Lesson 7 Clear Thinking 2	135
Lesson 8 Solving People Problems	153
Lesson 9 Letting Go of Stress	169
Lesson 10 Positive Living	187
Lesson 11 Creating Strong and SMART Goals	209
Lesson 12 Finishing UP!	225
Section III Appendices	
Appendix A <i>Strong Kids</i> Knowledge Test: For Use with Students in <i>Strong Kids</i> —Grades 3–5	244
Appendix B Basic Fidelity Checklist	249

About the Authors

Dianna Carrizales-Engelmann, Ph.D., College of Education, 230Q HEDCO, 1215 University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403

Dianna Carrizales-Engelman is currently an instructor at the University of Oregon in Eugene specializing in performance assessment for teacher preparation. Over the course of her career in the field of education, Dianna has maintained a consistent focus in the development, research, and troubleshooting of educational assessments. Dianna's assessment development experience includes state assessments, nationally standardized assessments, and classroom and curriculum-based assessments. In addition to her role in the field of educational assessment, Dianna has had several years of policy-related experience related to education and assessment at the Oregon Department of Education.

Laura L. Feuerborn, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Department of Education, University of Washington, Tacoma, 1900 Commerce Street, Box 35835, Tacoma, Washington 98402

Dr. Feuerborn is Associate Professor at the University of Washington, Tacoma, and is a nationally certified school psychologist. She received her Ph.D. in school psychology with an emphasis in emotional and behavioral supports from the University of Oregon. Since joining the faculty at the University of Washington, Tacoma, in 2006, she has taught graduate-level courses for educators in both general and special education. Her areas of teaching expertise include classroom management, systems of prevention and supports, and collaborative consultation. She developed and now leads a course that focuses on social and emotional learning (SEL) for teachers. Dr. Feuerborn's research centers on the science of implementing systems change. She is an author of the Staff Perceptions of Behavior and Discipline, an assessment tool that helps leadership teams understand the needs and perceptions of school staff in the implementation of positive behavior interventions and supports (PBIS). Dr. Feuerborn has been presenting her work in regional, national, and international conferences for more than 15 years. She serves as a reviewer for scholarly journals and publishes peer-reviewed research in the fields of SEL and schoolwide PBIS.

Barbara A. Gueldner, Ph.D., Licensed Psychologist, *Successful Kids Today*, P.O. Box 772748, Steamboat Springs, Colorado 80477

Dr. Gueldner is a licensed psychologist and nationally certified school psychologist who works with children and families in Steamboat Springs, Colorado. She obtained her doctorate in school psychology from the University of Oregon and has worked in educational, medical, and community settings for 20 years. Dr. Gueldner specializes in promoting wellness and resilience through social and emotional learning (SEL) program development and implementation, parent education and support, integrating mental health care into primary care and schools, and early detection and intervention with developmental, behavioral, social, and emotional problems. She has published in the areas of SEL and general childhood mental health issues, co-authoring journal articles, book chapters, the first editions of *Strong Kids* and *Strong Teens*, and a book on implementing SEL in schools. Dr. Gueldner is involved in a variety of public outreach and educational initiatives in her community.

Oanh K. Tran, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Educational Psychology, California State University, East Bay, 25800 Carlos Bee Boulevard, Hayward, California 94542

Dr. Tran teaches in the Child Clinical/School Psychology (CCSP) Program at California State University, East Bay. The CCSP program is approved by the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP). Dr. Tran also practices as a school psychologist in the San Francisco Bay Area and consults with school districts and mental health agencies. Dr. Tran's direct experience includes working with diverse and at-risk populations in public and nonpublic schools as well as residential, foster care, outpatient, and in-home settings. Her research and professional interests include psychoeducational assessments, special education, social and emotional learning, academic and behavioral consultation, response to intervention, positive behavior supports, cognitive behavioral therapy, and parent training. She has presented locally and nationally and has published articles, chapters, and prevention curricula in the area of children's mental health. Dr. Tran continues her research and mentoring of her graduate students in social-emotional development and learning for students in Grades K–12.

About *Strong Kids*



Strong Kids[™]: *A Social and Emotional Learning Curriculum* is a social and emotional learning curriculum that consists of five brief and practical social and emotional learning (SEL) programs designed for the purpose of teaching social and emotional skills and assets that promote resilience and mitigate risk in children and adolescents. These introductory chapters provide information on the following:

- The importance of promoting children’s mental health and doing so in the context of social and emotional learning
- The design of the *Strong Kids* program
- Evidence of the program’s effectiveness
- Tips for using the curriculum effectively and with confidence
- Updates to the second edition

Strong Kids—Grades 3–5 is designed specifically for use with children in Grades 3–5 or those who are approximately ages 8–12 years. Because *Strong Kids—Grades 3–5* is designed to be both a prevention and an early intervention (EI) program, it has a wide range of applications and may be used effectively with children who are high functioning, typically developing, at risk for social and emotional problems, or struggling with social and emotional difficulties. *Strong Kids—Grades 3–5* can be implemented in a variety of settings: general and special education classrooms, group counseling settings, and youth treatment facilities that have an educational component.

