## APPENDIX A- WINGS Learning Objectives

The WINGS program specifies specific skills and behaviors as its learning objectives. These learning objectives seek to both build increased positive skills and behaviors and avoid negative, distracting and disruptive behaviors. Each week, WINGS leaders focus on one of the 30 learning objectives listed below.

## Self-awareness

A. Kids will be able to identify their feelings.

1. Kids will understand that there is a wide range of emotion within the human experience. They will develop a vocabulary that demonstrates their understanding of this range.
2. Kids will be able to identify the ways in which a wide range of emotions manifests itself within one's body.
B. Kids will increase their introspection skills, noting patterns in their emotional lives, recognize their wants in relationship to their needs, and recognize their blessings.
3. Kids will learn to observe and identify patterns in both their feelings and their responses to those feelings.
4. Kids will recognize that their wants may sometimes be complementary to their needs and at other times conflict with them. They will identify their blessings.
C. Kids will demonstrate increased self-acceptance. They will learn the process of knowing oneself and monitoring internal self-talk. They will show an ability to identify and value their strengths and understand their weaknesses.
5. Kids will claim and value personal strengths, weaknesses and individuality.
6. Kids will view themselves as having emerging personalities, recognizing which traits they are proud of and which traits might not be the best.
7. Kids will recognize the need to consciously encourage themselves. Kids will monitor negative self-talk and replace critical comments with supportive ones.

## Self-Management

A. Kids know how to regulate and apply appropriate emotional responses to life situations.
8. Kids will understand the dynamic between thoughts, feelings, and actions, and that this understanding assists in managing impulses.
9. Kids will understand the factors that can cause an emotional hijacking.
B. Kids will learn techniques for handling their emotions.
10. Kids will brainstorm alternative emotional responses to negative situations and predict their consequences to choose the best response. Kids will practice evaluating the level of success in their response.
11. Kids will brainstorm alternative emotional responses to positive situations and predict their consequences to choose the best response. Kids will practice evaluating the level of success in their response.
12. Kids will learn how to focus their attention inward to limit distractions.
13. Kids will identify circumstances in which they experience worry, fear, anger, or other stressful emotions.
14. Kids will learn alternative responses to stress including: deep breathing, physical exercise, and creative expression.

## Responsible Decision Making

A. Kids will demonstrate personal decision-making skills. They will know how to identify alternative actions and their consequences.
15. Kids will learn how to make an agreement with themselves or others and understand the importance of taking responsibility for upholding agreements. Kids will learn what to do if agreements are broken.
16. Kids will understand their responsibility for positive and negative outcomes.
17. Kids will learn how to brainstorm alternative actions and predict consequences before choosing the action they will take. Kids will practice evaluating the level of success in the action chosen.
18. Kids will learn what peer pressure looks and feels like. Kids will learn how to say "no."
B. Kids will set goals and understand the need for delaying gratification and accepting personal responsibility.
19. Kids will develop goal-setting strategies. Kids will heighten motivation by recognizing that small successes build on one another. Kids will develop an ability to be patient and delay gratification.
20. Kids will recognize the importance of attitude and its influence on behavior. Kids will apply perseverance in the face of disappointment, creating resiliency. Kids will understand how competition acts as a motivating force.

## Social Awareness

A. Kids will develop empathy: the ability to understand other people's nonverbal and verbal emotional messages.
21. Kids will identify the emotions manifested in others through an awareness of facial expression, tone of voice, pitch, and gesture. Kids will learn skills to understand the emotional state of others.
B. Kids will demonstrate an understanding that differences amongst people make life rich and interesting, and that those differences are to be valued. Kids will understand the importance of nonprejudicial attitudes.
22. Kids will increase their sensitivity to individual preferences and differences of others. Kids will acknowledge and appreciate the points of view of others. Kids will learn methods to express their understanding and support.
23. Kids will learn the many ways in which people can differ and how spending time with different people can have a positive effect. They will demonstrate an understanding that all people are given gifts and have challenges in life. Prejudicial attitudes will diminish as a result of these interactions.

## Relationship Skills

A. Kids will be able to identify components of a trusting relationship, communicate honestly and work cooperatively with others.
24. Kids will identify the components of a trusting relationship. They will experience sharing confidences and maintaining confidentiality in building a safe and trusting environment. 25. Kids will work in teams to recognize the value of each individual's contribution as well as the benefits of teamwork.
B. Kids will demonstrate problem-solving and conflict resolution skills.
26. Kids will understand how conflicts escalate and learn skills to keep conflicts from escalating. They will learn and practice techniques for problem solving and conflict resolution.
27. Kids will learn ways to make amends.
28. Kids will recognize the difference between win/win and win/lose outcomes.

They will recognize that conflict and change are natural and valuable components of life and are not to be feared or avoided.
C. Kids will demonstrate communication skills through expressing their feelings and thoughts effectively, actively listening to others, offering supportive feedback, and assertively expressing their own needs.
29. Kids will recognize the underlying intent and/or motivation in a comment. They will understand the importance of positive feedback and learn how to give it appropriately. They will learn to make supportive, rather than critical, suggestions. 30. Kids will learn how to express their feelings and thoughts and will practice doing so assertively, not passively or aggressively. They will learn active and reflective listening techniques by learning how to ask clarifying questions and understand their importance.

## APPENDIX B- WINGS Program Components

The WINGS program has a weekly structure and curriculum that is described below.

## A. COMMUNITY UNITY ( 30 Minutes daily)

The WINGS program begins each day with Community Unity, which consists of four parts:

1. The Welcome, when WINGS Leaders greet incoming students;
2. Eat and Meet, providing nutritious snacks with group interaction;
3. Circle Time, when leaders connect with kids and engage them in brief activities;
4. Good News and Announcements, for sharing student information with everyone.

During Community Unity, the kids gather in the cafeteria. This is the time they all recite Our Creed. The Nests of 10-12 kids sit in circles playing a game. Their WINGS Leader, a college student, teaches the life skills curriculum through team-building and group activities.

Then the Program Director (PD) introduces the learning objective for the week through storytelling. For example, the PD tells the kids about the time when she was in a play and forgot her lines because she was looking out into the audience. She asks for other staff members and kids to come up and give examples of when they got distracted and it ended badly.

## B. DISCUSSION (40 Minutes Monday)

Children begin each week with the Creed:

## The WINGS Creed

I soar with WINGS. Let me tell you why.
I learn lots of skills that help me reach the sky.

I love and accept who I am on the inside
and know my emotions are nothing to hide
Life's full of surprises that make me feel different ways.
If I can control myself, I will have much better days.
I understand the choices I make should be what's best for me to do, and what happens is on me and not any of you.

I understand others are unique. I want to learn more about everyone I meet.
I want to step into their shoes and see what they are going through.

I am a friend. I support and trust. Working together is a must.
Kind and caring I will be. I listen to you. You listen to me.

I soar with WINGS. I just told you why. All of these things are why I fly high.

Following the Creed, the learning objective for the week is introduced. Children learn one new objective each week in a way that is developmentally appropriate. After introducing the objective, WINGS leaders check for understanding either through role-playing, sharing personal stories, or telling a fictional story and asking children to solve social problems together.

## C. CHOICE TIME (40 minutes Tues/Thurs)

As a regular part of our life skills curriculum, our kids have one Choice Time twice a week over the course of a semester. Choice Time offers a group of electives divided into appropriate developmental levels and utilizes collaborations with community partners. Once kids make their choices, they pursue their electives for one semester. Many electives will be suggested by the students which increases their involvement.

To build decision-making skills, students will think through their interests and strengths and discuss them with teachers when selecting their Choice Time Activity. Two days a week the kids participate in activities like dance, exercise and nutrition, history, music, computer capabilities, reading and writing, science, chess or visual and verbal puzzle-solving, art, sports, and photography. To strengthen and develop affinities, students are encouraged to select activities that build upon their strengths or allow them to explore their curiosities.

## D. ACADEMIC CENTER (40 minutes Mon-Thurs)

Academic Center comes at the end of the day. All students spend 40 minutes in quiet Academic Centers where staff and volunteers provide assistance and encouragement in a productive atmosphere and the adult-student ratio is 1 to 12. Keeping with the learning objective example, a WINGS Leader reinforces skills which can be applied to a classroom setting.

## E. WINGSWORKS (40 minutes Weds)

The life skills curriculum includes WINGSWorks: student-led community service around the school and community. Research demonstrates that when students contribute through activities that serve others, it improves attachment to school and increases their own pride and self-confidence.

## F. WILDWINGS (90 minutes Friday)

WildWINGS is a school-wide event to end the weekly life skills curriculum. WildWINGS includes games, discussions and role-playing that help students comprehend the relationship between thoughts, emotions, and actions. It's always something new - and the emphasis is on fun and team building.

APPENDIX C- WINGS Organizational Chart


Implementation Study Report
WINGS Program Evaluation
College of Charleston

Summer 2015

## Contents

Executive Summary and Conclusions ..... - i
Technical Report ..... 1
Method ..... 1
Emotional Climate ..... 2
Instructional Strategies ..... 10
Learning Environment Organization ..... 15
References ..... 24
Appendix ..... 26

## Executive Summary and Conclusions

The WINGS for Kids Program Evaluation addresses the quality of the implementation of the WINGS program at the Nest level between WINGSLeaders and their students, in terms of (1) emotional and relationship quality, (2) instructional quality, and (3) organizational quality. In the following technical report, we cover these sections in more detail within corresponding sections: (1) emotional climate, (2) instructional strategies, and (3) learning environment organization. Multiple raters and measures converged to create an overall picture of the quality of interactions in Nests.

The findings presented in this report provide evidence that quality varies greatly among Nests. Across multiple measures, scores ranged from the minimum to the maximum. High scores indicate that Nests are capable of being friendly, supportive, and nurturing places that are conducive to learning and growth. On the other hand, low scores reflect a presence of negativity and hostility where management is lacking and the potential for student growth and learning is weakened. The range of experiences across Nests suggests that implementation fidelity is inconsistent. Opportunities to improve consistency may include attention to initial and sustained training and mentoring. Below, we discuss findings in more detail.

Emotional and Relationship Quality. Children thrive in emotionally-supportive learning environments that encourage student participation and positive relationships; this is particularly true for children at risk for school failure (Hamre \& Pianta, 2005; Ladd, Birch, \& Buhs, 1999). However, at-risk children who are in less-supportive environments often have more conflicts with teachers and do not fare as well academically (Hamre \& Pianta, 2005). Observational data collected by the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) and the Out-of-School-Time (OST) measures provide information regarding the emotional and relationship quality within Nests. On the CLASS, WINGS Nests received a mid-range average ( 4.46 on a 1 to 7 scale) for the positive climate dimension, which is comparable to elementary school classrooms in other studies (4.44 (4Rs ${ }^{1}$ ); 4.91 (Responsive Classroom ${ }^{2}$ )). The frequency of codes indicate that a majority of observations ( $69.3 \%$ ) were coded in the mid-range, with $24.8 \%$ within the high-range, and a small percentage (5.8\%) in the low-range. High-range codes illustrate the presence of consistently warm, supportive relationships, positive communication, and respect; low codes indicate the absence of these positive environmental indicators.

Furthermore, the CLASS negative climate dimension measures the presence of negativity in the WINGS Nests. By looking at code frequencies, we can see that WINGS Nests were coded the vast majority of times ( $82.4 \%$ ) in the low-range, which is preferable for this dimension and indicates the absence of or very rare instances of negativity within the environment. However, it should be noted that some (16\%) observations were coded in the mid-range, indicating mild displays of irritability, occasional yelling, sarcasm, and disrespect; and two observations were coded as having instances of severe negativity (score of 6) within the high-range, indicating physical aggression among children.

[^0]The OST averages of youth relationships ( 3.27 on a scale of 1 to 7 ) and staff-youth relationships ( 3.46 on a scale of 1 to 7) fall within the mid-range; when comparing WINGS relationship averages to other afterschool programs, staff-youth relationship averages as measured by the OST were more than 1point lower ( 3.46 (WINGS); 4.5 (New Jersey After $3^{3}$ )) and the youth relationship average was more than 2-points lower (3.27 (WINGS); 5.86 (New Jersey After 3)).

Instructional Quality. Instructional quality can have a profound influence on student engagement and learning. Relatedly, students who are attending to academic tasks are less likely to be disruptive and/or off-task. Instructional quality focuses on the processes that effectively support cognitive and language development. WINGS delivers its social-emotional curriculum through instruction which is guided by thirty weekly social and emotional learning objectives and lessons. Thus, the quality of instruction is important, if not key, to effectively supporting the social and emotional development of WINGS kids.

On observational measures (OST and CLASS), Nest averages fall in the low-range for instructional quality. On the OST dimension of instructional strategies the WINGS average was 2.57 (in the low-range), while averages of two comparison studies were within the mid-range ( 3.6 (New Jersey After 3); 3.77 (The After School Corporation (TASC ${ }^{4}$ )); the same is true when comparing WINGS averages on the CLASS dimensions of concept development (1.46 (WINGS); 3.82 (Responsive Classroom); 3.84 (4Rs)) and quality of feedback ( 2.13 (WINGS); 4.77 (Responsive Classroom); 3.54 (4Rs)). Within the low range of quality, learning environments are characterized by drill-oriented activities, teacher or WINGSLeader-controlled conversations, and close-ended questions that focus on rote information and recall. This stands in comparison to what is possible with a high-level of instruction; for example, an environment that incorporates problem solving, creativity, brainstorming, teachable moments (a key provision of the WINGS curriculum), back-and-forth exchanges, and the use of advanced language and open-ended questions.

Improving the quality of instructional processes is particularly important for schools and out-of-schooltime programs, like WINGS, that serve students who are at risk for school failure. In one study, students from families with low-parental education who were placed in first-grade classrooms offering mid- tohigh instructional quality displayed academic achievement at similar levels as peers from families with higher parental education; whereas those students in low instructional quality classrooms fell further behind (Hamre \& Pianta, 2005). Moreover, we must remember that differences in just over 1 point on the CLASS 7-point scale translate into improved achievement and social skill development for students (CASTL, n.d.). In essence, this suggests that if WINGS demonstrated even small changes in effective interactions, it would have practical implications for the success of its students.

Organizational Quality. According to the WINGS training manual, "WINGS works with the toughest kids in the toughest schools," and the program goal is to transform each child through improved behavior and self-regulation. Common sense tells us that learning environments with well-behaved students function best; however, the relationship is two-fold. The development and expression of self-control and self-regulatory skills is highly dependent on the nature of the learning environment (Anderson, Evertson, \& Emmer, 1980; Emmer \& Stough, 2001; Kounin, 1970; Pintrich, 2000; Sanford \& Evertson, 1981; Soar \&

[^1]Soar, 1979). In other words, students exhibit better self-regulation in organized, structured, and engaging learning environments.

Observational data collected by the CLASS shows that WINGS Nests received a behavior management average in the mid-range ( 4.16 on a 1 to 7 scale). Classrooms in the 4Rs and Responsive Classroom studies had averages in the mid- to mid-high range (4.98 (4Rs); 5.14 (Responsive Classroom)). Beyond averages, a look at the frequency of scores reveals variability in behavior management quality: $19 \%$ of Nest observations received a code of 6 (high level), indicating clearly stated rules and expectations, consistent use of proactive techniques, individualized praise, and well-behaved students. Conversely, $28 \%$ of observations received a score of 3 (at the base of mid- level codes), indicating inconsistently enforced expectations, periodic episodes of misbehavior with time taken away from learning to manage behavior, and more reactive than proactive responses. Thus, observations during the school year reveal variability in practice among Nests. Notably, learning behavior management skills is one of the most frequently identified problems by pre-service teachers (Briton \& Holten, 1989; Greenlee \& Ogletree, 1993; Meister \& Melnick, 2003; Avalos \& Aylwin, 2007; Ozturk, 2008; Ulvik et al. 2009). Consequently, behavior management skills are difficult to teach except through experience, when teachers have the opportunity to work with a diverse classroom of students (Debreli, 2013; Johnson, 1996).

Given that classrooms run the smoothest when children have interesting things to do, the organization of the learning environment also takes into consideration student engagement and the ways in which the teacher/WINGSLeader facilitates that engagement. WINGS describes itself as "an instruction-based learning curriculum weaved into an active and engaging after-school program," thus student engagement is one of its key provisions. Instructional learning formats, a CLASS dimension, focuses on the teacher and the extent to which he/she facilitates student engagement. The WINGS average for this dimension falls in the mid-range ( 3.5 on a 1 to 7 scale), within the same range but slightly lower than the Responsive Classroom and 4Rs studies ( 4.23 and 4.21 respectively). Here we see that the difference between WINGS and these other studies is slight ( 0.73 and 0.71 ), however it is important to know that differences in just over 1 point on the CLASS 7-point scale translate into improved achievement and social skill development for students (CASTL, n.d.). A look at the frequency of scores reveals variability in quality that is not evident when considering the overall average. While most of the observations ( $63.5 \%$ ) were coded in the mid-range, $27.7 \%$ of observations were coded in the low-range, indicating that the teacher/WINGSLeader made few attempts at guiding students to learning objectives, did not provide or was inconsistent in providing interesting, creative materials and hands-on opportunities, and did little to expand students' involvement or ask questions. A small percentage of observations were coded in the high-range (8.75\%).

The OST assesses student engagement in its youth participation component. The WINGS average within this component falls at the upper end of the low-range ( 2.76 on a 1 to 7 scale). This average indicates that youth were not at all or rarely on task, actively listening, contributing to discussions, or taking leadership roles. The lack of participation captured on OST is meaningful for WINGS because the cornerstone of its social and emotional learning curriculum is Discussion, a twenty-minute lesson in which WINGSLeaders introduce and discuss with students the weekly learning objective. The WINGS average for youth participation as assessed during this specific component ( 2.40 on a 1 to 7 scale) indicates that students are not effectively or actively participating in one of the most important instructional components of the program.

Additionally, poorly managed routines contribute to less instructional time, student disengagement, and often lead to student misbehavior (Gettinger \& Seibert, 2002; Sprick, Garrison, \& Howard, 1998). Observational time sampling data that was collected on 6 Nests during WINGS program hours revealed that students spent $20-46 \%$ of their time in transition.

Stakeholder Perceptions. Observations, while perhaps the most important type of information, provide only one lens with which to view WINGS. Stakeholders, such as principals, teachers, and program staff, lend a unique and valuable perspective. Principals and program staff were interviewed and teachers were surveyed in order to capture a fuller and more nuanced description of the significance of WINGS as well as how it functions. When given a list of adjectives, teachers described WINGS as loud (59\%), but also engaging (52\%) and positive (52\%). They described WINGS staff as caring (55\%), friendly (46\%), and well-intentioned (41\%). Additionally, WINGSLeaders often described their work environment as having "a family vibe" and discussed relationships with their students as the best part of their day.

Nevertheless, the qualitative interviews captured a broad range of experiences that also reflect the variability in scores on the observational measures. Many WINGSLeaders reported behavior management as their biggest challenge, while only a few reported it as one of their strengths. Again, this finding is common among pre-service teachers. Most striking was the variability within individual WINGSLeader reports. Specifically, many WINGSLeaders affirmed that they had a positive relationship with students and were "most of the time" able to meet instructional goals, but would then go on to further explain that they felt overwhelmed when they encountered behavior management challenges and when struggling to keep kids engaged with lessons that were "too easy," "over their heads," or "boring." This is to say that implementation quality appears to be variable not only depending on the WINGSLeader, but on the day and the activity. Accordingly, in interviews, principals mentioned that program implementation was less than ideal. One principal provided, "I think that the program has good intentions, [but] it is not being implemented well."

Conclusions. Taken together, all data collection efforts uncovered areas of growth for the program that can have a great impact on program functioning and, consequently, student learning and growth. Here, we offer conclusions and suggestions to guide improvement efforts.
(1) Emotional and relationship quality is moderate. While WINGS averages are roughly similar to other elementary school classrooms and out-of-school-time programs, this should be a strength of a social-emotional intervention program targeting at-risk youth. WINGSLeaders would benefit from constant, ready support on the job; this can be accomplished by having extra support staff ready when challenges occur. Additionally, Nest sizes could be smaller to aid the bond between WINGSLeader and children, and in turn help with behavior management. Finally, staff selection should be a priority; understanding characteristics of successful WINGSLeaders is an area for further study.
(2) Instructional quality is poor. Enhancing the instruction of the WINGS curriculum will increase student learning and growth. This can be ameliorated through training and ongoing support for WINGSLeaders to focus on tailoring instruction for varying age
groups so that instruction allows for higher-order thinking and real-world application of social-emotional concepts.
(3) Organizational quality is moderate. Structured, organized, and engaging learning environments allow for student learning and growth. Ongoing training and support can be provided for WINGSLeaders to develop behavior management skills and focus on increasing student engagement during routines and instruction. Additionally, fine-tuning the program schedule to eliminate unnecessary lag-time (i.e. time spent on transitions and managerial tasks) can increase quality instructional and skill development time.

## Technical Report

## Introduction

This report synthesizes data collected from Fall 2013 to Spring 2015 for an implementation study chiefly carried out by the College of Charleston WINGS for Kids program evaluation team members in Charleston, SC. This implementation study has been carried out in conjunction with an impact study conducted on the WINGS for Kids program led by the University of Virginia and Portland State University. Therefore, this study complements efforts related to the impact study by seeking to contextualize and illustrate program-level characteristics at play within the program, as well as within the larger school context.

## Structure of Report

This report is organized into three sections: (1) emotional climate, (2) instructional strategies, and (3) learning environment organization. Hence, data from each of the methods employed (observations, interviews, surveys) is presented within these overarching sections. The first two sections include information that was briefly covered at the 2015 WEAC meeting within the fidelity two-pager. The third section (Learning Environment Organization) includes new information that was not within the scope of the two-pager.

## Method

This report draws from four data sources: (1) video-recorded observations, (2) live observations, (3) surveys, and (4) qualitative interviews.

## Observations

Observations were conducted during program hours at the four study schools (Chicora Elementary School, Memminger Elementary School, and North Charleston Elementary School, and James Simons Elementary School) during the 2013-2014 school year using three observational tools: the (1) Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS; Pianta, La Paro, \& Hamre, 2008), the (2) Out of School Time observation instrument (OST; Pechman, Mielke, Russell, White, \& Cooc, 2008) and the (3) Hunter-Bailin WINGS Checklist.

Observers video-recorded program activities at all four sites. Those recorded segments were later observed and coded using the CLASS. CLASS coding only focused on Discussion, Choice Time, and WINGS Works; Community Unity was excluded due to the inability of video cameras to accurately capture the nature of interactions within specific Nests while all staff and students were in one room. Recorded segments ( $\mathrm{n}=137$ ) were approximately 15 minutes long and were coded by evaluation team members at the College of Charleston and Portland State University; approximately $15 \%$ were double-coded with an inter-rater reliability of $88.57 \%$.

Live observations were conducted during Community Unity, Discussion, Choice Time, and WINGS Works activities by College of Charleston team members using the OST and the Hunter-Bailin Checklist. These activities were selected for observation because of their importance in delivering and facilitating the WINGS curriculum and objectives and also because of their representativeness of the week's activities. OST observations consisted of approximately 6 cycles per day, with 10 minutes of activity observed per
cycle. $20 \%$ of the observations were dual -coded with an inter-rater reliability of $92.4 \%$ at the item-level and at least $89.7 \%$ at the indicator-level. The Hunter-Bailin observations consisted of approximately 3 cycles per day, 1 cycle per activity, lasting the length of the activity. Within Community Unity, Choice Time, and Academic Center, two segments per activity were dual-coded in each observation time period (fall, spring); overall inter-rater reliability was $88.46 \%$.

Time sampling data was collected at the three study schools during the 2014-2015 school year and consisted of observations on two Nests per school ( $n=6$ Nests). Students were in the first, third, and fifth grades; one girl Nest and one boy Nest per grade. Nests were selected by random sampling. Time sampling observations spanned 2.5 hours per day (program day minus meal time); coded observational time was approximately 2 hours per day. Observers coded students' activities in 1-minute intervals across the entire observation and tracked time spent in transitions.

## Interviews

In-depth audio-recorded interviews were conducted with WINGS staff representing the four programs in Charleston. Participants included WINGS Leaders (WLs), Peace Managers (PMs), Program Assistants (PAs), and Program Directors (PDs). In total, 26 interviews were conducted with program staff ( $14 \mathrm{WLs}, 4$ PMs, 4 Pas, and 4 PDs). WLs were sampled through a combination of random and purposeful sampling to ensure a fair representation of those that work with younger grades, middle grades, and older grades, as well as a variety of levels of experience and demographics.

Interviews were also conducted with school principals in order to get an understanding of the schoolprogram partnership. At the time of these interviews (Spring 2015), one WINGS program was discontinued due to changing school demographics, leaving three study schools. Therefore, the three remaining study school principals in the Charleston area were interviewed (Chicora Elementary School, Memminger Elementary School, and North Charleston Elementary School).

## Surveys

All teachers in each of the three remaining study schools in Charleston were surveyed using paper surveys ( $\mathrm{n}=54 ; 37 \%$ overall response rate). The paper survey consisted of 13 items which gauged the teachers' opinions regarding the program.

## Emotional Climate

Positive, emotionally-supportive environments help children feel connected with their peers and teachers; these types of environments encourage student participation in the learning environment, which is necessary for achievement in the early years of schooling (Ladd, Birch, \& Buhs, 1999). Research provides that children who may be at risk for school failure benefit the most from emotionallysupportive environments (Hamre \& Pianta, 2005). Additionally, at-risk children who are in lesssupportive environments do not fare as well academically and also tend to have more conflicts with teachers (2005).

## CLASS domain: Emotional support

The CLASS domain that focuses on aspects of emotional climate is called Emotional Support. Within this domain, there are four dimensions that provide observational direction: (1) positive climate, (2) negative climate, (3) teacher sensitivity, and (4) regard for student perspectives (see appendix, table A).

Positive climate captures the relationships between teachers and students as well as among students; the authors of the observational tool define this dimension as "[a reflection of] the emotional connection between the teacher and students and among students and the warmth, respect, and enjoyment communicated by verbal and nonverbal interactions" (Pianta, La Paro, \& Hamre, 2008, p.22). Observable indicators that show positive climate include: relationships (peer-peer assistance, matched affect), positive affect (smiling, laughter), positive communication (positive expectations, verbal affection), and respect (eye contact, warm voice, respectful language) (2008).

Graph 1 shows WINGS CLASS dimension averages for the domain emotional support. The data shows the positive climate dimension average was 4.46, within the mid-range of codes. This average indicates that in observed WINGS segments, the indicators of positive climate (for instance, matched emotion, smiling, laughter, positive expectations, respectful language) were sometimes observed across all segments. This should be compared to a high-range code, which indicates these behavioral markers are consistently observed. Graph 2 shows WINGS positive climate frequencies; these frequencies show that $69.3 \%$ of observations were coded in the mid-range. The graph also shows that only $24.8 \%$ of observations were coded in the high-range for positive climate; as noted earlier, a code in the highrange indicates an emotional connection between teacher and students as well as among students is consistently observed throughout the segment.

*A low code for the negative climate dimension is preferable (indicating low instances of negative climate indicators).

Graph 2. CLASS: Frequency of codes for the positive climate dimension.


The negative climate dimension takes into consideration the harshness of the environment. This dimension is defined as, "[reflecting] the overall level of expressed negativity in the classroom; the frequency, quality, and intensity of teacher and peer negativity are key to this scale" (2008, p. 22). This dimension is unique from all of the other dimensions within CLASS in that it is preferable to have a low code, indicating the absence of a negative climate. Observable indicators of negative climate include (all take into consideration interactions between teacher-student as well as student-student): negative affect (anger, harsh voice, irritability), punitive control (yelling, threats), sarcasm/disrespect (teasing, humiliation), and severe negativity (bullying, physical punishment) (2008).

The negative climate dimension average was 1.68 , within the low-range of codes (see graph 1). As noted earlier, a code of 1 is the lowest that can be given and indicates the absence of negative indicators. The WINGS average indicates that at times, the program environment was coded as having instances of negativity. Graph 3 shows the negative climate frequencies. While $56.9 \%$ of observations were coded with a 1 (indicating the absence of negative climate), it is concerning that $43 \%$ of observations were coded higher than 1 . While codes in the low-range ( 1,2 ) indicate no instances or very rare instances of negativity, codes within the mid-range ( $3,4,5$ ) indicate occasional negativity (sarcasm, disrespect), and any code within the high-range $(6,7)$ indicates the presence of consistent negativity and instances of physical altercations.

Graph 3. CLASS: Frequency of codes for the negative climate dimension.

