

Social-Emotional Learning Assessment Measures for Middle School Youth



KEVIN HAGGERTY, MSW
JENNA ELGIN, M.Ed.
ANDREW WOOLLEY

January 5, 2011

Social Development Research Group, University of Washington
Commissioned by the Raikes Foundation



RAIKES
FOUNDATION

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
Introduction	5
Table 1. Summary of Rating Type and Core Competencies for Recommended Tools	10
ASEBA System: Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL), Teacher Report Form (TRF), and Youth Self-Report (YSR)	11
Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale: Second Edition (BERS)	14
Communities That Care (CTC) Youth Survey	17
The Comprehensive School Climate Inventory (CSCI)	21
Developmental Assets Profile (DAP)	25
Devereux Student Strengths Assessment (DESSA)	28
School Social Behaviors Scale (SSBS)	32
Social Skills Improvement System Rating Scales (SSIS)	36
Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ)	39
Washington State Healthy Youth Survey (HYS)	42
Table 2. Summary of Recommended Measures	46
Glossary of Terms	49
Figure 1. Sample of the Child Behavior Checklist	51
Figure 2. Sample of the Communities that Care Survey	52
Figure 3. Sample of the Comprehensive School Climate Inventory	53
Figure 4. Sample of the Developmental Assets Profile	54
Figure 5. Sample of the Devereux Student strengths assessment	55
Figure 6. Sample of the Strengths and Difficulties questionnaire	56
Figure 7. Sample of the Washington State Healthy Youth Survey	57
References	58

Executive Summary

PURPOSE:

Children with strong Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) skills have been shown to excel in school, both socially and academically. SEL programs are imperative to address the social, emotional, and academic needs of students. However, reliable and valid assessment tools are necessary to conduct needs assessments and monitor the success of SEL programs over time.

The purpose of the current review is to identify valid, reliable, and useable school-wide assessments for social/emotional well-being of youth and to help schools and districts identify tools that could be useful in determining the success of the programs created to improve student social/emotional well-being.

PROCEDURE:

The current report reviews many existing tools and instruments used to measure social and emotional well-being of middle school youth. We conducted an extensive review of the literature on social and emotional learning in middle school students. We identified and evaluated 73 instruments and use the following criteria to determine whether or not to recommend them for school-wide assessment.

In order to be recommended to be used with middle school students, an assessment needs to have sound psychometric properties, be suited for program evaluation, be readily available for schools to access and obtain information on, and not be designed to assess specific programs. Of the 73 instruments reviewed, 10 met our criteria for inclusion in this report.

RECOMMENDED ASSESSMENTS:

The following assessments met the review criteria and were included in this report:

- Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale: Second Edition (BERS-2)
- ASEBA: Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL), Teacher Report Form (TRF), and Youth Self-Report (YSR)
- Communities That Care (CTC) Survey
- The Comprehensive School Climate Inventory (CSCI)
- Developmental Assets Profile (DAP)
- Devereux Student Strengths Assessment (DESSA)
- School Social Behaviors Scale, Second Edition (SSBS-2)
- Social Skills Improvement System Rating Scales (SSIS-Rating Scale)
- Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ)
- Washington State Healthy Youth Survey (HYS)

FUTURE RECOMMENDATIONS:

Overall, the review yielded relatively few strong assessment choices for middle schools to choose from when conducting program evaluation that is not designed to be program specific. The assessments that met our criteria and included in this report contain many of the characteristics necessary to be useful for middle schools interested in evaluating social emotional well-being of students. However, none of these assessment tools we reviewed will meet every school's needs. For example, some of the assessments do not have standard procedures and software to create reports at the school level so some schools may need to have personnel who are capable of aggregating survey data and putting it in a report format.

In addition, some of the assessments are teacher rating scales, which require more teacher time than self-report assessments. The DESSA is one example of a teacher rating assessment. An area of future development in the field of SEL assessment would be to turn the DESSA into a self-report assessment and conduct research on the psychometric properties of the instrument. Our intention with this report is to provide a manageable list for educators and others interested in SEL assessment of large populations of students over time. We feel this report will be beneficial to schools interested in student social emotional well-being.

Introduction

The purpose of the current report is to review the existing assessment tools used to measure social and emotional well-being of middle school youth. Educators are concerned with the social and emotional well-being of the youth they serve. Because of this, many schools are implementing various Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) curricula to address the social and emotional needs of their students.

Social-Emotional Learning programs for elementary and middle school youth seek to promote various social and emotional skills and have been linked to positive social and academic outcomes (Payton et al., 2008). A review on SEL programming conducted by the Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL) found that SEL programs yielded many benefits for children and adolescents (Payton et al., 2008). These benefits were found for students in both school and after-school settings, and for students with and without behavioral and emotional problems. Their review found that SEL programs improved students' social-emotional skills, attitudes about self and others, connection to school, positive social behavior, and academic performance. They also found reductions in conduct problems and emotional distress (Payton et al., 2008).