For younger students in the early elementary grades, the *Strong Kids* curriculum also offers *Strong Start—Pre-K* and *Strong Start—Grades K–2*. For older students in higher grades, the curriculum also offers *Strong Kids—Grades 6–8* for use with students in middle school and *Strong Teens—Grades 9–12* for use with high school-age students.

Children in the *Strong Kids—Grades 3–5* range experience a host of changes during this time in their development. Academic task demands increase, along with expectations for increased independence and organization. Social relationships become more complex, emotional experiences may feel

confusing, and students become increasingly aware of issues of which they may have been previously unaware or only partially aware. Stressors such as family problems, parents' marital conflict, peer acceptance or rejection, and expectations at school and in their community suddenly gain weight and relevance. *Strong Kids—Grades 3–5* is designed to help increase children's awareness of their social and emotional worlds and teach skills to manage both effectively while having fun and engaging in activities that support their academic, social, and emotional learning.

PROMOTING CHILDREN'S MENTAL HEALTH

As many researchers, writers, and public officials have noted, changes in the structure of society and families have resulted in an increasing percentage of children and families who are at risk for developing a variety of behavioral, social, and mental health problems (e.g., Costello & Angold, 2000; Doll & Lyon, 1998; Farmer & Farmer, 1999; Hoagwood & Erwin, 1997; Satcher, 1999). The numbers of children and youth affected by these problems are surprisingly high. Greenberg, Domitrovich, and Bumbarger (2001) asserted that between 12% and 22% of children and adolescents younger than age 18 experience mental health problems of sufficient severity to be in need of mental health services. These percentages represent a staggering figure of up to 1 out of every 5 children and adolescents in some instances. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2013) estimated that among adolescents within a 12-month period, 8% will attempt suicide and 20% will have been bullied, and during a 30-day period, 41.4% texted or e-mailed while driving a car and 34.9% consumed alcohol. Without question, effective responses early on to these problems, including mental health prevention and EI curricula in educational settings, must occur if these challenges are to be stemmed.

Despite sincere and well-meaning attempts to offer real solutions to social, emotional, and mental health problems of students in school settings, many of the programs or interventions that have been implemented are simply ineffective. Walker stated that “educators are notorious for embracing programs that look good but do no actual good” (2001, p. 2). In these educators' defense, we should note that school personnel who work on the front lines of serving children and youth who have significant mental health issues are often overworked and not provided with sufficient resources with which to make the impact they desire. Furthermore, some developers and publishers of mental health prevention programs tend to overwhelm educators and clinicians with claims of effectiveness, even when there is little or no supporting evidence. Worse yet are reactionary school policies, such as the perennial “get tough” approaches that are not only ineffective in the long term but also contribute to the development of systems that are hostile, aversive, socially toxic, and incompatible with optimal development of academic skills and mental health (Hyman & Perone, 1998; Skiba & Peterson, 1999).

Despite these problems and challenges, there is reason for optimism regarding our ability to positively affect the social and emotional health and resilience

of children and adolescents, even those from very adverse life circumstances. One reason for this optimism is the accumulation of a large body of scientific evidence regarding what has been termed *developmental resilience* (Doll & Lyon, 1998). This notion of resilience concerns the ability of individuals to cope successfully with adversity, risk factors, and severe life stress and for young people to develop into competent and happy adults despite these problems.

Central to this notion of developmental resilience is the idea that some characteristics of resilience—the cognitive, behavioral, and affective skills that enable one to cope effectively with adversity—may be systematically taught and learned. Although some aspects of resilience or developmental hardiness may be innate or biologically based, the evidence shows that learning plays a crucial role in developing the ability to cope effectively with problems and challenges. Stated simply, the ability to be resilient and to cope effectively in the face of adverse circumstances and challenges in life is something that can be acquired in great measure through systematic and effective instruction in the critical requisite skills involved.