## Frequency of Codes: <br> Negative Climate *


*A low code for the negative climate dimension is preferable (indicating low instances of negative

The teacher sensitivity dimension incorporates the teacher's awareness of his or her students' needs. Here, the dimension is defined as, "[encompassing] the teacher's awareness of and responsivity to students' academic and emotional needs; high levels of sensitivity facilitate students' ability to actively explore and learn because the teacher consistently provides comfort, reassurance, and encouragement" (2008, p.22). Observable indicators include: awareness (of students who need extra support, assistance, or attention), responsiveness (acknowledges emotions, provides comfort and assistance), addresses problems (is effective and timely at resolving problems), and student comfort (seeks support and guidance from teacher) (2008).

The teacher sensitivity dimension average was 4.01; this average falls within the mid-range of codes (see Graph 1). This mid-range average shows that the teacher/WINGSLeader was sometimes aware of student needs and was both responsive and unresponsive to students throughout an observation. An average in the high-range would indicate teachers/WINGSLeaders who were consistently aware of students' needs, who were responsive at all times to students, and consistently effective at helping students. Graph 4 shows that $61.3 \%$ of teacher sensitivity observations were coded in the mid-range, indicating the teachers/WINGS Leaders across segments were sometimes responsive and aware of students' needs. The remaining frequencies show the variability in observational segments: $21.1 \%$ were coded in the low-range and $17.5 \%$ were coded in the high-range.

Graph 4. CLASS: Frequency of codes for the teacher sensitivity dimension.


The regard for student perspectives dimension takes into account the support and encouragement the teacher provides in understanding and valuing student perspectives. In addition, this dimension takes into consideration the extent to which students are independent in thoughts and actions. Here, the dimension is defined as: "[capturing] the degree to which the teacher's interactions with students and classroom activities place an emphasis on students' interests, motivations, and points of view and encourage student responsibility and autonomy" (2008, p. 22). Observable indicators include: flexibility and student focus (incorporates students' ideas and follows students' lead), support for autonomy and leadership (gives students choices, gives students responsibility), student expression (encourages student talk, elicits ideas and/or perspectives), and restriction of movement (allows independence of movement, is not rigid with student placement) (2008).

The regard for student perspectives dimension average for WINGS was 2.99, in the low-range of codes (see Graph 1). In the low-range, teachers/WINGSLeaders are rigid with their lesson plans, often do not incorporate students' ideas in the activities, fail to support student independence and leadership, and offer little opportunity for student talk and expression. When looking at the frequencies for the regard for student perspectives dimension (see graph 5), we can see that $52.5 \%$ of observations were coded in the mid-range, indicating that WINGSLeaders periodically supported students' autonomy and only sometimes allowed for student talk and expression. The graph additionally shows that $42.3 \%$ of observations were coded in the low-range, showing that WINGSLeaders did not support student autonomy and provided few opportunities for student talk and expression.

Graph 5. CLASS: Frequency of codes for the regard for student perspectives dimension.


When compared to other studies (see table 1), WINGS dimension averages of positive climate and negative climate are similar (see Graph 6). The WINGS teacher sensitivity average, however, is slightly lower than the other studies, but still within the same mid-range. The biggest difference in averages is seen in the regard for student perspectives dimension; here, the 4Rs average was 1.27 points higher.

Table 1. 4Rs and Responsive Classroom study background information.

| 4Rs (Jones, Brown, \& Aber, 2011) | Responsive Classroom (Rimm-Kaufman, as <br> cited in Pianta, La Paro, \& Hamre, 2011) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Grade 3 (n=82) | Grades 1-5 (n=88) |
| $45.6 \%$ Hispanic/Latino | $53.63 \%$ ethnic minorities |
| $41.1 \%$ Black/African American | $35.32 \%$ eligible for free or reduced lunch |
| 61.8\% living at or below 100\% of the poverty |  |
| line | Urban district in the Northeast |
| New York city |  |

Graph 6. Study comparison of CLASS emotional support dimension averages.


## OST: Youth and staff relationships

Two components within the OST measure also provide information on the emotional climate of the program environment: (1) youth relationship building and (2) staff relationship building. The youth relationship component focuses on the students and their relationships. Observable indicators include: [students are] friendly and relaxed with one another, respect one another, show positive affect to staff, assist one another, and are collaborative (Pechman, Meilke, Russell, White, \& Cooc, 2008). Staff relationship building focuses on staff and their relationships with the students. Here, observable markers are: [staff] use positive behavior management, encourage participation of all, show positive affect toward all, attentively listen to and/or observe youth, encourage sharing of ideas, opinions, concerns, engage personally with youth, and guide positive peer interactions (2008; see appendix, table D).

WINGS OST relationship data

Graph 7 shows WINGS youth relationship and staff relationship averages. The WINGS youth relationship component average was 3.27 ; this falls at the low end of the mid-range of codes. A code of 3 indicates that the exemplar is rarely evident and a code of 5 indicates that the exemplar is evident or implicit. The WINGS staff-youth relationship component average was 3.46. Here again, this average falls in the lower end of the mid-range.

Graph 7. WINGS OST youth and staff-youth relationship averages.


When comparing WINGS relationship averages to other afterschool programs (see table 2), both WINGS youth relationship and staff relationship averages were lower (see Graph 8). In the staff relationships component, all three studies had averages in the mid-range, but the WINGS average was slightly lower (roughly 1 point) than the comparison studies. The youth relationships component comparison shows a much greater difference; the WINGS average was at the lower end of the midrange, while the New Jersey After 3 average was well within the high-range of codes, indicating observable evidence of consistent positive youth relationships.

| Table 2. New Jersey After 3 and TASC study background information. |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| New Jersey After 3 (Walking Eagle, et al., 2009) | The After School Corporation (TASC) <br> Follow-Up Study (Birmingham, et al., 2005) |
| Grades K-8 ( $\mathrm{n}=78$ afterschool classes at 10 <br> programs) | Grades 4-8 ( $\mathrm{n}=31$ activities at 10 afterschool <br> programs) |
| 87\% African American or Hispanic <br> $57 \%$ eligible for free or reduced lunch | No demographic data available |
| New Jersey | New York City |

Graph 8. Study comparison of OST relationship averages.

*Youth relationships average included the following indicators: (1) are friendly and relaxed with one another, (2) respect one another, and (3) show positive affect with staff.
+Staff-youth relationships average included the same indicators as WINGS observations except: (1) guide positive peer interactions.

## Perspectives of program staff and school personnel

## WINGSLeaders and Peace Managers

In interviews, WLs and PMs mention the importance of relationships in the WINGS program. A majority of WLs discussed their relationships with children as the best part of their job. Here, two reiterate this:
"[The best part is] growing bonds with the kids on an individual basis. The kids are a lot of fun."
"[The best part is] the kids coming in and swarming you with love."
However, the inconsistency of emotional support within the program is highlighted as a PM provides that when WLs are "too hard on the kids," children's support to learn and grow is impaired. Here, he/she provides:
"We have WLs even here that are too hard on the kids. When that happens the kids aren't getting what they need so there is no change. They are not really learning."

## Teachers

From surveys, teachers' perceptions regarding the program atmosphere and staff were positive. When given a list of adjectives to describe the atmosphere, most teachers felt it was (1) loud (59\%), but also (2) engaging ( $52 \%$ ), and (3) positive ( $52 \%$ ). When asked about their perceptions of the program staff, most teachers felt they were (1) caring (55\%), (2) friendly (46\%), and (3) well-intentioned (41\%).

## Instructional Strategies

Instructional practices that afford students the opportunity to learn content in usable and meaningful ways has been shown to affect cognitive development (National Research Council, 1999). This is observed when teachers interact with students in a way that delivers instruction, yet places priority on students' comprehensive understanding, instead of on rote memorization of isolated facts. Interactions in the learning environment act as a mechanism to forward students' thinking; through classroom discussions, students' explanations of their thinking, and back-and-forth exchanges.

## CLASS domain: Instructional support

The CLASS domain that targets these aspects of the learning environment is termed Instructional Support. This domain is divided into three dimensions: (1) concept development, (2) quality of feedback, and (3) language modeling (see appendix, table B).

Concept development focuses on the ways the teacher allows his/her students to interact with the content of the lesson/activity in meaningful ways. The authors define this dimension as, "[measuring] the teacher's use of instructional discussions and activities to promote students' higher-order thinking skills and cognition and the teacher's focus on understanding rather than on rote instruction" (Pianta, La Paro, \& Hamre, 2008, p. 64). Within this dimension, there are four observable indicators that guide observations: analysis and reasoning (the teacher asks why and how questions, students take part in problem solving, prediction/experimentation), creating (students brainstorm, plan, and produce their own ideas and products), integration (the teacher helps connect concepts and integrates the new content with previous knowledge), and connections to the real world (new concepts are related to students' lives).

Graph 9 shows the WINGS concept development average was 1.46, in the low-range of codes. This average indicates that the teacher/WINGSLeader rarely encouraged analysis and reasoning in discussions, rarely provided opportunities for the students to create their own products or ideas, concepts were not tied to previous knowledge, and concepts were not related to students' lives. The frequencies for this dimension (see graph 10) show that $92.7 \%$ of the observations were coded in the low-range; $62 \%$ of observations were coded as 1 , the lowest possible code.

Graph 9. WINGS CLASS dimension averages for the instructional support domain.


Graph 10. CLASS: Frequency of codes for the concept development dimension.


The quality of feedback dimension targets the way the teacher facilitates learning through the feedback he/she gives. This dimensions is defined as, "[assessing] the degree to which the teacher provides feedback that expands learning and understanding and encourages continued participation" (2008, p. 72). This dimension includes the following observable indicators: scaffolding (the teacher's use of hints and assistance to develop student thought), feedback loops (follow-up questions to expand student thinking), prompting thought processes (students explain their thinking), providing information (teachers expand on student thinking with additional information), and encouragement and affirmation (the teacher encourages and supports student persistence).

The quality of feedback dimension average was 2.13 , also within the low-range of codes (see Graph 9). This indicates that the teacher/WINGSLeader rarely provided scaffolding to students, often times did not provide meaningful feedback to students (only perfunctory), rarely asked students to explain their thinking, rarely offered additional information to students to expand understanding, and rarely offered encouragement of students' efforts. Frequencies show that $65.6 \%$ of observations were coded in the low-range, with $33.5 \%$ coded in the mid-range (see graph 11). This indicates that while most of the observations showed low-levels of quality feedback, there were some instances of mid-level quality feedback present.

Graph 11. CLASS: Frequency of codes for the quality of feedback dimension.


Finally, the language modeling dimension focuses on how well the teacher and the learning environment supports students' language development. Here, the dimension is defined as, "[capturing] the quality and amount of the teacher's use of language-stimulation and language-facilitation techniques" (2008, p. 79). This dimension is assessed through the following indicators: frequent conversation (prevalence of teacher-student and student-student discussions), open-ended questions (questions illicit more than one-word responses), repetition and extensions (the teacher repeats and extends student responses), self- and parallel talk (the teacher describes his/her actions or student actions), and advanced language (a variety of words are used in the learning environment).

The language modeling average of 1.89 is also in the low-range of codes (see graph 9). In this range, there are few or no conversations in the learning environment, the majority of the teacher's/WINGSLeader's questions are close-ended, the teacher/WINGSLeader rarely incorporates techniques to develop students' language skills (repetition and extension, self- and parallel talk), and does not use advanced language with students. The frequencies provide that $76.6 \%$ of observations were coded in the low-range, with $23.3 \%$ of observations coded in the mid-range (see graph 12). These frequencies illustrate that while most of the observations had poor language stimulation, some observations had occasional instances of mid-level language modeling.

Graph 12. CLASS: Frequency of codes for the language modeling dimension.


When comparing WINGS instructional support averages with others (4Rs and Responsive Classroom; table 1), we see that while WINGS averages are in the low-range for all dimensions, both the Responsive Classroom and 4Rs studies have quality of feedback and concept development averages in the midrange; with the Responsive Classroom quality of feedback dimension average at the high-end of the mid-range (see Graph 13). It should be noted that at the time of the 4Rs and Responsive Classroom studies, the CLASS measure did not contain a language modeling dimension; hence, there was no data collected for that specific dimension.

Graph 13. Study comparison of CLASS instructional support dimension averaqes.


## OST: Staff instructional strategies

The OST component that targets similar indicators to the CLASS Instructional Support dimensions is called instructional strategies. Here, the staff are assessed on the presence and quality of how they: communicate goals, the purpose, and expectations, verbally recognize efforts and accomplishments, assist youth without taking control, ask youth to expand upon their answers and ideas, challenge youth to move beyond current levels, employ a variety of teaching strategies, and plan for/ask youth to work together (Pechman, Mielke, Russell, Whiite, \& Cooc; see appendix, table E).

Graph 14 shows the WINGS OST overall average of instructional strategies was 2.57, in the low-range of codes. As mentioned previously a code of 3 indicates the exemplar is rarely evident and a code of 1 indicates the exemplar is not evident. When looking at the OST instructional strategies average per activity (see graph 15), we see that the lowest instructional strategies codes were observed in the Discussion activity, a component when WINGS deliberately delivers its social-emotional content.

Graph 14. OST: WINGS instructional strategies average.

## WINGS OST: Instructional Strategies <br> Overall Average

Low Mid High

Graph 15. OST: WINGS instructional strategies averages by activity.


When comparing the WINGS OST instructional strategies dimension average to two other studies (TASC \& New Jersey After 3; table 2), we see that while both comparison studies had averages in the midrange of codes ( $3.6 \& 3.77$ ), the averages were within the lower-end of this mid-range (see Graph 16). As stated previously, the WINGS average indicates that the behavioral markers (indicators) of instructional strategies (i.e. staff assist youth without taking control, ask youth to expand on their ideas, verbally recognize youth efforts) were rarely evident; a mid-range average, however, indicates the exemplars are more consistently evident.

Graph 16. Comparison of OST instructional strategies dimension averages.


## Hunter-Bailin: Teachable moments

An additional mechanism that WINGS uses to deliver content, teachable moments, is assessed on the Hunter-Bailin measure. Teachable moments are thought of as an informal teaching method that provides the SEL curriculum to students throughout the day; for instance, a WL discussing delayed gratification with his/her Nest as the students complete homework before an ice cream party. Teachable moments will either include references to a specific SEL objective (for instance, "Give me your 3Es-eyes, ears, and energy") or the WINGS creed ("I listen to you, and you listen to me").

Graph 17 shows that the majority of teachable moments present within observations were of low to moderate quality. There were many instances of low quality teachable moments involving both SEL objectives ( $42.7 \%$ ) and the creed ( $43.3 \%$ ). This indicates that WLs either did not use teachable moments or used them in a counterproductive way (for example yelling "I listen to you, you listen to me" while disregarding the student's needs).

Graph 17. Hunter-Bailin: Frequency and quality of teachable moments.


## Perceptions of program staff

## WINGSLeaders and Program Directors

When interviewed, WLs felt they could accomplish the goals of the activities during the program, but they also mentioned feelings of frustration when planning and facilitating a discussion or brainstorming ideas with children. One PD speaks to this and also discussed the value in offering support to WLs when she said:
"Discussion is very hard...WINGS just gives [the WLs] text, so it's up to the WLs to make it fun and engaging. Sometimes with the Discussion, the WLs don't understand the objective. The PDs who go over it on Monday and what the Discussion will look like for the week definitely have more successful WLs, because they can deliver it more confidently."

## Learning Environment Organization

Research has provided that learning environments are most effective when they are well-managed; this includes the behavior of the students, the organization of activities and routines, and the use of interesting materials and activities coupled with teacher facilitation (Emmer \& Stough, 2001). Specifically, learning environments that incorporate positive behavior management practices and are productive are inclined to have the most engaged students (Emmer \& Stough, 2001; Evertson, Emmer, Sanford, \& Clements, 1983; Evertson \& Harris, 1999; Brophy \& Evertson, 1976; Coker, Medley, \& Soar, 1980; Good \& Grouws, 1977; Stallings, 1975; Stallings, Cory, Fairweather, \& Needels, 1978). Research also provides that in order for learning to occur, students must be interested in the activities, supporting the need for engaging activities and materials for active student participation (Yair, 2000). However, poorly managed routines, including transitions, often result in student misbehavior and ultimately take
away instructional time needed for engaged learning (Gettinger \& Seibert, 2002; Sprick, Garrison, \& Howard, 1998).

## CLASS domain: Classroom organization

The CLASS domain that focuses on these aspects is called Classroom Organization. Within this domain, there are three dimensions that provide observational direction: (1) behavior management, (2) productivity, and (3) instructional learning formats (see appendix, table C).

## CLASS: Behavior Management

Behavior management captures the teacher/WINGSLeader's ability to set behavior expectations and deal with misbehavior; the authors of the CLASS define this dimension as "[encompassing] the teacher's ability to provide clear behavioral expectations and use effective methods to prevent and redirect misbehavior" (Pianta, La Paro, \& Hamre, 2008, p.44). Observable indicators include: clear behavior expectations, proactive (low escalation and reactivity), redirection of misbehavior, and student behavior (compliance with rules and the presence of defiance) (2008).

Graph 18 shows the CLASS behavior management dimension average falls within the mid-range of codes. This mid-range average indicates that during observations, rules and expectations were unclear at times, the teacher/WINGSLeader used a mix of proactive and reactive behavior management techniques, the teacher/WINGSLeader was somewhat effective at redirecting behavior, and there were occasional episodes of misbehavior in the learning environment.


When looking at the code frequencies for the CLASS behavior management dimension (see graph 19), we see that $68.6 \%$ of codes were within the mid-range, followed by $21.8 \%$ of codes in the high-range. These frequencies indicate that high-quality behavior management did occur in the WINGS program within $21.8 \%$ of the observations; where rules and expectations were clear and consistently enforced, the teacher/WINGSLeader used proactive techniques throughout the observation, the teacher/WINGSLeader was effective at redirecting misbehavior, and there was little student
misbehavior in the learning environment. However, this high-level of quality was not observed for the majority of observations.

Graph 19. CLASS: Frequency of codes for the behavior management dimension.


## Hunter-Bailin: Behavior management techniques

The Hunter-Bailin captures the quality of behavior techniques specific to the WINGS program in regards to frequency and effectiveness of implementation. These are proactive (MESS), corrective (GET PAST), and instructional (DDADA) techniques WINGS trains and encourages WINGSLeaders to employ in order to shape the behavior of their students.

The Hunter-Bailin data reveals that the quality of both proactive and corrective techniques was wideranging (see graph 20). The majority of observations for both proactive (MESS; 59.1\%) and corrective (GET PAST; 59.8\%) techniques are scored as moderate and moderate-high. More instances of highquality implementation are observed for proactive (MESS; 24.4\%) in comparison to corrective (GET PAST; 8.5\%) techniques. In contrast, the overwhelming majority of time instructional techniques (DDADA) are scored at a low level of quality, indicating that the technique was never used or was used in a counterproductive way. The range in scores indicates that students' exposure to the program's trademark techniques varied greatly in regards to frequency and effectiveness.

Graph 20. Hunter-Bailin: Frequency and quality of behavioral techniques.


## Perceptions among staff and school partners

## WINGSLeaders

Some WLs discussed behavior management as their biggest strength. One WL provides:
"I'm good at proactive prevention of potential incidents."

However, other WLs explicitly mentioned student behavior or behavior management techniques as a challenge. One WL adds:
"Most difficult days, a lot of things are going wrong at once, I get a little bit overwhelmed. I can deal with one kid misbehaving, but when the majority are misbehaving, I usually have to call someone and just be like, 'I need a reset.' Once one is quiet, another one is talking; managing the big group is really my biggest difficulty."

Still others discussed the difficulty in staying positive and managing their own behavior when faced with negative and difficult behavior from students. Two WLs provided:
"You can be happy all day, then kids do things that are frustrating, then you become upset and want to quit sometimes."
"Lately I've noticed that I'm very quick to lose my cool."

## School Principals

Principals are uneasy that school rules and expectations for the children during the school day are not upheld afterschool. To this end, two principals described it as 'loud.' Here, they added:
"... it's just always loud. And the one thing that I said is if the kids are loud, then the WINGSLeader can't be louder, cause now you're all loud, and [it looks like] you can't manage discipline. And that's the part that I'm not in love with with WINGS, to be honest with you. I'm just not in love with it."
"The biggest concern is that when the bell rings at [ $X$ ], the kids ... are running and shouting and yelling and so one of the concerns was, we need them to have a cleaner, quieter dismissal cause that's not what the expectation is here. No one runs here, yells here."

## CLASS: Productivity

Productivity encompasses the teacher's/WINGSLeader's ability to manage the flow of the learning environment; its activities and routines. This dimension is defined as, "[considering] how well the teacher manages instructional time and routines and provides activities for students so that they have the opportunity to be involved in learning activities" (2008, p. 44). Observable indicators include: maximizing learning time (there is something for the students to do, steady pacing), routines (students have a clear understanding of what to do), transitions (are brief and efficient), and preparation (the teacher is prepared and knows the lessons) (2008).

The WINGS CLASS data in graph 18 also shows the productivity average (4.21) was in the mid-range. Mid-range codes indicate that students had an activity to take part in most of the time, there was some evidence of an understanding of classroom routines, the teacher/WINGSLeader was mostly prepared to conduct the activity/lesson, and transitions were sometimes too frequent and too inefficient. The CLASS frequencies for the productivity dimension (see graph 21) show that $58 \%$ of observations were coded in the mid-range, with $25.5 \%$ in the high-range, and $16 \%$ in the low-range. This, again, shows that there were instances of high productivity within observations of WINGS settings, but the majority of observations showed mid-level productivity.

Graph 21. CLASS: Frequency of codes for the productivity dimension.


## Time Sampling

By looking at the time sampling data (see table 3), we see that students within Nests at the three study schools spent between $20-46 \%$ of their time transitioning in and out of activities. Table 4 is an example of an observation detailing the time spent in transition for the third grade girls' Nest in WINGS. This shows the Nest was in transition a total of 67 minutes during the observation period, accounting for $46.5 \%$ of the time (out of 144 minutes).

Table 3. Percentages of time spent in transition.

| Grade | Gender | Time in <br> Transition |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | M | $19.61 \%$ |
| 1 | F | $21.57 \%$ |
| 3 | M | $30.77 \%$ |
| 3 | F | $46.53 \%$ |
| 5 | M | $35.86 \%$ |
| 5 | F | $31.16 \%$ |

Table 4. Example time sampling observation for the third grade girls' Nest.

| Amount of Time | Activity |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Countdown |
| 1 | From watching demo to starting SEL |
| 1 | From starting SEL game to snack |
| 5 | Cleaning up snack, countdown, starting creed |
| 6 | Waiting to be dismissed from community unity to academic center |
| 10 | Lining up in community unity, walking in the hall to academic center |
| 5 | Coming into academic center room, finding a seat, waiting for pencils, <br> worksheets passed out |
| 4 | Cleaning up and packing after academic center <br> choice time |
| 13 | Lining up, getting hula hoops for choice time, walking down hallway to choice <br> time |
| 9 | Getting kids to find their line-up position for rehearsing their hoop routine |
| 2 | Getting kids to listen |
| 2 | Lining up, walking down the hallway from choice time to dinner |
| 8 | Total Time in Transition |
| 67 minutes |  |

## CLASS: Instructional Learning Formats

Instructional learning formats brings into consideration the teacher's/WINGSLeader's ability to facilitate lessons and activities in a way that engages students. This dimension is defined as, "[focusing] on the ways in which the teacher maximizes students' interest, engagement, and ability to learn from lessons and activities" (2008, p. 57). Observable indicators of this dimension include: effective facilitation (the teacher is involved in the activity and uses questions to engage), variety of modalities and materials (considers the types of activities and materials used in engaging students), student interest (how
focused and active the students are), and clarity of learning objectives (considers the teacher's attempts at focusing the students towards the objective) (2008).

Graph 18 shows the instructional learning format average was 3.5. While this average is within the midrange of codes, it is on the lower-end of the mid-range. A mid-range average indicates the teacher/WINGSLeader was sometimes active in facilitating student engagement within the activity, the students were sometimes engaged with the lesson/activity, and the teacher/WINGSLeader sometimes oriented students to the learning objectives. Frequencies support the prevalence of mid-range codes across observations; $63.5 \%$ of codes are within the mid-range, while $27.7 \%$ are in the low-range (see graph 22). A code in the low-range indicates no teacher/WINGSLeader facilitation towards sparking student interest, rare instances of student engagement, and the teacher/WINGSLeader is unsuccessful or makes no attempt at orienting the students towards the lesson objective during WINGS observations.

Graph 22. CLASS: Frequency of codes for the instructional learning formats dimension.


When compared to two other studies (Responsive Classroom and 4Rs; table 1), the mid-range WINGS CLASS averages were similar to the other studies, although WINGS averages were slightly lower (see graph 23). This graph also shows that the Responsive Classroom average of behavior management was within the high-range of codes.

Graph 23. Study comparison of classroom organization dimension averages.


## OST: Youth participation

The youth participation component of the OST measure allows the observer to focus on the students and the extent of their participation in the activities. This component addresses the following observable indicators: [students are] on task, listen actively and attentively to peers and staff, contribute opinions, ideas, and/or concerns to discussions, have opportunities to make meaningful choices, and take leadership responsibility/roles (Pechman, Mielke, Russell, Whiite, \& Cooc; see appendix, table F).

Graph 24 shows the WINGS youth participation average. The WINGS overall average of 2.76 falls within the low-range of codes, indicating the observable indicators were not evident or were rarely evident.

When we look at the youth participation within each activity (see graph 25), averages show that most student participation occurred during Community Unity, with an average code of 3 (at the base of the mid-level of codes). However, for all other activities observed, youth participation was in the low-range.


When comparing the WINGS youth participation average to another study (TASC, table 2), we see that the TASC study had an average of 4.49; at the higher-end of the mid-range (see Graph 26). The TASC average, however, combines the two dimensions of youth participation and youth relationships to result in this composite score.

Graph 26. Study comparison of OST youth participation averages.

*TASC youth participation average included youth relationship component indicators as well.