In addition to improving students' social-emotional skills, the review found that SEL programs improved students' performance in the classroom (Payton et al., 2008). Specifically, they found an increase of 11% to 17% in test scores (Payton et al., 2008). Thus, research demonstrated that SEL is absolutely crucial to children's success in school, both academically and socially (Greenberg et al., 2003; Payton et al., 2008).

Children with strong SEL skills have been shown to excel in school, both socially and academically. SEL programs are imperative to address the social, emotional, and academic needs of students. However, reliable and valid assessment tools are necessary to conduct needs assessments and to monitor the success of SEL programs over time. The goal of this report is to assist middle school educators with choosing appropriate measures of social and emotional skills over time.

For the purpose of this review, we used the social and emotional competencies identified by the CASEL as a framework for identifying and reviewing various assessment measures. The five interrelated social and emotional competencies as described by CASEL include:

Self-Awareness. Accurately assessing one's feelings, interests, values, and strengths; maintaining a well-grounded sense of self-confidence.

Self-Management. Regulating one's emotions to handle stress, controlling impulses, and persevering in addressing challenges; expressing emotions appropriately; and setting and monitoring progress toward personal and academic goals.

Social Awareness. Being able to take the perspective of and empathize with others; recognizing and appreciating individual and group similarities and differences; and recognizing and making the best use of family, school, and community resources.

Relationship Skills. Establishing and maintaining healthy and rewarding relationships based on cooperation; resisting inappropriate social pressure; preventing, managing, and resolving interpersonal conflict, and seeking help when needed.

Responsible Decision Making. Making decisions based on consideration of ethical standards, safety concerns, appropriate social norms, respect for others, and likely consequences of various actions; applying decision-making skills to academic and social situations; and contributing to the well-being of one's school and community.

CURRENT REVIEW

The current landscape of tools to assess social and emotional competencies is broad and includes instruments that look at population-level changes in social-emotional constructs, program outcomes, and process outcomes. The measures come from multiple frameworks such as youth risk and protective factors and youth developmental assets. The purpose of the current review is to identify key assessment tools for evaluating changes in social/emotional well-being of the youth served and to help districts identify tools that could be useful in determining the success of the programs created from the perspective of student social/emotional well-being.

The following assessment tools have been gathered in an attempt to find assessments for researchers, schools, and educational and policy practitioners; to gauge the social and emotional skills of middle school students; as well as to monitor the progress of SEL programming. There are many compendia of measurement tools currently in existence, but we feel that this report adds to these because (1) it focuses on tools available for middle school students, (2) rather than being exhaustive, this review attempts to highlight those tools with the most sound psychometric and technical properties, ease of use for schools, and availability, and (3) this review focuses on tools that can be used for program evaluation but are not focused on evaluating specific programs.

The current review focuses on measures of social and emotional competence using the CASEL framework as a guide. Though we used the 5 social and emotional competencies as a framework to identify measures, every instrument defines social and emotional constructs in slightly different ways. In addition, the SEL measures come from multiple frameworks and have slightly different theoretical underpinnings, and thus the taxonomy for each assessment tool is slightly different. We used the taxonomy and constructs as defined by the developers of the individual assessments when describing them in this report.

An in-depth review of the literature was conducted on social and emotional programming, school climate, and related emotional well-being constructs in middle school youth. Our review yielded 73 assessment measures. Of those 73 measures, 10 measures met our criteria and were included in this report. A review of the current literature was conducted on key measurement instruments that assess social and emotional well-being in school or in out-of-school settings, using the CASEL definition of SEL competencies as a guide. After reviewing all of the social-emotional assessments available, those that met the following criteria were included in this report:

1. Intended Population:

- a. Appropriate for middle school student
- b. Universal assessment, meaning it can be used to assess all students, not just a clinical or targeted group
- c. Not designed for a specific population
- d. Not designed to evaluate a specific program

2. Monitors Change Over Time:

- a. Assesses population-level change
- b. Able to monitor program-level outcomes
- c. Sensitive to change

3. Scientifically Sound:

- a. Has been evaluated using a representative norm group (when applicable)
- b. Good reliability. Reliability refers to an instrument's ability to generate consistent answers or responses across situations where variation is not desired or expected. There are several types of reliability that are especially relevant for this review:

i. **Internal Consistency (Reliability)**: measures whether items that propose to measure the same general construct produce similar scores and are positively correlated with their scale scores and the total test score. Internal consistency is usually measured with Cronbach's Alpha, which ranges from 0 to 1.00.

- 1. Good: .70 and above
- 2. Adequate: .60 - .69
- 3. Poor: .59 and below

ii. **Test-Retest Reliability**: measures the consistency of an assessment over time. Results are typically presented as a correlation coefficient from 0 to 1.00. Because some SEL skills can change within a short amount of time, some assessments are expected to have lower test-retest reliability than others.

- 1. Good: .70 and above
- 2. Adequate: .60 - .69
- 3. Poor: .59 and below

- c. Strong evidence of validity. Validity is the extent to which an assessment measures what it is intended to measure (American Educational Research Association, 1999). We considered several types of validity:

- i. **Criterion-Related Validity**: Degree to which a measure is related in expected ways to some type of criterion or outcome, measured either at the same time (concurrent validity) or a later time (predictive validity).
- ii. **Convergent and/or Discriminant Validity**: Convergent validity is the degree to which scores on a measure are associated positively with scores on measures of the same or highly similar constructs; discriminant validity is the degree to which scores on a measure are not associated at unexpectedly high levels with scores on measures of distinct constructs.

