

SEL and Preservice Teacher Education

Kimberly A. Schonert-Reichl, Jennifer L. Hanson-Peterson,
and Shelley Hymel

How can we prepare teachers most effectively for the challenges of teaching? What are the courses and experiences that preservice teacher candidates need to equip them with the skills, dispositions, and knowledge necessary to promote the success of all of their students in diverse classrooms in the 21st century? A growing body of evidence has documented how students' academic and life successes, as well as their social-emotional well-being, are bolstered when attention is given to the social and emotional dimensions of teaching and learning (Durlak, Weissberg, Dymnicki, Taylor, & Schellinger, 2011). Consequently, understanding how preservice teacher education programs can best prepare teachers with the background knowledge necessary to succeed in the teaching profession has become a recent topic among educators, policymakers, and the public at large.

This chapter identifies the ways in which issues related to social and emotional learning (SEL)—including knowledge about students' social and emotional development, teachers' social and emotional competence, and how to create caring and supportive classroom environments that are well managed, participatory, and safe—are incorporated into preservice teacher education. We begin with a brief overview of teacher preparation in the United States and provide

a rationale for the importance of including information on issues relevant to SEL in preservice teacher education programs. Then, we review the extant research on the degree to which this is currently occurring. We focus our discussion on recent research examining the nature and frequency with which coursework in teacher preparation programs focuses on topics related to the promotion of students' SEL and development. Given that much of what is incorporated into preservice teacher education is determined by state-level policy directives, we also report on our recent scan examining the extent to which dimensions relevant to SEL (e.g., implementation of SEL programs, teachers' social and emotional competence, and the creation of classroom contexts that support students' social and emotional well-being) are incorporated into state-level teacher certification requirements. We conclude our chapter by offering some guidelines and recommendations for incorporating SEL into preservice teacher education and note some potential problems and pitfalls in doing so.

The Case for SEL in Preservice Teacher Education

In recent years, we have witnessed increased theoretical and empirical attention to the

school-based promotion of students' social and emotional competence as educators, parents, and policymakers seek solutions to contemporary problems such as declining academic motivation and achievement (Eccles & Roeser, 2011), escalating dropout rates (Battin-Pearson et al., 2000), and increasing school bullying and aggression (Swearer, Espelage, Vaillancourt, & Hymel, 2010). Longitudinal research indicates that between ages 9 and 16, 37–39% of youth are diagnosed with at least one or more diagnosable psychiatric disorders (Jaffee, Harrington, Cohen, & Moffitt, 2005), with prevalence rates increasing to 40–50% by age 21 (e.g., Arseneault, Moffitt, Caspi, Taylor, & Silva, 2000). Lamentably, roughly 80% of children with social, emotional, and behavioral problems do not receive the services they need (U.S. Public Health Service, 2000), and all too often the services provided are neither appropriate nor evidence-based (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1999). The Institute of Medicine's 2009 report on mental, emotional, and behavioral disorders of young people emphasized that prevention and the use of empirically supported interventions are essential strategies for reducing mental illness and promoting social and emotional health. Implicit in this trend is the assumption that educational interventions can be designed to foster students' strengths and resiliency.

Coupled with the need to train and prepare teachers adequately to promote their students' mental health, current theory and research suggest that a high-quality education should not just cultivate the intellectual skills of students; schools today also need to nurture the development of social and emotional competencies and positive human traits such as self-awareness, social awareness, self-management, relationship skills, and responsible decision making (Greenberg et al., 2003). SEL is the process of acquiring the competencies to recognize and manage emotions, develop caring and concern for others, establish positive relationships, make responsible decisions, and handle challenging situations effectively (Osher et al., 2008; Payton et al., 2000; Weissberg, Payton, O'Brien, & Munro, 2007). This attention to promoting students' SEL as a central aim of education is in accord with views espoused

since the advent of public education, which stress that schooling should foster the development of skills such as empathy, collaboration, and conflict resolution in order "to prepare students to participate effectively as citizens in our constitutional democracy" (McClung, 2013, p. 38). Prior theory and evidence verify that these intrapersonal and interpersonal competencies can be taught and measured, that they promote developmental assets and reduce problem behaviors, and that they improve students' academic performance, citizenship, and health-related behaviors (e.g., Durlak et al., 2011). In particular, SEL skills can be fostered through nurturing and caring learning environments and experiences (Elias et al., 1997; Greenberg, 2010), with long-lasting effects (Hawkins, Kosterman, Catalano, Hill, & Abbott, 2008). Given that the very nature of school-based learning is relational, social and emotional skills create responsive, caring, and inclusive classrooms, and provide a foundation for building and sustaining learning relationships that promote academic success and responsible citizenship.

Importantly, teachers hold in high regard the role of SEL in their own teaching. For example, a nationally representative survey of more than 600 teachers (Bridgeland, Bruce, & Hariharan, 2013) indicated that most teachers, from preschool to high school, believe that social and emotional skills are teachable (95%), that promoting SEL will benefit students from both rich and poor backgrounds (97%), and will have positive effects on school attendance and graduation (80%), standardized test scores and overall academic performance (77%), college preparation (78%), workforce readiness (87%), and citizenship (87%). These same teachers also reported that in order to effectively implement and promote SEL, they need strong support from district and school leaders. Thus, although teachers are ready to promote SEL, there is a need for a systemic approach that supports implementation at the federal, state, district, and school levels. Results of a 2013 Gallup Poll indicate that sentiments of the general public echo those espoused by teachers (Bushaw & Lopez, 2013). Nevertheless, teachers report limited training and confidence in responding to student behavioral needs and, in turn, supporting students' SEL and development

(Reinke, Stormont, Herman, Puri, & Goel, 2011; Walter, Gouze, & Lim, 2006).