Although the primary mission of public education has traditionally been perceived as promoting the development of academic skills, there is growing support and advocacy for the systematic inclusion of skills that may be considered “nonacademic” but are, in fact, key to supporting students’ overall development (Pellegrino & Hilton, 2013). Critical thinking, problem solving, creativity, communication, and responsible thinking are necessary for students to succeed in the 21st century (Partnership for 21st Century Skills, 2008), and a growing body of evidence demonstrates that social and emotional skills are particularly relevant (see Durlak, Dymnicki, Taylor, Weissberg, & Schellinger, 2011, for a meta-analytic review) and believed to be a “missing piece” (Elias, 2006, p. 6). There is no question that most educators, parents, students, and the general public also support and expect a broader mission for schools (Greenberg et al., 2003). Some examples of this expanded agenda include character education, development of good work habits, promotion of good citizenship, development of social and emotional competence, and promotion of a healthy and productive lifestyle. Commenting on the need for this broader agenda, Greenberg and his colleagues stated

High-quality education should teach young people to interact in socially skilled and respectful ways; to practice positive, safe, and healthy behaviors; to contribute ethically and responsibly to their peer group, family, school, and community; and to possess basic competencies, work habits, and values as a foundation for meaningful employment and citizenship. . . . We consequently assert that school-based prevention programming—based on coordinated social, emotional, and academic learning—should be fundamental to preschool through high school education. (2003, pp. 466–467)

We emphatically agree with this statement. In addition, we propose that teaching young people positive social, emotional, and behavioral skills is not only an essential mission for educators and mental health professionals but also one of the most critical challenges facing our society in the 21st century. Students are placed under so many stressors at times during their young development that teaching resilience is critical for academic and life success.

SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL LEARNING

A framework, aptly named *social and emotional learning*, has guided efforts to effectively teach the social and emotional health and resilience of young people. Drawing from the fields of child and adolescent development, health promotion, principles of instruction, affective neuroscience, positive psychology, cognitive therapy, behavioral theory and application, and prevention science (Zins, Bloodworth, Weissberg, & Walberg, 2004), specific skills are ideally taught over the course of students' academic tenure (i.e., preschool through high school). These skills also should be taught with coordination and strategy in mind (Devaney, O'Brien, Resnik, Keister, & Weissberg, 2006; Greenberg et al., 2003). That is, how will the skills be infused throughout a busy school day? How will we know students are learning and applying the information? What kind of support is needed and is this support feasible? The goal is to provide *all* students with effective instruction and support to mitigate risk behaviors and outcomes and enhance protective factors known to affect positive overall development (Greenberg et al., 2003). Achieving this goal is possible by applying current evidence and continuing to investigate ways in which we can improve.

The efforts of the Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL) at supporting SEL in youth have been instrumental in understanding the key areas for social and emotional development and best practices in facilitating this process. CASEL has endorsed five person-centered and inter-related competency areas that are essential to cognitive, social, and emotional development: self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision making (CASEL, 2014; Zins et al., 2004). There is growing evidence that SEL programming, highlighting these competency areas, is effective (e.g., Durlak et al., 2011; Durlak & Wells, 1997; Payton et al., 2008; Sklad, Diekstra, De Ritter, Ben, & Gravesteyn, 2012). Improvements have been measured in areas such as identifying emotions, resolving conflict, self-efficacy, attitudes toward school, positive social behaviors, and academic performance. Conduct problems, as well as emotional distress, have been reduced. In addition to benefits for youth, teachers view SEL to be a priority (Bridgeland, Bruce, & Hariharan, 2013), and school staff are able to implement SEL effectively and without mental health training (Durlak et al., 2011).

Since the early 1990s, many SEL programs have been developed and used in education and mental health settings. The type of program ultimately selected will depend on a variety of factors such as the needs of the setting, financial considerations, training and resource requirements, and time constraints. *Strong Kids* was designed with these variables in mind and, we believe, offers an affordable and relatively low-resource option, using principles of effective instruction and evidence-based strategies for promoting mental health, to effectively teach SEL skills.

MODEL FOR PREVENTING BEHAVIORAL AND EMOTIONAL PROBLEMS

Education researchers have adapted a public health prevention model for use in school systems (e.g., Merrell & Buchanan, 2006; U.S. Department of Education,




Figure 1.1. The prevention triangle model, specifically adapted for how to make systems work for assessing, identifying, and serving students with behavioral, social, and emotional problems. (Key: IEP, individualized education program.)

2004; Walker et al., 1996). We believe that this three-tiered model (see Figure 1.1) has great importance for promoting SEL and for school-based promotion of children’s mental health in general. Sometimes referred to as the “triangle,” this model of prevention and intervention includes service delivery at three levels of prevention: students who currently are not experiencing learning or social/behavior difficulties (*primary prevention*); students who are considered to be at risk for the development of learning or social/behavior difficulties (*secondary prevention*); and students who currently are experiencing significant learning or social/behavior difficulties (*tertiary prevention*).