For each measure, we provide a brief description and the results of research demonstrating the measure's criterion and convergent and/or discriminant validity.

4. Practical to Administer:

- a. Content, format, and scoring are appropriate for school administration
- b. The assessment tool and information on the tool is readily available and easy to access

For each measure that met criteria, a detailed examination of the tool was conducted. In this report we present detailed information about each measure, including administration (rater, format, length), scoring, psychometrics (reliability and validity), technical assistance, overall strengths and weaknesses, pricing, source, and references. For most of the measures, we also provide a sample image of the assessment, which can be found at the end of the report.

No attempt was made to be comprehensive; rather, we tried to find psychometrically very good measures that match the constructs of importance here for middle school students. In addition, some assessment tools are designed to measure multiple SEL constructs, whereas others measure only a few. Also, some assessments also measure outcomes, such as academics, substance use, alcohol use, and violence, while others do not.

The recommended assessment measures are not necessarily the best assessments available for all purposes, and the recommended assessments may not be suitable for all schools and their individual needs. In addition, if an assessment did not meet our criteria for inclusion in this report that does not necessarily indicate the assessment is not appropriate in certain situations. For example, many assessments we looked at may be well suited for clinical applications with individual students, but were not the best fit for larger groups of students. Also, it was difficult to find comprehensive information on some of the assessments we reviewed, which would likely impact the ability of a school to easily implement the assessment, so we did not include them in our report. We also did not include assessment tools that are intended to assess specific programs and program outcomes. Our intention with this report is to provide a manageable list for educators and others interested in SEL assessment of large populations of students over time.

LOGISTICAL CONSIDERATIONS

It is important to consider that schools can benefit by taking an inventory of already existing data in their school(s), such as student demographics, school-level building demographics, and student academic and behavioral outcome data. These data can be important when schools combine their social and emotional data with important student outcomes. In addition, this effort is important so that schools do not duplicate efforts or collect redundant data. SEL assessment should be integrated with other survey efforts taking place at that school.

Before choosing an assessment tool in a school, the scoring protocols, administration manual, and the assessment reports should be reviewed so schools and educators understand what the scores indicate and thus choose the most appropriate tool for their needs. The normative scores from reports should aid schools and educators on interpreting the scores. The assessment scoring reports should be reviewed to determine if the assessment information is presented in ways that are easy for schools and educators to understand. The reports and the accompanying manual should be reviewed to determine how the scores for each of the assessed constructs are presented. The reports and results should be reviewed to obtain information that can be used to help schools and educators understand the current status of students' SEL competencies. The assessment should aid schools and educators in creating actionable steps to improve students' SEL competencies and have positive impacts on student outcomes. Where possible, the developers should be contacted for consultation about how to best use the assessment for the particular school and how the data from various sources can be related with each other.

The logistics of SEL assessment administration should be outlined beforehand. Schools should identify personnel who can administer the assessment, arrange for any necessary training, determine when the assessments can be administered during the school day, and decide on the time frame for administration. The school should make plans for working with the survey developers to understand their school's SEL assessment results and decide how the results can be used to make decisions about their SEL programs, policies, and practices.

We should also note that schools may need to seek Institutional Review Board (IRB) clearance or permission from their school districts for administering some of the surveys. Issues and logistics of obtaining parental consent need to be considered as well.

Table 1. Summary of Rating Type and Core Competencies for Recommended Tools

	RATING TYPE			CORE COMPETENCIES				
	Self	Teacher / Staff	Parent / Guardian	Self-Awareness	Self-Management	Social Awareness	Relationship Skills	Responsible Decision Making
ASEBA; Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL), Youth Self-Report (YSR), Teacher Report Form (TRF)	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓
Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale; Second Edition (BERS-2)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Communities That Care (CTC) Survey	✓				✓	✓	✓	✓
The Comprehensive School Climate Inventory (CSCI)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Developmental Assets Profile (DAP)	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Devereux Student Strengths Assessment (DESSA)		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
School Social Behaviors Scale, Second Edition (SSBS-2)		✓	✓		✓		✓	✓
Social Skills Improvement System Rating Scales (SSIS-Rating Scale)	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ)	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
Washington Healthy Youth Survey (HYS)	✓					✓	✓	✓

ASEBA System;

CHILD BEHAVIOR CHECKLIST (CBCL), YOUTH SELF-REPORT (YRS) AND TEACHER REPORT FORM (TRS)

Part of the Achenbach System on Empirically Based Assessment (ASEBA)

OVERVIEW:

The Achenbach System of Empirically Based Assessment (ASEBA; Achenbach, & Rescorla, 2001) offers a comprehensive approach to assessing adaptive and maladaptive functioning in children and adolescents. It is used in national surveys to track development and predict competencies and problems. It is also supported by extensive research on service needs and outcomes, diagnosis, prevalence of problems, medical conditions, treatment efficacy, genetic and environmental effects, and epidemiology. The system provides optimal evidence-based, normed tools for identifying intervention needs, monitoring progress, and evaluating responses to interventions for behavioral, emotional, and social problems.