Research on teacher attrition provides some interesting insights into the value of understanding the ways in which social and emotional teaching and learning dimensions affect teachers. The evidence is now clear that teacher burnout and attrition is a major problem that poses a threat to efforts to improve teacher quality. According to a report from the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (2007), teacher turnover costs the United States up to \$7 billion a year, with the negative impact of teacher turnover being greatest at low-performing, high-poverty, high-minority schools. Stress and poor emotion management rank as the primary reasons why teachers become dissatisfied with the profession and leave their positions (Darling-Hammond, 2001). Another contributing factor is student behavior (Ferguson, Frost, & Hall, 2012). One study, for instance, indicated that of the 50% of teachers who leave the field permanently, almost 35% report reasons related to problems with student discipline (Ingersoll & Smith, 2003). Problems with student discipline, classroom management, and student mental health emerge at the beginning of teachers' careers, and first-year teachers feel unprepared to manage their classroom effectively and are unable to recognize common mental health problems such as anxiety (Koller & Bertel, 2006; Siebert, 2005). On a more positive note, data also suggest that when teachers receive training in the behavioral and emotional factors that impact teaching and learning in the classroom, they feel better equipped to propose and implement positive, active classroom management strategies that deter students' aggressive behaviors and promote a positive classroom learning climate (Alvarez, 2007). In order to understand the conditions under which the effective promotion of students' SEL and development can occur, institutional factors that may impact SEL promotion need to be addressed. Therefore, an important issue is to what extent preservice teacher education provides the necessary information, coursework, and/or experiences that prepare teachers to address dimensions relevant to SEL, including information on theories and research on the social and emotional development and

the knowledge and skills necessary for creating classroom learning contexts that are well-managed and promote student mental health.

Preservice Teacher Preparation and SEL

Teacher Preparation in the United States

Preservice teacher preparation refers to the education and training provided to teacher candidates prior to entering the teaching profession. This education typically occurs within a college or university setting for which a set program of coursework and experiences is delineated by state-level requirements for teacher certification.¹ A full history and critical analysis of preservice teacher preparation is beyond the scope of this chapter, but readers interested in learning more about the current state of teacher education can find more information in Darling-Hammond (2010, 2013).

Currently, over 1,400 institutions of higher education prepare the majority of the nation's teachers (Greenberg, McKee, & Walsh, 2013). According to a report by the National Council on Teacher Quality (Greenberg, McKee, et al., 2013), approximately 200,000 teachers graduate each year from teacher preparation programs. Preservice teacher education programs vary considerably in terms of duration of training (e.g., 4-year bachelor's degree programs, or 1- or 2-year graduate programs), emphasis on subject content or pedagogy across particular school levels (e.g., elementary school, middle school, high school) and/or content area (middle school and/pre-high school teachers typically identify a subject area, such as Science, Math, Social Studies, etc.), length of practicum periods, and requirements for certification. Obtaining a degree in teacher education generally requires a minimum grade point average (GPA); completion of a bachelor's degree; knowledge about how social, institutional, and state policy affect the educational process; an understanding of how learning occurs and how to teach effectively; and successful completion of supervised field experiences (Zeichner & Paige, 2007). A certificate obtained in one country or state may not be recognized in

another. Within the United States, state-to-state reciprocity is limited.

Research on the extent to which preservice teacher education includes direct information and/or training in SEL is in a nascent stage. However, findings from a few recent studies provide a glimpse into the extent to which factors that provide the foundation for promoting students' SEL in classrooms and schools are routinely included in teacher preparation. For example, knowledge about classroom management is essential for all teachers because the promotion of students' social and emotional competence is most effective when it occurs within a supportive learning environment that is a safe, caring, participatory, and well-managed environment that supports children's development and affords them opportunities for practicing SEL skills (Weissberg et al., 2007). The term "classroom management" refers to the ways in which teachers establish order, routine, and limits in their classrooms, deliver lessons, manage multiple transitions that occur between activities, and create an atmosphere of safety and support for students. Effective classroom management prevents the occurrence of disruptive or undesirable behaviors and increases engaged academic learning time in the classroom, which in turn leads to students' improved behavioral and academic performance. Issues including communication styles, high performance expectations, classroom structures and rules, school organizational climate, commitment to the academic success of all students, teacher social and emotional competence (Jennings & Greenberg, 2009), and openness to parental and community involvement are all important components of effective classroom management in general and SEL in particular. In the next section, we examine the extent to which SEL is currently incorporated into coursework in U.S. preservice teacher education programs.

Teacher Preparation and Knowledge about Child and Adolescent Development

One dimension that is considered central to effective, high-quality teaching and learning is teachers' knowledge and understanding of their students' social, emotional, and cognitive development (Comer & Maholmes, 1999; Daniels & Shumow, 2003; Darling-

Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Sarason, 2001). More than a decade of research indicates that teachers who have knowledge about child and adolescent development are better able to design and carry out learning experiences in ways that support student social, emotional, and academic competence, and enhance student outcomes (Hamre & Pianta, 2006; Rimm-Kaufman & Hamre, 2010). Associations between successful social relationships in schools (i.e., student-teacher relationships and peer relationships) and positive social and academic outcomes have also been documented (Hamre & Pianta, 2001; Wentzel, 2003).

Recently, the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD), the National Institute of Health (NIH), and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (USDHHS) (2007) and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE; 2010) collaborated in conducting two roundtable discussions on the critical relevance of child and adolescent development research for preservice teacher preparation, with input provided from a selected group of internationally renowned experts in teacher training and in child and adolescent development research. The reports that followed from these meetings (see NCATE, 2010; available at www.ncate.org) emphasized the importance of preservice teachers being knowledgeable about many issues related to SEL, including children's social and emotional development, teacher-student relationships, and the learning environment. The current status of child and adolescent development in teacher preparation programs was explored in a 33-item, online survey sent to unit heads at 595 NCATE-accredited institutions, both public and private, in 2005. Of the 283 responses received (48% response rate; 64% from public and 36% from private institutions), 90% indicated that they required teacher candidates to take at least one course in child-adolescent development, although several programs reported foregoing courses altogether because of state limitations on credit hours for preparation programs. The *application* of this knowledge to classroom practice may be more limited, however. Indeed, in the NCATE survey, the 20% of programs that did not themselves offer courses in development reported rely-

ing on psychology departments for such courses, where connections to the classroom are less likely. Furthermore, survey results indicated that for many of the texts used in courses, there was virtually no application of child–adolescent development to actual classroom practice, leaving instructors to create their own examples. Survey respondents underscored the potential benefits of a text that made more explicit connections between developmental research and its application.

With an ever-expanding knowledge base for the field of teacher education, it is the responsibility of both educators and preparation institutions to enrich and revise practices, programs, policies, and partnerships, and to determine critical foci. One conclusion that emerged from the NCATE (2010) report is that current efforts to incorporate coursework in the developmental sciences into teacher training are woefully inadequate. In order to advance the field of teacher education, they recommended that programs integrate academic study in the behavioral sciences with real opportunities to implement child and adolescent development best practices in classrooms and communities. Moreover, policymakers must consider the importance of child and adolescent development as they design new standards and assessments for evaluating student and teacher performance, particularly when evaluating low-performing schools, whose students are often in greater need of developmental supports to improve achievement.