We can visualize this model and its three levels of prevention as a triangle. The entire triangle represents all students within a school setting, the majority of whom are not experiencing difficulties (i.e., the bottom portion of the triangle), some of whom are at risk of developing significant problems (i.e., the middle portion), and an even smaller percentage who are currently experiencing significant difficulties (i.e., the top portion). Typical practice is to focus on those students who are at the top of the triangle—those who are currently experiencing significant learning or social-emotional difficulties. Practitioners tend to spend the majority of their time and effort providing tertiary prevention (i.e., individualized assessment and intervention services)

to these students on a case-by-case basis. These students make up the smallest percentage of the school population, but because of the significance of their problems, they often require the majority of time and resources from school personnel (Walker et al., 1996). Figure 1.1 illustrates the prevention triangle model, specifically adapted for how to make systems work for assessing, identifying, and serving students with behavioral, social, and emotional problems.

Shifting to a systemwide prevention model requires looking at the “big picture” by considering the needs of *all* students, not just those who are referred because they are currently experiencing significant difficulties. The foundation of a prevention approach is the use of universal interventions (i.e., primary prevention) designed to enhance the delivery of effective instruction and improved school climate to promote the academic, social, and behavioral resilience of *all* students in the school. This idea requires that educators begin to move some resources and energy toward those children and adolescents who are not currently experiencing significant difficulties in order to promote skills to provide a sort of inoculation for the developmental challenges that may occur. The premise is to reduce the probability that these youth will eventually rise to the “top of the triangle” where more resources are required. More specifically, primary prevention for students who are not currently experiencing learning or social/behavior difficulties is accomplished through schoolwide and classwide efforts that involve the consistent use of research-based effective practices, ongoing monitoring of these practices and student outcomes, staff training, and professional development. The goal of primary prevention is to create school and classroom environments that promote student learning and health and decrease the number of students at risk for learning or social/behavior problems.

As important as it is to focus on primary prevention, we also know that not all students respond similarly to these efforts. Thus, it is important to monitor student progress and to assess whether students are at risk (i.e., in need of secondary prevention efforts) or are experiencing significant difficulties (i.e., in need of tertiary prevention efforts). Identifying students at risk for learning, social-emotional, and behavior difficulties is an important aspect to comprehensive prevention efforts. For students identified as at risk and in need of secondary prevention efforts, the focus is on the delivery of specialized interventions (often at a small-group level) to prevent the worsening of problems and to prevent the development of more significant concerns. The focus on early identification and EI is important.

With respect to mental health and social-emotional problems of children and adolescents, we believe that this prevention model is an ideal way to think about providing SEL programs and other services. Thinking in this way about the challenges faced in promoting social-emotional wellness and mental health among children and adolescents makes these challenges more manageable. Instead of waiting until students have developed severe problems and require extensive time and effort to simply be managed, you can continually focus a portion of your resources on prevention activities that will ultimately reduce the number of students at the “top of the triangle.”

DESIGN OF THE *STRONG KIDS* CURRICULUM: BACKGROUND

The *Strong Kids* curriculum was developed by the Oregon Resiliency Project (ORP) at the University of Oregon and under the direction of the late Kenneth W. Merrell, Ph.D. Several goals led the research and development efforts to

1. Target each of the five pathways to wellness advocated by Cowen (1994), a pioneer in the modern science of mental health and wellness promotion:
 - Forming wholesome early attachments
 - Acquiring age-appropriate competencies
 - Having exposure to settings that favor wellness outcomes
 - Having the empowering sense of being in control of one's fate
 - Coping effectively with stress
2. Make available a program that was prevention oriented, practical, cost-effective, and feasible for teachers to implement in the classroom and within the course of a typical class period
3. Design the program to be useful across grade levels, thereby providing a means to provide a more cohesive and collaborative approach to SEL programming (Zins, 2004)

As we revised this curriculum, we envisioned *Strong Kids* as a carefully designed SEL program to prevent the development of certain mental health problems and promote social and emotional wellness among young people (see Chapter 4 for more information on the revisions). *Strong Kids* is not the right SEL program for all types of problems. We especially targeted the domain of internalizing behavioral and emotional problems (e.g., depression, anxiety, social withdrawal, somatic problems), using a largely cognitive-behavioral theoretical orientation given its evidence of effectiveness with youth in these areas (Weisz, Hawley, & Doss, 2004), to promote *social and emotional resilience*. *Strong Kids* should not be considered a comprehensive program for preventing school violence or antisocial behavior, even though it may play a role in supporting these aims as part of a comprehensive program of effective behavior support.