## Program Staff Perception

## WINGSLeaders

During interviews, some WLs discussed the difficulty in preparing and facilitating activities to engage students. Here, two WLs illustrate this:
"I can interact with a couple of kids, but managing a group of twelve or ten is my, kind of...that's what I've had to struggle with. And I think I've gotten better, you know. But definitely it's like very teacher-oriented. Keeping kids engaged, you know."
"And especially with things that aren't fun, like WINGS Works: it's difficult, it feels like we're forcing it. None of the WINGSLeaders really like it, it's hard. Every Wednesday is the most difficult day."
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| Dimension | Observable Indicators | Behavioral Markers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Positive Climate | Relationships | Physical proximity Shared activities Peer assistance Matched affect Social conversation |
|  | Positive affect | Smiling Laughter Enthusiasm |
|  | Positive communication | Verbal affection Physical affection Positive expectations |
|  | Respect | Eye contact <br> Warm, calm voice <br> Respectful language <br> Cooperation and/or sharing |
| Negative Climate | Negative affect | Irritability <br> Anger <br> Harsh voice <br> Peer aggression <br> Disconnected or escalating negativity |
|  | Punitive control | Yelling <br> Threats <br> Physical control <br> Harsh punishment |
|  | Sarcasm/disrespect | Sarcastic voice/statement Teasing Humiliation |
|  | Severe negativity | Victimization <br> Bullying <br> Physical punishment |
| Teacher Sensitivity | Awareness | Anticipates problems and plans appropriately Notices lack of understanding and/or difficulties |
|  | Responsiveness | Acknowledges emotions Provides comfort and assistance Provides individualized support |
|  | Addresses problems | Helps in an effective and timely manner Helps resolve problems |
|  | Student comfort | Seeks support and guidance Freely participates Takes risks |
| Regard for Student Perspectives | Flexibility and student focus | Shows flexibility Incorporates students' ideas Follows students' lead |
|  | Support for autonomy and leadership | Allows choice <br> Allows students to lead lessons Gives students responsibility |
|  | Student expression | Encourages student talk Elicits ideas and/or perspectives |
|  | Restriction of movement | Allows movement Is not rigid |

Table B. CLASS instructional support domain, dimensions, indicators, and behavioral markers.

| Dimension | Observable Indicators | Behavioral Markers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Concept Development | Analysis and reasoning | Why and/or how questions Problem solving Prediction/experimentation Classification/comparison Evaluation |
|  | Creating | Brainstorming <br> Planning <br> Producing |
|  | Integration | Connects concepts Integrates with previous knowledge |
|  | Connections to the real world | Real-world applications Related to students' lives |
| Quality of Feedback | Scaffolding | Hints <br> Assistance |
|  | Feedback loops | Back and forth exchanges Persistence by teacher Follow-up questions |
|  | Prompting thought processes | Asks students to explain thinking Queries responses and actions |
|  | Providing information | Expansion Clarification Specific feedback |
|  | Encouragement and affirmation | Recognition Reinforcement Student persistence |
| Language Modeling | Frequent conversation | Back and forth exchanges Contingent responding Peer conversations |
|  | Open-ended questions | Questions require more than a one-word response Students respond |
|  | Repetition and extension | Repeats <br> Extends/elaborates |
|  | Self- and parallel talk | Maps own actions with language Maps student action with language |
|  | Advanced language | Variety of words Connected to familiar words and/or ideas |


| Dimension | Observable Indicators | Behavioral Markers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Behavior Management | Clear behavior expectations | Clear expectations Consistency Clarity of rules |
|  | Proactive | Anticipates problem behavior or escalation Low reactivity Monitors |
|  | Redirection of misbehavior | Effective reduction of misbehavior <br> Attention to the positive <br> Uses subtle cues to redirect <br> Efficient redirection |
|  | Student behavior | Frequent compliance <br> Little aggression and defiance |
| Productivity | Maximizing learning time | Provision of activities <br> Choice when finished <br> Few disruptions <br> Effective completion of managerial tasks <br> Pacing |
|  | Routines | Students know what to do Clear instructions Little wandering |
|  | Transitions | Brief <br> Explicit follow-through <br> Learning opportunities within |
|  | Preparation | Materials ready and accessible Knows lessons |
| Instructional Learning Formats | Effective facilitations | Teacher involvement <br> Effective questioning <br> Expanding children's involvement |
|  | Variety of modalities and materials | Range of auditory, visual, and movement opportunities Interesting and creative materials <br> Hands-on opportunities |
|  | Student interest | Active participation Listening Focused attention |
|  | Clarity of learning objectives | Advanced organizers <br> Summaries <br> Reorientation statements |


| Table D. OST relationship components and indicators. |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Youth Relationship <br> Building | Youth are friendly and relaxed with one another <br> Youth respect each other <br> Youth show positive affect with staff <br> Youth assist one another <br> Youth are collaborative |
| Staff Relationship <br> Building | Staff use positive behavior management <br> Staff encourage participation of all <br> Staff show positive affect toward all <br> Staff attentively listen to and/or observe youth <br> Staff encourage sharing of ideas, opinions, concerns <br> Staff engage personally with youth <br> Staff guide positive peer interactions |

Table E. OST instructional strategies component and indicators.

| Instructional Strategies | Staff communicate goals, purpose, expectations <br> Staff verbally recognize efforts and accomplishments <br> Staff assist youth without taking control <br> Staff ask youth to expand upon their answers and ideas <br> Staff challenge youth to move beyond current levels <br> Staff employ a variety of teaching strategies <br> Staff plan for/ask youth to work together |
| :--- | :--- |

Table F. OST youth participation component and indicators.

| Youth Participation | Youth are on task <br> Youth listen actively and attentively to peers and staff <br> Youth contribute opinions, ideas, and/or concerns to discussions <br> Youth have opportunities to make meaningful choices <br> Youth take leadership responsibility/roles |
| :--- | :--- |

Table E. 1 Relationships between Measures and Outcomes

| ASS | SMENT TOOLS |  | SHOR <br> FIVE | T-TERM OUTC <br> COMPETE | COMES NCIES |  | INTERMEDIAT RELATIONSHIP | OUTCOMES <br> \& BEHAVIOR | LONG <br> ACADE | ERM <br> IIC AC | UTCOMES <br> IEVEMENT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Selfawareness | Social awareness | Responsible decisionmaking | Selfmanagement | Relationship skills | Relationships | Problem Behaviors | Language/ Literacy | Math | Academic KnowledgeEF, Other |
|  | Emotion Knowledge Task (EMT) | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Assessment of Emotion Skills (ACES) | $X$ | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Delay of gratification task |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Head-Toes-Knees-Shoulders (HTKS) |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | NEPSY II theory of mind |  | $X$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | DAS working memory |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | DAS naming vocabulary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |
|  | DAS verbal comprehension |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |
|  | WJ III Letter-word ID |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |
|  | WJ III Applied problems |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |
|  | WJ III Academic knowledge |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | Student-Teacher Relationship Scale |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| - | Social Skills Improvement System | X | X | X | X | X |  | X |  |  |  |
| 号 | Devereaux Student Strengths Assess | X | X | X | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Child Behavior Rating Scale |  |  | X | X |  |  | X |  |  |  |
|  | Child Behavior Rating Scale |  |  | X | X |  |  | X |  |  |  |
|  | Child-Parent Relationship Scale |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| $\underset{\sim}{\text { ¢ }}$ | Social Skills Improvement System | X | X | X | X | X |  | X |  |  |  |
| 㐫 | Devereaux Student Strengths Assess | X | X | X | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |

Appendix E.2- Description of Measures and Psychometrics

| Short-term Outcomes: SEL Competencies |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Measure Name and Author | Measure Description and Age Range | Sub-Scales | Psychometric Properties | Data Collection Method and Timeline |
| Wally Child Social ProblemSolving Detective Game (WALLY, Webster-Stratton \& Hammond, 1997); developed from Spivak and Shure's (1985) Preschool ProblemSolving Test and Rubin \& Krasnor's Social Problems Solving Test (1986) | The WALLY game evaluates dimensions of Social Problem Solving. Children are shown 12 brightly colored pictures of hypothetical problem situations (e.g., about teasing, conflict) and asked to be "a problem-solving detective" to solve them. Appropriate through the early years of school | Two summary scores: 1) Number of positive strategies proposed and 2) ratio of different positive strategies to total negative strategies. | Acceptable internal consistency (.50-.64). Interrater reliabilities ICC above .95. Construct validity with the Rubin positive/negative strategies ( $r=.60$ and .50 , respectively; WebsterStratton \& Hammond, 1997). | Direct assessment at baseline and post-test each year of participation during the summer months. |
| Emotion Matching Task <br> (EMT; Morgan, Izard, \& King, 2009) | The Emotion Matching Task <br> (EMT: Izard et al., 2003) <br> was designed for preschool <br> age children, including <br> those who are <br> economically <br> disadvantaged. The EMT <br> features brightly colored <br> photographs of ethnically <br> diverse children making <br> facial expressions of <br> happiness, sadness, anger, <br> fear/surprise, and "neutral" <br> (no visible facial muscle <br> movement that signals | The EMT consists of four parts which measure the components of receptive emotion knowledge, expressive emotion knowledge, emotion situation knowledge, and emotion expression matching. | Regression analyses revealed moderate to strong predictive validity for EMT. Compared to KEI and AKT, the EMT was a more robust predictor of teacher rated emotion regulation and parent reported effortful control. Compared to KEI and AKT, the EMT correlated similarly with verbal ability and age (Morgan, Izard, \& King, 2009) | Direct assessment at baseline and post-test each year of participation during the summer months. |


|  | emotion). |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assessment of Children's Knowledge Task (ACES) | Assesses children's emotion attribution accuracy and emotion biases. <br> Age range: elementary school years | Three sections that cover social behaviors (presented with 15 brief social situations, children are asked to label appropriate emotions), social situations (three vignettes), and facial expressions (labeling emotions from 26 photographs). | Reliability: Internal consistency is adequate across studies <br> (e.g., Mavroveli et al., <br> 2009; Schultz et al., 2004). <br> This scale had moderate internal reliability ( $a=.71$ ). <br> These items cohered moderately well (Cronbach's alpha = .68). Validity: Mavroeli et al.(2009) found that the ACES correlated well with trait emotional intelligence. | Direct assessment at baseline and post-test each year of participation during the summer months. |
| Head-Toes-Knees-Shoulders (HTKS, Ponitz, McClelland, et al., 2008) | Children must pay attention, remember the instructions, and demonstrate selfmanagement in a behavioral motor response by touching their head when asked to "touch your toes" and by touching their toes when asked to "touch your head." The task increases in complexity and is appropriate for pre-K through early elementary years. | The HTKS task has been conceptualized by Ponitz, et al., (2008) as a measure of inhibitory control (a child must inhibit the dominant response of imitating the examiner), working memory (a child must remember the rules of the task) and attention focusing (must focus attention to the directions being presented by the examiner). | Scores on the HTKS and its two-rule predecessor, the Head-to-Toes Task (HTT) have shown strong reliability and construct and predictive validity in several studies with diverse samples (McClelland, Cameron et al., 2007; Ponitz, McClelland, et al., 2008; Matthews et al., in press; Ponitz et al., in press). | Direct assessment at baseline and post-test each year of participation during the summer months. |
| Theory of Mind sub-test of the Developmental NEuroPSYchological Assessment (NEPSY-II; Korkman, Kirk \& Kemp, 2007a, 2007b) | Two tasks designed to assess ability to understand mental functions and another's point of view. 1) Verbal task assessement <br> Understanding of another's | Theory of Mind construct, or the ability to recognize emotions, to guess what another person is thinking and feeling, empathy. | Up-to-date psychometric norms are based on the standardization of over 1,000 U.S. children which enables the comparison of a child's performance to others in the | Direct assessment at baseline and post-test each year of participation during the summer months. |


|  | thoughts, ideas, feelings. 2) Contextual task assesses ability to relate emotion to social context Appropriate for ages 3-16. |  | appropriate age group. Validity Studies were carried out with NEPSY, WISC-IV, DAS—IIII, WNV, WIAT—IIII, CMS, DKEFS, BBCS:3R, DSMD, ABAS—II, Brown ADD Scales and CCC-2. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sticker and candy delay of gratification task (Brock 2008, unpublished dissertation thesis; Hongwanishkul et al, 2005). | Each child asked to choose either a single desirable item (sticker, candy) immediately or a greater number ( 2,4 , or 6 ) of the same item after a delay. | Dichotomous outcomes of single item now versus greater number later; 6 summary scores calculated. | Inter-rater reliability is high (1.00, Brock, 2008). <br> Performance on a task involving prolonged delay has been found to be predictive of academic performance into high school (Mischel, Shoda, and Rodriguez, M.L, 1989). | Direct assessment at baseline and post-test each year of participation during the summer months. |
| Devereux Student Strengths Assessment (DESSA; Lebuffe, Shapiro, \& Naglieri, 2008). | 72 items rated on a 5-point scale varying from "never" to "very frequently." <br> Appropriate for K-8th grade. | Five constructs include: SelfAwareness, Self-Management, Social Awareness, Relationship Skills, Responsible decisionmaking | Reliability: Alpha coefficients for scales ranged from .82 to . 98. <br> Test-retest reliability .79-. 94 for parent and teacher rating. <br> Validity: Mean scores between regular education and students classified as seriously emotionally disturbed were different. Scores on the DESSA correlated with scores on the Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale (BERS) and the Behavioral Assessment System for Children (BASC-2). (Nickerson \& Fishman, 2009). | Teacher-report questionnaire completed each fall and spring. <br> Parent-report through interview each summer. |
| Intermediate Outcomes: Relationships and Behaviors |  |  |  |  |
| Measure Name and Author | Measure Description and | Sub-Scales | Psychometric Properties | Data Collection Method |


|  | Age Range |  |  | and Timeline |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Individualized Classroom <br> Assessment Scoring System - <br> Child Version (inCLASS; <br> Downer, Booren, et al., 2009) | The inCLASS is an observational measure of the quality of children's interactions in the classroom. | Includes 10 dimensions rated on a 7-point scale based on the child's display of specific behavioral markers, e.g., Interactions with Teachers (positive engagement with teachers, teacher communication, teacher conflict) and Interactions with Peers (peer sociability, peer communication, peer assertiveness, peer conflict). | ICCs from double-coded observations above . 84. inCLASS scores are associated with relevant teacher ratings, ranging .20-. 50 <br> Shows predictive validity with direct assessments of selfregulation (Downer, Booren, Luckner, \& Pianta, 2009) and expressive language and letter knowledge (Vitiello, Downer, Williford, \& Booren, 2010). | Classroom observation by a certified assessor in the spring of each year. |
| The Student-Teacher Relationship Scale (STRS; Pianta, 2001) | Teachers assess the quality of their relationship with an individual child in their classroom using a 15 -item, 5-point scale (Pianta, 2001). | Scales include Teacher-Child Conflict and Closeness. | Internal consistencies range .86-. 89 (Pianta, 1992); predictive relations with children's classroom behavior, school retention, and academic outcomes (Hamre \& Pianta, 2001; Pianta, Steinberg, \& Rollins, 1995). | Teacher-report questionnaire completed each fall and spring. |
| The teacher version of the Social Skills Improvement System (SSIS; Gresham \& Elliott, 2008). | The SSIS is a widely used teacher-reported measure of an individual child's relationships and social behaviors. The SSIS uses norms generated from a sample of more than 4,500 children from across the United States. | The child's Cooperation, Responsibility, Empathy, Engagement, and Self-Control. Problem behaviors assessed include Externalizing, Bullying, Hyperactive /Inattention, and Internalizing. | High levels of internal consistency reliability (alphas range from .75-.97) and interrater reliability (alphas range from .74-.86). <br> Correlated above .50 with other established measures of social skills, such as the previous version of this measure (SSRS; and the BASC-2. | Teacher-report questionnaire completed each fall and spring. |
| The Child-Parent <br> Relationship Scale (CPRS; | Parents assess the quality of relationship with WINGS | Conflict, Positive Aspects of the | Reliability of the CPRS was demonstrated on a sample | Parent-report through |


| Pianta, 1992). | study child with a 30-item Likert-type scale (1-5). | relationship, and Dependence | ( $n=714$ ) of children aged 4.5 to 5.5 years of age (alphas range from . 50 for the dependence scale to .83 for the conflicts scale; Pianta, 1992). | interview each summer. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The parent version of the Social Skills Improvement System (SSIS; Gresham \& Elliott, 2008). | The SSIS is a widely-used parent-reported measure of an individual child's relationships and social behaviors. | Subscales include Cooperation, Responsibility, Empathy, Engagement, and Self-Control. Problem behaviors assessed include Externalizing, Bullying, Hyperactive/Inattention, and Internalizing. | Internal consistency reliability above .80; interrater reliability above .70. Correlated above . 47 with other established measures of social skills, such as the previous version of this measure (SSRS; and the BASC-2. | Parent-report through interview each summer. |
| Long-Term School Outcomes: Academic Achievement and Social Adjustment |  |  |  |  |
| Measure Name and Author | Measure Description and Age Range | Sub-Scales | Psychometric Properties | Data Collection Method and Timeline |
| Administrative records from the child's school. | Records documenting the child's school experiences and documented problems. | Discipline Problems; Attendance; Special Education Referral; and Repeated a Grade. |  | Coordination with school district the year following participation. |
| Differential Ability Scales II (Elliott, 2007) | The WJ-III is a widely used, individually administered assessment battery that measures general cognitive abilities and achievement. Appropriate for ages $21 / 2$ through 17 years. | Working Memory: Recall of Sequential Order subtest Receptive Vocabulary: Verbal Comprehension subtest <br> Expressive Vocabulary: Naming Vocabulary subtest | Demonstrates convergent validity with <br> WISC-IV; WPPSI- III; WIAT-II: Kaufman Test of Educational Achievement II; Woodcock Johnson- III | Direct assessment at baseline and post-test each year of participation during the summer months. |
| The Woodcock-Johnson-III Tests of Achievement (WJ-III; Woodcock; McGrew, \& Mather, 2001). | The WJ-III is a widely used, individual assessment battery that measures general cognitive abilities and achievement from age two through adulthood, providing standardized performance relative to the | Reading skills: Letter-Word Identification (name letters and read real words). Mathematics skills: Applied Problems (simple calculations and word problems). <br> Broad Academic Performance: | Subtests demonstrate high internal reliability and acceptable validity. | Direct assessment at baseline and post-test each year of participation during the summer months. |

## Appendix F- Teacher and Parent Survey Instruments

This Appendix contains three sections: teacher, parent and family instruments. The teacher measures are administered at various times; please see the following table which contains descriptions of each, their subscales, psychometric properties, collection method and timeline. The Parent Quantitative and Qualitative Interview gather information at the beginning of each school year.

- Teacher Measures
- Devereux Student Strengths Assessment (DESSA; Lebuffe, Shapiro, \& Naglieri, 2008)
- Student-Teacher Relationship Scale (STRS; Pianta, 2001)
- Social Skills Improvement System (SSIS; Gresham \& Elliott, 2008)
- Woodcock-Johnson-III Tests of Achievement (WJ-III; Woodcock; McGrew, \& Mather, 2001)
- Differential Ability Scales (DAS)
- DAS II- Verbal Comprehension
- DASII- Recall of Sequential Order
- DAS II- Naming Vocabulary
- Head-Toes-Knees-Shoulders Task (HTKS, Ponitz, McClelland, et al., 2008)
- Emotion Matching Task (EMT) (EMT; Morgan, Izard, \& King, 2009) and Assessment of Children's Knowledge Task (ACES; Mavroveli et al., 2009)
- Theory of Mind (NEPSY II; Korkman, Kirk \& Kemp, 2007a, 2007b)
- Delay of Gratification Task, (Mischel, Shoda, \& Rodriguez, 1989)
- Parent Quantitative Interview
- Family Qualitative Interview

Appendix F - Description of Teacher Measures and Psychometrics

| Measure Name and Author | Measure Description and Age Range | Sub-Scales | Psychometric Properties | Data Collection Method and Timeline |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Devereux Student <br> Strengths <br> Assessment <br> (DESSA; Lebuffe, <br> Shapiro, \& Naglieri, 2008). | 72 items rated on a 5-point scale varying from "never" to "very frequently." <br> Appropriate for K-8th grade. | Five constructs include: SelfAwareness, Self-Management, Social Awareness, Relationship Skills, Responsible decisionmaking | Reliability: Alpha coefficients for scales ranged from . 82 to . 98 . <br> Test-retest reliability .79-. 94 for parent and teacher rating. <br> Validity: Mean scores between regular education and students classified as seriously emotionally disturbed were different. Scores on the DESSA correlated with scores on the Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale (BERS) and the Behavioral Assessment System for Children (BASC-2). (Nickerson \& Fishman, 2009). | Teacher-report questionnaire completed each fall and spring. Parent-report through interview each summer. |
| The Student- <br> Teacher <br> Relationship Scale <br> (STRS; Pianta, <br> 2001) | Teachers assess the quality of their relationship with an individual child in their classroom using a 15 -item, 5 point scale (Pianta, 2001). | Scales include Teacher-Child Conflict and Closeness. | Internal consistencies range .86-. 89 (Pianta, 1992); predictive relations with children's classroom behavior, school retention, and academic outcomes (Hamre \& Pianta, 2001; Pianta, Steinberg, \& Rollins, 1995). | Teacher-report questionnaire completed each fall and spring. |
| The teacher version of the Social Skills Improvement System (SSIS; Gresham \& Elliott, 2008). | The SSIS is a widely used teacher-reported measure of an individual child's relationships and social behaviors. The SSIS uses norms generated from a sample of more than 4,500 children from across the United States. | The child's Cooperation, Responsibility, Empathy, Engagement, and Self-Control. Problem behaviors assessed include Externalizing, Bullying, Hyperactive /Inattention, and Internalizing. | High levels of internal consistency reliability (alphas range from .75-.97) and interrater reliability (alphas range from .74-.86). Correlated above .50 with other established measures of social skills, such as the previous version of this measure (SSRS; and the BASC-2. | Teacher-report questionnaire completed each fall and spring. |
| The Woodcock-Johnson-III Tests of Achievement (WJIII; Woodcock; McGrew, \& Mather, 2001). | The WJ-III is a widely used, individual assessment battery that measures general cognitive abilities and achievement from age two through adulthood, providing standardized performance relative to the same-age population. | Reading skills: Letter-Word Identification (name letters and read real words). Mathematics skills: Applied Problems (simple calculations and word problems). <br> Broad Academic Performance: (Academic Knowledge) | Subtests demonstrate high internal reliability and acceptable validity. | Direct assessment at baseline and posttest each year of participation during the summer months. |


| Measure Name and Author | Measure Description and Age Range | Sub-Scales | Psychometric Properties | Data Collection Method and Timeline |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Differential Ability Scales II (Elliott, 2007) | The WJ-III is a widely used, individually administered assessment battery that measures general cognitive abilities and achievement. Appropriate for ages $21 / 2$ through 17 years. | Working Memory: Recall of Sequential Order subtest Receptive Vocabulary: Verbal Comprehension subtest Expressive Vocabulary: Naming Vocabulary subtest | Demonstrates convergent validity with WISC-IV; WPPSI- III; WIAT-II: Kaufman Test of Educational Achievement II; Woodcock Johnson- III | Direct assessment at baseline and posttest each year of participation during the summer months. |
| Head-Toes-KneesShoulders (HTKS, Ponitz, McClelland, et al., 2008) | Children must pay attention, remember the instructions, and demonstrate selfmanagement in a behavioral motor response by touching their head when asked to "touch your toes" and by touching their toes when asked to "touch your head." The task increases in complexity and is appropriate for pre-K through early elementary years. | The HTKS task has been conceptualized by Ponitz, et al., (2008) as a measure of inhibitory control (a child must inhibit the dominant response of imitating the examiner), working memory (a child must remember the rules of the task) and attention focusing (must focus attention to the directions being presented by the examiner). | Scores on the HTKS and its two-rule predecessor, the Head-to-Toes Task (HTT) have shown strong reliability and construct and predictive validity in several studies with diverse samples (McClelland, Cameron et al., 2007; Ponitz, McClelland, et al., 2008; Matthews et al., in press; Ponitz et al., in press). | Direct assessment at baseline and posttest each year of participation during the summer months. |
| Emotion Matching <br> Task (EMT; <br>  <br> King, 2009) | The Emotion Matching Task (EMT: Izard et al., 2003) was designed for preschool age children, including those who are economically disadvantaged. The EMT features brightly colored photographs of ethnically diverse children making facial expressions of happiness, sadness, anger, fear/surprise, and "neutral" (no visible facial muscle movement that signals emotion). | The EMT consists of four parts which measure the components of receptive emotion knowledge, expressive emotion knowledge, emotion situation knowledge, and emotion expression matching. | Regression analyses revealed moderate to strong predictive validity for EMT. Compared to KEI and AKT, the EMT was a more robust predictor of teacher rated emotion regulation and parent reported effortful control. Compared to KEI and AKT, the EMT correlated similarly with verbal ability and age (Morgan, Izard, \& King, 2009) | Direct assessment at baseline and posttest each year of participation during the summer months. |


| Measure Name and Author | Measure Description and Age Range | Sub-Scales | Psychometric Properties | Data Collection Method and Timeline |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assessment of Children's Knowledge Task (ACES) | Assesses children's emotion attribution accuracy and emotion biases. <br> Age range: elementary school years | Three sections that cover social behaviors (presented with 15 brief social situations, children are asked to label appropriate emotions), social situations (three vignettes), and facial expressions (labeling emotions from 26 photographs). | Reliability: Internal consistency is adequate across studies <br> (e.g., Mavroveli et al., 2009; Schultz et al., 2004). This scale had moderate internal reliability ( $a=.71$ ). These items cohered moderately well (Cronbach's alpha = .68). Validity: Mavroeli et al.(2009) found that the ACES correlated well with trait emotional intelligence. | Direct assessment at baseline and posttest each year of participation during the summer months. |
| Theory of Mind sub-test of the Developmental NEuroPSYchological Assessment (NEPSY-II; Korkman, Kirk \& Kemp, 2007a, 2007b) | Two tasks designed to assess ability to understand mental functions and another's point of view. 1) Verbal task assessment Understanding of another's thoughts, ideas, feelings. 2) Contextual task assesses ability to relate emotion to social context. Appropriate for ages 3-16. | Theory of Mind construct, or the ability to recognize emotions, to guess what another person is thinking and feeling, empathy. | Up-to-date psychometric norms are based on the standardization of over 1,000 U.S. children which enables the comparison of a child's performance to others in the appropriate age group. Validity Studies were carried out with NEPSY, WISC-IV, DAS—IIII, WNV, WIAT-IIII, CMS, DKEFS, BBCS:3R, DSMD, ABAS-II, Brown ADD Scales and CCC-2. | Direct assessment at baseline and posttest each year of participation during the summer months. |
| Sticker and candy delay of gratification task (Brock 2008, unpublished dissertation thesis; Hongwanishkul et al, 2005). | Each child asked to choose either a single desirable item (sticker, candy) immediately or a greater number ( 2,4 , or 6) of the same item after a delay. | Dichotomous outcomes of single item now versus greater number later; 6 summary scores calculated. | Inter-rater reliability is high (1.00, Brock, 2008). Performance on a task involving prolonged delay has been found to be predictive of academic performance into high school (Mischel, Shoda, and Rodriguez, M.L, 1989). | Direct assessment at baseline and posttest each year of participation during the summer months. |
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## Student-Teacher Relationships

Please reflect on the degree to which each of the following statements currently applies to your relationship with this student. Circle the appropriate number for each item.

|  |  |  |  |  | 䖴 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a. I share an affectionate, warm relationship with this child. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| b. This child and I always seem to be struggling with each other. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| c. If upset, this child will seek comfort from me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| d. This child is uncomfortable with physical affection or touch from me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| e. This child values his/her relationship with me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| f. When I praise this child, he/she beams with pride. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| g. This child spontaneously shares information about himself/herself. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| h. This child easily becomes angry at me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| i. It is easy to be in tune with what this student is feeling. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| j. This child remains angry or is resistant after being disciplined. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| k. Dealing with this child drains my energy. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| l. When this child arrives in a bad mood, I know we're in for a long and difficult day. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| m. This child's feelings toward me can be unpredictable or can change suddenly. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| n. This child is sneaky or manipulative with me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| o. This child openly shares his/her feelings and experience with me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

$\qquad$

## Social Skills Rating Scale

We are interested in learning about children's social competence and problem behaviors in classroom settings. Please read the following statements with the above child in mind. Decide how frequently the statement applies to him or her (1=never, $2=$ seldom, $3=0$ ften, $4=$ almost always). Circle just ONE number for each statement. Be sure to respond to each question.

Never Seldom Often | Almost |
| :---: |
| always |

SOCIAL COMPETENCE

| 1. Observes rules and follows directions without requiring repeated reminders. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. Interacts well with other children. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3. J oins activities that have already started. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4. Uses appropriate language when upset. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 5. Responds appropriately when pushed or hit. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 6. Participates in games or group activities. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 7. Returns to unfinished tasks after interruption. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 8. Responds to instructions and then begins an appropriate task without being reminded. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 9. Takes time to do his/ her best on a task. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 10. Invites others to join in activities. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 11. Starts conversations with peers. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 12. Makes a compromise during a conflict. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 13. Attempts new challenging tasks. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 14. Stays calm when disagreeing with others. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 15. Makes friends easily. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 16. Completes learning tasks involving two or more steps (e.g. cutting and pasting) in organized way. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 17. Completes tasks successfully. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 18. Introduces herself/ himself to others. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 19. Concentrates when working on a task; is not easily distracted by surrounding activities. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 20. Stays calm when teased. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 21. Takes criticism without getting upset. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 22. Finds and organizes materials and works in an appropriate place when activities are initiated. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 23. Sees own errors in a task and corrects them. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 24. Resolves disagreements with you calmly. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

(Continue on Back)

$\qquad$ (for office use only)

Child ID $\qquad$

## Almost always

PROBLEM BEHAVIORS

| 25. Acts without thinking. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 26. Bullies others. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 27. Has difficulty waiting for turn. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 28. Does things to make others feel scared. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 29. Fidgets or moves around too much. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 30. Forces others to act against their will. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 31. Withdraws from others. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 32. Has temper tantrums. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 33. Keeps others out of social circles. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 34. Breaks into or stops group activities. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 35. Is aggressive toward people or objects. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 36. Gets embarrassed easily. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 37. Cheats in games or activities. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 38. Acts lonely. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 39. Is inattentive. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 40. Fights with others. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 41. Says bad things about self. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 42. Disobeys rules or requests. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 43. Has low energy or is lethargic. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 44. Gets distracted easily. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 45. Talks back to adults. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 46. Acts sad or depressed. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 47. Lies or does not tell the truth. | 2 | 3 | 4 |  |
| 48. Acts anxious with others. | 1 | 3 | 4 |  |

Thank you for providing this important information!
$\qquad$ (for office use only)

## Chapter 2

# Descriptions of the WJ III ACH Tests and Clusters 

The WJ III ACH contains 22 tests measuring five curricular areas-reading, mathematics, written language, oral language, and academic knowledge--and two auxiliary writing evaluation procedures. Specific combinations, or groupings, of these 22 tests form clusters for interpretive purposes. (For administration and scoring procedures, see Chapters 3 and 4.) Each form (A and B) of the Standard Battery contains 12 tests and each form (A and B) of the Extended Battery contains 10 additional tests.