Teacher Preparation and Student Social and Emotional Behavioral Problems, Mental Health, and Classroom Management

Recent educational research on the factors that promote students' social and behavioral competence and prevent negative outcomes, such as mental illness and aggression, has focused on the contributions of school context given evidence that empirically based school curricula can deter the onset of problem behaviors and emotional difficulties (Durlak et al., 2011; Sklad, Diekstra, De Ritter, & Ben, 2012; Weare & Nind, 2011). Teachers play a critical role in these initiatives by fostering positive student–teacher relationships and by creating supportive

and caring classroom environments (Hamre & Pianta, 2005, 2006); there is evidence that teachers who effectively integrate SEL programs into their practice have students with more positive outcomes (Durlak et al., 2011). Less is known about the role of teachers in addressing student mental illness and social, emotional, and behavioral problems. Teachers are in a unique position to recognize significant adjustment problems in their students or to identify disruptive behaviors that are common in schools. However, the majority of teachers feel ill-prepared to address such issues (Walter et al., 2006), due to their lack of knowledge and skills in the area of student mental health and/or classroom management. Indeed, Koller, Osterlind, Paris, and Weston (2004) found that both experienced and first-year teachers reported that they did not receive adequate training in their teacher education programs to identify and manage the mental health concerns of their students. Similarly, in a national study of 2,335 educators, conducted by the Coalition for Psychology in Schools and Education (2006), teachers indicated that they did not receive adequate training on handling student behavior during preservice teaching, with the majority of teachers (especially first-year teachers) ranking classroom management as one of their top two professional development needs.

Analyses of educational curricula confirm that preservice education programs are not adequately preparing teachers to deal with student social, emotional, and behavioral problems. State, Kern, Starosta, and Mukherjee (2011) collected and examined the content of syllabi in required educational courses of U.S. preservice teacher elementary preparation programs. They found that 42 of the 80 syllabi examined (53%) did not include *any* content related to students' social, emotional, and behavioral problems (SEB), and most of the other required courses provided very limited coverage. For example, relatively little class time was devoted to teaching student teachers how to identify student problems and/or how to promote SEL in students. With regard to course topics, among 38 syllabi, only eight (21%) focused on classroom management, six (16%) included information on the characteristics and identification of emotional and behavioral disorders, and only two (5%)

included information on children's social and emotional development.

With regard to the total amount of class time spent on the various SEB topics, State and colleagues (2011) estimated that an average of 168 minutes was spent in discussion of possibly useful interventions, whereas an average of 57 minutes was allocated to classroom management topics. For example, State and colleagues estimated that an average of *only 16 minutes* was spent discussing characteristics or identification of students with SEB problems, including psychiatric disorders, and an average of *only 7 minutes* of class time was spent on social-emotional development. Slightly less than 1 hour (mean = 57 minutes) was spent on classroom management. Overall, State and colleagues found that across all the required coursework, students received in the typical teacher education program, on average, only 6 hours and 50 minutes (range 1–1,331 minutes) were devoted to issues related to understanding, identifying, and managing students' problematic behaviors and promoting their social and emotional development. Obviously, the preparation of new teachers varies considerably on these topics. Some teachers receive no formal preparation at all, whereas others may receive quite a bit.

Expanding on State and colleagues' (2011) review, Vinnes, Keenan, and Green (2014) examined the extent to which university *graduate* teacher education programs included content related to four topics related to SEB—social development, emotional development, behavior management, and abuse/neglect. Analyzing course descriptions for all required classes in the top 50 graduate teacher education programs as designated by *U.S. News & World Report* (2012), they examined whether the inclusion of these topics varied as a function of program level (elementary vs. secondary training), type of university (public vs. private), or geographic location (Northeast, South, West, Midwest). Their final sample of 78 elementary and secondary education programs from 43 of the top 50 universities across the United States included those programs that posted publicly available online course descriptions.

Vinnes and colleagues (2014) found that over two-thirds of the 78 programs they reviewed required at least one course

on the topics of social development, emotional development, behavior management, or abuse/neglect, although only one course included mention of abuse/neglect. Behavior management was the topic most frequently cited, although little more than half of the graduate teacher education programs reviewed (52.6%) included a course that specifically mentioned behavior, behavior management, or classroom management in its title or course description. Only one-fourth of the programs (26.9%) required a course on social development, one-fifth (20.5%) required two courses, and one program (1.3%) required three courses. Few programs required a course on emotional development (16.7%), although three programs (3.8%) required two classes on the topic. Inclusion of these topics did not differ across elementary and secondary programs or across public and private institutions. There were, however, significant regional differences, with fewer programs including social development located in the South, and behavior management more frequently addressed in programs located in the West. Vinnes and colleagues speculated that these differences might be due to variations in state legislation and policies related to school mental health service provision; teacher licensure requirements; and the value systems of schools, teachers, and school mental health service providers.

A recent report from the National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ; Greenberg, Putman & Walsh, 2013) echoed the relative inattention to classroom management in preservice education. Using course materials such as syllabi, textbooks, and student teaching observation/evaluation instruments, the NCTQ study examined classroom management-related professional coursework in 119 teacher preparation programs in 79 institutions of higher education in 33 states. Findings revealed that although 97% of the programs they reviewed included *some* mention of classroom management, instruction and practice in classroom management strategies were often scattered throughout the curriculum and did not draw from the latest scientific research identifying the most effective strategies. Moreover, there was relatively little attention given to providing preservice teachers with opportunities for translating knowledge of effective

classroom management into practice during their student-teaching experience. Indeed, only one-third of the programs reviewed required the *practice* of classroom management skills as they were learned. Given the relative inattention to training and experience in classroom management in preservice teacher education, it is not surprising that a high percent of teachers report that student behavior is a significant impediment to their success in the classroom (Ingersoll & Smith, 2003).

In summary, the few studies to date that have examined the extent to which preservice teacher education programs include knowledge about dimensions relevant to SEL and its practical application consistently indicate that little attention is paid to equipping teachers with the knowledge and skills necessary for promoting their students' social and emotional competence and creating positive classroom environments that enhance student success (Jones & Boufard, 2012). How can we influence preservice teacher education programs to expand their focus on SEL? Colleges and universities are directed by state and federal policy and certification requirements that mandate the topics and courses that must be included in teacher preparation programs for teachers to be licensed to teach. Accordingly, in the next section, we present findings from the Social-Emotional Learning in Teacher Education (SEL-Ted) project, a recent state-level scan of SEL of preservice teacher education K-12 certification requirements in the United States—a critical first step in ensuring that teachers are prepared for integrating SEL into educational practice.