The advantage of this programming approach is that *Strong Kids* follows the recommendations outlined by Durlak and DuPre (2008) for skill training by being sequenced, active, focused, and explicit. One disadvantage of this approach is that the program is not designed to be a complete mental health treatment package for children and youth with severe mental health problems. Although our research to date has shown that the curriculum can make a meaningful difference with these populations, it should be used as one component of a comprehensive, intensive intervention program in such cases.

IMPLEMENTATION GUIDELINES AND LESSON STRUCTURE

The *Strong Kids* and *Strong Teens* programs were designed to circumvent common barriers to implementation such as time, resources, and training while

upholding criteria for effective instructional design and delivery (Carnine, Silbert, Kame'enui, & Tarver, 2009; Coyne, Kame'enui, & Carnine, 2006). Thus, this curriculum was developed with both time feasibility and ease of implementation as high priorities. Even an exceptionally strong intervention program will fail to make an impact if its time requirements and difficulty of implementation result in few people being able to use it within the time and training constraints of a school system or other youth-serving agency. We recommend teaching the *Strong Kids—Grades 3–5* lessons once per week for 12 weeks, although there is evidence to support implementation at a more accelerated tempo such as two lessons per week for 6 weeks with similar effective outcomes (Tran, 2008). The one lesson per week format may allow students sufficient time to complete any homework that may be assigned, internalize the concepts taught, and practice the new skills they learn, both at school and outside of school.

Each lesson takes between 60 and 80 minutes to complete. All lessons can be shortened by stopping at the end of an activity and finishing up with the Closure activity, found at the end of the lesson. When continuing the lesson, teachers simply resume by starting with the Mindfulness-Based Focusing Activity found in the Introduction section, followed by the point in the lesson where the lesson was stopped during the previous instructional period and, again, ending with the Closure activity. For each lesson, we have suggested a stopping point. Please refer to the Running Short on Time? section, found at the beginning of each lesson, for these suggestions. Lessons also can be lengthened, using additional activities found at the end of each lesson, at the instructor's discretion.

Each lesson includes instructional scaffolding (e.g., optional scripting and explicit directions) to eliminate the need for intensive preparation, a review and introduction of the lesson and key concepts, a range of examples to define the concept, and opportunities to practice and integrate skills through activities such as modeling, guided practice and role play, and independent practice. Generalization and maintenance of skills are promoted by providing strategies for practice throughout the school day, in other academic areas, and across settings.

We specifically designed *Strong Kids* as a low-cost, low-technology program that can be implemented in a school or related educational setting with minimal professional training and resources. It is not necessary to be a licensed mental health professional to learn and implement this curriculum. General and special education teachers, speech-language pathologists, school counselors, social workers, psychologists, and other education or mental health professionals may serve as effective group leaders. The program may be taught in a general education classroom or in selected small-group settings. One of the advantages of the *Strong Kids* curriculum is that it is designed to support academic skills and to be integrated within an instructional program. The activities in this curriculum not only promote SEL and resilience but also support literacy, language arts, social studies, and health.

Strong Kids—Grades 3–5 is highly structured and semiscripted, designed to cover very specific objectives and goals. We developed the objectives and goals for each lesson, as well as the implementation guidelines, based on current research findings in education and psychology, aiming for a prevention and

intervention program that is built on a solid base of empirical evidence. Each lesson follows a similar format with the following sections:

Social and Emotional Competency Areas: CASEL (2014) endorsed five key areas necessary in building SEL skills (self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision making); skills categories are assigned to each lesson where content reflects these areas.

Purpose and Objectives: Describes the skills students will learn

Materials Needed: Lists the materials needed for advance preparation

Running Short on Time?: Suggests an optional stopping point to segment the lesson

Instructor Reflection: Provides an opportunity for instructors to reflect on the content of the lesson to increase knowledge and personalize the application

Review: Lists topics covered in the previous lesson

Introduction: Introduces the concepts for the lesson

Mindfulness-Based Focusing Activity: Helps students focus and prepare for the lesson

Key Terms and Definitions: Provides an introduction to any relevant vocabulary

Instructional Content and Practice Activities: Provides content and activities specialized to each lesson's theme