The tests in the Standard Battery combine to form 10 cluster scores, including a Total Achievement score. When used in conjunction with the tests in the Extended Battery, 9 additional clusters are derived. Although tests are the basic administration components of the WुJ III ACH, clusters of tests provide the primary basis for test interpretation. Cluster interpretation minimizes the danger of generalizing from the score for a single, narrow ability to a broad, multifaceted ability. Cluster interpretation results in higher validity because more than one component of a broad ability comprises the score that serves as the basis for interpretation. The subject's performance on individual tests is primarily used to understand the broader cluster score and broad area of competence.

## WJ III ACH Tesis

The selective testing table, presented in Table 2-1, illustrates the scope of interpretive information available from the WJ III ACH and shows the combinations of tests that form the various cluster scores.

## Test 1:Letter-Word Identification

Letter-Word Identification measures the subject's word identification skills. The initial items require the individual to identify letters that appear in large type on the subject's side of the Test Book and the remaining items require the person to pronounce words correctly. The individual is not required to know the meaning of any word. The items become increasingly difficult as the selected words appear less and less frequently in written English. Letter-Word Identification has a median reliability of .91 in the age 5 to 19 range and .94 in the adult range.

## Test 2: Reading Fluency

Reading Fluency measures the person's ability to quickly read simple sentences in the Subject Response Booklet, decide if the statement is true, and then circle Yes or No. The difficulty level of the sentences gradually increases to a moderate level. The individual attempts to complete as many items as possible within a 3 -minute time limit. Reading Fluency has a median reliability of .90 in the age 5 to 19 range and .90 in the adult range.

Table 2-1.
WJ III ACH Selective
Testing Table


## Test 3: Story Recall

Story Recall measures aspects of oral language including language development and meaningful memory. The task requires the subject to recall increasingly complex stories that are presented using an audio recording. After listening to a passage, the individual is asked to recall as many details of the story as he or she can remember. Story Recall has a median reliability of .87 in the age 5 to 19 range and .89 in the adult range.

## Test 4: Understanding Directions

Understanding Directions is an oral language measure. The task requires the person to listen to a sequence of audio-recorded instructions and then follow the directions by pointing to various objects in a colored picture. The items gradually increase in linguistic complexity as the number of tasks to perform increases. Understanding Directions has a median reliability of .77 in the age 5 to 19 range and .90 in the adult range.

## Test 5: Calculation

Calculation is a test of math achievement measuring the ability to perform mathematical computations. The initial items in Calculation require the individual to write single numbers. The remaining items require the person to perform addition, subtraction, multiplication, division, and combinations of these basic operations, as well as some geometric, trigonometric, logarithmic, and calculus operations. The calculations involve negative numbers, percents, decimals, fractions, and whole numbers. Because the calculations are presented in a traditional problem format in the Subject Response Booklet, the person is not required to make any decisions about what operations to use or what data to include. Calculation has a median reliability of .85 in the age 5 to 19 range and .89 in the adult range.

## Test 6: Math Fluency

Math Fluency measures the ability to solve simple addition, subtraction, and multiplication facts quickly. The person is presented a series of simple arithmetic problems in the Subject Response Booklet. This test has a 3-minute time limit. Math Fluency has a median reliability of .89 in the age 7 to 19 range and .92 in the adult range.

## Test 7: Spelling

Spelling measures the ability to write orally presented words correctly. The initial items measure prewriting skills such as drawing lines and tracing letters. The next set of items requires the person to produce uppercase and lowercase letters. The remaining items measure the person's ability to spell words correctly. The items become increasingly difficult as the words become more difficult. This test has a median reliability of .89 in the age 5 to 19 range and .95 in the adult range.

## Test 8: Writing Fluency

Writing Fluency measures skill in formulating and writing simple sentences quickly. Each sentence must relate to a given stimulus picture in the Subject Response Booklet and include a given set of three words. This test has a 7 -minute time limit. It has a median reliability of .86 in the age 7 to 19 range and .92 in the adult range.

## Test 9: Passage Comprehension

The initial Passage Comprehension items involve symbolic learning, or the ability to match a rebus (pictographic representation of a word) with an actual picture of the object. The next items are presented in a multiple-choice format and require the person to point to the picture represented by a phrase. The remaining items require the person to read a short passage and identify a missing key word that makes sense in the context of that passage. The items become increasingly difficult by removing pictorial stimuli and by increasing passage length, level of vocabulary, and complexity of syntactic and semantic cues. Passage Comprehension has a median reliability of .83 in the age 5 to 19 range and .88 in the adult range.

## Test 10: Applied Problems

Applied Problems requires the person to analyze and solve math problems. To solve the problems, the person must listen to the problem, recognize the procedure to be followed, and then perform relatively simple calculations. Because many of the problems include extraneous information, the individual must decide not only the appropriate mathematical operations to use but also which numbers to include in the calculation. Item difficulty
increases with complex calculations. This test has a median reliability of .92 in the age 5 to 19 range and .95 in the adult range.

## Test 11: Writing Samples

Writing Samples measures skill in writing responses to a variety of demands. The person must produce written sentences that are evaluated with respect to the quality of expression. Item difficulty increases by increasing passage length, level of vocabulary, grammatical complexities, and level of concept abstraction. The individual is not penalized for errors in basic writing skills, such as spelling or punctuation. Writing Samples has a median reliability of .84 in the age 5 to 19 range and .91 in the adult range.

## Handwriting

Two procedures are available to evaluate handwriting: (a) the Handwriting Legibility Scale, a standardized evaluation of the general appearance of the handwriting; and (b) an informal evaluation of six handwriting elements. The WJ III ACH Handwriting Legibility Scale (Appendix C) provides a norm-based evaluation of handwriting produced on the Writing Samples test or on samples collected from other sources.

## Writing Evaluation Scale

The Writing Evaluation Scale (Mather \& Woodcock, 1997), located in Appendix D, provides a more comprehensive profile of an individual's writing skill and is used to evaluate one or more samples of an individual's writing, such ás a story or essay written in class. This informal procedure allows the examiner to assess writing competence in more detail and to obtain a more comprehensive profile of an individual's writing skill.

## Test 12: Story Recall-Delayed

Story Recall-Delayed measures aspects of language development and meaningful memory using previously presented stories. The task requires the individual to recall, after 30 or more minutes on the same day or up to 8 days after administration, the story elements presented in Test 3: Story Recall. This test has a median reliability of 81 in the age 5 to 19 range and .81 in the adult range.

## Tesi 13: Word Atack

Word Attack measures skill in applying phonic and structural analysis skills to the pronunciation of unfamiliar printed words. The initial items require the individual to produce the sounds for single letters. The remaining items require the person to read aloud letter combinations that are phonically consistent, or regular, patterns in English orthography but are nonwords or low-frequency words. The items become more difficult as the complexity of the nonwords increases. Word Attack has a median reliability of .87 in the age 5 to 19 range and .87 in the adult range.

## Test 14: Picture Vocabulary

Picture Vocabulary measures oral language development and lexical (word) knowledge. The task requires the person to identify pictured objects. Although a few receptive items are offered at the beginning of the test, this is primarily an expressive language task at the singleword level. The items become increasingly difficult as the selected pictures appear less and less frequently in the environment. As in any vocabulary task, word retrieval is a component. This test has a median reliability of .77 in the age 5 to 19 range and .90 in the adult range.

## Early Years Core Subtests

## Verbal Comprehension

## Differential

Usual Age Range

2:6-6:11
Extended Age Range
2:6-8:11
Contributes to These Composites
Verbal Ability and GCA

## CHC Factors

Broad Ability: Crystallized intelligence/Verbal ability (Gc)
Narrow Ability: Listening ability ( $L S$ )

## Objective

The Verbal Comprehension subtest measures understanding of language through a receptive mode. No items require the child to respond orally, and the manipulatives are easily handled by most children.

## Essential Features of Content

The first items use a picture of a teddy bear; the child is asked to point to several features named by the examiner. Then the child is shown an array of toys for the next set of items, which samples the child's understanding of object names and commands. The child is also asked to do certain manipulations with the objects (e.g., "Put the cat in the box"), and of the functions of the objects (e.g., "Give me the one that goes on your wrist"). The next set of items uses wooden objects such as a bridge, houses, and a car. The instructions generally sample the child's understanding of prepositions (e.g., "Put the child under the bridge"). Note that the item examples presented above and all subsequent examples are simulated rather than real items from the DAS-II.

For each item in the fourth set, (see Figure 4.1) the child views an array of four pictures, each of which depicts a distinct situation or outcome; the child is asked to select the picture that goes best with the story (e.g., Sam and his father took turns playing the video game with Amy). To perform this task the child must perceive various, possibly relevant, features of the drawings. Then, the child must engage in hypothesis testing to select the single drawing that accurately reflects an event or outcome consistent with the story. For the final set of items the child uses red, blue, and yellow chips of different shapes to demonstrate understanding of more complex instructions (e.g., "Give me all of the blue chips except the triangle").


Exan:iner $\qquad$

Eary Years Record Form

(Disregard the Days)

## Verbal Comprehension

| Hhents |  |  | 1. Achitroint |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -Teddy Bear photo | Ages 2:6-3:11 Item 1 | You may repeat an item only | Fewer than 3 wrong: Continue | Items 1-23: 5 consecutive |
| - Box of toys | Ages 4:0-5:11 Item6 | once if the child asks or | to next decision point. | failures |
| Primary grip pencil | Ages 6:0-7:11 Item 13 | appears not to understand. | Fewer than 3 right: Go Back to | Items 24-36: 3 failures in |
| Inset tray of wooden figures | Ages 8:0-8:11 Item 24 |  | previous start point if applicable. | 4 consecutive items ltems 37-42: None |






## Materials

Early Years or School-Age Record Form
Stimulus Book 2

## Start Point

## Ages 5:0-17:11 Samples A-E, then Item I

## Decision Point

## See Record Form

## Discontinue Rule

Discontinue after a ceiling has been reached. A ceiling is no more than one pass in a block of items.
Do not count scores on Sample Items D, E, and F toward the discontinue rule.

## Administration Points

The task is performed first while looking at a stimulus picture; later items require recall without the aid of the picture. The most difficult items require the child to recall one or two nonbody part items in addition to the list of parts of the body.
For Items 1-12, the stimulus picture should be in front of the child; however, when administering these items, do not allow the child to touch the picture.
For Items 13-32, remove the stimulus picture from the child's view.

For each item, say the words in a measured way (approximately one word per second) and drop your voice slightly on the last word of each item to denote the end of the list of words.

You may prompt the child to listen carefully prior to beginning a sequence.

## Samples $A-C$

The purpose of Samples A-C is to establish that the child understands the concepts of "highest" and "lowest" before starting the Recall of Sequential Order subtest. These sample items are not counted toward the discontinue rule.

If the child fails Samples A-C, do not administer this subtest.

## Establishing Basal and Ceiling Levels for Items 1-20

After completing Samples A-E, all children start with Item 1. The items are grouped into eight blocks; each block consists of four items of the same number of words. When the child completes ablock with no more than one error, that block becomes the basal. The block in which a child passes no more than one item constitutes the ceiling.
I. Administer Item 1. If the child passes, proceed to the first item of the next block (Item 5). Continue with the first item of each block until an item is failed or until you reach Item 17.
2. If the child successfully completes Item 17, administer Items 18-20. (Be sure to establish a basal before discontinuing.)
3. When a child fails the first item in a block, move back one block and administer the remaining items in that block. After completing the block, if the child has failed more than one item in that block, immediately move back to the previous block. Continue until a basal is established (Basal Level: no more than one failure in a block).
4. Go forward to the block in which the first item was failed. Administer the remaining items in that block. If the child passes more than one item in that block, continue on and administer items until the ceiling is established (Ceiling Level: no more than one pass in a block).
5. Give credit for all items below the basal block and obtain the raw score for Items I-20.

## Should the child go on to Items 21-32?

If three or more items have been failed (score 0 ), score the child on Item Set I-20 and discontinue the subtest.

If fewer than three items above have been failed, continue as follows:

1. Administer Sample Item F.
2. Then, starting with Item 21 , administer all remaining items in order.
3. Establish the ceiling (no more than one pass in a block) or continue until Item 32 has been administered.

## Repetitions

Word sequences may not be repeated.
If the child asks for a word or word sequence to be repeated, say: I can't say them again. Give it a try. Allow the child to try if he or she wishes; give credit if the response is correct. Then say: Listen carefully. I won't be able to repeat the words.

## Teaching

An apple icon indicates a Teaching item.
Provide teaching for all children on Samples A-F.

Provide teaching on Items 1, 2, 3, 5, and 21 only if the child fails an item.

## Recording and Scoring

Score 1 point if the child recalls all of the words in an item in the correct sequence. Score 0 points for incorrect sequences or no response.
Score the response as correct if the child self-corrects.

For Items 29-32, score I point if the parts of the body are recalled in their correct order, and the two nonbody parts are given at the end of the list (regardless of order).
If Items $21-32$ are administered, add the raw score for Items l-20 to the raw score for Items 21-32 and score the child on Item Set 1-32.

## Item Administration

## Al Aines

## Sample A

Turn to Sample A in the Stimulus Book. Say: Look at these dogs jumping. Show me the one jumping highest.
If the child responds incorrectly, prompt and demonstrate, saying: Look (point to the higher dog), this one's jumping high.
Then say: Now show me the one jumping low. Prompt and explain again if necessary.

## - Sample B

Turn to Sample B in the Stimulus Book. Say: Look at these flags. Show me the highest.
If the child responds incorrectly, prompt and demonstrate, saying: Look (point to the highest flag), this flag is highest.
Then say: Now show me the lowest. Prompt and explain again if necessary.

## © SampleC

Turn to Sample C．Say：Look at this picture． There＇s a tree，a house，and a child．Now tell me which is the highest．
If the child responds incorrectly，prompt and demonstrate，saying：Look，the tree is the high－ est．It is higher than the house and it is higher than the child．So it＇s the highest．
Then say：Now tell me the one that is the lowest． Prompt and explain again if necessary．
If the child has demonstrated understand－ ing of the concepts＂highest＂and＂lowest，＂ proceed to Sample D．
If the child does not understand these con－ cepts，do not administer this subtest．

## Sample D

Turn to the stimulus picture and keep it in front of the child for Samples D and E and Items 1－12．
Say：Look at this picture．It shows parts of the body．I will point to some body parts，starting with the highest part（gesture to the top of the picture）and going down to the lowest part of the body（gesture to the bottom of the picture）． Tell me the names of the parts I point to．
Point to each part of the body in the follow－ ing order：hair，eyes，nose，mouth，chin，neck， shoulder，elbow，hand，knee，ankle，and foot． Pause for the child to name each part．If the child does not respond to a part，supply the name and ask the child to say it．

Say：Now I＇m going to tell you some parts，and I want you to tell them back to me，starting with the highest part（gesture to the top of the picture）and ending with the lowest（gesture to the bottom of the picture）．Listen carefully． I won＇t be able to repeat the words．Remem－ ber，say the body parts starting with the high－ est．．．mouth，nose．Drop your voice slightly on the last word．

If the response is correct say：Good．Nose is higher than mouth．

If the response is incorrect，say：I said mouth， nose．Your nose is higher than your mouth（dem－ onstrate with the picture，point to the nose， then move your finger down to the mouth）．So you should have said nose and then mouth．
If the child has not repeated＂nose，mouth＂ spontaneously，say：You say nose．．．mouth． （Pause for response．）Encourage the child to say the words in the correct order if this has not already been done．If the child responds correctly，say：Good．Nose，mouth．

## Sample E

Say：Let＇s try another．Listen carefully．Tell these back starting with the highest part．．．hand， hair．
If the response is correct say：Good．Hair is higher than hand．
If the response is incorrect，say：I said hand， hair．Your hair is higher than your hand（demon－ strate with the picture，point to the hair，then move your finger down to the hand）．So you should have said hair and then hand．
If the child has not repeated＂hair，hand＂ spontaneously，say：You say hair．．hand．（Pause for response．）Encourage the child to say the words in the correct order if this has not already been done．

If the child responds correctly after teaching say：Good．Hair，hand．
If both Samples $D$ and $E$ are failed，proceed to the next subtest．

## Item 1

Say：Now tell me these，starting with the high－ est．．．foot，hand．

If the response is correct say：Good．Hand is higher than foot．Proceed to Item 5.
If the response is incorrect say：I said foot， hand．Your hand is higher than your foot（dem－ onstrate with the picture，point to the hand， then move your finger down to the foot）．So you should have said hand and then foot．Proceed to Item 2.

## Items 2-4

For Items 2-4, say: Now tell me these, starting with the highest $\qquad$ $\therefore$.
Provide teaching if the child fails Items 2-3. Do not provide teaching on Item 4.

Items 5-20
Say: Now tell me these starting with the highest...

Provide teaching if the child fails Item 5.
For Items 13-32, remove the stimulus picture from the child's view.

## Sample F

Say: In the next list of words there's one word that isn't a part of the body. I want you to tell me all of the parts of the body as you have been doing, from the highest to the lowest, and after that, tell me the word that isn't a part of the body. So if I say, hand, hair, fish, knee, you say...? Pause and encourage the child to respond.
If the response is correct say: Good. Hair, hand, and knee are in the right order, and fish comes at the end. Now listen carefully. Remember, the last word you tell me should be the one that isn't a part of the body. Proceed to Item 21.
If the response is incorrect, say: The right order for hand, hair, and knee is hair, hand, and knee (gesture to your own hair, hand, and knee). Fish isn't a part of the body, so that comes last. The order they should be in is hair, hand, knee, and fish. Let's try another one. Remember, the last word you tell me should be the one that isn't part of the body. Proceed to Item 21.

## Item 21

Say: Get ready...chin, hair, cat, knee, nose. If the response is correct, proceed to Item 22.

Ifthe child fails to say the nonbody part as the last word, score the response as incorrect and say: Remember, the last word you tell me should be the one that isn't a part of the body.

## Items 22-28

Say: Now tell me these starting with the highest...

## Items 29-32

Say: Now in the next list there are going to be two things that aren't parts of the body. Tell me the parts of the body as you have been doing, from the highest to the lowest, then tell me the ones that aren't parts of the body. Get ready. (Pause.) Mouth, ankle, ring, elbow, frog, nose, knee.

If the response to Item 29 is correct, administer Items 30-32 consecutively until the ceiling is reached.

## Pecall of Sequential Order

|  |  | Lecisin potiti |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stimulus Book 2 | $\hat{\theta}=$ Teaching item <br> For Items 1－12，keep the stimulus picture in front of the child． For Items 13－32，remove the stimulus picture from the child＇s view． If the child fails Sample Items A－C or D and E，do not administer this subtest． | See below for Items 21－32 |
| Strain |  | 1）Soltinetite |
| Ages 5：0－17：11 <br> Samples A－E，then Item 1 |  | Discontinue after a ceiling has been reached． <br> See below for basal and ceiling rules． <br> Do not count scores on Sample Items D，E，and $F$ toward discontinue rule． |
|  |  |  |

1．Administer Item 1 ．If the child passes，proceed to the first item of the next block（Item 5）．Continue with the first item of each block until an item is failed or until you reach Item 17.
2．If the child successfully completes Item 17，administer Items 18－20．（Be sure to establish a basal before discontinuing．）
3．When a child fails the first item in a block，move back one block and administer the remaining items in that block．After completing the block，if the child has failed more than one item in that block，immediately move back to the previous block．Continue until a basal is established（Basal Level：no more than one failure in a block）．
4．Go forward to the block in which the first item was failed．Administer the remaining items in that block．If the child passes more than one item in that block，continue on and administer items until the ceiling is established（Ceiling Level：no more than one pass in a block）
5．Give credit for all items below the basal block and obtain the raw score for Items $1-20$ ．


Understanding＂Highest＂and＂Lowest＂

If the child has demonstrated understanding of the concepts＂highest＂ and＂lowest，＂proceed to Sample D．

If the child does not understand these concepts，do not administer this subtest．

|  | fiem Stimulus | Correct Response Order | Response | $\begin{gathered} \text { Score } \\ 0-1 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All Ages | 盧 Mouth，nose | Nose，mouth |  |  |
|  | （ ${ }^{\text {com }}$ Hand，hair | Hair，hand |  |  |


| 最 Foot，hand | Hand，foot |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6is）Chin，nose | Nose，chin |  |
| 䮩 Eyes，shoulder | Eyes，shoulder |  |
| 4 Mouth，hair | Hair，mouth |  |


|  | Mouth，hand，foot |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 Shoulder，nose，knee | Nose，shoulder，knee |  |
| 7 Foot，eyes，hair | Hair，eyes，foot |  |
| 8 Elbow，chin，hand | Chin，elbow，hand |  |

（Continues on next page．）

| Lem Stimulus | Correct Response Order | Response |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{9}$ Eyes, ankle, hand, nose | Eyes, nose, hand, ankle | Score |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ Knee, elbow, neck, hair | Hair, neck, elbow, knee |  |
| $\mathbf{1 1}$ Hand, chin, foot, ankle | Chin, hand, ankle, foot |  |
| $\mathbf{1 2}$ Mouth, knee, shoulder, hand | Mouth, shoulder, hand, knee |  |

For Items 13-32, remove the stimulus picture from the child's view.

| 13 Hair, elbow, eyes, chin | Hair, eyes, chin, elbow |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 14 Hand, elbow, knee, nose | Nose, elbow, hand, knee |  |
| 15 Ankle, mouth, chin, knee | Mouth, chin, knee, ankle |  |
| 16 Eyes, neck, hand, shoulder | Eyes, neck, shoulder, hand |  |
| 17 Neck, knee, nose, foot, chin | Nose, chin, neck, knee, foot |  |
| 18 Hair, hand, shoulder, ankle, eyes | Hair, eyes, shoulder, hand, ankle |  |
| 19 Foot, elbow, mouth, neck, nose | Nose, mouth, neck, elbow, foot |  |
| 20 Eyes, ankle, neck, foot, mouth | Eyes, mouth, neck, ankle, foot |  |

## Should the child go on to Items 21-32?

園 If three or more items above have been failed (score 0), score the child on Item Set 1-20 and discontinue.
If fewer than three items above have been failed, continue as follows:

1. Administer Sample Item F (see Manual for instructions).
2. Then, starting with Item 21 , administer all remaining items in order.
3. Establish the ceiling (no more than one pass in a block) or continue until Item 32 has been administered.
4. Add the raw score for Items $1-20$ to the raw score for Items $21-32$ and score the child on Item Set $1-32$.

| Item Stimulus | Correct Response Order | Response | $\begin{gathered} \text { Score } \\ 0-1 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Wand, hair, fish, knee | Hair, hand, knee, fish |  |  |
| (2) Chin, hair, cat, knee, nose | Hair, nose, chin, knee, cat |  |  |
| 22 Tree, foot, shoulder, mouth, elbow | Mouth, shoulder, elbow, foot, tree |  |  |
| 23 Hand, eyes, ankle, bird, neck | Eyes, neck, hand, ankle, bird |  |  |
| 24 Elbow, bed, nose, knee, neck | Nose, neck, elbow, knee, bed |  |  |


| Item Stimulus | Correct Response Order | Response | $\begin{gathered} \text { Score } \\ 0-1 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25 Ankle, horse, knee, hair, elbow, mouth | Hair, mouth, elbow, knee, ankle, horse |  |  |
| 26 Eyes, chin, foot, nose, bus, shoulder | Eyes, nose, chin, shoulder, foot, bus |  |  |
| 27 Neck, book, hand, mouth, foot, knee | Mouth, neck, hand, knee, foot, book |  |  |
| 28 Shoulder, eyes, elbow, chair, ankle, neck | Eyes, neck, shoulder, elbow, ankle, chair |  |  |

See Manual for instructions for Items 29-32
Note. For Items 29-32, the nonbody parts can be recalled in either order.

| 29Mouth, ankle, ring, elbow, frog, <br> nose, knee | Nose, mouth, elbow, knee, ankle, <br> frog, ring |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 30Shoulder, pen, neck, foot, spoon, <br> hand, eyes | Eyes, neck, shoulder, hand, foot, <br> pen, spoon |  |
| 31Knee, chin, hair, bike, shoulder, <br> brush, elbow | Hair, chin, shoulder, elbow, knee, <br> bike, brush |  |
| 32Hand, car, nose, ankle, elbow, cow, <br> mouth | Nose, mouth, elbow, hand, ankle, <br> car, cow |  |

## Recall of Sequential Order

Raw Score to Ability Score

| Raw <br> Score | Item 5et |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1-20 | 1-32 |
| 0 | $10(4)$ | 10 (14) |
| 1 | 23(1) | 23 (11) |
| 2 | 33 (9) | 33 (9) |
| 3 | 41 19) | 419 |
| 4 | 50 (9) | 5019 |
| 5 | $58(9)$ | 5899 |
| 6 | 66 (9) | 66 (9) |
| 7 | 74 (9) | 74 (3) |
| 8 | 82 (9) | 829 |
| 9 | 89 (8) | 89 (8) |
| 10 | 950 | 950 |
| 11 | 100 ${ }^{\text {m }}$ | 100 () |
| 12 | 1050 | 104\% |
| 13 | 1100) | 10907 |
| 14 | 115 (8) | 1140 |
| 15 | 122 (8) | 1190) |
| 16 | 129(9) | 124(7) |
| 17 | 138(9) | 1290) |
| 18 | 147(0) | 1340) |
| 19 | 157(12) | 13807 |
| 20 |  | 142(6) |
| 21 |  | 146 (6) |
| 22 |  | 150 (6) |
| 23 |  | 155 (6) |
| 24 |  | 159(7) |
| 25 |  | 1630. |
| 26 |  | 16801 |
| 27 |  | 1730) |
| 28 |  | 1780) |
| 29 |  | 184 [8] |
| 30 |  | 191 (9) |
| 31 |  | 201 (11) |
| 32 |  | 212(16) |


| Number Correct <br> (Give credit for all <br> items below the basal.) |
| :---: |
| Ability score $\square$ |



$$
\infty
$$
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## Naming Vocabulary

## Usual Age Range

## 2；6－6：11

Extended Age Range

## 2：6－8：11

## Contributes to These Composites

## Verbal Ability and GCA

## CHC Factors

Broad Ability：Crystallized intelligence／Verbal ability（ $G c$ ）
Narrow Ability：Lexical knowledge（ $V L$ ）

## Objective

The Naming Vocabulary subtest measures the spoken vocabulary of young children．It measures expressive language ability，in contrast to the receptive language ability measured by the Verbal Comprehension subtest． Successful performance on the subtest depends on the child＇s previous development of a vocabulary of nouns， and on the most difficult items，knowledge of verbs and adjectives．Picture recognition is also crucial；however， the pictures are large and brightly colored and are unlikely to cause problems except for children with major visual impairments or those with no experience with picture books．The items require the child to recall words from long－term memory rather than to recognize or to understand the meaning of words，as comprehension tests do．The task is also more convergent and more highly structured than the task in the Word Definitions subtest，which involves more open－ended responses．

## Essential Features of Content

The test starts by asking the child the names of two parts of the body，and continues with a Stimulus Book of colored pictures of objects that the child is shown one at a time and is asked to name．

## Interpretation of Performance

Scores on the Naming Vocabulary subtest may reflect the child＇s
嚁 expressive language skills，
唋 vocabulary knowledge of nouns，
缽 ability to attach verbal labels to pictures，

荡 general language development，

䧾 level of language stimulation．
In addition，low scores on this subtest may reflect the child＇s
綮 reluctance to speak．

## Naming Vocabulary



$\qquad$

# HEAD-TOES-KNEES-SHOULDERS (HTKS) 
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Parts I, II, and III<br>FORM B - Extended
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Directions: After establishing positive rapport with the child, say or read the directions in bold type aloud. Words in CAPITAL LETTERS should be emphasized. Administer the task seated or standing; the child should stand, about 3 feet from you, during the task. Administer Part II if the number of points in the testing section totals to 4 or more. Administer Part III if the number of points in the testing section totals to 4 or more.

The person symbol indicates that you should perform the motion to demonstrate the correct movement to the child. If the child produces the correct (opposite) response immediately, score the item " 2 ". If they self-correct to the correct response, score the item " 1 ". If they do not touch the correct part of their body at all or touch the named part, score the item " 0 ".