SEL and State-Level Teacher Certification Requirements: The SEL-Ted Project

In the United States, there are requirements that teacher education programs must meet to be considered approved programs. The goal of these requirements is to ensure that high-quality training is provided to preservice teachers by providing benchmarks for the teacher education programs. These requirements usually include prescribed standards (statements that outline necessary teacher competencies) and coursework (a set of specific courses) that preservice teachers

must complete successfully to receive a state-issued teaching certificate.

To investigate these requirements, we began by reviewing articles, reports, and government websites to understand the teacher certification process and identify the institutions responsible for prescribing teacher education program requirements in the United States. Each state, namely through a state department (e.g., Department of Education) or board (e.g., Board of Regents, State Board of Education), has the authority to develop its own teacher education program requirements. Some states mandate that teacher education programs be accredited by NCATE or the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC). The accreditation process for each of these non-profit accrediting bodies involves reviewing teacher education programs to determine whether they meet the principles and standards established by these bodies. Some states do not mandate NCATE or TEAC accreditation but do use the NCATE professional standard as the foundation for their state standards.

Data Collection and Coding

Information was gathered for all 50 U.S. states and the District of Columbia on the prescribed standards and coursework requirements with which state-approved teacher education programs must comply. In the data collection process, the website of each state's department or board responsible for establishing the standards and coursework requirements was examined, and the documents that outlined these were located.

A coding guide was developed to analyze the teacher education program standards identified for the U.S. states, with definitions drawn from SEL theory and research by experts in the field (see Fleming & Bay, 2004; Jennings & Greenberg, 2009; Payton et al., 2000; Zins, Weissberg, Wang, & Walberg, 2004). The coding guide comprised three sections that addressed (1) Social and Emotional Competence (SEC) of Teachers (e.g., preservice teachers learn to foster their own SEL competencies, such as self-awareness, social awareness), (2) Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) of Students (e.g., preservice teachers learn to foster their stu-

dents' SEL skills), and (3) the Learning Context (e.g., a focus on classroom, school, and community environments that promote students' SEL skills). The first two categories—SEC of Teachers and SEL of Students—were further divided into the five SEL dimensions outlined by the Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL; 2013): (1) Self-Awareness, (2) Social Awareness, (3) Self-Management, (4) Relationship Skills, and (5) Responsible Decision Making. The latter category, the Learning Context, was further subdivided into four subcategories: (1) Classroom Context, (2) Supporting Schoolwide Coordination, (3) Developing School-Family Partnerships, and (4) Building School-Community Partnerships. These dimensions were designed to assess the extent to which preservice teachers learn to create an optimal environment in which SEL can be fostered and to collaborate with others beyond the classroom who can also enhance students' SEL skills.

When analyzing each standard, the unit of analysis was a meaningful unit, as opposed to the whole standard. However, the context of each standard was accounted for when performing the analysis. Take, for example, the following standard: "The pre-service teacher models effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom" (Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2006, p. 23). When coding this standard, rather than applying one code to the whole standard, it was split into four meaningful units: (1) "The pre-service teacher models effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques", (2) "to foster active inquiry", (3) "collaboration", and (4) "supportive interaction in the classroom" (p. 23). When coding each meaningful unit in this example, the research assistant considered whose SEL competencies were being exercised or fostered (e.g., the teacher or students) and via what means (e.g., the use of communication skills).

Trained research assistants reviewed the content of the gathered documents on the state standards for teacher education programs; SEL-related phrases in the standards were coded according to the coding guide,

which used a qualitative approach to coding data (Creswell, 2007). Only standards that were "required", as opposed to "recommended", by the state were coded. Also, we distinguished between states that applied their standards to *all* preservice teachers and those that applied them to grade-level and subject-area-specific preservice teachers (e.g., preservice teachers specializing in elementary education, secondary language arts). We were most interested in finding and coding standards that applied to all preservice teachers in each state. Therefore, standards that applied to particular preservice teacher groups were considered only if there were no general standards that applied to all preservice teachers, or if the standards that applied to all preservice teachers did not meet at least one domain in the three SEL categories. In our review of the state standards, 90% of states had standards that applied to all preservice teachers, whereas only 10% only had standards that applied to grade-level and subject-area specific preservice teachers.

Interrater agreement and kappa statistics were used to assess the reliability of the coding system employed for the terms used to code the standards. Eight U.S. states were randomly selected, and two research assistants each coded those states' standards. Percent of interrater agreement and kappa statistics were as follows: 87.5% (kappa = .697) for SEC of Teacher, 95% (kappa = .722) for SEL of Student, and 100% (kappa = 1.000) for Learning Context.

Based on these codes, each state received a score for each of the three categories (i.e., SEC of Teacher, SEL of Student, and the Learning Context) based on the extent to which their teacher education standards/requirements addressed the subcategories (e.g., Self-Awareness) of each category.²

Key Findings

In this section we present the key findings based on how many of the five SEL Competency of Teacher and Student domains, and the four Learning Context domains appeared in each state's standards.

Key finding 1: The promotion of the SEL competencies of teachers is given little

emphasis in state-level teacher education program standards. We found that *not one* state had standards that addressed all five core SEL Competency of Teacher domains. The vast majority of the states (71%) had standards that addressed between one and three of the five core SEL Competency of Teacher domains, whereas only 20% of states addressed four of the five core SEL Competency of Teacher domains. Furthermore, 10% of states had standards addressing SEL Competency of Teacher domains that were only applicable to preservice teachers in specific grade levels or subject areas, rather than all preservice teachers.

Of the five core SEL Competency of Teacher domains, the most commonly addressed in the standards were Responsible Decision Making (90% of states), Social Awareness (86% of states), and Relationship Skills (80% of states). In contrast, the most commonly absent SEL Competency of Teacher domains in the standards were Self Awareness (only 18% of states) and Self-Management (only 4% of states). In other words, very few states required preservice teachers to learn skills such as how to identify their feelings, strengths, and weaknesses, or how to control and appropriately express their feelings, manage stress, and monitor their progress toward achieving goals.

Below we provide examples of standards we found that fit each SEL Competency of Teacher domain:

- Self-Awareness—“Understand one’s own . . . ethics and values” (Tennessee Department of Education, 2001, p. 1).
- Social Awareness—“A teacher must . . . understand developmental progressions of learners and ranges of individual variation within the physical, social, emotional, moral, and cognitive domains, be able to identify levels of readiness in learning, and understand how development in any one domain may affect performance in others” (Minnesota Department of Education, 2009, p. 3).
- Responsible Decision Making—“The ability to recognize and deal with dehumanizing biases, including, but not limited to, sexism, racism, prejudice, and discrimination, and an awareness of the

impact such biases have on interpersonal relations” (Nebraska Department of Education, 2008, p. 14).