Putting It All Together: Reviews the key concepts practiced in the lesson

Closure: Provides a brief breathing and reflection activity

In addition, each lesson provides optional scripts to aid content delivery, sample situations and examples to better illustrate the content, and opportunities for guided and independent practice. Group leaders can follow the script and examples directly or modify the sample script to present the lesson's main ideas using language that is most appropriate for their group(s). At the end of each of the 12 lessons is a section titled *Tips for Transfer Training and Homework*. This section includes optional homework assignments and take-home handouts, tactics that are further designed to reinforce learning outside of the *Strong Kids—Grades 3–5* instructional setting. This section also prompts instructors to precorrect (i.e., anticipate students' errors and difficulties in learning the skills), remind (i.e., provide verbal or visual prompts of the steps and actions needed to use the skills), and reinforce (i.e., provide social reinforcement, such as praise, when students use the skills) the lesson objectives. These instructional principles are known to improve skills maintenance over time and generalization across settings (e.g., Langland, Lewis-Palmer, & Sugai, 1998; Sugai, Bullis, & Cumblad, 1997). Ideas for making the content especially relevant to students are included in each lesson, typically within each practice activity. Additional suggestions for activities are listed at the end of each lesson and are provided to encourage practice that is embedded throughout the course of the school day, to make the lesson content relevant to students, and to allow additional opportunities to practice and reinforce the concepts. Lesson 12 can be used as a

“booster lesson” to provide an opportunity to reteach and reemphasize critical *Strong Kids* content and skills after a period of time—usually several weeks to a few months—and following the completion of the 12 lessons.

EVIDENCE

The *Strong Kids* curriculum, from *Strong Start—Pre-K* to *Strong Teens*, has been evaluated and continues to be studied within a multitiered model (universal and tertiary prevention and intervention programming), across age and grade levels (elementary through high school–age individuals), and in a variety of settings. The strongest evidence exists for a unilateral increase in knowledge of social and emotional content across studies. Some studies have also found significant decreases in internalizing problem symptoms and increases in social and emotional skills and assets. Teachers and students have found the program worthwhile and feasible, thereby providing evidence for the social validity of the program. A reference section at the end of this chapter provides relevant sources for these studies. If you are conducting research or a program evaluation of the *Strong Kids* curriculum, we would be very interested in hearing from you.

SUMMARY

We are at a pivotal point in history whereby our youths’ social and emotional resilience is developing through direct instruction and application, with the use of materials developed from years of research and practice across multiple relevant disciplines. The *Strong Kids* curriculum offers one way of helping our youth develop into socially and emotionally healthy individuals. Together, we can prepare today and tomorrow’s global citizens for 21st century stressors and opportunities.

Strong Start, Strong Kids, and Strong Teens: Research

- Barker, E.S., Marcotte, A.M., & Whitcomb, S.A. (2015). Promoting positive teacher–child interactions through implementation of a social emotional learning curriculum with performance feedback. Manuscript in revision.
- Berry-Krazmien, C., & Torres-Fernandez, I. (2007, March 27–31). *Implementation of the Strong Kids curriculum in a residential facility*. Poster presentation at the Annual Convention of the National Association of School Psychologists, New York, NY.
- Caldarella, P., Christensen, L., Kramer, T.J., & Kronmiller, K. (2009). Promoting social and emotional learning in second grade students: A study of the *Strong Start* curriculum. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 37, 51–56. doi:10.1007/s10643-009-0321-4
- Castro-Olivo, S. (2014). Promoting social-emotional learning in adolescent Latino ELLs: A study of the culturally adapted Strong Teens program. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 29, 567–577.
- Faust, J.J. (2006). *Preventing anxiety and depression: An evaluation of social-emotional curriculum* (Unpublished educational specialist’s thesis). University of Wisconsin, Whitewater.
- Feuerborn, L.L. (2004). *Promoting emotional resiliency through classroom instruction: The effects of a classroom-based prevention program* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Oregon, Eugene.
- Guedner, B.A., & Merrell, K.W. (2011). The effectiveness of a social and emotional learning program with middle school students in the general education setting and the effect of