A self-correct occurs if the child makes any discernible motion toward an incorrect response, but then changes his/her mind and makes the correct response. Pausing to think, not moving, and then responding correctly does not count as a self-correction - it would be scored as correct.

## COPYRIGHT STATEMENT

[^2]$\qquad$

## PART I: INTRODUCTION

Now we're going to play a game. The game has two parts. First, copy what I do. Touch your knees.

Touch your knees; wait for the child to touch his/her knees.

## Good! Now touch your shoulders.

Touch your shoulders; wait for the child to touch his/her shoulders.


Repeat the two commands with motions again, or until the child imitates you correctly.

## PART I: PRACTICE

Now we're going to be a little silly and do the OPPOSITE of what I say. When I say to touch your KNEES, INSTEAD of touching your knees, you touch your SHOULDERS. When I say to touch your SHOULDERS, you touch your KNEES. So you're doing something DIFFERENT from what I say.

If the child responds correctly: Provide positive feedback on each practice item where the child responds correctly.
**If the child responds incorrectly at any point during the practice portion, provide additional explanations up to 3 times before beginning the test portion:

| Remember, when I say to touch your $\qquad$ instead of touching your $\qquad$ you touch your $\qquad$ . Do the OPPOSITE of what I say. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of add | ional explanations given: | 0 | 23 |
|  | Incorrect seffer | correct | correct |
| A1. What do you do if I say "touch your knees"? | 0 (other than shoulders) | 1 | 2 (shoulders) |
| A2. What do you do if I say "touch your shoulders"? | 0 (other than knees) | 1 | 2 (knees) |


| Ok, let's practice a few more. | Incorrect |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | self-correct | correct |
| B1. Touch your knees | 0 (other than shoulders) | 1 | 2 (shoulders) |
| B2. Touch your shoulders | 0 (other than knees) | 1 | 2 (knees) |
| B3. Touch your knees | 0 (other than shoulders) | 1 | 2 (shoulders) |
| B4. Touch your shoulders | 0 (other than knees) | 1 | 2 (knees) |

Proceed to Part I test section. Do not explain any parts of the task again. Do not provide feedback during the test portion.
$\qquad$

PART I: TESTING

We will keep playing this game, and you keep doing the OPPOSITE of what I say.

| Incorrect |  | Self-Correct |  | Correct |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1. Touch your knees | 0 (other than shoulders) | 1 | 2 (shoulders) |  |
| 2. Touch your shoulders | 0 (other than knees) | 1 | 2 (knees) |  |
| 3. Touch your shoulders | 0 (other than knees) | 1 | 2 (knees) |  |
| 4. Touch your knees | 0 (other than shoulders) | 1 | 2 (shoulders) |  |
| 5. Touch your shoulders | 0 (other than knees) | 1 | 2 (knees) |  |
| 6. Touch your knees | 0 (other than shoulders) | 1 | 2 (shoulders) |  |
| 7. Touch your knees | 0 (other than shoulders) | 1 | 2 (shoulders) |  |
| 8. Touch your shoulders | 0 (other than knees) | 1 | 2 (knees) |  |
| 9. Touch your knees | 0 (other than shoulders) | 1 | 2 (shoulders) |  |
| 10. Touch your shoulders | 0 (other than knees) | 1 | 2 (knees) |  |

TOTAL POINTS $\longrightarrow \square$ IF THE CHILD SCORED 4 OR MORE POINTS, CONTINUE TO PART II

If THE CHILD SCORED LESS THAN 4 POINTS: Thank you for playing this game with me today!
$\qquad$

## PART II: INTRODUCTION

Ok, now that you've got that part, we're going to add a part. Now, you're going to touch your HEAD and your TOES. First, touch your HEAD.

Touch your head; wait for the child to touch his/her head.

## Now, touch your toes.

Touch your toes; wait for the child to touch his/her toes.
Repeat the two commands with motions again, or until the child imitates you correctly.

## PART II PRACTICE:

Ok, now we're going to be silly again. You keep doing the opposite of what I say like before. But this time, touch your HEAD and TOES. When I say to touch your HEAD, you touch your TOES, and when I say to touch your TOES, you touch your HEAD.

If the child responds correctly: Provide positive feedback on each practice item where the child responds correctly.
**If the child responds incorrectly at any point during the practice portion, provide additional explanations up to 2 times before beginning the test portion:

Remember, when I say to touch your $\qquad$ , you touch your $\qquad$ so you are doing something DIFFERENT from what I say. Let's try another one.

|  | Incorrect | Self-correct | Correct |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| C1. What do you do if I say "touch your head"? | 0 (other than toes) | 1 | 2 (toes) |
| If the child responds verbally: "can you show me?"" | Incorrect | Self-correct | Correct |
|  | 0 (other than toes) | 1 | 2 (toes) |
| D1. Touch your head | 0 (other than head) | 1 | 2 (head) |
| D2. Touch your toes | 0 (other than toes) | 1 | 2 (toes) |
| D3. Touch your head | 0 (other than head) | 1 | 2 (head) |
| D4. Touch your toes |  |  |  |

Proceed to Part II test section. Do not explain any parts of the task again. Do not provide feedback during the test portion.
$\qquad$

Now that you know all the parts, we're going to put them together. You're going to keep doing the opposite of what I say to do, but you won't know what l'm going to say.

There are four things I could say:
If I say touch your HEAD, you touch your TOES.
If I say touch your TOES, you touch your HEAD.
If I say touch your KNEES, you touch your SHOULDERS.
If I say touch your SHOULDERS, you touch your KNEES.


Are you ready? Let's try it.

## PART II TESTING:

| Incorrect |  | Self-Correct | Correct |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11. Touch your head | 0 (other than toes) | 1 | 2 (toes) |
| 12. Touch your toes | 0 (other than head) | 1 | 2 (head) |
| 13. Touch your knees | 0 (other than shoulders) | 1 | 2 (shoulders) |
| 14. Touch your toes | 0 (other than head) | 1 | 2 (head |
| 15. Touch your shoulders | 0 (other than knees) | 1 | 2 (knees) |
| 16. Touch your head | 0 (other than toes) | 1 | 2 (toes) |
| 17. Touch your knees | 0 (other than shoulders) | 1 | 2 (shoulders) |
| 18. Touch your knees | 0 (other than shoulders) | 1 | 2 (shoulders) |
| 19. Touch your shoulders | 0 (other than knees) | 1 | 2 (knees) |
| 20. Touch your toes | 0 (other than head) | 1 | 2 (head) |

TOTAL POINTS $\longrightarrow \square$ If THE CHILD SCORED 4 OR MORE POINTS, CONTINUE TO PART III If The Child scored less than 4 points: Thank you for playing this game with me today!
$\qquad$

## PART III INTRODUCTION

You are doing so well we just have one more part! Now we are going to change the rules of the game.

When I say to touch your HEAD, you touch your KNEES.
When I say touch your KNEES, you touch your HEAD.
When I say touch your SHOULDERS, you touch your TOES. And when I say touch your TOES, you touch your SHOULDERS.


## Ok? Let's practice!

If the child responds correctly: Provide positive feedback on each practice item where the child responds correctly.
**If the child responds incorrectly at any point during the practice portion, provide additional explanations up to 2 times before beginning the test portion:

Remember, we changed the rules. "Touch your head" means touch your KNEES - head goes with knees now. "Touch your shoulders" means touch your TOES - shoulders goes with toes.

PART III PRACTICE:

|  | Incorrect | self-correct | correct |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| E1. What do you do if I say "touch your head"? | 0 (other than knees) | 1 | 2 knees) |
| E2. What do you do if I say "touch your shoulders"? | 0 (other than toes) | 1 | 2 (toes) |

If the child responds verbally: "can you show me?"

| Incorrect |  | self-correct | correct |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| F1. Touch your head | 0 (other than knees) | 1 | 2 (knees) |
| F2. Touch your shoulders | 0 (other than toes) | 1 | 2 (toes) |
| F3. Touch your toes | 0 (other than shoulders) | 1 | 2 (shoulders) |
| F4. Touch your knees | 0 (other than head) | 1 | 2 (head) |

## You're doing great! Let's do a few more.

Proceed to Part III test section. Do not explain any parts of the task again. Do not provide feedback during the test portion.
$\qquad$

PART III TESTING:

| Incorrect |  | Self-Correct | Correct |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 21. Touch your shoulders | 0 (other than toes) | 1 | 2 (toes) |
| 22. Touch your head | 0 (other than knees) | 1 | 2 (knees) |
| 23. Touch your knees | 0 (other than head) | 1 | 2 (head) |
| 24. Touch your toes | 0 (other than shoulders) | 1 | 2 (shoulders) |
| 25. Touch your toes | 0 (other than shoulders) | 1 | 2 (shoulders) |
| 26. Touch your knees | 0 (other than head) | 1 | 2 (head) |
| 27. Touch your shoulders | 0 (other than toes) | 1 | 2 (toes) |
| 28. Touch your head | 0 (other than knees) | 1 | 2 (knees) |
| 29. Touch your head | 0 (other than knees) | 1 | 2 (knees) |
| 30. Touch your shoulders | 0 (other than toes) | 1 | 2 (toes) |

Thank you for playing this game with me today!

## EMT/ACES Combined Measure

## Test Administration:

1. Sit beside the child, not across from them. This will help you match up the test booklet photographs with the recording sheet.
2. For each of the 48 items of EMT, make sure you have the child's attention focused on the task. If giving the instructions exactly as they are written for each Part does not elicit a response to the item, say in a neutral tone "Ok, let's do the next one." Then write "DK" for that item on the answer form.
3. Administer Parts, $1,2,3$, and 4 to all children. Only administer Parts 5 and 6 to children who answered at least 6 questions correctly on Part 2.
4. When children are expected to respond by indicating one of four pictures, mark the quadrant they choose with a circle (an X might give a child the impression that they've answered the question incorrectly). For example:


## Part 1: Matching two Expressions of the Same Emotion

Note: Always keep the Quad of expressions on the right page covered until you are ready to ask the child to point to the Key expression.

## Child Instructions:

Show child Key expression from $1^{\text {st }}$ warm-up item:
"Now we will play the game with pictures of children's faces. The faces show how the children feel. Let's play the game. OK?"

## $1^{\text {st }}$ Warm-up:

"Look at her face. [Point to Key expression]. Her face shows how she feels. Now, I want to find the face over here [uncover and point to the photos in the quad] that shows the same feeling as this one [point back to Key expression]. [Pause 2 s , then point to the matching photo and say]: It's this one, isn't it! Her face shows that she [still pointing to the matching photo] feels the same way as this one." [Point to the Key expression].

## $\underline{2}^{\text {nd }}$ Warm-up:

Turn to $2^{\text {nd }}$ warm up item:
"Look at her face. [Point to the Key expression] Her face shows how she feels."
[Interviewer waits about 3s.] "Now look at the faces over here. [Uncover and point to the adjacent Quad of expressions]. Now I want you to point to the one over here [point to the Quad] whose face shows the same feeling as this one [pointing to the Key expression]."

If necessary, repeat: "Look at these faces. Show me the one [point to the pictures in the Quad] that feels the same way as this one" [Point to the Key expression].

Child's Answer:


## Test:

For each of the following 12 Key Expressions and associated Quads, ask the child to:
"Look at her face. [Point to Key expression] Her face shows how she feels. [Pause 4s] Now look at the faces over here [point to the Quad for item 1]. Show me which one of these [point to the Quad] feels the same as this one [point to Key expression]."
1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.


## Part 2: Matching a Spoken Description of an Emotion Activator With One of Four Expressions

Note: If the child does not give an answer in 4 seconds, repeat the question. If he or she still does not give an answer after 4 seconds, say in a neutral tone: "Ok, let's do the next one." Record "DK" for that item and continue with the next item.

## Child Instructions:

Show child Quad from the warm-up item:
"Now, we'll play another game with the pictures of children's faces. It's about faces children make when something happens to them. I'm going to say what just happened to one of these children [pointing to the first Warm-Up Quad] and I want you to show me which child it happened to."

## Warm-up:

Point again to the Quad for the first Warm-Up item and say:
"OK. Show me the one who just got a nice new toy, just what they wanted."


Test:
Total Correct (score immediately):

| 1. Show me the one whose nice <br> drawing just got torn up by a <br> mean kid. | $\boxed{ }$ |  | 7. Show me the one who is all <br> alone and has no one to play <br> with. | $\boxed{ }$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Part 3: Emotion Expression Labeling

Note: If the child says a general emotion word or a non-emotion word (e.g., bad, good, big eyes), say "Can you say another word that tells me how she feels?" If the child gives a second response, place a " $Q$ " before it.

Note: If the child does not give a response in 4 or 5 s, repeat the initial question. If the child still does not respond after an additional 4s, say in a neutral tone: "Let's do another one". Write "DK" for any non-response or if the child says they do not know an answer.

## Child Instructions:

See warm-up.

## Warm-up:

Show child warm up picture.
"Now, I'd like you to say a word that tells us how this person feels" [pointing to the warm-up item]. "Look at his face. His face shows how he feels. Tell me: How does he feel?" [If no response after 4s, say:] "Can you say a word that tells me how he feels?"

When the child responds, say " $\mathbf{O K}$ " in a neutral tone of voice. Then proceed to test items.
Child's Answer: $\qquad$

## Test:

For each of the 12 test items, repeat:
"Look at her face. How does she feel?"

| 1. | 7. |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. | 8. |
| 3. | 9. |
| 4. | 10. |
| 5. | 11. |
| 6. | 12. |

## Part 4: Matching a Spoken Emotion Label with One of Four Emotion Expressions

Note: If the child does not give an answer in 4 seconds, repeat the question. If he or she still does not give an answer after 4 seconds, say in a neutral tone: "Ok, let's do the next one." Record "DK" for that item and continue with the next item.

## Child Instructions:

Show child the Quad for the warm-up item:
"Now we'll play a different game. I'm going to tell you how one of these children feels [point to the Quad for the warm-up item, where Key expression is high intensity Happy]. Look at each of the pictures [point to the Quad again] and show me the one who feels what I say."

## Warm-up:

Show child warm-up Quad:
OK. Now, show me the one who feels happy.

Child's Answer:


## Test:

| 1. Now, show me the one who <br> feels happy. |    | 7. Show me the one who feels <br> scared or surprised. |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Part 5: Emotional Situations

## Child Instructions:



## Part 6: Emotional Behaviors

## Child Instructions:

I'm going to tell you about some kids your age, and I want you to tell me if they would feel happy, sad, mad, or scared. Sometimes you might think they would feel two emotions, like both mad and sad. If so, I want you to pick the feeling you think they would have more strongly. Sometimes they may not feel any emotion strongly, and you can tell me that by saying, "no feeling." Don't say "no feeling" just because you're not sure how they would feel, though. If you think they would feel something, I want you to take a guess at what it is ${ }_{00}$ okay?


## NEPSY Theory of Mind Items with Scoring Guidelines

1. Picture of box on table; box has picture of cookies on it.

When Andre opened the cookie box, he saw that Mom had put some spaghetti in there. He was sad and put the box back. His brother came in and saw the cookie box. What did his brother think was in the box?
2. Picture of a mom and a girl looking through a department store window. There's a couch on sale, and on the couch is a doll.

Mom and Maya are looking in the store window. Mom is thinking about buying a new sofa. What does Mom (point) think that Maya (point) is thinking about buying?
3. Picture of a man with a pensive look (kind of like a modern take on the Rodin Le Penseur sculpture from the neck up).

What is the man doing?
(Full credit for something like "thinking"; partial credit for "touching his lip" or other literal description; and zero points for "picking his nose").
4. Shows a photo of a boy walking on a wall.

Now I am going to act out a rhyme. Watch and do what I do.
Walking on a wall is fun (examiner "walks" index fingers 3-4 steps across the table).
When we walk it in the sun. We pretend we're giants tall (examiner holds arms up over head)
When we're walking on the wall (examiner resumes finger walking).
1 point for 2 or more "steps" and 1 point for both hands over head.
5. Three pictured scenes: a girl swimming on a dolphin, a girl dreaming of hugging a dolphin, and a girl reading a book about dolphins.

Ming lives by the ocean (point). Her daddy lets her swim with the dolphins. Sheryl had a dream last night (point). In her dream, she was hugging a dolphin. Luz loves to read about dolphins (point). Who can hug a dolphin in real life: Ming (point), Sheryl (point), or Luz (point).
6. Place 2 boxes on table, both of which have a picture of blocks on the lid. One of the boxes, however, has pencils in it.

What is in the box? (Typically, child guesses blocks). Let's see (examiner opens box). Yes, this box is full of blocks.
What is in this box? (Typically, child guesses blocks). OK, let's see. (Opens box to reveal pencils). Whoops! It is not blocks at all! Let's put the pencils back.

If your friend came in now, what would your friend think was in this box (i.e., the one with the pencils).
7. No visual on this one.

Brandon has a hard time with spelling. He didn't do well on his spelling test in school. That afternoon, Mom said, "You'll feel better if you go play with Cameron." Brandon went to Cameron's house. Cameron wanted to play Word Spell. Brandon decided to go home. Why?

Full credit involves identifying that Brandon didn't like to spell or that he is poor at it. Partial is more vague (e.g., "He couldn't do it.")
8. Photo of merry-go-round with Ferris wheel in background.

Reggie and Patrick wanted to ride the Ferris wheel. Audrey and Hannah didn't want to ride it so they decided to go on the merry-go-round. When the boys got to the Ferris wheel, the line was too long, so they went to the fun house instead. When Audrey and Hannah were finished at the merry-go-ground, where would they look for the boys, at the fun house or the Ferris wheel?
9. Photo of boy dressed in a suit with a briefcase next to him.

Look at the picture. What is Eric pretending?
Full credit for something that gets at the idea of someone working, partial credit for him being a man or grown-up.
10. No visual on this one. (This is one of the egregious ones in terms of listening comprehension)

Laurie Lamb asked Mother Sheep if she could go play. Mother said, "Yes, dear, but don't go near the forest. Mr. Wolf is hiding there." Laurie skipped off with her friends to play hide and seek. Laurie ran into the woods to hide behind a tree. Just then she saw a big sheep with a white wooly coat, a long nose, and big teeth smiling as it came torward her. Mother Sheep was watching. Suddenly she grabbed Laurie and they ran from the woods! Why did Mother Sheep run with Laurie?

Credit for identifying the big sheep as the wolf or conveying fear/need for help.
11. Picture of a teapot made to look like an apple (it looks more like a cross between the two)

What is this?
Credit for recognizing that it's a teapot. No points for identifying it as an apple.
12. Picture of a boy working on a craft.

Mrs. Russell's class was making presents for the people at the nursing home. It was almost time for recess. Mrs. Russell said, "Class, we'd better wrap it up now." What did she mean?

Credit for getting that that's an expression to hurry up or finish up.
13. Photo of two very similar looking girls.

Denise and Emily are sisters. Mama says they are like two peas in a pod. What does that mean?
Credit for them being alike or twins or very close. No credit for identifying them as best friends or sisters or liking to do things together.
14. No visual.

This story is a lot like the story I read before, but listen for something different. Laurie Lamb asked Mother Sheep if she could go play. Mother said, "Yes, dear, but don't near the forest. Mr. Wolf is hiding there." Laurie skipped off to play hide and seek with her friends. Laurie ran into the woods to hide behind a tree. Just then she saw a big sheep with a white wooly coat, skinny gray legs, a long nose, and big teeth, smiling as it came toward her. Suddenly, a funnylooking wooly brown bear came roaring into the woods and chased off the big sheep. Laure was so scared that she ran all the way home. Grandma Sheep hugged Laure and said, "Mama will be home soon," and smiled to herself. Just
then Mother Sheep came up the path out of breath. Her wool was all wet, and it was torn in places. Laurie ran to her and said, "Mama. I won't ever go into the woods again. There is a funny-looking, roaring bear in there." Mama hugged Laurie and laughed.

Who was the funny-looking wooly bear? Credit for identifying Mama.
Why did Grandmother smile to herself when she hugged Laurie? Full credit for GM knowing that Mama was the bear, or that Laurie had been tricked, or that Laurie was safe. Partial credit for vaguer instances of above.
15. Photo of mother and young boy.

Oscar said, "Mom, Uncle Carlos is going to take me for ice cream!" Mother smiled and said, "Oscar, you have Uncle Carlos wrapped around your little finger." What does Oscar's mother mean?

Full credit for Carlos spoiling Oscar or getting him whatever he wants; partial for them caring for each other or them spending a lot of time with each other.

The remainder of the items are the contextual ones, with the sketched pictures of scenarios and four photos of different facial expressions.

The next items are about Julia. I will show you some drawings of things that happen to Julia. Next to the drawings are four photos of Julia's face. Look carefully at the drawing and point to the picture of Julia's face that most closely shows how she feels in the drawing. Let's try some.

## PROTOCOL FOR DELAY TASK

## MATERIALS FOR DELAY TASK:

- Parent letter describing task (explaining candy \& stickers)
- Envelope for letter and delayed rewards
- Paper bag for candy and stickers
- Stapler to attach rewards
- Tape to seal envelope
- Small containers for showing skittles
- Large container of skittles
- Paper (to stick stickers)
- Coding sheet


## IMPLEMENTING DELAY TASK:

- This task requires some pre-planning. It is helpful to have materials arranged in advance (i.e. stickers pre-cut). It is also helpful to have the desk clear of any materials so that the child can focus on the task at hand.
- The tester will first demonstrate an immediate reward situation and a delay situation (these situations will remain constant)
- Next the tester will offer various delay situations to the child. These situations will be presented in random order (study children will have coding sheets with varying delay sequences)
- If a child chooses a delay condition, the candy/stickers should be removed from the table and placed in a location out of the child's view. If a child chooses not to delay, the candy/sticker should be immediately presented and the child should be given an opportunity to eat/stick.
- If a child chooses an immediate reward condition, allow a few seconds for the child to enjoy and savor the reward.
- Upon completion of this task, all of the delay items should be placed in a small paper bag, stapled to the parent letter and placed in a sealed envelope for the child's backpack.


## CODING THE DELAY TASK:

- Circle the number of items that the child selects.
- Give examples of the verbal comments made by the child.

Demonstration phase
To introduce the new task:
"Now we are going to play a new game. I brought some fun things with me today. I have scratch and sniff stickers and candy for us and you can choose to have some now or when you get home"

Now model a delay situation:
"Let me show you how to play. Here is a cup with one candy in it, and here is a cup with two candies in it. I can have one candy now, or two candies later. I am going to choose to have two later."
The tester puts the skittle out of sight for "later".
Here, model a non-delay situation:
Here are some scratch and sniff stickers. I can choose to have one now or six later. I think I will have one now."
Take the sticker, scratch it and put it on your shirt. Savor the smell (e.g., "mmm...smells like peaches and I love peaches) and smile.

## Test Phase

Here, the script will vary according to the random order of the conditions presented. "Now it's your turn. Do you want to have one $\qquad$ now, or do you want to wait until you get home to have (x amount of $x$ items) ?"

Repeat for all six conditions.
Pay attention to any motoric or verbal behaviors and document on the coding sheet. Try to capture verbal behaviors in writing (under strategies heading) to the extent that it does not interrupt the natural flow of the task.

* It is important to remain neutral about the choices children make. Avoid any comments that could be perceived as value judgments (e.g. "Good job").

Hypotheticals

If the child wants both options, say, "You can only choose one of these." and gesture with hand motions showing both options. An alternate prompt can be "You can only make one choice" or "You can have this or this".

Demographic Questionnaire- First I will ask you some factual questions about you and your child

| Items | 1. Mother | Responses | 3. Grandmother |  | 4. Aunt | 5. Other |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. What is your relationship with the child? Gender: |  | 2. Father |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Are you the primary caregiver? |  |  | you been? |  | 2. No <br> If no, who is? |  |  |
| 3. What is your date of birth? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. What is your ethnicity or race? $\quad \begin{aligned} & \text { 1. Black/ Afri. } \\ & \text { Amer }\end{aligned}$ | 2. Native Amer/ Indian | 3. White/ Caucasian | 4. Hispanic/ Spanish/Latino | 5. Asian | 6. Other | 7. Multi-racial |  |
| 5. What is the child's mother's age, if you are not the mother? |  | years |  | months |  |  |  |
| 6. What was the estimated birth weight of this child? |  | Pounds |  | Ounces |  |  |  |
| 7a. Last year, did the child attend preschool or head start? <br> 7b. If yes, how many hours per week did he/she attend? |  | Hr/wks: |  | 2. No <br> If no, wh <br> K'garte | did the child do | the year b |  |
| 8. How many times has this child moved in the last two years? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. Has this child been referred for special education services? |  | 1. Yes | 2. No |  |  |  |  |
| 9b. If answer is yes, what was diagnosis/identified disability: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. What language does this child speak at home? |  |  | 1. English |  | 2. Spanish |  | 3. Other |

11. What is the highest level of education of this child's mother?
12. What is the highest level of education of this child's primary caregiver (if mother is not primary caregiver)? $\qquad$
13. Including the study child, who are the other children who live in the child's home?

| Name | Relationship to Child | Age | Gender | Education Level (Grade <br> Only) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

14. Including yourself, who are all of the adults who live in the child's home?

| Name | Relationship to <br> Child | Age | Gender | Education level (Primary <br> Caregiver Only) | Employment status (Primary <br> Caregiver Only) | Employment <br> Pay Rate | Employment Schedulue (Hours <br> Per Week |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

15. (COHORT 1 Only) What time did your child go to bed on a school night during the school year? $\qquad$
16. (COHORT 1 Only) Last year during the school year, where did your child go after the end of the school day until bedtime?

| After School Location | Hours per day |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1. At home with mother/primary caregiver |  |
| 2. With other family member or friend |  |
| 3. Day care |  |
| 4. After school program <br> (Name: <br> 5. Babysitter |  |
| 6. Other: |  |

(if situation changed by day or mid-year, describe below:)
17. (COHORT 1 Only) Last school year, how often did your child participate in any of these activities after the end of the school day?

| After School Activities | Never | Half-hour | 1 hour | $\mathbf{2}$ hours | $\mathbf{3}$ or more <br> hours |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Afterschool program |  |  |  |  |  |
| Homework alone |  |  |  |  |  |
| Homework with adult |  |  |  |  |  |
| Homework with older sibling or older peer |  |  |  |  |  |
| watch tv |  |  |  |  |  |
| play videogames |  |  |  |  |  |
| play outside |  |  |  |  |  |
| play inside |  |  |  |  |  |
| reading |  |  |  |  |  |
| nap |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Don't know |  |  |  |  |  |

(if situation changed by day or mid-year, describe below:)

Family Interview - Qualitative FALL 2014
WINGS Introduction: Thank you for taking the time to talk with me today. [Introduce yourself, a little about you and what you're doing with the project.] We appreciate your willingness to spend some time with us. We are interested in learning more about your family and your and your child's experiences with WINGS. We are conducting these interviews as part of the study of the WINGS program and the lives of children in the program. This interview should take about an hour. You have the right to stop the interview at any time and you can also feel free to skip any question that makes you uncomfortable, just tell me you would like to move on. I will be asking you some general questions about your family and its routines, as well as some questions about your child, your neighborhood, your child's school, and your child's out-of-school experiences. Do you have any questions for me before you start?

CONTROL Introduction: Thank you for taking the time to talk with me today. [Introduce yourself, a little about you and what you're doing with the project.] We appreciate your willingness to spend some time with us. We are interested in learning more about your family and your child's transition to kindergarten and what s/he does after-school. We are conducting these interviews as part of the program evaluation that we have been talking to you about. This interview should take about an hour. You have the right to stop the interview at any time and you can also feel free to skip any question that makes you uncomfortable, just tell me you would like to move on. I will be asking you some general questions about your family and its routines, as well as some questions about your child, your neighborhood, your child's school, and your child's out-of-school experiences. Do you have any questions for me before you start?

EVERYONE: We would like to record the interview. We will delete the recording after we transcribe it and your name will be replaced with a code number to protect your privacy. Is it ok for me to turn on the recorder now?

Ok - I want to first just get some updated contact information.

1. Has your address changed? If yes, get new address
a. If yes, ask the following questions about the move:
i. When did you move?
ii. What led you to move?
iii. What factors did you consider in deciding where to move?
iv. Has this move affected your child's school or after-school activities at all? If yes, how?
v. IF CHILD IS NO LONGER IN WINGS BECAUSE OF MOVE: How did you feel about moving to a school that did not offer WINGS?
vi. How satisfied are you with your new home?
b. Can we get contact information for 2-3 other people who would know how to get in touch with you if you changed your phone number or your address? We want this information so that we can follow-up with you later in the study in case you move or change your number.