- Self-Management—“Teachers understand and utilize anger management . . . as appropriate in the classroom” (North Carolina State Board of Education, 2006, p. 2).
- Relationship Skills—“Ability to develop a positive relationship with every student” (Alabama State Board of Education, 2007, p. 260).

Key finding 2: Few state-level standards for teacher education programs have a comprehensive focus on promoting students’ SEL competencies. One-third (33%) of states addressed all five SEL Competency of Student domains, 20% addressed four of the five domains, and 29% addressed between one and three of the five domains. Furthermore, 12% states had standards addressing SEL Competency of Student domains that were only applicable to preservice teachers in specific grade levels or subject areas rather than all preservice teachers. SEL of Students was the only category that was not addressed at all by some of the states’ standards, with 6% of states having standards that did not address any of the SEL Competency of Student domains.

Of the five core student competencies, the majority of states identified Responsible Decision Making (82%), Relationship Skills (78%), and Self-Management (73%) in their standards. Therefore, most states were concerned with preparing preservice teachers to enhance their students’ abilities to make constructive and respectful choices; establish and maintain healthy relationships; and regulate their thoughts, emotions, and behaviors.

Less attention was given, however, to Self-Awareness (43%) and Social Awareness (51%) in the standards, indicating that fewer states were concerned with preparing preservice teachers to enhance their students’ abilities to identify their feelings, strengths, and weaknesses, or take the perspective of and empathize with people from diverse backgrounds.

Below we provide examples of standards we found that fit each SEL student competency domain:

- Self-Awareness—“ . . . uses assessment strategies to involve learners in self-assessment activities, to help them become aware of their learning behaviors, strengths, needs and progress” (Missouri Standards for Teacher Education Programs, cited in Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2006, p. 3).
- Social Awareness—“Teacher’s instructional units . . . are designed to expose students to a variety of intellectual, social, and cultural perspectives” (South Carolina Department of Education, n.d., p. 5).
- Responsible Decision Making—“Create a values-oriented classroom environment that supports students’ personal responsibility for their own learning and behaviors” (Maryland State Board of Education, 1994, p. 13).
- Self-Management—“The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages . . . self-motivation” (Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 2000, p. 13).
- Relationship Skills—“Understands how to help students work cooperatively and productively in groups” (Illinois State Board of Education, 2001, p. 5).

Key finding 3: Almost every state’s standards for teacher education programs require that teachers obtain knowledge of the Learning Context. The Learning Context was the most highly addressed category in the standards across the U.S. states. Specifically, 82% of states had comprehensive standards that addressed all four Learning Context domains; 6% addressed three of the four domains, and only 2% addressed one or two of the four domains. Moreover, 10% of states had standards addressing the Learning Context domains that were only applicable to preservice teachers in specific grade levels or subject areas, rather than all preservice teachers.

The majority of states included the four domains of the Learning Context in their standards: Schoolwide Coordination (90%), School–Community Partnerships (88%), School–Family Partnerships (86%), and Classroom Context (86%).

Below we provide examples of standards we found that fit each Learning Context domain:

- Classroom Context—“The competent teacher . . . understands principles of and strategies for effective classroom management” (Illinois State Board of Education, 2001, p. 5).
- Schoolwide Coordination—“The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues . . . to support student learning and well-being” (South Dakota Department of Education, 2006).
- School–Family Partnerships—“Works actively to involve parents in their child’s academic activities and performance, and communicates clearly with them” (Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2012).
- School–Community Partnerships—“The teacher values and utilizes the knowledge that all community members have something to contribute to the classroom to assist in the educational process” (New Mexico Public Education Department, 1998, p. 8).

Next Steps

For our next phase of the SEL-Ted project, we are coding the content of required coursework in over 300 public and private colleges of education across all 50 states and the District of Columbia via a stratified random sampling, using a framework that is similar to the one we used for coding of state-level certification requirements. Other aspects of our project will include interviews with Deans of Colleges of Education in the United States for their suggestions/reflections on how to integrate SEL into teacher preparation, as well as descriptions of exemplary preservice teacher education programs that are embedding SEL into teacher preparation. This work, coupled with our research on the state scan of SEL in state-level certification requirements, will provide a more comprehensive portrait of the extent to which SEL is being integrated into teacher preparation, allowing for informed decision making for advancing the science and practice of SEL in preservice teacher education.

Recommendations

Based on our review of the extant literature, we can offer seven recommendations to advance the field of SEL in relation to pre-service teacher education.

1. State policymakers should redesign policies to ensure that teacher certification requires all educators to demonstrate their ability to apply contemporary knowledge of child and adolescent SEL and development to PreK–12 classroom practice. One example of this is currently unfolding in Massachusetts, where a group of educators and policymakers are working collaboratively to embed SEL into preservice teacher education (see www.sel4mass.org).
2. In accord with the recommendations of the NCATE (2010) report, more attention needs to be given to providing opportunities for teacher candidates to learn principles of child and adolescent social and emotional development by integrating developmental science principles throughout the teacher preparation curriculum.
3. Moreover, teacher candidates need to learn about the latest innovations and science in SEL and its practical application, with intentional and specific attention to all domains of SEL.
4. Preservice teacher education programs need to redesign their curricula so as to combine course content on SEL and practical application of SEL concepts into classroom teaching. This can be done through both supervised student teaching experiences and classroom-based video examples, role plays, and out-of-classroom mentorship.
5. A necessary prerequisite for incorporating domains of SEL into preservice education is having a cadre of teacher educators and classroom supervisors with the necessary SEL knowledge and skills. Thus, colleges and faculties of education need to hire new personnel with the required expertise and provide professional development for their current faculty in this area.
6. Relatedly, during their student teaching experience, teacher candidates need to be placed in classrooms with teachers

who have expertise in the knowledge and implementation of SEL, so that teacher candidates can have firsthand experience in observing and then implementing SEL.

7. All teacher candidates should have supervised instruction in how to prepare their lesson plans to address their students' social and emotional, as well as academic, learning.