PROGRAM TARGET AGE:

The Achenbach System can be used to assess children and youth ages 6-18.

CONSTRUCTS MEASURED:

Empirically Based Syndromes Scales:

- Anxious/Depressed
- Withdrawn/Depressed
- Somatic Complaints
- Social Problems
- Thought Problems
- Attention Problems
- Rule-Breaking Behavior
- Aggressive Behavior

DSM-Orientated Scales (diagnostic):

- Affective Problems
- Anxiety Problems
- Somatic Problems

- Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Problems
- Oppositional Defiant Problems
- Conduct Problems

STRUCTURE:

There are three forms: the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) is completed by parents, the Youth Self-Report (YSR) is completed by the youth, and the Teacher Report Form (TRF) completed by the teacher. The CBCL has 118 items, the YSR has 113 items, and the TRF has 112 items. All responses are on a 3-point scale (Not True, Somewhat or Sometimes True, Very True, or Often True). The forms take approximately 20 minutes to complete. The ASEBA system is also available in Spanish.

The CBCL, YSR, and TRF have been standardized to obtain normative points (i.e., what is typically reported by such informants for normative samples of youth; see Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1983, 1986; Edelbrock & Achenbach, 1984). Scoring is done by hand or by using the optional scoring software. Standard T scores quantify a youth's standing in relation to other youth and determine whether elevated scores on a particular scale fall in a clinical range.

See Figure 1 for a sample of the CBCL.

STRENGTHS:

There is extensive use and research demonstrating the psychometric properties of the ASEBA system. The conceptualization, administration, and scoring are straightforward. The ASEBA system has a long history of use by school practitioners and extensive research to support its use.

WEAKNESSES:

The CBCL and TRF may be difficult to use with large numbers of children. The YSR would be easier if many children were being surveyed, such as in program evaluation. It does not appear that the software is able to generate reports for entire classrooms/schools to track progress over time. Thus, knowledge of how to do this and separate data management software may be necessary to compile and analyze results for monitoring the progress of intervention and prevention programs.

TECHNICAL PROPERTIES:

(see Achenbach, & Rescorla, 2001)

Reliability.

Internal Reliability: Adequate to Good

Test-Retest Reliability: Good

Validity.

Criterion Validity: Scores have been shown to differentiate between referred and non-referred children.

Convergent and/or Discriminant Validity: To assess convergent validity, scores on the CBCL and the TRF were compared with scores on the youth and teacher Conners Scales (1997) and the Behavior Assessment System for Children (BASC). They found moderate to strong correlations between analogous scales and subscales, indicating strong convergent validity.

TECHNICAL SUPPORT:

Information can be found on the website: www.ASEBA.org.

Support can be obtained by calling 802-656-5130, or by emailing techsupp@aseba.org. In addition, the technical manual has extensive information on reliability, validity, administration, scoring, and interpretation.

AVAILABILITY:

The Achenbach system is available for purchase through www.ASEBA.org. The cost is 50 forms for \$25, Manual \$40, and optional software scoring is \$395.00.

Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale

SECOND EDITION (BERS-2)

OVERVIEW:

The Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale, Second Edition (BERS-2; Epstein & Sharma, 1998) measures the personal strengths and competencies of children and adolescents in five areas. The BERS-2 is a multi-modal assessment system that measures children's behavior from three perspectives: the child, parent, and teacher or other professional. It can be used as an evaluation measure, for planning interventions and services, and as an outcome measure. The BERS-2 has been widely adopted by local, state, and federal agencies to evaluate the outcomes of services.

PROGRAM TARGET AGE:

The BERS-2 Parent Rating Scale and Teacher Rating Scale can be used to assess children and youth ages 5 to 18, and the Youth Rating Scale can be used to assess children ages 11 to 18.

CONSTRUCTS MEASURED:

- Interpersonal Strength: Ability to control emotions and behaviors in a social situation.
- Involvement with Family: Participation and relationship with his or her family.
- Intrapersonal Strength: Outlook on his or her competence and accomplishment.
- School Functioning: Competence in school and classroom tasks.
- Affective Strength: Ability to express feelings towards others and to accept affection from others.

STRUCTURE:

There are three forms that comprise the BERS-2 system: The child self-report (Youth Rating Scale), the parent report (Parent Rating Scale), and teacher or other professional report (Teacher Rating Scale). The three forms can be used in isolation or together to get a more comprehensive picture.

Typically, the forms take less than 15 minutes to complete. There are 52 items and each item is rated on a 4-point scale of 0 to 3 (not at all like the child, not much like the child, like the child, very much like the child; not at all like me, not much like me, like me, very much like me). In addition, there are eight open-ended questions on each version that ask about child academic, social, athletic, family, and community strengths. The rater should have had regular, daily contact with the child for at least a few months before responding to the rating scale.