Thanks, now I'd like to ask you some questions about your family's routines.

1. Who does the child spend time with every week when they are not in school? [Note to Interviewer, if they start naming a lot of the kids' friends you can have them just summarize with the total number of friends their age they see on a weekly basis and how many are boys vs. girls. We are not asking specific ages, just whether it is an adult or a child - over or under age 18]
[USE SEPARATE TABLE OF PEOPLE IN CHILD'S LIFE TO FILL IN WITH PARTICIPANT]

| Name | Relationship <br> to child | Over or <br> Under 18? | Gender | How often <br> interacts <br> with child |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

2. Are there other people in the child's life who they don't spend time with on a weekly basis but are still important who are not on the previous table?
[USE SEPARATE TABLE OF PEOPLE IN CHILD'S LIFE TO FILL IN WITH PARTICIPANT]

| Name | Relationship <br> to child | Over or <br> under 18? | Gender | How often <br> interacts with <br> child |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

3. Are there any other adults who contribute to the household either financially or through material or childcare support [reword if needed to: are there any other adults who provide the people in your house with money, childcare, or items to help out the family?]
a. If yes, in what ways do they contribute?
4. Before we do the timeline about your family routine, which you might remember from last year, I wanted to just get your thoughts on how, if at all, your family life or routines have changed in the last year.
a. If they describe any changes - why do you think those things have changed?
b. Thinking back on when your child transitioned to Kindergarten, how would you compare your family life and routines now to during that transition time?

Now I want to ask you some more detailed questions about your family's typical activities. [USE SEPARATE TIMELINE DOCUMENT TO FILL IN WITH PARTICIPANT]
5. Tell me about your day yesterday [or Friday if interview is on a Monday] from when your child got home from school (or after-school) to when he or she went to bed. Using these different colors for different categories, show me what [study child] is doing during
that time, who they are with during each activity, and where they are for each activity (provide timeline to fill in).
a. Activities
i. Homework
ii. Household chores
iii. Meals
iv. Personal hygiene (e.g., bathing, brushing teeth, doing hair)
v. Playing video games
vi. Playing board games
vii. Playing recreational games (physical activity) inside
viii. Playing recreational games (physical activity) outside
ix. Reading
x. Taking a trip/going to ____[fill in the blank]
xi. Talking (what about?)
xii. Talking on the phone
xiii. Television watching
xiv. Using the computer
b. People
c. Places
a. Rooms in the home
b. Places outside the home
d. Was yesterday a typical day? If no - what would be different on a typical day in your home?
6. Now we are going to do the same thing from when your child got up this morning to when he or she went to school. Using these different colors for different categories, show me what [study child] is doing during that time and who they are with during each activity (provide timelines to fill in)
a. Activities
i. Homework
ii. Household chores
iii. Meals
iv. Personal hygiene (e.g., bathing, brushing teeth, doing hair)
v. Playing video games
vi. Playing board games
vii. Playing recreational games (physical activity) inside
viii. Playing recreational games (physical activity) outside
ix. Reading
x. Taking a trip/going to $\qquad$
xi. Talking (what about?)
xii. Talking on the phone
xiii. Television watching
xiv. Using the computer
b. People
c. Places
a. Rooms in the home
b. Places outside the home
c. Places outside the home
d. Was today a typical day? If no - what would be different on a typical day in your home?
7. What kinds of things does your family do on the weekend?
8. In general, what time does [study child] get up on the weekends?
9. In general, what time does $\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{he}$ go to bed?
10. Are there any regular activities that [study child] does every weekend?

Are there any activities that you do with your child every now and then that are not included on any of these timelines? [e.g., library, museum, zoo, family reunion, visiting family or friends, etc.]
Thank you. Now I want to ask you a few general questions about your family. [NOTE: if the person being interviewed is not the child's family, questions should be re-worded to ask about the study child's family and home]
11. Tell me a bit about your family.
12. What are the biggest joys in your family?
13. All families have challenges, what are the biggest challenges faced by your family? [you can use the word "struggle" instead of challenges if interviewee doesn't respond to challenges]
a. How do you encourage [study child] when s/he or the family are struggling with something?
i. Prompt for follow-up if they can't think of a challenge: Doesn't need to be a big challenge, could be something small.
ii. If haven't had challenges - if you had a situation where child/family was struggling, how do you think you'd talk about it with your child?
14. Has your family had any major events happen within the last year (e.g., death or birth, moving, loss of a job, gain of a job, marriage, divorce, etc.)?
a. How did [study child] respond to that?
b. Was that something that you had to talk to [study child] about? If yes, how did you talk about it?
c. Sometimes things happen outside our family that are difficult for us to talk about with children but that kids hear about from other kids, on tv or the internet, or see in the neighborhood. Some families talk about these kinds of things with their kids and other families don't. Have you ever had a conversation about something like that with your child?
i. If yes, how did you approach that?
ii. If no, do you think you ever would? How would you approach that?
15. What is your relationship with [the study child]?
a. Do you live with child?
b. Does child stay with you after school?
c. How would you describe your relationship with [the study child]? [possible rewording or prompt: What is your relationship like with [study child]?]
d. How would you describe [study child]? [possible re-wording or prompt: Tell me a bit about [the study child].]
i. What are [the study child]'s strengths?
ii. What are [the study child]'s challenges?
e. In some families, people talk to each other a lot and in other families people don't talk that much. What's the norm for your family?
i. If you were spending time with your child, say riding the bus, doing errands, eating a meal, or taking a walk, what might you talk about, if anything?

Now we are going to talk a little bit about your neighborhood and [the study child's] school.
16. Tell me about your neighborhood.
f. What things do you like about your neighborhood?
g. What things do you dislike about your neighborhood, if anything?
$h$. What kinds of things are there for kids to do in your neighborhood (for example, parks, after-school centers, programs run by churches, etc)?
i. As we talked about earlier, all families sometimes face challenges, what kinds of challenges/struggles are faced by families in your neighborhood?
17. Tell me about your child's school.
a. What things do you like about your child's school?
b. What things do you dislike about your child's school?
c. What does your child like about the school?
d. What does your child dislike about the school?
e. IF CHILD HAS CHANGED SCHOOLS: How was the transition to the new school for your child?
f. How satisfied are you with the education your child gets at his/her school?
j. How would you describe the overall feeling (vibe or atmosphere) at the school to a new family?
k. How would you describe your child's friends at school?
i. At some schools parents tend to know each other and at other schools parents don't really know each other very much, how well do you know the parents of the other kids at school, if at all?
l. What is your relationship with the school like?
i. How often are you at the school? [try to get specific, e.g. weekly daily, monthly, versus "a lot"]
ii. What are you usually doing when you are at the school?
iii. Who do you interact with or talk to when you come to the school?
m . Who is your child's main teacher?
i. Some teachers talk to parents a lot and others don't, how often do you talk to your kid's main teacher(s)?
ii. How would you describe your child's main teacher?
iii. Some parents feel like they have good relationships with their kids’ teachers and other parents don't feel like they have very good
relationships with their kids’ teachers. How would you describe your relationship with your kid's teacher(s)?
iv. How would you describe your child's relationship with his/her teacher?
n. Who is your child's other teacher?
i. How often do you talk to your kid's other teacher(s)?
ii. How would you describe your child's other teacher?
iii. How would you describe your relationship with your kid's other teacher(s)?
iv. How would you describe your child's relationship with his/her other teacher?
o. Some principals have active relationships with and talk to parents a lot and other principals don't talk to parents very much, how often do you talk to your child's principal?
i. If they report talking to principal at least sometimes: how would you describe your relationship with your kid's principal?
p. [If they named anyone else they interact with or talk to in iii ask the following two questions about that person/those people]:
i. How often do you talk to X?
ii. How would you describe your relationship with X?
18. People have very different feelings about and experiences with school. How did you feel about school when you were a kid?
a. How interested were you in school back then?
b. What things do you wish had been different about your own schooling?
c. How would you compare your experiences in school as a kid with your child's experiences in school now?
d. How do you feel about education now?
i. If that is different from how you used to feel, what changed?
e. What was your last/most recent experience with school?
i. If parent talks about being in school now or starting school soon or having gone back to school earlier, ask about that timeline: It sounds like you have had the chance to start and stop school at different points, can you tell me a bit about when in your life you have stopped and started school?
19. How important is school to you?
20. How does your child feel about school?
a. How interested is your child in school?
b. Has that changed at all over time [for later interviews, not Time 1]
c. What concerns do you have about your child in school?
21. How far do you hope your child will go in school?
22. How far do expect him/her to go in school?
a. If s/he doesn't get to [their response] would you be disappointed? Why/why not?
23. In what ways do you influence your child's academic achievement?
a. Looking ahead, what influence do you think you will have on your child's academic achievement as $\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{he}$ gets older?
b. Who else do you think influences your child's academic achievement? How?
24. How much do you think school is related to being successful in life?

Now I'd like to ask you some questions about the after-school arrangements that you have for [study child] and your other children [if applicable]. [Ask the following questions first about the study child and then about every other child listed on demographic sheet as living in the same house as the study child. If a child has more than one after school arrangement, ask the series of questions about each place that the child spends time after school.]

## FOR WINGS FAMILIES ONLY [control group skip to Question 37]

25. What would [study child] do after-school if s/he did not go to WINGS?
iii. About how much would that cost you?
26. On a scale of 1 to 4 , with 1 being very unhappy and 4 being very happy, how happy are you with the WINGS program?

1 - very unhappy 2 - unhappy 3 - happy 4 - very happy
27. What do you like best about WINGS?
28. Since part of the goal of this research is to help improve WINGS, we are also interested in what, if anything, you don't like about WINGS.
29. Does your child talk to you about what they do in WINGS? If yes, what do they tell you?
a. What do you think your child likes best about WINGS?
b. What do you think your child likes least about WINGS?
c. Does your child use any WINGS language at home (e.g., The Creed)?
d. What, if anything, do you think your child gets out of WINGS?
e. Does your child behave the same or differently at home and at WINGS? If differently, how so?
f. How does your child feel about his or her friends in WINGS?
30. Have you noticed any changes/differences in your child since being in WINGS?
a. If yes: How?
b. If yes: Do you think these changes are because of WINGS? Why or Why not?
31. What do you think your child learns in WINGS?
a. What do you think the goals of WINGS are?
b. What do you want your child to get out of WINGS?
c. Does your child do his/her homework in WINGS?
i. How happy are you with that arrangement?
32. How often do you interact with or talk to WINGS staff, if at all?
a. If interact or talk to them at all: How would you describe your relationship with WINGS staff? What do you talk to them about?
b. Do you feel that's too little, just the right amount, or too much?
c. How happy are you with your relationship with the WINGS staff?
d. How would you describe your child's relationship with their WINGS leader?
e. How would you describe your child's relationship with other WINGS staff?
33. The transition to Kindergarten can be difficult for children and families, thinking back, how was that transition for you and your child?
a. How did WINGS affect your child's or your adjustment to Kindergarten, if at all?
34. Looking back on your child's experience in WINGS last year (and the year before if relevant), how has their experiences changed over the years, if at all?
35. IF RELEVANT: How would you compare your older child's experience to your younger child’s experience in WINGS?
36. How do you think your and your family's life would be different without WINGS, if at all?

## FOR FAMILIES OF KIDS NOT IN WINGS [including non-study kids who don't attend WINGS but are in WINGS families]

37. What does [study child] do after school?
a. [if not at home] Where is that located?
b. [if more than one location] How much time does [study child] spend at each location? [if they can't say then ask "where does [study child] spend the most amount of time after school?]
38. On a scale of 1 to 4 , with 1 being very unhappy and 4 being very happy, how happy are you with the after-school care that [study child] receives??

1 - very unhappy 2 - unhappy 3 - happy 4 - very happy
39. Does your child talk to you about what they do after school? If yes, what do they talk to you about?
a. What do you think your child likes best about what $\mathrm{s} /$ he does after school?
b. What do you think your child likes least about what s/he does after school?
c. Does your child do his/her homework in this after school setting?
i. How happy are you with this arrangement?
40. How much does this cost you each week? [possible re-wording: how much do you pay for [study child's] after school care each week?]
a. If they don't know weekly give option to answer for whole year

IF CHILD IS CARED FOR AT HOME SKIP TO QUESTION 42
IF CHILD IS CARED FOR AT MULTIPLE LOCATIONS OVER A WEEK ASK 43 AND THEN ASK QUESTIONS 41-48 ONLY FOR THE PLACE THAT THE CHILD SPENDS A MAJORITY OF TIME.
41. How does [study child] get to that location?
42. How does [study child] get home from that location?
43. How much time does [study child] spend there each week?
44. How would you describe the place?
45. [If the child is in home care at someone else's home] Can you tell me about the neighborhood where the home is?
46. Who are the adults who are with [study child] after school? [Make sure to get the total number of adults even if they don't know all the names]
a. Total \# of adults: $\qquad$
b. [if it is not the interviewee] How well, if at all, do you know that person?
c. What is your relationship like with [that person/people]?
d. How would you describe your child's relationship with [that person]?
47. Who are the other kids who are with [study child] after school? [Make sure to get the total number of kids even if they don't know all the names]
e. Total \# of kids: $\qquad$
f. How well, if at all, do you know the parents of the other kids?
g. How does your child feel about his/her friends in the after school setting?
48. What does [study child] usually do there (e.g., types of activities), if you know? It's ok if you don't know.
a. What kinds of things are available for your child to use there (if they ask what we mean or for examples can say: e.g., toys, games, outdoors equipment, art supplies, books, videos, etc)
49. The transition to Kindergarten can be difficult for children and families, thinking back, how was that transition for you and your child?
a. How did your after-school arrangements for your child affect your child's or your adjustment to Kindergarten, if at all?
50. Looking back on your child's after-school experiences last year (and the year before if relevant), how has their experiences changed over the years, if at all?
51. What other activities and programs are available in your community for kids to do afterschool?
a. School-based options
b. Community-based options, for example, music or dance lessons, sports, cheerleading, church groups, Boys \& Girls Clubs, Boy Scouts or Girl Scouts, 4-H, etc.
c. There are lots of reasons why parents don't choose to use certain programs, sometimes they don't like the program, sometimes the program is too expensive, sometimes the location isn't convenient, and lots of other reasons. What made you decide not to use those programs or activities?

## FOR KIDS WHO USED TO BE IN WINGS BUT ARE NOT ANYMORE - ASK Q52-61 AND THEN ASK THE FOLLOWING:

I know that [study child] used to attend WINGS but does not any more. I'd like to ask you a few questions about your experiences with WINGS when s/he was in it and your decision to leave.
52. Why did [study child] stop attending WINGS?
a. What made you choose [current after school arrangements] over WINGS?
53. On a scale of 1 to 4 , with 1 being very unhappy and 4 being very happy, how happy were you with the WINGS program when $\mathrm{s} /$ he was in it?

1 - very unhappy 2 - unhappy 3 - happy $\quad 4$ - very happy
54. What did you like best about WINGS?
55. What did you like least about WINGS?
56. Did your child talk to you about what they did in WINGS? If yes, what did they tell you?
a. What do you think your child liked best about WINGS?
b. What do you think your child liked least about WINGS?
c. What, if anything, do you think your child got out of WINGS?
d. How did your child feel about the other kids in WINGS?
57. What do you think your child learned in WINGS?
a. What do you think the goals of WINGS are?
b. What did you want your child to get out of WINGS?
58. How often did you interact with or talk to WINGS staff, if at all?
a. If interact or talk to them at all: How would you describe your relationship with WINGS staff? What did you talk to them about?
b. Do you feel that's too little, just the right amount, or too much?
c. How would you describe your child's relationship with their WINGS leader?
d. How would you describe your child's relationship with other WINGS staff?
59. The transition to Kindergarten can be difficult for children and families, thinking back, how was that transition for you and your child?
a. How did WINGS affect your child's or your adjustment to Kindergarten, if at all?
60. How would you compare your child's experiences in their current after-school arrangements to their experience in WINGS?
61. Would you ever go back to WINGS?
a. Why/why not?

## FOR EVERYONE

62. What does [study child] do during the summer?
63. How satisfied are you with what [study child] does over the summer?
64. About how much does this cost you?

Repeat questions 62-64 for every child who lives in home with study child
65. What other activities, programs, and summer camps are available in your community for kids to do during the summer?
a. School-based options
b. Community-based options
c. There are lots of reasons why parents don't choose to use certain programs, sometimes they don't like the program, sometimes the program is too expensive, sometimes the location isn't convenient, and lots of other reasons. What made you decide not to use those programs or activities?
66. Is there anything that you feel that you spend a lot of time on with your child or thinking about in regards to your child that we haven't asked about?

## Contact Sheet

Address Change (if applicable):

Secondary Contact Information

| Name | Phone \# | Relationship to family |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Appendix B

Tables and Figures for Two-Year Results

Table 7.1 Teacher Assessment of Positive Behavior (ITT)

| Teacher Positive ITT |  |  | Listwise Data Estimates |  |  | Imputed Data Estimates |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bucket | Measure |  | Null | Pretest | Covariates | Null | Pretest | Covariates |
| SEL <br> Competence <br> - Teacher DESSA | Self <br> Awareness | beta | 0.13 | 0.12 | 0.15 | 0.17 | 0.14 | 0.14 |
|  |  | se | 0.16 | 0.15 | 0.16 | 0.15 | 0.14 | 0.14 |
|  |  | p | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.33 | 0.24 | 0.31 | 0.3 |
|  | Social Awareness | beta | 0.09 | 0.04 | 0.06 | 0.15 | 0.1 | 0.11 |
|  |  | se | 0.16 | 0.15 | 0.16 | 0.15 | 0.14 | 0.14 |
|  |  | p | 0.59 | 0.79 | 0.71 | 0.32 | 0.5 | 0.44 |
|  | Self Management | beta | $0.21+$ | 0.13 | 0.11 | 0.25++ | 0.19+ | $0.2+$ |
|  |  | se | 0.16 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.14 | 0.14 |
|  |  | p | 0.19 | 0.39 | 0.46 | 0.09 | 0.19 | 0.16 |
|  | Decision Making | beta | 0.15 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.19+ | 0.15 | $0.17+$ |
|  |  | se | 0.16 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.13 |
|  |  | p | 0.34 | 0.37 | 0.35 | 0.19 | 0.28 | 0.19 |
|  | Relationship Skills | beta | 0.11 | 0.1 | 0.06 | 0.14 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
|  |  | se | 0.16 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.14 | 0.13 |
|  |  | p | 0.49 | 0.51 | 0.7 | 0.34 | 0.46 | 0.46 |
| Classroom Relationships and Behaviors | STRS Closeness | beta | 0.18 | 0.26+ | 0.28++ | 0.19 | 0.2 | 0.17 |
|  |  | se | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.17 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.16 |
|  |  | p | 0.27 | 0.11 | 0.1 | 0.24 | 0.22 | 0.29 |
|  | T SSIS Self Control | beta | 0.08 |  | 0.1 | 0.07 |  | 0.08 |
|  |  | se | 0.16 |  | 0.17 | 0.15 |  | 0.15 |
|  |  | p | 0.61 |  | 0.55 | 0.64 |  | 0.59 |
|  | T SSIS Engagement | beta | 0.02 |  | 0.02 | 0 |  | -0.03 |
|  |  | se | 0.16 |  | 0.16 | 0.16 |  | 0.15 |
|  |  | p | 0.92 |  | 0.88 | 0.98 |  | 0.86 |
|  | T CBRS Self Regulation | beta | 0.2 |  | 0.2 | 0.19 |  | 0.17 |
|  |  | se | 0.16 |  | 0.16 | 0.15 |  | 0.15 |
|  |  | p | 0.21 |  | 0.23 | 0.22 |  | 0.24 |

Figure 7.1 Teacher Assessment of Positive Behavior (ITT)


Table 7.2 Teacher Assessment of Positive Behavior (TOT)

| Teacher Positive TOT |  |  | Listwise Data Estimates |  |  | Imputed Data Estimates |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bucket | Measure |  | Null | Pretest | Covariates | Null | Pretest | Covariates |
| SEL <br> Competence <br> - Teacher DESSA | Self <br> Awareness | beta | 0.31 | 0.29 | 0.35 | 0.46 | 0.37 | 0.37 |
|  |  | se | 0.38 | 0.36 | 0.35 | 0.39 | 0.37 | 0.35 |
|  |  | p | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.32 | 0.24 | 0.31 | 0.29 |
|  | Social Awareness | beta | 0.21 | 0.1 | 0.14 | 0.4 | 0.26 | 0.29 |
|  |  | se | 0.39 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.4 | 0.38 | 0.37 |
|  |  | p | 0.59 | 0.79 | 0.71 | 0.32 | 0.5 | 0.44 |
|  | Self Management | beta | 0.5+ | 0.3 | 0.26 | 0.67++ | $0.5+$ | $0.52+$ |
|  |  | se | 0.39 | 0.35 | 0.35 | 0.4 | 0.38 | 0.37 |
|  |  | p | 0.2 | 0.39 | 0.46 | 0.1 | 0.19 | 0.17 |
|  | Decision Making | beta | 0.37 | 0.32 | 0.32 | 0.5+ | 0.39 | 0.44+ |
|  |  | se | 0.39 | 0.36 | 0.34 | 0.38 | 0.36 | 0.34 |
|  |  | p | 0.34 | 0.37 | 0.35 | 0.19 | 0.28 | 0.2 |
|  | Relationship Skills | beta | 0.27 | 0.24 | 0.13 | 0.37 | 0.27 | 0.25 |
|  |  | se | 0.38 | 0.36 | 0.34 | 0.38 | 0.36 | 0.34 |
|  |  | p | 0.49 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.34 | 0.46 | 0.46 |
| Classroom Relationships and Behaviors | STRS Closeness | beta | 0.43 | 0.61+ | 0.65+ | 0.5 | 0.52 | 0.44 |
|  |  | se | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.4 | 0.43 | 0.43 | 0.42 |
|  |  | p | 0.28 | 0.12 | 0.1 | 0.24 | 0.23 | 0.29 |
|  | T SSIS - <br> Self Control | beta | 0.2 |  | 0.24 | 0.19 |  | 0.21 |
|  |  | se | 0.39 |  | 0.4 | 0.4 |  | 0.4 |
|  |  | p | 0.61 |  | 0.55 | 0.64 |  | 0.59 |
|  | T SSIS Engagement | beta | 0.04 |  | 0.06 | -0.01 |  | -0.07 |
|  |  | se | 0.39 |  | 0.38 | 0.41 |  | 0.4 |
|  |  | p | 0.92 |  | 0.88 | 0.98 |  | 0.86 |
|  | T CBRS Self Regulation | beta | 0.48 |  | 0.46 | 0.49 |  | 0.45 |
|  |  | se | 0.39 |  | 0.38 | 0.41 |  | 0.39 |
|  |  | p | 0.22 |  | 0.23 | 0.23 |  | 0.25 |

Figure 7.2 Teacher Assessment of Positive Behavior (TOT)


Table 7.3 Teacher Assessment of Negative Behavior (ITT)

| Teacher Neg | tive ITT |  | Listwi | e Data | stimates | Impu | d Data | timates |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bucket | Measure |  | Null | Pretest | Covariates | Null | Pretest | Covariates |
| Classroom Relationships and Behaviors | STRS Conflict | beta | -0.13 | -0.16 | -0.22+ | -0.17 | -0.21+ | -0.24++ |
|  |  | se | 0.16 | 0.15 | 0.16 | 0.15 | 0.14 | 0.14 |
|  |  | p | 0.4 | 0.29 | 0.17 | 0.25 | 0.14 | 0.09 |
|  | T SSIS Internalizing | beta | -0.1 |  | -0.14 | -0.11 |  | -0.12 |
|  |  | se | 0.16 |  | 0.17 | 0.16 |  | 0.15 |
|  |  | p | 0.52 |  | 0.4 | 0.46 |  | 0.42 |
|  | T SSIS Externalizing | beta | -0.23+ |  | -0.27+ | -0.21+ |  | $-0.23+$ |
|  |  | se | 0.16 |  | 0.17 | 0.16 |  | 0.16 |
|  |  | p | 0.15 |  | 0.11 | 0.19 |  | 0.15 |
|  | T SSIS Bullying | beta | -0.3++ |  | -0.32++ | $0.26++$ |  | -0.26++ |
|  |  | se | 0.16 |  | 0.17 | 0.15 |  | 0.16 |
|  |  | p | 0.06 |  | 0.06 | 0.09 |  | 0.1 |
|  | T SSIS Hyperactivity | beta | $0.28++$ |  | -0.33++ | $0.27++$ |  | -0.3++ |
|  |  | se | 0.16 |  | 0.17 | 0.15 |  | 0.15 |
|  |  | p | 0.08 |  | 0.05 | 0.08 |  | 0.05 |
|  | T SSIS Problem Behaviors | beta | $0.27++$ |  | -0.31++ | -0.25+ |  | -0.27++ |
|  |  | se | 0.16 |  | 0.17 | 0.15 |  | 0.16 |
|  |  | p | 0.1 |  | 0.07 | 0.11 |  | 0.09 |

Figure 7.3 Teacher Assessment of Negative Behavior (ITT)

## Teacher Negative ITT



Measure

Table 7.4 Teacher Assessment of Negative Behavior (TOT)

| Teacher Negative TOT |  |  | Listwise Data Estimates |  |  | Imputed Data Estimates |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bucket | Measure |  | Null | Pretest | Covariates | Null | Pretest | Covariates |
| Classroom Relationships and Behaviors | STRS Conflict | beta | -0.32 | -0.37 | -0.49+ | -0.46 | -0.55+ | -0.63+ |
|  |  | se | 0.39 | 0.35 | 0.37 | 0.4 | 0.38 | 0.38 |
|  |  | p | 0.41 | 0.3 | 0.18 | 0.26 | 0.15 | 0.1 |
|  | T SSIS Internalizing | beta | -0.25 |  | -0.33 | -0.3 |  | -0.32 |
|  |  | se | 0.39 |  | 0.4 | 0.41 |  | 0.4 |
|  |  | p | 0.52 |  | 0.41 | 0.47 |  | 0.43 |
|  | T SSIS Externalizing | beta | -0.56+ |  | -0.63+ | -0.54+ |  | -0.59+ |
|  |  | se | 0.39 |  | 0.41 | 0.42 |  | 0.41 |
|  |  | p | 0.16 |  | 0.13 | 0.2 |  | 0.16 |
|  | T SSIS Bullying | beta | $0.74++$ |  | -0.74++ | -0.68+ |  | -0.68+ |
|  |  | se | 0.4 |  | 0.41 | 0.41 |  | 0.42 |
|  |  | p | 0.07 |  | 0.07 | 0.1 |  | 0.1 |
|  | T SSIS Hyperactivity | beta | $0.67++$ |  | -0.76++ | $0.71++$ |  | -0.77++ |
|  |  | se | 0.4 |  | 0.41 | 0.41 |  | 0.41 |
|  |  | p | 0.09 |  | 0.07 | 0.09 |  | 0.06 |
|  | T SSIS Problem Behaviors | beta | -0.65+ |  | -0.71++ | -0.65+ |  | -0.69+ |
|  |  | se | 0.4 |  | 0.41 | 0.42 |  | 0.42 |
|  |  | p | 0.11 |  | 0.09 | 0.12 |  | 0.1 |

Figure 7.4 Teacher Assessment of Negative Behavior (TOT)

## Teacher Negative TOT




Measure

Table 7.5 Parent Assessment of Positive Behavior (ITT)

| Parent Positive ITT |  |  | Listwise Data Estimates |  |  | Imputed Data Estimates |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bucket | Measure |  | Null | Pretest | Covariates | Null | Pretest | Covariates |
| SEL <br> Competence <br> - Parent <br> DESSA | Self <br> Awareness | beta | -0.05 | -0.11 | -0.23+ | -0.13 | -0.15 | -0.19 |
|  |  | se | 0.16 | 0.15 | 0.16 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.17 |
|  |  | p | 0.75 | 0.48 | 0.14 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.27 |
|  | Social Awareness | beta | 0.14 | -0.03 | -0.13 | 0.07 | -0.01 | -0.09 |
|  |  | se | 0.16 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.18 |
|  |  | p | 0.37 | 0.84 | 0.39 | 0.69 | 0.93 | 0.62 |
|  | Self Management | beta | 0.09 | 0.01 | -0.09 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.03 |
|  |  | se | 0.16 | 0.14 | 0.15 | 0.16 | 0.15 | 0.18 |
|  |  | p | 0.56 | 0.93 | 0.55 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.86 |
|  | Decision Making | beta | -0.03 | -0.09 | -0.13 | -0.1 | -0.1 | -0.09 |
|  |  | se | 0.16 | 0.14 | 0.15 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.17 |
|  |  | p | 0.84 | 0.55 | 0.38 | 0.53 | 0.54 | 0.58 |
|  | Relationship Skills | beta | -0.01 | -0.15 | -0.23+ | -0.06 | -0.11 | -0.13 |
|  |  | se | 0.16 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.16 | 0.15 | 0.18 |
|  |  | p | 0.95 | 0.32 | 0.13 | 0.69 | 0.5 | 0.47 |
| Home Relationships and Behaviors | CPRS Closeness | beta | 0.21+ | 0.18 | 0.25+ | 0.15 | 0.17 | 0.18 |
|  |  | se | 0.16 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.14 | 0.15 |
|  |  | p | 0.19 | 0.25 | 0.11 | 0.3 | 0.22 | 0.24 |