Potential Problems, Pitfalls, and Conclusions

Although we have delineated several recommendations to move SEL into preservice teacher education, there are also several potential problems and pitfalls that need to be mentioned. The first potential pitfall is ignoring the importance of promoting the SEL of educators (Jones, Bouffard, & Weissbourd, 2013). From our review, it is clear that little attention is given currently to the cultivation and promotion of preservice teachers' own social and emotional competence and well-being. This is problematic if we want to advance the science and practice SEL, particularly with regard to the effective implementation of SEL programs. Indeed, SEL programs are most likely to lead to positive outcomes for students when implemented with fidelity (Durlak et al., 2011). As recent evidence indicates, SEL programs are implemented poorly when teachers experience burnout (Ransford, Greenberg, Domitrovich, Small, & Jacobson, 2009), and when they do not "buy in" to SEL programming (Reyes, Brackett, Rivers, Elbertson, & Salovey, 2012). A second problem that may arise is the creation of courses that provide superficial knowledge about the social and emotional dimensions of teaching and learning, and exclude information about evidence-based SEL programs and practices, and their effective implementation. For example, upon reading the recommendations we have put forth regarding the importance of including SEL in preservice teacher education, a number of administrators and faculty members in teacher preparation programs may rush to create additional SEL courses that do not give adequate attention to providing experiences and opportunities for teacher candidates to *apply* SEL knowledge and skills in their student teach-

ing. Indeed, poor-quality preparation of teachers will not advance the field. Finally, we must be cautious not to be shortsighted and rely only on good faith that preparing preservice teachers with SEL knowledge and experiences will lead to positive student outcomes. Indeed, we do not know how well the inclusion of SEL knowledge and practice in preservice teacher education translates to the promotion of student competencies in classrooms. Although we now have evidence demonstrating that quality teacher-led implementation of evidence-based SEL leads to positive student outcomes (Durlak et al., 2011), we do not yet know how well quality instruction in SEL during preservice teacher preparation leads to more positive outcomes for students.

New Initiatives in Teacher Preparation

Although the field has far to go, there are some emerging examples of teacher preparation programs that are now incorporating theory, research, and practical application of SEL into preservice education. For example, the faculty at San Jose State University in the Collaborative for Reaching and Teaching the Whole Child (<http://reachandteachthewholechild.org>) is committed to embedding the social-emotional dimension of teaching and learning into its teacher preparation program. Preservice courses that have been revised to embed the SEL lens include math and science methods and classroom management. Moreover, the faculty members at San Jose State not only focused on embedding SEL into coursework, but they also developed an observation protocol with an SEL lens for mentor teachers and university supervisors to use when observing preservice teachers during their student teaching.

In the Faculty of Education at the University of British Columbia in Canada, SEL has been explicitly integrated into a postbaccalaureate, 12-month teacher preparation program. Specifically, one of the nine options available to the approximately 400 elementary preservice teacher education students is the SEL Cohort (comprising approximately 36 students each year). Within this program, teacher candidates take the regular teacher education program with a special emphasis on SEL. Throughout all of their coursework,

teacher candidates not only learn about current research and theory on SEL but are also provided with explicit training and opportunities for implementing SEL evidence-based programs and practices into classrooms during their student teaching practicum. There is even an “SEL Program” library in the Faculty of Education that includes a wide variety of SEL programs that teacher candidates can review and integrate into their coursework and student teaching. Practicum placements provide opportunities for teacher candidates to integrate SEL programs and practices into the classroom and curriculum. Moreover, in addition to explicit attention to SEL within this unique SEL Cohort, all teacher candidates, both elementary and secondary, are provided with specific coursework and active learning approaches for creating safe, caring, and participatory classroom and school environments (see <http://teach.educ.ubc.ca/bachelor-of-education-program/elementary>). Although promotion of SEL in preservice teacher education is, in our opinion, an important step, it is not without its challenges. Indeed, the addition of a course on creating safe, caring, and supportive learning contexts within an already demanding and intensive 1-year program has to be balanced by reductions in required coursework in other areas (e.g., child and adolescent development, specific curriculum areas). Thus, SEL must be recognized and promoted at the university and college level as a necessary part of teacher training efforts.

Concluding Comments

To create a world characterized by caring, cooperation, empathy, and compassion among all people, it is essential that educators, parents, community members, and policymakers work together to promote students' personal and social development, and embedding SEL into preservice teacher education is a step in the right direction. Indeed, it is critical that we make intentional efforts to devise the most effective educational practices that promote SEL both in teachers and their students. Such efforts must be based on strong conceptual models and sound research. The promotion of social and emotional competencies is fundamental to the mission of education (Jones et al., 2013).

Acknowledgment

We are grateful for the support of CASEL, which inspired and funded our State Scan of SEL in pre-service teacher education certification requirements.

Notes

1. Although the majority of teachers receive their degrees from colleges or faculties of education in colleges or universities, a growing number of teachers receive their state teaching licensure via alternative certification routes. The National Association for Alternative Certification (www.alt-teachercert.org) indicated that about 30% of teachers in the United States receive their teacher certification through alternative routes, and this number continues to grow.

2. A subcategory was met if at least one of the multiple components in the category was addressed (e.g., if just “awareness of feelings” of teachers was addressed, but “constructive sense of self” of teachers is not, the Self-Awareness subcategory would nevertheless be considered met for the SEC of Teachers category).

References

- Alabama State Board of Education. (2007). Rules of the Alabama State Board of Education: Chapter 290-3-3: Teacher Education: Professional Services. Retrieved April 4, 2012, from <http://coe.alasu.edu/ncate/documents/chapter%20290-3-3%20teacher%20education%20adopted%208-6-07.pdf>.
- Alvarez, H. K. (2007). The impact of teacher preparation on responses to student aggression in the classroom. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23, 1113–1126.
- Arseneault, L., Moffitt, T. E., Caspi, A., Taylor, P. J., & Silva, P. A. (2000). Mental disorders and violence in a total birth cohort: Results from the Dunedin study. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 57, 979–986.
- Battin-Pearson, S., Newcomb, M. D., Abbott, R. D., Hill, K. G., Catalano, R. F., & Hawkins, J. D. (2000). Predictors of early high school dropout: A test of five theories. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 92, 568–582.
- Bridgeland, J., Bruce, M., & Hariharan, A. (2013). *The missing piece: A national survey on how social and emotional learning can empower children and transform schools*. Washington, DC: Civic Enterprises.
- Bushaw, W. J., & Lopez, S. J. (2013, September). Which way do we go?: The 45th annual PDK/Gallup Poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 95(1), 8–25.
- Coalition for Psychology in Schools and Education. (2006). *Report on the teacher needs survey*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL). (2013). *2013 CASEL guide: Effective social and emotional learning programs—preschool and elementary school edition*. Chicago: Author.
- Comer, J., & Maholmes, J. (1999). Creating schools of child development and education in the USA: Teacher preparation for urban schools. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 25, 3–5.
- Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. (2000). Chapter 354: Preparation of Professional Educators. Retrieved on April 6, 2012, from www.pacode.com/secure/data/022/chapter354/022_0354.pdf.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Daniels, D. H., & Shumow, L. (2003). Child development and classroom teaching: A review of the literature and implications for educating teachers. *Applied Developmental Psychology*, 23, 495–526.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2001). The challenge of staffing our schools. *Educational Leadership*, 58, 12–17.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). Teacher education and the American future. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61, 35–47.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2013). *Powerful teacher education: Lessons from exemplary programs*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (Eds.). (2005). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., & Schellinger, K. B. (2011). Enhancing students' social and emotional development promotes success in school: Results of a meta-analysis. *Child Development*, 82, 474–501.
- Eccles, J. S., & Roeser, R. W. (2011). School and community influences on human development. In M. H. Bornstein & M. E. Lamb (Eds.), *Developmental science: An advanced textbook* (6th ed., pp. 571–643). New York: Psychology Press.
- Elias, M. J., Zins, J. E., Weissberg, R. P., Frey, K. S., Greenberg, M. T., Haynes, N. M., et al. (1997). *Promoting social and emotional learn-*