Scoring of the BERS-2 is done by hand. Scores on all items are scored to create an overall raw score. The rating scale sheet allows for scoring of the items. The BERS-2 Strength index converts raw subscale

scores into a standard score with a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15. Normative tables are provided in the technical manual to convert the subscale raw scores to percentile ranks and scaled scores. Detailed scoring information can be found in the technical manual.

STRENGTHS:

The BERS-2 appears to be a psychometrically sound, strength-based rapid-assessment instrument. It is widely used by schools and social service agencies. The technical adequacy has been determined with respect to the instrument's reliability and validity. The BERS-2 focuses on students' strengths instead of deficits.

WEAKNESSES:

There are no provisions for how to coordinate results from parent, teacher, and student scales or how to compile the information when using the scales for program-level evaluation. Someone familiar with aggregating data may be necessary to compile the survey results for school personnel to use.

TECHNICAL PROPERTIES:

Reliability.

Internal Reliability: Good (Epstein & Sharma, 1998)

Test-Retest Reliability: Good (Epstein & Sharma, 1998; Epstein, Mooney, Ryser, and Pierce, 2004)

Validity.

Criterion Validity: In a large national sample, the BERS-2 was shown to differentiate between those with emotional-behavioral disorders and those without (Epstein, Ryser, & Pearson, 2002)

Convergent and/or Discriminant Validity: Several studies have been conducted to assess the convergent validity of the BERS-2 (Epstein, Nordness, Nelson, & Hertzog, 2002; Harniss, Epstein, Ryser, & Pearson, 1999). The BERS-2 consistently demonstrated moderate to high correlations with competence-oriented scales on the Social Skills Rating Scale and moderate to high negative correlations with deficit-oriented scales across different age ranges (Epstein, Nordness, Nelson, & Hertzog, 2002; Epstein, Mooney, Ryser, and Pierce, 2004).

TECHNICAL SUPPORT:

Information about the BERS-2 can be found on the ProEd website: <http://www.proedinc.com/>. In addition, the technical manual has extensive information on reliability, validity, administration, scoring, and interpretation.

AVAILABILITY:

The BERS-2 is available for purchase from Pro Ed. The cost of the manual is \$64.00; a package of 25 forms (Teacher, Parent, or Youth Rating Scales) is \$34.00, and a pad of 50 summary forms is \$34.00.

Communities That Care (CTC) Youth Survey

DEVELOPED BY THE SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH GROUP

OVERVIEW:

The Communities That Care Youth Survey is designed to identify the levels of risk and protective factors that predict problem behaviors such as alcohol, tobacco, and other drug use, poor school achievement, and delinquency in young people (Arthur et al., 2002). The survey is based upon an extensive research base, which ensures that assessment efforts are based on prevention science, and has consistently demonstrated reliable and valid measurements of these factors across grades, both genders, and racial and ethnic groups (Glaser et al. 2005). In addition to measuring risk and protective factors, the survey also measures the actual prevalence of drug use, violence, and other antisocial behaviors among surveyed students.

PROGRAM TARGET AGE:

The CTC Youth Survey can be used to assess middle and high school youth (Grades 6 through 12).

CONSTRUCTS MEASURED:

Community Risk Factors:

Low Neighborhood Attachment, Community Disorganization, Transitions and Mobility, Perceived Availability of Handguns, Laws and Norms Favorable to Drug Use

Community Protective Factors:

Opportunities for Prosocial Involvement, Rewards for Prosocial Involvement

Family Risk Factors:

Family History of Antisocial Behavior, Poor Family Management, Family Conflict, Parental Attitudes Favorable Towards Drug Use, Parent Attitudes Favorable to Antisocial Behavior

Family Protective Factors:

Attachment, Opportunities for Prosocial Involvement, Rewards for Prosocial Involvement

School Risk Factors:

Academic Failure, Low Commitment to School

School Protective Factors:

Opportunities for Prosocial Involvement, Rewards for Prosocial Involvement

Peer-Individual Risk Factors:

Rebelliousness, Gang Involvement, Perceived Risk of Drug Use, Early Initiation of Drug Use, Early Initiation of Antisocial Behavior, Favorable Attitudes Towards Drug Use, Favorable Attitudes Towards Antisocial Behavior, Sensation Seeking, Rewards for Antisocial Involvement, Friends' Use of Drugs, Interaction with Antisocial Peers, Intentions to Use

Peer-Individual Protective Factors:

Interaction with Prosocial Peers, Belief in the Moral Order, Prosocial Involvement, Rewards for Prosocial Involvement, Social Skills, Religiosity

Outcome Measures:

Depression, High Substance Use Frequency, Substance Use Frequency, Antisocial Behavior, Antisocial Behavior Frequency

STRUCTURE:

The CTC Youth Survey is a self-report instrument with a total of 142 items, and takes the youth approximately 50 minutes to complete. The survey can be administered in large groups. There are several different response options to the survey questions. A majority of the questions use various 4-point response option scales (e.g., NO!, no, yes, YES!; OR Very Wrong, Wrong, A Little Bit Wrong, Not Wrong At All; OR No Risk, Slight Risk, Moderate Risk, Great Risk). Other questions are simply yes/no questions, while others seek a response regarding the frequency of behaviors (e.g., Never, 1 or 2 times, 3 or 4 times, 5 or 6 times, 7 or more times). The Bach Harrison, LLC company provides services for scoring, aggregating the data, and generating reports for the school(s) to use for program planning and evaluation.