Figure 7.5 Parent Assessment of Positive Behavior (ITT)
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Table 7.6 Parent Assessment of Positive Behavior (TOT)

| Parent Positive TOT |  |  | Listwise Data Estimates |  |  | Imputed Data Estimates |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bucket | Measure |  | Null | Pretest | Covariates | Null | Pretest | Covariates |
| SEL <br> Competence <br> - Parent <br> DESSA | Self <br> Awareness | beta | -0.12 | -0.24 | -0.47+ | -0.34 | -0.41 | -0.51 |
|  |  | se | 0.37 | 0.34 | 0.33 | 0.41 | 0.4 | 0.47 |
|  |  | p | 0.75 | 0.48 | 0.16 | 0.41 | 0.31 | 0.28 |
|  | Social Awareness | beta | 0.32 | -0.07 | -0.27 | 0.17 | -0.03 | -0.24 |
|  |  | se | 0.37 | 0.32 | 0.31 | 0.43 | 0.41 | 0.48 |
|  |  | p | 0.38 | 0.84 | 0.4 | 0.69 | 0.94 | 0.62 |
|  | Self Management | beta | 0.21 | 0.03 | -0.18 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.08 |
|  |  | se | 0.37 | 0.32 | 0.3 | 0.41 | 0.39 | 0.47 |
|  |  | p | 0.57 | 0.93 | 0.56 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.86 |
|  | Decision Making | beta | -0.07 | -0.19 | -0.27 | -0.27 | -0.25 | -0.25 |
|  |  | se | 0.36 | 0.32 | 0.31 | 0.44 | 0.41 | 0.45 |
|  |  | p | 0.84 | 0.55 | 0.38 | 0.53 | 0.54 | 0.59 |
|  | Relationship Skills | beta | -0.02 | -0.32 | -0.46+ | -0.17 | -0.28 | -0.34 |
|  |  | se | 0.37 | 0.32 | 0.31 | 0.43 | 0.41 | 0.47 |
|  |  | p | 0.95 | 0.32 | 0.14 | 0.69 | 0.5 | 0.47 |
| Home Relationships and Behaviors | CPRS Closeness | beta | 0.48+ | 0.4 | 0.52+ | 0.4 | 0.45 | 0.47 |
|  |  | se | 0.37 | 0.35 | 0.33 | 0.39 | 0.37 | 0.4 |
|  |  | p | 0.2 | 0.25 | 0.11 | 0.3 | 0.22 | 0.25 |

Figure 7.6 Parent Assessment of Positive Behavior (TOT)
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Table 7.7 Parent Assessment of Negative Behavior (ITT)

| Parent Negative ITT |  |  | Listwise Data Estimates |  |  | Imputed Data Estimates |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bucket | Measure |  | Null | Pretest | Covariates | Null | Pretest | Covariates |
| Home Relationships and Behaviors | CPRS Conflict | beta | -0.01 | -0.02 | -0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | -0.01 |
|  |  | se | 0.16 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.16 | 0.14 | 0.17 |
|  |  | p | 0.94 | 0.87 | 0.93 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.94 |
|  | PSSIS Internalizing | beta | -0.09 | -0.1 | 0 | -0.07 | -0.15 | -0.06 |
|  |  | se | 0.16 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.15 | 0.14 | 0.18 |
|  |  | p | 0.57 | 0.45 | 0.98 | 0.67 | 0.27 | 0.72 |
|  | P SSIS Externalizing | beta | -0.04 | -0.07 | -0.05 | -0.09 | -0.12 | -0.14 |
|  |  | se | 0.16 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.14 | 0.12 | 0.17 |
|  |  | p | 0.79 | 0.6 | 0.68 | 0.51 | 0.32 | 0.4 |
|  | P SSIS - <br> Bullying | beta | 0.06 | 0.02 | -0.03 | -0.02 | -0.04 | 0 |
|  |  | se | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.19 |
|  |  | p | 0.71 | 0.9 | 0.83 | 0.89 | 0.8 | 0.99 |
|  | P SSIS Hyperactivity | beta | -0.17 | -0.15 | -0.14 | -0.18 | -0.16 | -0.2 |
|  |  | se | 0.16 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.14 | 0.13 | 0.17 |
|  |  | p | 0.29 | 0.27 | 0.32 | 0.21 | 0.22 | 0.24 |
|  | P SSIS Problem Behaviors | beta | -0.07 | -0.08 | -0.07 | -0.11 | -0.14 | -0.14 |
|  |  | se | 0.16 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.14 | 0.13 | 0.17 |
|  |  | p | 0.66 | 0.53 | 0.59 | 0.45 | 0.25 | 0.43 |

Figure 7.7 Parent Assessment of Negative Behavior (ITT)
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Table 7.8 Parent Assessment of Negative Behavior (TOT)

| Parent Negative TOT |  |  | Listwise Data Estimates |  |  | Imputed Data Estimates |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bucket | Measure |  | Null | Pretest | Covariates | Null | Pretest | Covariates |
| Home Relationships and Behaviors | CPRS Conflict | beta | -0.03 | -0.05 | -0.03 | 0.02 | 0.01 | -0.03 |
|  |  | se | 0.37 | 0.32 | 0.28 | 0.42 | 0.37 | 0.44 |
|  |  | p | 0.94 | 0.87 | 0.93 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.94 |
|  | P SSIS Internalizing | beta | -0.23 | -0.23 | -0.01 | -0.4 | -0.4 | -0.17 |
|  |  | se | 0.31 | 0.31 | 0.29 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.47 |
|  |  | p | 0.45 | 0.45 | 0.98 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.72 |
|  | P SSIS Externalizing | beta | -0.15 | -0.15 | -0.11 | -0.32 | -0.32 | -0.37 |
|  |  | se | 0.29 | 0.29 | 0.27 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.44 |
|  |  | P | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.68 | 0.32 | 0.32 | 0.41 |
|  | P SSIS - <br> Bullying | beta | 0.05 | 0.05 | -0.07 | -0.1 | -0.1 | 0.01 |
|  |  | se | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.35 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.5 |
|  |  | P | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.83 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.99 |
|  | P SSIS Hyperactivity | beta | -0.33 | -0.33 | -0.28 | -0.41 | -0.41 | -0.53 |
|  |  | se | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.28 | 0.34 | 0.34 | 0.46 |
|  |  | P | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.31 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.25 |
|  | P SSIS Problem Behaviors | beta | -0.16 | -0.19 | -0.15 | -0.28 | -0.38 | -0.36 |
|  |  | se | 0.37 | 0.3 | 0.28 | 0.38 | 0.33 | 0.45 |
|  |  | p | 0.66 | 0.53 | 0.59 | 0.45 | 0.26 | 0.43 |

Figure 7.8 Parent Assessment of Negative Behavior (TOT)
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Table 7.9 Building Block Skills from Direct Child Measures (ITT)

| Building | ks ITT |  | List | ise Data | Estimates | Imp | ted Data | Estimates |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bucket | Measure |  | Null | Pretest | Covariates | Null | Pretest | Covariates |
| Building Blocks | Choice Delay | beta | -0.03 | -0.03 | -0.13 | -0.1 | -0.1 | -0.11 |
|  |  | se | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.17 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.15 |
|  |  | p | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.42 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.46 |
|  | DAS Naming Vocab | beta | 0.25+ | 0.23++ | 0.32* | 0.25+ | 0.26++ | 0.26* |
|  |  | se | 0.15 | 0.13 | 0.14 | 0.15 | 0.14 | 0.12 |
|  |  | p | 0.11 | 0.08 | 0.02 | 0.1 | 0.06 | 0.04 |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DAS Recall } \\ \text { of Seq } \\ \text { Order } \end{gathered}$ | beta | 0.05 | 0.04 | -0.1 | 0.03 | 0.06 | 0 |
|  |  | se | 0.16 | 0.15 | 0.16 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.15 |
|  |  | p | 0.77 | 0.79 | 0.53 | 0.85 | 0.67 | 1 |
|  | DAS VerbalComp | beta | -0.09 | -0.04 | 0.01 | -0.09 | -0.03 | -0.05 |
|  |  | se | 0.16 | 0.15 | 0.17 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.15 |
|  |  | p | 0.57 | 0.81 | 0.96 | 0.56 | 0.82 | 0.76 |
|  | EMT-ACES | beta | -0.04 | 0.04 | 0 | -0.03 | 0.03 | 0.07 |
|  |  | se | 0.16 | 0.14 | 0.15 | 0.16 | 0.15 | 0.15 |
|  |  | p | 0.78 | 0.76 | 0.99 | 0.87 | 0.84 | 0.67 |
|  | HTKS | beta | 0.21+ | 0.26++ | 0.3++ | 0.21+ | 0.27++ | 0.26++ |
|  |  | se | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.15 | 0.15 |
|  |  | p | 0.19 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.19 | 0.08 | 0.09 |
|  | NEPSY TOM | beta | -0.16 | -0.06 | -0.08 | -0.13 | -0.05 | -0.07 |
|  |  | se | 0.16 | 0.14 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.15 | 0.14 |
|  |  | p | 0.3 | 0.66 | 0.63 | 0.41 | 0.73 | 0.6 |
|  | VMI | beta | 0 | -0.04 | -0.04 | -0.09 | -0.04 | -0.07 |
|  |  | se | 0.16 | 0.13 | 0.14 | 0.15 | 0.14 | 0.13 |
|  |  | p | 1 | 0.78 | 0.8 | 0.57 | 0.77 | 0.58 |

Figure 7.9 Building Block Skills from Direct Child Measures (ITT)

## Building Blocks ITT




Table 7.10 Building Block Skills from Direct Child Measures (TOT)

| Building | cks TOT |  | List | ise Data | Estimates | Imp | ted Data | Estimates |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bucket | Measure |  | Null | Pretest | Covariates | Null | Pretest | Covariates |
| Building Blocks | Choice Delay | beta | -0.07 | -0.07 | -0.28 | -0.27 | -0.27 | -0.24 |
|  |  | se | 0.35 | 0.35 | 0.35 | 0.43 | 0.43 | 0.33 |
|  |  | P | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.43 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.46 |
|  | DAS <br> Naming Vocab | beta | 0.53+ | 0.49++ | 0.66* | 0.66+ | 0.68++ | 0.57* |
|  |  | se | 0.34 | 0.28 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.37 | 0.28 |
|  |  | P | 0.11 | 0.08 | 0.03 | 0.11 | 0.07 | 0.04 |
|  | DAS Recall of Seq Order | beta | 0.1 | 0.09 | -0.21 | 0.08 | 0.17 | 0 |
|  |  | se | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.4 | 0.39 | 0.39 |
|  |  | p | 0.77 | 0.79 | 0.53 | 0.85 | 0.67 | 1 |
|  | DAS Verbal Comp | beta | -0.19 | -0.08 | 0.02 | -0.24 | -0.09 | -0.1 |
|  |  | se | 0.33 | 0.32 | 0.35 | 0.41 | 0.39 | 0.34 |
|  |  | p | 0.57 | 0.82 | 0.96 | 0.56 | 0.82 | 0.76 |
|  | EMT-ACES | beta | -0.1 | 0.09 | 0.01 | -0.07 | 0.08 | 0.17 |
|  |  | se | 0.35 | 0.31 | 0.32 | 0.41 | 0.39 | 0.4 |
|  |  | p | 0.78 | 0.76 | 0.99 | 0.87 | 0.84 | 0.67 |
|  | HTKS | beta | $0.46+$ | 0.58++ | 0.63++ | 0.54+ | 0.7++ | 0.67++ |
|  |  | se | 0.35 | 0.33 | 0.35 | 0.41 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
|  |  | p | 0.19 | 0.08 | 0.07 | 0.19 | 0.08 | 0.1 |
|  | NEPSY TOM | beta | -0.35 | -0.13 | -0.15 | -0.34 | -0.13 | -0.16 |
|  |  | se | 0.34 | 0.31 | 0.32 | 0.41 | 0.38 | 0.31 |
|  |  | p | 0.31 | 0.66 | 0.63 | 0.42 | 0.73 | 0.6 |
|  | VMI | beta | 0 | -0.08 | -0.08 | -0.23 | -0.11 | -0.16 |
|  |  | se | 0.34 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.41 | 0.38 | 0.29 |
|  |  | p | 1 | 0.78 | 0.8 | 0.57 | 0.77 | 0.58 |

Figure 7.10 Building Block Skills from Direct Child Measures (TOT)


Table 7.11 Academic Skills from Direct Child Measures (ITT)

| Academics ITT |  |  | Listwise Data Estimates |  |  | Imputed Data Estimates |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bucket | Measure |  | Null | Pretest | Covariates | Null | Pretest | Covariates |
| Academics | $\begin{gathered} \text { WJ-App } \\ \text { Prob } \end{gathered}$ | beta | -0.22+ | -0.2+ | -0.15 | -0.22+ | -0.16 | -0.21+ |
|  |  | se | 0.15 | 0.13 | 0.14 | 0.15 | 0.13 | 0.13 |
|  |  | p | 0.16 | 0.13 | 0.27 | 0.14 | 0.24 | 0.11 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { WJ - Ac } \\ & \text { Know } \end{aligned}$ | beta | 0.06 | 0.02 | 0.09 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.08 |
|  |  | se | 0.16 | 0.12 | 0.13 | 0.15 | 0.12 | 0.12 |
|  |  | p | 0.71 | 0.87 | 0.5 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.53 |
|  | WJ - <br> Letter- <br> Word ID | beta | $0.22+$ | $0.18+$ | 0.18 | 0.16 | 0.13 | 0.15 |
|  |  | se | 0.15 | 0.13 | 0.14 | 0.15 | 0.14 | 0.13 |
|  |  | p | 0.16 | 0.17 | 0.2 | 0.31 | 0.33 | 0.25 |

Figure 7.11 Academic Skills from Direct Child Measures (ITT)

## Academics ITT

| $\begin{aligned} & 0.4 \\ & 0.3 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | Beta + SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | I |  |
| 0.2 |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{r} 0.1 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | + |  | 1 | Beta - SE |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & -0.1 \\ & -0.2 \\ & -0.3 \\ & -0.4 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | - Beta |
|  | $\Gamma$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | WJ - | WJ - | WJ - |  |
|  | App | Ac | Letter- |  |
|  | Prob | Know | Word |  |
|  |  |  | ID |  |

Measure

Table 7.12 Academic Skills from Direct Child Measures (TOT)

| Academics TOT |  |  | Listwise Data Estimates |  |  | Imputed Data Estimates |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bucket | Measure |  | Null | Pretest | Covariates | Null | Pretest | Covariates |
| Academics | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { WJ - App } \\ & \text { Prob } \end{aligned}$ | beta | $0.48+$ | -0.44+ | -0.33 | $0.58+$ | -0.42 | -0.48+ |
|  |  | se | 0.35 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.36 | 0.31 |
|  |  | p | 0.17 | 0.14 | 0.27 | 0.15 | 0.25 | 0.12 |
|  | WJ - Ac | beta | 0.13 | 0.04 | 0.19 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.18 |
|  |  | se | 0.34 | 0.27 | 0.28 | 0.39 | 0.33 | 0.28 |
|  |  | p | 0.71 | 0.87 | 0.5 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.53 |
|  | WJ - Letter- | beta | 0.48+ | 0.4+ | 0.39 | 0.41 | 0.35 | 0.34 |
|  |  | se | 0.35 | 0.29 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.36 | 0.3 |
|  |  | p | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.21 | 0.31 | 0.33 | 0.25 |

Figure 7.12 Academic Skills from Direct Child Measures (TOT)


## Appendix H - Fidelity Measures

This Appendix contains three items:

- OST (Out of School Time) cover sheet and Observation Instrument. Three live observations per nest are made each year: fall, winter and spring.
- WINGS Leader Questionnaire. This questionnaire is completed monthly by the program director.
- Hunter Bailin Modified Tool. Three live observations per nest are made each year: fall, winter and spring.

| Date: $(m m / d \mathrm{~d} / \mathrm{Y})$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | OUT OF SCHOOL TIME (OST) <br> OBSERVATION INSTRUMENT |

## COVER SHEET

| ACTIVITY | ata* | TYPE OF SPACE | one | TOTAL PARTICIPANTS | \# |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Community Unity |  | Classroom |  | Total number of boys |  |
| Academic Center |  | Gym |  | Total number of girls |  |
| Discussion |  | Cafeteria |  | (circle all that apply) |  |
| Choice Time |  | Auditorium |  |  |  |
| Free Play |  | Hallway |  | TOTAL STAFF | \# |
| ACTIVITY TYPE ata* |  | Computer Lab |  | WINGS Leaders |  |
| Homework Help |  | Outside Playground |  | Program Director |  |
| Story reading/listening |  |  |  | Peace Manager |  |
| Visual Arts |  | Other: |  | Program Assistant |  |
|  |  |  |  | Volunteer/Partner |  |



## OUT OF SCHOOL TIME (OST) OBSERVATION INSTRUMENT

## COVER SHEET

| COHORT: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Program: | WINGS Leader: |  | Observation Number: |  | Date: | Start Time: | End Time: |
| Activity Overview (1-2 <br> sentence description): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Activity Type | $\begin{gathered} \checkmark \\ \text { *ata } \end{gathered}$ | Activity Name |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \checkmark \\ \text { one } \end{gathered}$ | Total Participants |  | \# |
| Homework |  | Community Unity |  |  | Total number of girls |  |  |
| Academic Activities (not homework) |  | Academic Center |  |  | Total number of boys |  |  |
| Story reading/listening |  | Discussion |  |  | Grade Levels |  |  |
| Visual arts |  | Choice Time |  |  | K | 1 | 2 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Dance |  | Freeplay |  |  | Total Staff |  | \# |
| Music |  | WINGS Works |  |  | WINGS Leader |  |  |
| Drama |  | Type of Space |  | $\checkmark$ | Program Director |  |  |
| Crafts |  | Classroom |  |  | Peace Manager |  |  |
| Sports |  | Gym |  |  | Program Assistant |  |  |
| Open, unstructured time (e.g., free play) |  | Cafeteria |  |  | Partner/Volunteer |  |  |
| Staff-assigned learning games |  | Auditorium |  |  | Other: |  |  |
| Community service |  | Hallway |  |  | Co-Observed? |  | Yes |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\square$ No |
| Cultural awareness clubs/projects |  | Outside Playground |  |  | *ata = all that apply |  |  |
| Other: |  | Other: |  |  |  |  |  |

## OST INDICATOR ITEM RATINGS

Directions to Observers: After 15 minutes of observation, assign a rating of 1 (not evident) to 7 (highly evident and consistent) to each item below. To select a rating, identify the ODD NUMBER that most closely reflects how evident and pervasive an indicator is. If that number does not precisely reflect the level of evidence observed, then move down or up to the adjacent even number that more accurately reflects the item's presence within an activity.

Note that each indicator may not be present or applicable in each observation; therefore, a rating of " 1 " may be accurately descriptive and not necessarily negative. The " 5 " rating is also used in cases where the indicator's presence is implicit within the activity. For instance, if youth are generally friendly to each other throughout the observation, but most do not go beyond a casual, friendly interaction, the rating would be a " 5 ." If the congeniality is active, pervasive, and continuous, the rating would be a "7."

## RATINGS:



| RELATIONSHIP BUILDING: YOUTH... | PARTICIPATION: YOUTH... |
| :---: | :---: |
| Are friendly and relaxed with one another. Youth socialize informally. They are relaxed in their interactions with each other. They appear to enjoy one another's company. | Are on-task. Youth are focused, attentive, and not easily distracted from the task/project. They follow along with the staff and/or follow directions to carry on an individual or group task. Noise level and youth interactions can be high if youth are engaged in the expected task(s). |
| Respect one another. Youth refrain from causing disruptions that interfere with others accomplishing their own tasks. When working together, they consider one another's viewpoints. They refrain from derogatory comments or actions about an individual person and the work $s /$ he is doing; if disagreements occur, they are handled constructively. | Listen actively and attentively to peers and staff. Youth listen and respond to each other and staff. They appear interested in what others have to say. They look at peers and/or staff when they speak, and they provide concrete and constructive feedback about ideas or actions. |
| Show positive affect to staff. Youth interact with the staff, and these interactions are generally friendly interactions. For example, they may smile at staff, laugh with them, and/or share good-natured jokes. | Contribute opinions, ideas, and/or concerns to discussions. Youth discuss/express their ideas and respond to staff questions and/or spontaneously share connections they've made. This item goes beyond basic Q\&A and refers to sharing as part of the activity and within the class norms. Calling out - or disruptively talking out of turn - is not part of this item. |
| Assist one another. One or more youth formally or informally reach out to help/mentor peers and help them think about and figure out how to complete a task. This item refers to assistance that is intentional and prolonged, going beyond answering an incidental question. May include assisting one another with drama, dance, step, or sports techniques/moves. | Have opportunities to make meaningful choices. Within this activity, youth choose what they do, how they do it, and/or with whom they collaborate, and they experience the consequences of their choices. This item refers to genuine options about how to accomplish the task, not simple choices such as choosing between two types of games, or two sets of homework pages. |
| Are collaborative. Youth work together/share materials to accomplish tasks. Youth are equal partners in the work. This item includes strategizing how to complete a product and includes planning a cohesive product or performance (e.g., a dance, a play, or a musical event) or winning a game. This item is different from item D (above) in that it involves a joint intellectual effort. | Take leadership responsibility/roles. Youth have meaningful responsibility for directing, mentoring or assisting one another to achieve an outcome; they lead some part of the activity by organizing a task or a whole activity, or by leading a group of youth within the activity. |


| RELATIONSHIP BUILDING: STAFF... | INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES: STAFF... |
| :---: | :---: |
| Use positive behavior management techniques that allow youth to accomplish the activity's objectives. Staff set consistent limits and clear behavioral standards, and these are appropriate to the age of the youth and the activity type. If it is necessary to discipline, staff do so in a firm manner, without unnecessary accusations, threats, or anger and there is no evidence of disciplinary problems. | Communicate goals, purpose, expectations. Staff make clear the purpose of what youth are doing and/or what they expect them to accomplish. Activity goals/expectations may also be implicit if students are clearly on task without staff direction. This item goes beyond how youth are expected to behave (which would be captured in item K). |
| Encourage the participation of all. Regardless of gender, race, language ability, or other evident differences among students, staff try to engage students who appear isolated; they do not favor (or ignore) a particular student or small cluster of students. | Verbally recognize youth's efforts and accomplishments. Staff explicitly acknowledge youth's participation and progress to motivate them using praise, encouragement, and/or constructive guidance/modeling. (Must involve verbal statements not just implied affirmation.) |
| Show positive affect toward youth. Staff tone is caring and friendly; they use positive language, smile, laugh, or share good-natured jokes. They refrain from threats, cutting sarcasm, or harsh criticism. If no verbal interaction is necessary, staff demonstrate a positive and caring affect toward youth. | Assist youth without taking control. Staff refrain from taking over a task or doing the work for the youth. They coach, demonstrate, or employ scaffolding techniques that help youth to gain a better understanding of a concept or complete an action on their own. This assistance goes beyond checking that work is completed. |
| Attentively listen to and/or observe youth. Staff look at youth when they speak and acknowledge what they have said by responding and/or reacting verbally or nonverbally. They pay attention to youth as they complete tasks and are interested in what youth are saying/doing. | Ask youth to expand upon their answers and ideas. Staff encourage youth to explain their answers, to give evidence, or suggest conclusions. They ask youth "why," "how," and "if" questions to get youth to expand, explore, better clarify, articulate, or concretize their thoughts/ideas. This item goes beyond basic Q\&A. |
| Encourage youth to share their ideas, opinions, and concerns about the content of the activity. Staff actively elicit youth ideas, opinions, and concerns on the activity content through discussion and/or writing. This item goes beyond basic Q\&A to fully engage with youth's ideas and thinking. | Challenge youth to move beyond their current level of competency. Staff give constructive feedback that is designed to motivate youth, to set a higher standard, and meant to help youth gauge their progress. Staff help youth determine ways to push themselves intellectually, creatively, and/or physically. |
| Engage personally with youth. Staff show a personal interest in youth as individuals, ask about their interests, and engage in discussion about events in their lives. This goes beyond content-based discussions to include personal interest and demonstrate caring by the adults. | Employ varied teaching strategies. To engage students and/or reach those with different learning styles, staff use diverse instructional strategies, which may include: direct instruction, coaching, modeling, demonstrating, or others. Varied instructional strategies can occur simultaneously and/or sequentially within the observation period. |
| Guide positive peer interactions. The lesson structure/content explicitly encourages positive relationships/interactions and/or teaches interpersonal skills. May involve staff explaining or through planned activity content why negative behavior (e.g., bullying, teasing, etc.) is unacceptable and offering constructive behavior alternatives. However, this item does not refer to behavior management, as described above (see item K) | Plan forlask youth to work together. Staff structure activities so that youth work cooperatively to solve problems, and/or accomplish tasks. The focus of the activity is youth-to-youth, rather than youth-to-staff. This item goes beyond staff-assigned teams for competitive games and sports. In the case of staffassigned teams, staff actively encourage youth to collaborate, plan, devise strategies, etc. |
| CONTENT AND STRUCTURE: ACTIVITY <br> (Note: When homework is the observed activity, do not score these indicators.) |  |
| Is well organized. Activity has clear (implicitly or explicitly stated) goals/objectives; there is evidence of a clear lesson plan and process(es), and tasks can be conducted in the timeframe available. If special materials are needed, they are prepared and available. | Involves the practice/a progression of skills. Activity involves practicing skills needed to complete tasks. If a longterm project, youth's activity on the project provides the opportunity to apply or expand skills or techniques previously learned. |
| Challenges students intellectually, creatively, developmentally, and/or physically. Activity's level of challenge is not so difficult that youth have trouble participating successfully and not so easy that youth complete tasks routinely, without thought, and become restless/disengaged. | Requires analytic thinking. Activity calls on students to think about and solve meaningful problems and/or juggle multiple activities or strategies/dimensions to accomplish a task. For example, the activity requires youth to think about two or more ideas, and/or understand and apply sequencing or patterns. This can apply to complex dance, arts, theater, or sports moves, routines, or strategies. |


| ENVIRONMENTAL CONTEXT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Is the level of adult supervision appropriate to activity and age group? | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| If no: Why not? | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Is the work space conducive to the activity? | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| If no: Why not? | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Are necessary materials available and in sufficient supply? | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| If no: Why not? |  | No |  |  |  |  |  |