- ing: *Guidelines for educators*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Ferguson, K., Frost, L., & Hall, D. (2012). Predicting teacher anxiety, depression, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Teaching and Learning, 8*, 27–42.
- Fleming, J., & Bay, M. (2004). Social and emotional learning in teacher preparation standards. In J. E. Zins, R. P. Weissberg, M. C. Wang, & H. J. Walberg (Eds.), *Building school success through social and emotional learning: Implications for practice and research* (pp. 94–110). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Greenberg, J., McKee, A., & Walsh, K. (2013). *Teacher prep review: A review of the nation's teacher preparation programs*. Washington, DC: National Council on Teacher Quality. Retrieved December 10, 2014, from www.nctq.org/dms-stage/teacher_prep_review_2013_report.
- Greenberg, J., Putman, H., & Walsh, K. (2013). *Training our future teachers: Classroom management*. Washington, DC: National Council on Teacher Quality. Retrieved January 13, 2014, from www.nctq.org/dmsview/future_teachers_classroom_management_nctq_report.
- Greenberg, M., Weissberg, R., O'Brien, M. U., Zins, J., Fredericks, L., Resnik, H., et al. (2003). Enhancing school-based prevention and youth development through coordinated social, emotional, and academic learning. *American Psychologist, 58*, 466–474.
- Greenberg, M. T. (2010). School-based prevention: Current status and future challenges. *Effective Education, 2*, 27–52.
- Hamre, B., & Pianta, R. C. (2001). Early teacher-child relationships and trajectory of school outcomes through eighth grade. *Child Development, 72*, 625–638.
- Hamre, B. K., & Pianta, R. C. (2005). Can instructional and emotional support in the first grade classroom make a difference for children at risk of school failure? *Child Development, 76*, 949–967.
- Hamre, B. K., & Pianta, R. C. (2006). Student-teacher relationships. In G. G. Bear & K. Minke (Eds.), *Children's needs III: Development, prevention, and intervention* (pp. 59–71). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Hawkins, J. D., Kosterman, R., Catalano, R. F., Hill, K. G., & Abbott, R. D. (2008). Effects of a social development intervention in childhood 15 years later. *Archives of Pediatric and Adolescent Medicine, 162*, 1133–1141.
- Illinois State Board of Education. (2001). Content-area standards for educators. Retrieved on November 28, 2011, from <http://lrs.ed.uiuc.edu/students/gbequett/standards.pdf>.
- Ingersoll, R. M., & Smith, T. M. (2003). The wrong solution to the teacher shortage. *Educational Leadership, 60*, 30–33.
- Institute of Medicine. (2009). *Preventing mental, emotional, and behavioral disorders among young people: Progress and possibilities*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- Jaffee, S. R., Harrington, H., Cohen, P., & Moffitt, T. E. (2005). Cumulative prevalence of psychiatric disorder in youths. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 44*, 406–407.
- Jennings, P. A., & Greenberg, M. T. (2009). The prosocial classroom: Teacher social and emotional competence in relation to student and classroom outcomes. *Review of Educational Research, 79*, 491–525.
- Jones, S. M., & Bouffard, S. M. (2012). Social and emotional learning in schools: From programs to strategies. *Society for Research on Child Development Social Policy Report, 25*(4), 1–22.
- Jones, S. M., Bouffard, S. M., & Weissbourd, R. (2013). Educators' social and emotional skills vital to learning. *Phi Delta Kappan, 94*, 62–65.
- Koller, J. R., & Bertel, J. M. (2006). Responding to today's mental health needs of children, families and schools: Revisiting the pre-service training and preparation of school-based personnel. *Education and Treatment of Children, 29*, 197–217.
- Koller, J. R., Osterlind, S. J., Paris, K., & Weston, K. J. (2004). Differences between novice and expert teachers' undergraduate preparation and ratings of importance in the area of children's mental health. *International Journal of Mental Health Promotion, 6*, 40–45.
- Maryland State Board of Education. (1994). *Essential dimensions of teaching*. Baltimore: Division of Certification and Accreditation Program Approval and Assessment Branch. Retrieved June 28, 2012, from <http://marylandpublicschools.org/nr/rdonlyres/2c7ffcc4-3f21-4b62-9406-311b06cdf2db/1500/edot1994.pdf>.
- Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2012). 603 CMR 7.00 Regulations for Educator Licensure and Preparation Program Approval: 7.08: Professional Standards for Teachers. Retrieved April 4, 2012, from www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr7.html?section=08.
- McClung, M. (2013). Repurposing education. *Phi Delta Kappan, 94*, 37–39.
- Minnesota Department of Education. (2009). Minnesota Administrative Rules: 8710.2000 Standards of Effective Practice for Teachers.