See Figure 2 for a sample of the CTC Youth Survey.

STRENGTHS:

The CTC Youth Survey is part of the Center for Substance Use Prevention (CSAP) Toolkit, which is part of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA). The CTC Survey, therefore, supports federal funding requirements and provides a solid and objective foundation to potential grant applications.

There is extensive research supporting the validity, reliability, and the usefulness of the CTC Youth Survey (Arthur et al. 2002; Arthur et al. 2007; and Glaser et al. 2005). The survey is designed to support

science-based prevention planning by facilitating the assessment and prioritization of risk and protective factors in youth populations at the community or school level. Also, in addition to examining social and emotional constructs, the CTC Youth Survey includes outcome measures in the areas of mental health, substance use, and antisocial behavior, which may be beneficial, as these areas are all related to SEL skills.

WEAKNESSES:

Extensive information on the Communities That Care prevention framework and processes is readily available, but information specific to the survey is more difficult to find online. This survey is longer than many of the others included in this report.

TECHNICAL PROPERTIES:

A distinguished body of research is available in support of the CTC Youth Survey. The timeline of supporting data also charts the progression of the method used to publish the results of the survey.

Reliability.

Internal Reliability: Good (Arthur et al., 2002)

Test-Retest Reliability: No information available

Validity.

Criterion Validity: Each of the risk and protective factors included in the CTC Youth Survey has been found to predict later drug use or problem behavior (Hawkins et al., 1992, 1995)

Convergent and/or Discriminant Validity: Glaser et al. (2005) concluded that the CTC Youth Survey measures risk and protective factors equally well across gender and ethnic/racial groups

TECHNICAL SUPPORT:

Information can be found on the following website: <http://ncadi.samhsa.gov/features/ctc/resources.aspx>

In addition, Bach Harrison provides expertise in research services, program evaluation, survey administration, data management systems, and web-based services. Contact Dr. Steve Harrison at steve@bach-harrison.com or (801) 359-2064 for more information and pricing.

AVAILABILITY:

The CTC Youth Survey is available to the public for free; however, there may be costs if services from Bach Harrison or other research contractors are needed.

*Information was reviewed by the Social Development Research Group

The Comprehensive School Climate Inventory (CSCI)

DEVELOPED BY THE NATIONAL SCHOOL CLIMATE CENTER (NSCC; Formerly, The Center for Social and Emotional Education)

OVERVIEW:

The Comprehensive School Climate Inventory (CSCI) is a nationally-recognized, empirically-validated school climate survey that provides an in-depth profile of a school's particular strengths and needs. School climate, as defined by the National School Climate Council, is the quality of school life as it relates to norms and values, interpersonal relations and social interactions, and organizational processes and structures. The CSCI provides an in-depth profile of a school community's particular strengths and needs in four main areas. The CSCI allows schools to assess student, parent, and school personnel perceptions, and get detailed information needed to make informed decisions for lasting improvement.

PROGRAM TARGET AGE:

The CSCI is designed to assess students in Grades 3 through 12, and K-12 parents and school personnel.

CONSTRUCTS MEASURED:

Safety

- Rules and Norms
- Sense of Physical Security
- Sense of Social-Emotional Security

Teaching and Learning

- Support for Learning
- Social and Civic Learning

Interpersonal Relationships

- Respect for Diversity
- Social Support from Adults
- Social Support for Students

Institutional Environment

- School Connectedness/Engagement
- Physical Surroundings

Staff Only

- Leadership
- Professional Relationships

STRUCTURE:

The CSCI provides the option of paper or online versions of the surveys. It is a multi-modal assessment, with student, parent, and school personnel forms. There are approximately 64 to 90 questions, depending on the population being assessed. The survey takes 15–20 minutes to complete. It is available in English and Spanish. Scoring is done by the National School Climate Center. Every school has access to a secure online portal that includes step-by-step guidelines for administration, form letters to aid in outreach, real-time response rates, best practices from the field, and detailed worksheets for focused prioritizing and action planning based on results. In addition, each school receives a comprehensive, customized report with graphic-rich data and recommended guidelines. The report includes narrative and numerical analysis of major findings, a summary of the report highlights, detailed data by sub-groups, item-by-item responses, and information-rich action charts to support schools in brainstorming next steps for targeted action planning.

See Figure 3 for a sample of the CSCI.

STRENGTHS:

The CSCI is yoked to a web-based portal system that supports schools to effectively administer the survey and use the resulting data as a springboard for school improvement efforts.

The CSCI includes action-planning worksheets as part of a comprehensive framework for school climate improvement, which promotes the development of core priorities and focused plans for sustained, measured progress over time.