- consultation on student outcomes. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 21, 1–27. doi:10.1080/10474412.2010.522876
- Gunter, L., Caldarella, P., Korth, B. B., & Young, K. R. (2012). Promoting social and emotional learning in preschool students: A study of Strong Start Pre-K. *Early Childhood Education*, 40, 151–159.
- Harlacher, J.E., & Merrell, K.W. (2009). Social and emotional learning as a universal level of support: Evaluating the follow-up effect of Strong Kids on social and emotional outcomes. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, 26(3), 212–229. doi:10.1080/15377903.2010.495903
- Isava, D.M. (2006). *An investigation of the impact of a social emotional learning curriculum on problem symptoms and knowledge gains among adolescents in a residential treatment center* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Oregon, Eugene.
- Kramer, T.J., Caldarella, P., Christensen, L., & Shatzer, R.H. (2010). Social and emotional learning in the kindergarten classroom: Evaluation of the *Strong Start* curriculum. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 37, 303–309. doi:10.1007/s10643-009-0354-8
- Kramer, T.J., Caldarella, P., Young, R., Fischer, L., & Warren, J.S. (2014). Implementing Strong Kids school-wide to reduce internalizing behaviors and increase prosocial behaviors. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 37, 659–680.
- Levitt, V. (2009). *Promoting social-emotional competency through quality teaching practices: The impact of consultation on a multidimensional treatment integrity model of the Strong Kids Program* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Oregon, Eugene.
- Marchant, M., Brown, M., Caldarella, P., & Young, E. (2010). Effects of Strong Kids curriculum on students at risk for internalizing disorders: A pilot study. *Journal of Empirically Based Practices in Schools*, 11(2), 123–143.
- Merrell, K.W., Juskelis, M.P., Tran, O.K., & Buchanan, R. (2008). Social and emotional learning in the classroom: Impact of Strong Kids and Strong Teens on students' social-emotional knowledge and symptoms. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, 24, 209–224. doi:10.1080/15377900802089981
- Meyer, K.M. (2014). *Program evaluation of the Strong Start curriculum as a selected intervention for early elementary students* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Nakayama, N.J. (2008). *An investigation of the impact of the Strong Kids curriculum on social-emotional knowledge and symptoms of elementary aged students in a self-contained special education setting* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Oregon, Eugene.
- Sicotte, J.L. (2013). *Effects of Strong Start curriculum on internalizing, externalizing behaviors, and emotion knowledge among kindergarten and first grade students* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Tran, O.K. (2008). *Promoting social and emotional learning in schools: An investigation of massed versus distributed practice schedules and social validity of the Strong Kids curriculum in late elementary aged students* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Oregon, Eugene.
- Whitcomb, S.A., & Merrell, K.W. (2012). Understanding implementation and effectiveness of Strong Start K–2 on social-emotional behavior. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 40, 63–71. doi:10.1007/s10643-011-0490-9
- White, N.J., & Rayle, A.D. (2007). Strong Teens: A school-based small group experience for African American males. *The Journal for Specialists in Group Work*, 32, 178–189. doi:10.1080/01933920701227224

REFERENCES

- Bridgeland, J., Bruce, M., & Hariharan, A. (2013). *The missing piece: A national survey on how social and emotional learning can empower children and transform schools*. Washington, DC: Civic Enterprises.
- Carnine, D.W., Silbert, J., Kame'enui, E.J., & Tarver, S.G. (2009). *Direct instruction reading* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Prentice Hall.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2013). Youth risk behavior surveillance—United States, 2013. *Surveillance Summaries*, 63, 1–168. Retrieved from <http://stacks.cdc.gov/view/cdc/23483>
- Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning. (2014). *What is SEL? Skills and competencies*. Chicago, IL: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.casel.org/social-and-emotional-learning/core-competencies>