- Retrieved April 8, 2012, from *www.revisor.mn.gov/rules/?id=8710.2000*.
- Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2006). Missouri standards for teacher education programs and benchmarks for preliminary teacher education programs. Retrieved April 28, 2012, from *www.dese.mo.gov/schoollaw/rulesregs/documents/mostep_10-06.pdf*.
- National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (2007). *The cost of teacher turnover in five school districts: A pilot study*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved June 1, 2007, from *www.nctaf.org/resources/demonstration_projects/turnover/documents/cttextexecutivesummaryfinal.pdf*.
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2010). The road less travelled: How the developmental sciences can prepare educators to improve student achievement: Policy recommendations. Retrieved September 1, 2011, from *www.ncate.org/public/researchreports/ncateinitiatives/increasingtheapplicationofdevelopmentalscienc/tabid/706/default.aspx*.
- National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, National Institutes of Health (NIH), & U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (USDHHS). (2007). *Child and adolescent development research and teacher education: Evidence-based pedagogy, policy, and practice*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Nebraska Department of Education. (2008). Title 92, Chapter 20: Approval of Teacher Education Programs. Retrieved May 27, 2012, from *www.sos.ne.gov/rules-and-regs/regsearch/rules/education_dept_of/title-92/chapter-20.pdf*.
- New Mexico Public Education Department. (1998). Title 6: Primary and Secondary Education: Chapter 61: School Personnel Specific Licensure Requirements for Instructors. Retrieved May 3, 2012, from *www.nmcpr.state.nm.us/nmac/parts/title06/06.061.0002.pdf*.
- North Carolina State Board of Education. (2006). Specialty Standards. Retrieved June 28, 2012, from *www.dpi.state.nc.us/docs/libe/materials/specialtystandards.pdf*.
- Osher, D., Sprague, J., Weissberg, R. P., Axelrod, J., Keenan, S., Kendziora, K., et al. (2008). A comprehensive approach to promoting social, emotional, and academic growth in contemporary schools. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology V* (Vol. 4, pp. 1263–1278). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Payton, J. W., Graczyk, P., Wardlaw, D., Bloodworth, M., Tompsett, C., & Weissberg, R. P. (2000). Social and emotional learning: A framework of promoting mental health and reducing risk behavior in children and youth. *Journal of School Health, 70*, 179–185.
- Ransford, C. R., Greenberg, M. T., Domitrovich, C. E., Small, M., & Jacobson, L. (2009). The role of teachers' psychological experiences and perceptions of curriculum supports on the implementation of a social and emotional learning curriculum. *School Psychology Review, 38*, 510–532.
- Reinke, W. M., Stormont, M., Herman, K. C., Puri, R., & Goel, N. (2011). Supporting children's mental health in schools: Teacher perceptions of needs, roles, and barriers. *School Psychology Quarterly, 26*, 1–13.
- Reyes, M. R., Brackett, M. A., Rivers, S. E., Elbertson, N. A., & Salovey, P. (2012). The interaction effects of program training, dosage, and implementation quality on targeted student outcomes for the RULER approach to social and emotional learning. *School Psychology Review, 41*, 82–99.
- Rimm-Kaufman, S. E., & Hamre, B. K. (2010). The role of psychological and developmental science in efforts to improve teacher quality. *Teachers College Record, 112*, 2988–3023.
- Sarason, S. (2001). *American psychology and the schools: A critique*. Washington, DC: Teachers College Press.
- Siebert, C. J. (2005). Promoting preservice teachers' success in classroom management by leveraging a local union's resources: A professional development school initiative. *Education, 125*, 385–392.
- Sklad, M., Diekstra, R., De Ritter, M., & Ben, J. (2012). Effectiveness of school-based universal social, emotional, and behavioural programs: Do they enhance students' development in the area of skill, behaviour, and adjustment? *Psychology in the Schools, 49*, 892–909.
- South Carolina Department of Education. (n.d.). ADEPT Performance Standards for Classroom-Based Teachers. Retrieved June 28, 2012, from *www.ed.sc.gov/agency/programs-services/50/documents/adeptstandards.pdf*.
- South Dakota Department of Education. (2006). South Dakota Legislature: Teacher Preparation Program Approval. Retrieved April 4, 2012, from *http://legis.state.sd.us/rules/displayrule.aspx?rule=24:53*.
- State, T. M., Kern, L., Starosta, K. M., & Mukherjee, A. D. (2011). Elementary pre-service teacher preparation in the area of social, emotional, and behavioural problems. *School Mental Health, 3*, 13–23.
- Swearer, S. M., Espelage, D. L., Vaillancourt, T., & Hymel, S. (2010). What can be done about school bullying?: Linking research to educational practice. *Educational Researcher, 39*, 38–47.
- Tennessee Department of Education. (2001). *Ten-*

- ennessee Licensure Standards and Induction Guidelines*. Nashville: Author. Retrieved April 6, 2012, from www.tennessee.gov/education/lic/doc/accttcblicstds.pdf.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (USDHHS). (1999). *Mental health: A report of the Surgeon General*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. News & World Report. (2012). The Top 50, Best Education Schools. Retrieved June 1, 2013, from: <http://grad-schools.usnews.rankingsandreviews.com/best-graduate-schools/top-education-schools/edu-rankings>.
- U.S. Public Health Service. (2000). *Report of the Surgeon's General's Conference on Children's Mental Health: A national action agenda*. Washington, DC: Department of Health and Human Services.
- Vinnes, S., Keenan, J. K., & Green, J. G. (2014, October). *Pre-service training in social-emotional development and behavior management: A review of graduate teacher education programs*. Poster presented at the annual convention of the Northeastern Educational Research Association, Trumbull, CT.
- Walter, H. J., Gouze, K., & Lim, K. G. (2006). Teachers' beliefs about mental health needs in inner city elementary schools. *Journal of the American Academy for Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 45, 61–68.
- Weare, K., & Nind, M. (2011). Mental health promotion and problem prevention in schools: What does the evidence say? *Health Promotion International*, 26, i29–i69.
- Weissberg, R. P., Payton, J. W., O'Brien, M. U., & Munro, S. (2007). Social and emotional learning. In F. C. Power, R. J. Nuzzi, D. Narvaez, D. K. Lapsley, & T. C. Hunt (Eds.), *Moral education: A handbook* (Vol. 2, pp. 417–418). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Wentzel, K. R. (2003). Are effective teachers like good parents?: Teaching styles and student adjustment in early adolescence. *Child Development*, 73, 287–301.
- Zeichner, L., & Paige, L. (2007). *The current status and possible future for "traditional" college and university-based teacher education programs in the U.S.* (Submission to the International Alliance of Leading Education Institutes). Madison: University of Wisconsin–Madison. Retrieved from www.intalalliance.org.
- Zins, J. E., Weissberg, R. P., Wang, M. C., & Walberg, H. J. (Eds.). (2004). *Building academic success on social and emotional learning: What does the research say?* New York: Teachers College Press.