The CSCI has been in development since 2002. In 2006, the following three independent researchers assessed how the CSCI had been developed: Kathy Burgoyne, Ph.D. (Senior Director of Capacity Building, Research, and Evaluation, Comprehensive Health Education Foundation), Madhabi Chatterji, Ph.D (Associate Professor of Measurement, Evaluation and Education, Teachers College, Columbia University), and, Chrys Dougherty, Ph.D. (Director of Research, National Center for Educational Accountability). All reported that the CSCI had been developed in a scientifically sound manner and initial indices of validity and reliability had been established. (For copies of these reports, please write to jonathancohen@schoolclimate.org.)

The reliability and validity claims made by the National School Climate Center are based upon a large pilot test of 64 schools (39 high schools, 25 middle schools), which yielded roughly 27,000 observations.

WEAKNESSES:

The CSCI is recommended as a school climate measure, but not as a purely social-emotional assessment. In addition, there is limited reliability and validity information on this measure. The research that has been done indicates very strong psychometrics, but further testing would be beneficial.

Professor Ann Higgins D'Alessandro (Director, Applied Psychology Program, Fordham University) is now conducting further reliability and validity studies.

TECHNICAL PROPERTIES:

The National School Climate Center has published the results of their empirical testing of the CSCI conducted via a pilot test of 64 schools. The final report is available at <http://www.schoolclimate.org/climate/documents/ValidityAndReliability-CSCI.pdf>

Reliability.

Internal Reliability: Good

Test-Retest Reliability: No information available

Validity.

Criterion Validity: As a school-level measure, the CSCI is able to discriminate among schools.

Convergent and/or Discriminant Validity: Correlations between the CSCI and a measure of nonacademic risk found 8 out of the 10 scale scores (as well as the unified scale score) had correlations above .60. The unified climate scale was significantly correlated with an index of academic performance, as well as high school graduation rates.

TECHNICAL SUPPORT:

Detailed information and support for the CSCI can be found on the National School Climate Center (NSCC) website: www.schoolclimate.org/programs/csci.php. For more information, contact Darlene Faster, Director of Communications, 212-707-8799, ext 22 or 800-998-4701, or dfaster@schoolclimate.org.

NSCC also provides technical assistance to schools, districts and State Departments of Education on how to (1) prepare and plan for the next phase of the school improvement process in general and school climate assessment in particular; and, (2) a series of tasks that support school personnel, students and parents/guardians understanding the school climate findings and developing an evidence-based action plan.

AVAILABILITY:

The paper survey is \$1.75 each. The online survey pricing is determined on a sliding scale.

Customization options are available for the survey, including open-ended or additional demographic questions.

Additional reporting options are available, including District-wide reports highlighting key trends and patterns across a network of schools and Aggregate reports displaying findings at each level (elementary, middle, and high).

*Information was reviewed by the National School Climate Center

Developmental Assets Profile (DAP)

DEVELOPED BY THE SEARCH INSTITUTE

OVERVIEW:

The Developmental Assets Profile (DAP) is a survey designed to assess how youth are faring personally, socially, and within the contexts of family, school, and community. The DAP measures eight asset categories in a way that's quickly administered and scored. Developmental Assets are defined as positive experiences and qualities identified by the Search Institute as being essential to healthy psychological and social development in childhood and adolescence. These assets have the power to influence young people's developmental trajectories, protect them from a range of negative outcomes, and help them become more productive, caring, and responsible adults. Developmental Assets represent the positive relationships, opportunities, skills, and values that promote the positive development of all children and adolescents. The DAP is designed to be sensitive to changes in reported assets over time and it is suited to research and program evaluation. The DAP is useful for studying effects of youth programs, curricula, and interventions that are designed to enhance youth development and reduce negative outcomes.

PROGRAM TARGET AGE:

The DAP can be used with youth ages 11 to 18 (Grades 6 to 12).

CONSTRUCTS MEASURED:

There are two alternative ways of scoring and portraying reported assets.

Asset View:

- Support
- Empowerment
- Boundaries and Expectations
- Constructive Use of Time
- Commitment to Learning
- Positive Values
- Social Competencies
- Positive Identity

Context View:

- Personal
- Social

- Family
- School
- Community

STRUCTURE:

There are 58 questions completed by the student, rated on a 4-point scale from ‘Not at All or Rarely’ to ‘Extremely or Almost Always.’ Respondents are instructed to describe themselves “now or within the past three months.” The survey is usually completed within 10 minutes. The survey can be completed on paper and hand scored or there is an option of a web survey which allows for a secure environment in which to administer, score, view, print, and export DAP results.

Scoring should be done by a qualified user. Materials and procedures for hand-scoring the DAP are available. Alternatively, internet-based data entry and scoring are available. Prior to scoring, the DAP is checked for data quality problems (too many blanks, multiple responses, etc.) according to instructions in the manual. There are two scoring schemes available for the DAP. The Asset View portrays scores on eight scales representing the asset categories, whereas the Context View comprises scales representing five context areas. For either view, scores are computed for each scale by averaging the scores for completed items on the scale. If using the Asset View, an Internal Asset Score and an External Asset Score can be derived.