## OBSERVER'S SYNTHESIS AND RATING

On a 1-7 scale, rate the extent to which this activity demonstrates these features:

| Element | OBSERVER'S SYNTHESIS | RATING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SEQUENCED: Activity builds progressively more sequenced and advanced skills and knowledge and challenges youth to achieve clear goals. |  |  |
| ACTIVE: Youth engage actively in learning. They lead/participate in discussions, develop or research a product, contribute original ideas, collaborate, take on leadership roles, and/or are oriented toward completing tasks. |  |  |
| PERSONALLY FOCUSED: <br> Actively strengthens relationships among youth and between youth and staff. |  |  |
| EXPLICIT: The activity explicitly targets specific learning and/or developmental goals |  |  |


|  | ャ \＆て | $\downarrow$ を て I | $\downarrow$ を て | も \＆て | $\downarrow$ を 乙 | ：əuen（ZI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | も \＆て | も \＆乙 I | $\downarrow$ を 乙 I | † を 乙 โ | $\downarrow$ を 乙 | ：2uen（II |
|  | $\downarrow$ を 乙 I | $\downarrow$ \＆乙 I | 七 \＆て | † を て | † \＆乙 | ：əMeN（OT |
|  | 七 \＆乙 I | $\downarrow$ を 乙 I | カ \＆乙 I | † \＆乙 I | $\downarrow$ を 乙 | ：amen（6 |
|  | $\downarrow$ ¢ 乙 I | $\downarrow$ を 乙 I | ャ を 乙 I | カ と て | $\downarrow$ ¢ 乙 I | ：əumen（8 |
|  | † \＆乙 | $\downarrow$ ¢ 乙 I | カ を て I | $\downarrow$ を | $\downarrow$ ¢ 乙 I | ：amen（L |
|  | $\downarrow$ ¢ | $\downarrow$ を 乙 I | $\downarrow$ も | $\dagger$ \＆．乙 I | $\downarrow$ を 乙 I | ：əuren（9 |
|  | $\downarrow$ を 乙 I | カ と て | $\downarrow$ を | $\downarrow$ を | $\downarrow$ を |  |
|  | $\downarrow$ を 乙 I | $\downarrow$ ¢ 乙 I | $\downarrow$ ¢ 乙 I | $\downarrow$ を | $\downarrow$ を 乙 | ：amen（t |
|  | † と て I | $\downarrow$ を 乙 I | $\downarrow$ ¢ て | $\downarrow$ を | $\downarrow$ を 乙 I | ：əurn（E） |
|  | カ と 乙 I | $\downarrow$ \＆乙 I | カ ¢ 乙 I | $\downarrow$ を 乙 工 | 七 \＆乙 I | ：amen（Z |
|  | カ \＆乙 | $\downarrow$ を 乙 I | $\downarrow$ を 乙 | カ \＆て $\tau$ | † \＆乙 | ：əuen（I |
|  | зиашәяеяия ॥енало | рәяиапечว Aןpzepudoaddy | ране амр！sod | дормечеп anplsod | รәримрэе и！ uоредрpped | 1SวN dnod u！uadpl！पつ |

 children that you feel is important for us to know．Please be sure your ratings reflect your collective opinion of the child across all activity （hate each of the following five categories on a scale of 1 （low）to 4 （high）．Note any additional information regarding specific


| uo！ssas әyt <br>  <br>  ॥едәло раұедяsuowәр р！чЈ－ рауse sem ұечм эо ॥е ор оұ әqе sем pue <br>  |  <br>  ॥едәло рәцедияиошәр р！чว－ s8u！̣ч дәчłо <br>  qо！poos Ки！еје е р！p p！！чつ－ |  <br>  ן！！̣цед рәцедұsuoшәр р！！чว－ s8u！ <br>  <br>  qo！．„үо，ue p！p p！！чว－ |  <br>  <br>  <br> sцоцә доұәпцзи！ <br>  <br>  <br>  | รu！̣eג ॥еләло |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| spouad <br> 人и！и！ <br>  <br>  әшоs әлә！чэе ұои pınoэ әчs／วч <br>  әu！̣nuә8 puәdхә of pәрәәи <br>  łsn！әдәм syseł ॥e łsomiv－ |  10 диәшә马е马uәs！p рәриәұхә и！ <br>  <br>  <br>  әлә！̣эе pןnoэ ұпq доцә puәdxә <br>  <br>  |  |  | рәяиәәечэ <br>  |
| ұnou8nody7 ＂junt S！S！ <br>  чэns＇mse！snчłuә pue ssaulddey <br>  |  | ұиәшко！̣и <br>  <br>  до su8！！ләчдо мәృ чи！м ＇риччэ рәұиәұиоэ ‘‘едұnən－ |  <br>  <br>  |  |
|  <br>  <br>  ЧимМ spouad К ло！лечәq әфериәшшоэ－ | Зи！̣ицаә s，иәлр！！чэ дәчұо <br>  <br>  ＇วұә＇sıәәd <br>  <br>  səวuełsu！доu！ш әןdnoэ е рәмочS－ | sә！！！！！！ְе <br> әшоs Bu！̣nр рәлецәд <br> －॥әм иәәq әлец Кеш－ <br> ио！̣วәд！！рәд <br>  <br>  <br>  |  | ло！печәа ал！！！SOd |
| рәұэпдұsu！Кем әчъ u！ <br>  | реәısu！ <br>  <br>  <br>  | （әл！̣dnıs！ <br> иәәq әлеч дои Кеш ло Кеш） <br>  <br> u！pəsiesua łnq＇sə！ <br>  | （әл！！dnıs！̣p иәәq әлеч ¥ou Кеш ло Кеш）рәұэпдұsu！иечł дәчłо sКем u！ <br>  <br>  <br>  әчъ ґо Kue u！әұеd！！！ |  |
| HSIH－$\dagger$ | HSIH IVHM | MO1 IVHM3WOS－て | MO1－I |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |



## Classroom Behavior Assessment <br> WL complete weekly on Academic Center (AC) <br> Teachers complete quarterly

| Scale | (Based on frequency) |
| ---: | :--- |
| 0 | never |
| 1 | rarely |
| 2 | sometimes |
| 3 | often |
| 4 | almost always |
| 5 | always |

How often does the kid:

| Kid follows classroom/AC rules | Never Rarely Sometimes Often Almost Always Always |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Kid seems motivated and engaged in work | Never Rarely Sometimes Often Almost Always Always |
| Kid completes homework daily | Never Rarely Sometimes Often Almost Always Always |
| Kid strives to do well in class/AC | Never Rarely Sometimes Often Almost Always Always |
| Kid limits distractions to self | Never Rarely Sometimes Often Almost Always Always |
| Kid limits distractions to others | Never Rarely Sometimes Often Almost Always Always |
| Kid strives to do work independently | Never Rarely Sometimes Often Almost Always Always |
| Kid is respectful of teacher/WL | Never Rarely Sometimes Often Almost Always Always |
| Kid handles frustration appropriately | Never Rarely Sometimes Often Almost Always Always |
| Kid transitions smoothly between <br> assignments | Never Rarely Sometimes Often Almost Always Always |

## Hunter-Bailin Observation Tool <br> Child Trends modifications 11/5/15

## WINGS for kids - Implementation Assessment October 2015 Community Unity Observation Protocol

Site (school): $\qquad$
Date (include day of week): $\qquad$ WL (first name only):
Observer:
Total \# Participants (include \# girls/ \# boys): $\qquad$ Grade/Cohort: $\qquad$


| Group time | N/A | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 08. The PD or PA explains the SEL game using the microphone and if the kids do not already know the game, the D-D-A-D-A steps are used to explain it (Describe it, Demonstrate, Ask questions, Do it, Adapt) (Note: sometimes Kids Praise and Soaring Stars Awards are given out in place of SEL games) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 09. WINGS staff make the game fun and exciting (Note: Also applies to other activities such as Heys and Praise, and Awards) | $\chi$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. WINGS staff ensure that all kids are demonstrating Creed-like behavior (Note: in addition to the SEL game, this applies to other activities such as Heys and Praise, and Awards) | $X$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11. Staff member on the mic encourages the kids to participate by asking questions or calling on kids to share comments |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12. Staff member on the mic makes his/her announcements to the entire community |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Creed recital | N/A | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Notes |
| 13. The entire community says the WINGS Creed together | $X$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14. WL ensures that everybody in their nest says the Creed in a respectful manner (this is at the nest level, not the program level) | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15. Community Unity ends on time | YES |  | NO |  |  |  |

Social and Emotional Learning Implementation Standards



## WINGS for kids - Implementation Assessment October 2015

## Academic Centers Observation Protocol

Site (school): $\qquad$
Date (include day of week):
WL (first name only): $\qquad$
Observer:
Total \# Participants (include \# girls/ \# boys): Grade/Cohort: $\qquad$ Grade/Cohort:
$\square$


| Doing homework | N/A | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 06. WL fills out HMWK sheet and signs off | Yes |  |  | No |  |  |
| 07. The WL walks around the room answering questions and helping kids with difficult assignments. If there is no homework WL is engaged in helping with student activities (reading, worksheets, puzzles, etc.) | $\Lambda$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 08. Kids are sitting at desk/assigned space and not getting up without permission |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 09. WL provides feedback that encourages kids to be persistent and complete their homework or other academic activity. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. WL offers support for kids who are having difficulty understanding or completing their homework or academic activity. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11. The WL checks the assignment and gives it back to the child to make any corrections |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12. Kids have clear activities to do when waiting or finished with their work, also in the case they do not have homework. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13. Kids are quietly working and only speaking when they have raised their hand or have permission. | $X$ |  |  |  |  |  |


| ¢ Wrap-up |  |  | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Yes | No |  |
| 15. The kids pack up their supplies | Yes | No |  |
| 16. The classroom is left exactly as it is found | Yes | No |  |
| 17. Academic Center ends on time | Yes | No |  |



Behavior Management Implementation Standards

| Behavior Management Implementation Standards |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shaping/Modifying/Reinforcing behavior | N/A | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Notes |
| 20. WLs apply the M-E-S-S method to shape behavior (Make it fun, Expectations (set them clearly), Stay busy, Show kids how to help) <br> Note: expectation-setting may not be observed if expectations were set at a prior time; use notes column to record specific components of M-E-S-S observed/ not observed | $X$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21. WLs apply the G-E-T P-A-S-T method to shape behavior (Give choices, Experience consequences, Take it away, Problem (state it), Amends, State feelings strongly, Tell it in a word) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22. Were there any instance(s) of a kid(s) needing assistance with behavior issues, school problems, or personal situations? |  |  |  | NO |  |  |
| 23. If yes to \#22, WLs make use of the Peace Manager to provide needed assistance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24. WL use Behavior Boosters (aka The Great Trait Raffle) to recognize kids for displaying positive behaviors and SEL skills <br> Note: this includes the use of school-specific reward systems such as ‘NCES Cash' | $X$ |  |  |  |  |  |

## WINGS for kids - Implementation Assessment October 2015

Discussion Observation Protocol
Site (school): $\qquad$
Date (include day of week): $\qquad$
WL (first name only): $\qquad$
Observer:
Total \# Participants (include \# girls/ \# boys): Grade/Cohort: $\qquad$

| Activity-Based Implementation Standards |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Discussion | N/A | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



| Behavior Management Implementation Standards |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shaping/Modifying/Reinforcing behavior | N/A | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Notes |
| 05. WLs apply the M-E-S-S method to shape behavior (Make it fun, Expectations (set them clearly), Stay busy, Show kids how to help) <br> Note: expectation-setting may not be observed if expectations were set at a prior time; use notes column to record specific components of M-E-S-S observed/ not observed | $X$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06. WLs apply the G-E-T P-A-S-T method to shape behavior (Give choices, Experience consequences, Take it away, Problem (state it), Amends, State feelings strongly, Tell it in a word) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07. Were there any instance(s) of a kid(s) needing assistance with behavior issues, school problems, or personal situations? |  |  |  | O |  |  |
| 08. If yes to \#07, WLs make use of the Peace Manager to provide needed assistance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 09. WL use Behavior Boosters (aka The Great Trait Raffle) to recognize kids for displaying positive behaviors and SEL skills <br> Note: this includes the use of school-specific reward systems such as ‘NCES Cash' | $x$ |  |  |  |  |  |

## WINGS for kids - Implementation Assessment October 2015

## Choice Time Observation Protocol

Site (school):
Date (include day of week):
WL (first name only):
Observer: $\qquad$
Total \# Participants (include \# girls/ \# boys): $\qquad$ Grade/Cohort: $\qquad$

| Choice time | N/A | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01. Choice Time starts on time (according to weekly schedule) | YES NO |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02. WL and/or Choice Time Partner engage the kids throughout Choice Time | X |  |  |  |  | PLEASE DESCRIBE THE SPECIFIC CHOICE TIME ACTIVITY THAT TOOK PLACE |
| 03. The Choice Time room is left in the same condition as it was found |  |  |  | NO |  |  |



| Behavior Management Implementation Standards |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shaping/Modifying/Reinforcing behavior | N/A | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Notes |
| 06. WLs apply the M-E-S-S method to shape behavior (Make it fun, Expectations (set them clearly), Stay busy, Show kids how to help) <br> Note: expectation-setting may not be observed if expectations were set at a prior time; use notes column to record specific components of M-E-S-S observed/ not observed | $X$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07. WLs apply the G-E-T P-A-S-T method to shape behavior (Give choices, Experience consequences, Take it away, Problem (state it), Amends, State feelings strongly, Tell it in a word) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 08. Were there any instance(s) of a kid(s) needing assistance with behavior issues, school problems, or personal situations? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 09. If yes to \#08, WLs make use of the Peace Manager to provide needed assistance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. WL use Behavior Boosters (aka The Great Trait Raffle) to recognize kids for displaying positive behaviors and SEL skills <br> Note: this includes the use of school-specific reward systems such as 'NCES Cash' | $X$ |  |  |  |  |  |

WINGS for kids - Implementation Assessment October 2015
WINGS Works Observation Protocol

Site (school): $\qquad$
Date (include day of week):
WL (first name only): $\qquad$
Observer: $\qquad$
Total \# Participants (include \# girls/ \# boys):
Grade/Cohort: $\qquad$

| Activity-Based Implementation Standards |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WINGS Works | N/A | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Notes |
| 01. Wings Works starts on time | YES |  |  | NO |  |  |
| 02.WL is prepared for the day's activity | $X$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03. WLs leads their kids with a good attitude | $X$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04 . The theme of service is woven into the activity and geared towards kids' interest | $X$ |  |  |  |  | PLEASE DESCRIBE THE SPECIFIC ACTIVITY THAT TOOK PLACE |
| 05. WINGS Works ends on time |  | YE |  | vo |  |  |

## Social and Emotional Implementation Standards



| Behavior Management Implementation Standards |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shaping/Modifying/Reinforcing behavior | N/A | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Notes |
| 08. WL apply the M-E-S-S method to shape behavior (Make it fun, Expectations (set them clearly), Stay busy, Show kids how to help) <br> Note: expectation-setting may not be observed if expectations were set at a prior time; use notes column to record specific components of M-E-S-S observed/ not observed | $X$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 09. WL apply the G-E-T P-A-S-T method to shape behavior (Give choices, Experience consequences, Take it away, Problem (state it), Amends, State feelings strongly, Tell it in a word) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. Were there any instance(s) of a kid(s) needing assistance with behavior issues, school problems, or personal situations? | YES NO |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11. If yes to \#10, WLs make use of the Peace Manager to provide needed assistance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12. WL use Behavior Boosters (aka The Great Trait Raffle) to recognize kids for displaying positive behaviors and SEL skills <br> Note: this includes the use of school-specific reward systems such as 'NCES Cash' |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Scoring Instructions
$0=$ The behavior/activity was expected to occur but it never occurred; or the behavior/activity occurred with extremely low quality
1 = The behavior/activity occasionally occurred, or was demonstrated in relation to some but not all children, or it occurred but with moderate quality
2 = The behavior/activity frequently occurred, or was demonstrated in relation to most but not all children, or it occurred but with moderately high quality

3 = The behavior/activity always occurred, or was demonstrated in relation to all children, or it occurred but with extremely high quality
N/A = Only use N/A when the item describes something that did not occur and did not need to occur or was not expected to occur. If something did not occur, but it should have occurred, that would be scored a 0 . For example, for Item 9, "All kids sit in their nests and eat snack," you can check N/A if snack time does not occur as part of Community Unity at that school, or you can score it 0 if the kids are supposed to be sitting by nests to eat snack but they are up wandering around.

## Appendix I Changing School and WINGS Factors During the 3 Year Study Period (2012-2015)

Table I. 1 summarizes the important changes occurring by year and school that might both affect impact results and/or provide a context to better interpret results. These changes are described in more detail below.

Table I. 1 Important Changes in the WINGS Program and Schools over the 2012-2105 Period.

| Change | School and Year of Change |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | North Charleston | Chicora | Memminger | James Simmons ${ }^{1}$ |
| School Changes |  |  |  |  |
| School schedule changed |  |  |  | 2012-2013 |
| School location changed |  |  | 2013-2014 | 2013-2014 |
| Teaching pedagogy changed |  |  | 2014-2015 | 2013-2014 |
| Principal changed | 2014-2015 | 2014-2015 | 2014-2015 |  |
| WINGS Program Changes |  |  |  |  |
| Expansion to Atlanta | 2012-2013 | 2012-2013 | 2012-2013 | 2012-2013 |
| Program schedule changed |  |  |  | 2012-2013 |
| Program director changed | 2014-2015 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 |  |
| Access to school space changed |  |  | 2014-2015 |  |
| WINGS attendance policy changed | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 2012-2013 \\ 2013-2014 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2012-2013 \\ & 2013-2014 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 2012-2013 \\ 2013-2014 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2012-2013 \\ 2013-2014 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| ${ }^{1}$ James Simmons' WINGS program closed at end of 2013-2014 school year because the student population had changed so significantly. |  |  |  |  |

## Overall Major Changes

1. Two School Moves:
a. James Simons and Memminger Elementary- YEAR 2 (2013-14):
b. North Charleston to Downtown
c. Transportation was an issue for families
d. Student population changed
2. School Pedagogical Change at JSE: YEAR 2 (2013-14):
a. JSE moved to a Montessori model for PK- $3^{\text {rd }}$ grade
b. Student demographics changes- higher SES
c. Large teacher shift due to required training
d. WINGS was affected- no kindergarten, then no program
3. School Administrative Changes at Memminger and Chicora: YEARS 2 and 3 (2013-15)
a. Principal changes impacted WINGS
b. Relationships with WINGS Program Directors changed (Memminger only)
4. WINGS Schedule Changes at JSE due to Shared Building: YEAR 1 (2012-2013)
a. WINGS at JSE started later due to staggered start of school day (bussing issue)
b. WINGS shortened program to avoid ending too late in the day
c. Families still complained that children were getting home too late
5. WINGS Administrative Changes: Expanding to Atlanta: YEAR 1 (2012-2013)
a. Some staff moved to Atlanta
b. Trainings were bigger and involved the new staff in Atlanta
6. WINGS Policy Change: Children asked to leave program- YEAR 2 (2013-14):
a. In Year 1-WINGS kept children in
b. In Year 2- returned to their old model of having students leave for behavioral and attendance reasons
7. WINGS Space Restrictions at Memminger- YEAR 3 (2014-2015):
a. WINGS was banned from using classrooms
b. Access only to gym and cafeteria
c. Schedule of WINGS changed

## Major Changes by School

## NORTH CHARLESTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (NCES)

School/ Administrative Factors: During the three year study period, NCES has been stably located at the same site in North Charleston. NCES hired a new principal (Ms. Townsend), and she remained principal until the spring of Year 3 (2014-2015) of the study, at which time, the assistant principals took over.

WINGS Factors: The principal was very open and welcoming to WINGS, and the WINGS program remained very solid during the three year study period, with Nicole directing the WINGs program for the first 2 years, and Cara becoming the Program Director in Year 3.

## Major Impressions of NCES

- Very stable school with respect to location, administration and WINGS
- WINGS had a solid program during all three years


## CHICORA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

School/ Administrative Factors: During the three year study period, Chicora was housed in the Robert McNair Building ( 3795 Spruill Ave). Chicora hired a new principal (Mr. Agnew), who remained in this role for the first 2 years of the study. During the third year, Ms. Coakley, previously the assistant principal, moved into the role of Principal. She overhauled the teaching staff, bringing in many new teachers.

WINGS Factors: During all three study years the WINGS program had full support from both principals. Even though there was some turnover of Program Directors (from Cheryl to Ashley in Year 2), the program was very solid, extremely well run, and had a good reputation in the community (families wanted to be part of it). The principal and PD had a great working relationship the entire time.

Major Impressions of Chicora

- Very stable school with respect to location, administration and WINGS
- WINGS had a very strong program during all three years


## MEMMINGER ELEMENTARY

School/ Administrative Factors: Several years prior to the study Memminger, originally located in downtown Charleston on Beaufain St., had moved to the Brentwood campus in North Charleston (2685 Leeds Ave.). At the Brentwood campus, Memminger shared a building with James Simons Elementary. This move was hard on families who lived downtown because the children now had to be bussed to a new school. Additionally, Memminger enrolled all students living within its North Charleston vicinity, and thus mixed children from two different communities.

Prior to the start of the second year of the study (July, 2013), Memminger moved from the Brentwood campus in North Charleston back to its original space in downtown Charleston ( 20 Beaufain St), where it remained throughout the course of the study. This move was not completed by the time school began, with boxes still being unpacked on the first day of school. The school now did not accept children if they were no longer districted for the downtown location. As a result all North Charleston families previously attending were redistricted.

Memminger's principal, Ms. Taylor remained for the first and second year of the study. During the third year of the study, Dr. Woods became the principal. She began school procedures for International Baccalaureate certification. Some related standards made their way into school programs that year.

WINGS Factors: During the three year study period, there was a shift in Program Directors. Li was in the role of director during the first 2 years of the study with Mallory stepping in during Year 3. The principal initially was fairly uninvolved with WINGS. However, she did express concerns during the end of Year 2 that property being defaced in the classrooms. By the third year, she banned WINGS from using classrooms and only allowed use of the gym and the cafeteria. This forced WINGS to change its regular schedule in order to serve its many students within such rigid space constraints.

## Major Impressions of Memminger

- External and internal disruptions affected school staff and families
- moving
- administrative changes
- transportation issues for families
- beginnings of pedagogical changes
- WINGS had to work around space restrictions and a schedule change (shortening of program)


## JAMES SIMONS ELEMENTARY (JSE)

School/ Administrative Factors: Like Memminger (though smaller), JSE was originally a downtown school that moved from 741 King Street to the Brentwood Campus in North Charleston several years prior to the study. This move was hard on families who lived downtown (those originally districted to JSE), not only because the
children now had to be bussed to school, but the school had to stagger its start and end time with that of Memminger's. JSE families (who all lived downtown) complained about significant transportation issues, and their children getting home late and exhausted.

Midway through the second year, the school moved back downtown to its original address on King Street. The demographics of the school changed, with a greater percentage of the newly districted children being of a higher socioeconomic group. In addition, at the start of this school year, JSE switched to a Montessori model. All grades below fourth followed this model.

A new principal, Ms. White, was hired during the summer before our study, and remained in her role for all three years of the study. In response to the shift to a Montessori model during Year 2, she made changes to her teaching staff, hiring new Montessori trained teachers, and moving other untrained teachers around, either within or outside of the school.

WINGS Factors: At the start of the study, the principal expressed interested in the details of the study, and wanted to support families in any way she could. During the first year, JSE implemented a staggered start and end to the school day, due to sharing space with Memminger. The long school day that resulted forced WINGS to shorten its program to 2 hours. Families still complained about getting home late.

In Year 2, as a result of JSE's change to Montessori, WINGS did not hold a kindergarten group but still had first grade students. By the third year of the study, the WINGS program was no longer implemented at JSE. They had finished out the previous year and did not even start this year because the demographics had changed so much.

## Major Impressions of JSE

- Schedule changes due to sharing schools in Years 1-2
- Shortened WINGS
- Families stills struggled with children coming home late
- School Pedagogical Change: Shift to Montessori Model in Year 2
- Student demographic changed
- WINGS affected- no Kindergarten in Year 2
- WINGS affected- no WINGS program in Year 3


## GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ABOUT WINGS PROGRAM AND SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION

Within the context of each study school, and across each of the three years, the backdrop of the WINGS program inevitably did not stay the same. Significant stressors to schools and study families change components of both school and WINGS programming. These stressors also ultimately affected which children flow in and out of the program.

How much WINGS was or was not supported by schools varied from school to school, principal to principal, and year to year. However, it is important to recognize that the quality of the relationship between school administrators, teachers and WINGS staff is a critical ingredient to WINGS' success.

Two important WINGS-specific factors that occurred during the study period were 1) WINGS expansion, and 2) changes in policy about children leaving the program. During the course of the three year study, WINGS was expanding its program across the east coast. During the first year of the study, WINGS expanded to Atlanta. In addition to staff movement, the summer training of WINGS leaders in Charleston was bigger, given that WINGS bussed the trainees from Atlanta to Charleston to join the Charleston cohort in the training. Regarding the second factor, in the first year of the study, WINGS changed its policy about asking children to leave the program for behavioral or attendance reasons. They kept children in WINGS to help minimize program attrition. In Year 2, WINGS returned to the old model of asking students to leave for behavioral and attendance reasons.
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## AERA Classroom Observation Special Interest Group Exemplary Paper Nomination:

Kim, H., Cameron, C. E., Adams, C., \& West, H. (2016, April). Validating an individualized child observational measure in low-income kindergarten classrooms. Paper presented in B. L. Alford (chair), Classroom observations: Instruments, application, and findings, 2016 American Educational Research Association Annual Conference, Washington, DC.

Mace, A., Cameron, C. E. (2016, April). Are low-income children's social problem-solving skills associated with the relationship they develop with their kindergarten teacher? Poster presented at GSE Student Research Symposium, Buffalo, NY, USA.

Duran, C.A.K., Cottone, E. A., Mashburn, A., \& Grissmer, D. W. (2016, May). The Family Stress Model and Children's Cognitive Self-Regulation. Poster presented at Education and Inequality in 21st Century America Conference. Stanford, CA.

Duran, C.A.K., Cottone, E. A., Mashburn, A., \& Grissmer, D. W. (2016, July). The Family Stress Model and Children's Cognitive Self-Regulation. Poster presented at 2016 National Research Conference for Early Childhood, Washington, DC.

Kim, H., Doromal, J. B., \& Cameron, C. E. (2016, July). Patterns of behavioral self-regulation in low-income kindergarten children: A person-centered approach. Poster presented at 2016 National Research Conference for Early Childhood, Washington, DC.

Mace, A., \& Cameron, C. E. (2016, October). Kindergarteners' initial social problem-solving skills predict the relationship they develop with their teacher. Poster presentation accepted for the Northeastern Educational Research Association, Trumbull, CT, USA.

Brock, L. L., Kim, H., \& Adams, C. (2017, April). Self-regulation, perspective-taking, and student-teacher relationships in kindergarten. Paper accepted to C. Mulcahy (chair), Self-regulation and studentteacher relationships: Variable and person-centered approaches examining connections to development, 2017 Society for Research in Child Development Conference, Austin, TX.

Brock, L. L., Kim, H., \& Adams, C. (2017, April). The development of theory of mind: Predictors and moderators of improvement in kindergarten. Paper accepted for 2017 American Educational Research Association Annual Conference, San Antonio, TX.

Brock, L. L., Kim, H., \& Adams, C. (2017, April). Longitudinal associations among executive function, visuomotor integration, and achievement: Timing is everything. Paper accepted for 2017 American Educational Research Association Annual Conference, San Antonio, TX.

Brock, L. L., Kim, H., \& Adams, C. (2017, April). Mental representation, theory of mind, and social skills: Cross-lagged associations across kindergarten and first grade. Poster accepted to 2017 Society for Research in Child Development Conference, Austin, TX.

Kim, H., Cameron, C. E., Doromal, J. B., \& Grissmer, D. W. (2017, April). Patterns of behavioral self-regulation in low-income kindergarten children: Integrating variable- and person-centered approaches. Paper accepted to C. Mulcahy (chair), Self-regulation and student-teacher relationships: Variable and person-centered approaches examining connections to development, 2017 Society for Research in Child Development Conference, Austin, TX.
West, H., Adams, C., \& Kim, H. (2017, April). Classroom quality as a predictor of classroom behavior in a sample of socio-demographically at-risk students. Poster accepted to 2017 Society for Research in Child Development Conference, Austin, TX.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Study of third grade classrooms ( $n=82$ ) in New York city with $45.6 \%$ Hispanic/Latino and 41.1\% African American children; $61.8 \%$ of children were living at or below $100 \%$ of the poverty line at the time of the study (Jones, Brown, \& Aber, 2011).
    ${ }^{2}$ Study of first through fifth grade classrooms ( $n=88$ ) in an urban district in the northeast. $53.63 \%$ were ethnic minorities and $35.32 \%$ were eligible for free or reduced lunch (Rimm-Kaufman, as cited in Pianta, La Paro, \& Hamre, 2011).

[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ Study of programs ( $n=10$ ) for children in grades kindergarten through eight in New Jersey; $87 \%$ of children were African American or Hispanic and 57\% were eligible for free or reduced lunch.
    ${ }^{4}$ Study of programs ( $n=10$ ) for children in grades four through eight in New York City (Birmingham, et al., 2005).

[^2]:    Copyright and other intellectual property laws protect these materials. Reproduction or retransmission of the materials, in whole or in part, in any manner, without the prior written consent of the copyright holder, is a violation of copyright law. Users may not distribute such copies to others, whether or not in electronic form, whether or not for a charge or other consideration, without prior written consent of the copyright holder of the materials. Users may not post the task online. Contact Megan McClelland (megan.mcclelland@oregonstate.edu) or Claire Cameron (cecamero@buffalo.edu) for requests for permission to reproduce the Head-Toes-Knees-Shoulders task.