- Costello, E.J., & Angold, A. (2000). Developmental psychopathology and public health: Past, present, and future. *Development and Psychopathology, 12*, 599–618.
- Cowen, E.L. (1994). The enhancement of psychological wellness: Challenges and opportunities. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 22*, 149–179.
- Coyne, M.D., Kame'enui, E.J., & Carnine, D.W. (2006). *Effective teaching strategies that accommodate diverse learners* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Prentice Hall.
- Devaney, E., O'Brien, M.U., Resnik, H., Keister, S., & Weissberg, R.P. (2006). *Sustainable schoolwide social and emotional learning: Implementation guide and toolkit*. Chicago, IL: Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning.
- Doll, B., & Lyon, M.A. (1998). Risk and resilience: Implications for the delivery of educational and mental health services in schools. *School Psychology Review, 27*, 348–363.
- 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.
- Durlak, J.A., Dymnicki, A.B., Taylor, R.D., Weissberg, R.P., & Schellinger, K.B. (2011). The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: A meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions. *Child Development, 82*, 405–432. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01564.x
- Durlak, J.A., & Wells, A.M. (1997). Primary prevention mental health programs for children and adolescents: A meta-analytic review. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 25*, 115–152. Retrieved from http://hmpgrg.org/assets/root/PDFs/2012/07/prevention_meta_analysis_durlak_wells_1997.pdf
- Elias, M.J. (2006). The connection between academic and social-emotional learning. In M.J. Elias & H. Arnold (Eds.), *The educator's guide to emotional intelligence and academic achievement* (pp. 4–14). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Farmer, E.M.Z., & Farmer, T.W. (1999). The role of schools in outcomes for youth: Implications for children's mental health services research. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 8*, 377–396.
- Greenberg, M.T., Domitrovich, C., & Bumbarger, B. (2001, March 30). The prevention of mental health disorders in school-aged children: Current state of the field. *Prevention and Treatment, 4*(Article 1). Retrieved from http://www.researchgate.net/profile/Brian_Bumbarger/publication/216458565_The_prevention_of_mental_disorders_in_school-aged_children_Current_state_of_the_field/links/0fcfd50d20aa66cf7000000.pdf
- Greenberg, M.T., Weissberg, R.P., O'Brien, M.U., Zins, J.E., Fredericks, L., Resnick, H., et al. (2003). Enhancing school-based prevention and youth development through coordinated social, emotional, and academic learning. *American Psychologist, 58*, 466–474. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.58.6-7.466
- Hoagwood, K., & Erwin, H. (1997). Effectiveness of school-based mental health services for children: A 10-year research review. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 6*, 435–451.
- Hyman, I.A., & Perone, D.C. (1998). The other side of school violence: Educator policies and practices that may contribute to student misbehavior. *Journal of School Psychology, 36*, 7–27. Retrieved from <http://youthjusticenc.org/download/education-justice/suspension-and-expulsion/The%20Other%20Side%20of%20School%20Violence:%20Educator%20Policies%20and%20Practices%20That%20May%20Contribute%20to%20Student%20Misbehavior.pdf>
- Langland, S., Lewis-Palmer, T., & Sugai, G. (1998). Teaching respect in the classroom: An instructional approach. *Journal of Behavioral Education, 8*, 245–262.
- Merrell, K.W., & Buchanan, R.S. (2006). Intervention selection in school-based practice: Using public health models to enhance systems capacity of schools. *School Psychology Review, 35*, 167–180.
- Partnership for 21st Century Skills. (2008). *21st century skills, education, and competitiveness: A resource and policy guide*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.p21.org/storage/documents/21st_century_skills_education_and_competitiveness_guide.pdf
- Payton, J., Weissberg, R.P., Durlak, J.A., Dymnicki, A.B., Taylor, R.D., Schellinger, K.B., & Pachan, M. (2008). *The positive impact of social and emotional learning for kindergarten to eighth-grade students: Findings from three scientific reviews (Technical report)*. Chicago, IL: Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning.
- Pellegrino, J.W., & Hilton, M.L. (Eds.). (2013). *Education for life and work: Developing transferable knowledge and skills in the 21st century*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. Retrieved from <http://www.leg.state.vt.us/WorkGroups/EdOp/Education%20for%20Life%20and%20Work-%20National%20Academy%20of%20Sciences.pdf>
- Satcher, D. (1999). *Mental health: A report of the Surgeon General, 1999*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0735-7028.31.1.5>

- Skiba, R., & Peterson, R. (1999). The dark side of zero tolerance: Can punishment lead to safe schools? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 80, 372–376, 381–382. Retrieved from http://curry.virginia.edu/uploads/resourceLibrary/dark_zero_tolerance.pdf
- Sklad, M., Diekstra, R., De Ritter, M., Ben, J., & Gravesteijn, C. (2012). Effectiveness of school-based universal social, emotional, and behavioral programs: Do they enhance students' development in the area of skill, behavior, and adjustment? *Psychology in the Schools*, 49(9), 892–909. doi:10.1002/pits.21641
- Sugai, G., Bullis, M., & Cumblad, C. (1997). Provide ongoing skill development and support. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 5, 55–64.
- Tran, O.K. (2008). *Promoting social and emotional learning in schools: An investigation of massed versus distributed practice schedules and social validity of the Strong Kids curriculum in late elementary aged students* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Oregon, Eugene.
- U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports. (2004). *School-wide PBIS*. Retrieved from <http://www.pbis.org/school>
- Walker, H.M. (2001). "Preventing mental disorders in school-aged children: Current state of the field": Commentary. *Prevention and Treatment* 4(1).
- Walker, H.M., Horner, R.H., Sugai, G., Bullis, M., et al. (1996). Integrated approaches to preventing antisocial behavior patterns among school-age children and youth. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 4, 194–209. Retrieved from <http://idahotc.com/Portals/6/Docs/Tier%20Training/Preventing%20Antisocial%20Behavior%20Patterns.pdf>
- Weisz, J.R., Hawley, K.M., & Doss, A.J. (2004). Empirically tested psychotherapies for youth internalizing and externalizing problems and disorders. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics of North America*, 13(4), 729–815. Retrieved from <http://web.missouri.edu/~hawleyk/pdfs/WeiszHawleyJensenDoss2004.pdf>
- Zins, J.E., Bloodworth, M.R., Weissberg, R.P., & Walberg, H.J. (2004). The scientific base linking social and emotional learning to school success. In J. Zins, M. Wang, & H. Walberg (Eds.), *Building academic success and social-emotional learning: What does the research say?* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.