The DAP allows for two methods of interpretation: Theoretical and Empirical. The theoretical approach involves developing standards. There are some theoretically based interpretive guidelines for interpretation. Once scored, the DAP asset category and context area scales are divided into four ranges labeled Excellent, Good, Fair, and Low. The empirical approach involves statistically based norms based on representative standardization samples. The statistical norms are currently being constructed.

See Figure 4 for a sample of the DAP.

STRENGTHS:

The DAP has strong psychometric properties and uses a strength-based perspective. It is specifically designed for assessing change over time and evaluating SEL programming. In addition, there is technical support available to schools wanting to use the DAP.

WEAKNESSES:

No validity information exists for the Context Assets. Also, norms are still currently being developed and are not presented in the 2005 version of the manual, but they do give general guidelines to interpret scores.

TECHNICAL PROPERTIES:

(see Search Institute, 2005)

Reliability.

Internal Reliability: Good

Test-Retest Reliability: Good

Validity.

Criterion Validity: Students from two middle schools that were judged independently to differ in the kinds of positive experiences afforded to youth were compared. Youth from the more asset-rich school scored significantly higher on every DAP scale ($p < .001$), indicating the DAP is sensitive to differences between groups judged independently to differ in level of Developmental Assets.

Convergent and/or Discriminant Validity: The DAP was compared to the Attitudes and Behaviors Scale, also developed by the Search Institute. The DAP total asset score, as well as the External and Internal Asset Scores were found to correlate strongly with the Attitudes and Behaviors survey overall score and corresponding subscales. Also, scores on the DAP Positive Identity scale significantly correlated with scores on Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale, and with Harter's Global Self-Worth Scale, indicating considerable convergence between these measures.

TECHNICAL SUPPORT:

Information on scoring is provided in the technical manual. Information can also be found on the Search Institute's website at <http://www.search-institute.org/>. Additional information can be obtained by calling customer support at 877-240-7251 ext. 1 or by emailing Erika Klein at erikak@search-institute.org.

AVAILABILITY:

The DAP is available for purchase through the Search Institute at www.search-institute.org/. The paper version and the online version introductory packages cost \$195.00. The paper version includes a user's manual, 50 surveys, and 50 self-scoring profile forms. The online version includes a downloadable user's manual, 50 surveys, and scoring.

Devereux Student Strengths Assessment (DESSA)

DEVELOPED BY THE DEVEREUX CENTER FOR RESILIENT CHILDREN

OVERVIEW:

The Devereux Student Strengths Assessment (DESSA; LeBuffe, Shapiro, & Naglieri, 2008) is a behavior rating scale that assesses the social-emotional competencies that serve as protective factors for children in kindergarten through eighth grade. The assessment is entirely strength-based and does not assess risk factors or maladaptive behaviors. The DESSA defines social-emotional competence as the ability of the child to successfully interact with other children and adults in a way that demonstrates an awareness of, and ability to manage emotions in an age- and contextually appropriate manner. The DESSA also considers competence to be a continuum ranging from incompetence to being fully proficient.

The DESSA can be used to:

1. Identify social-emotional strengths and needs of elementary and middle school children.
2. Produce classroom profiles that guide universal prevention strategies.
3. Identify at-risk children who have specific social-emotional needs.
4. Produce individual student profiles that guide targeted prevention strategies.
5. For special education students, identify important strengths that can be incorporated into IEPs.
6. Evaluate social-emotional learning outcomes at the child, class, grade, school, and district levels.
7. Enable the evaluation of social-emotional learning and positive youth development programs by rigorously evaluating outcomes at the student, classroom, school/ program, and district/ community levels.

PROGRAM TARGET AGE:

Students in kindergarten through eighth grade.

CONSTRUCTS MEASURED:

- Self-Awareness: a child's realistic understanding of her/his strengths and limitations and consistent desire for self-improvement

- **Social-Awareness:** a child's capacity to interact with others in a way that shows respect for their ideas and behaviors, recognizes her/his impact on them, and uses cooperation and tolerance in social situations
- **Self-Management:** a child's success in controlling his or her emotions and behaviors, to complete a task, or succeed in a new or challenging situation
- **Goal-Directed Behavior:** a child's initiation of and persistence in completing tasks of varying difficulty
- **Relationship Skills:** a child's consistent performance of socially acceptable actions that promote and maintain positive connections with others
- **Personal Responsibility:** a child's tendency to be careful and reliable in her/his actions and in contribution to group efforts
- **Decision Making:** a child's approach to problem solving that involves learning from others and from her/his own previous experiences, using values to guide action, and accepting responsibility for decisions
- **Optimistic Thinking:** a child's attitude of confidence, hopefulness, and positive thinking regarding herself/himself and her/his life situations in the past, present, and future.

STRUCTURE:

The DESSA is completed by parents/guardians, teachers, or staff at schools and child-serving agencies, including after-school, social service, and mental health programs. For each of the 72 DESSA items, the rater is asked to indicate on a 5-point scale (Never, Rarely, Occasionally, Frequently, Very Frequently) how often the student engaged in each behavior over the past four weeks. Therefore, raters must know the child for at least four weeks. The same rating form is used for children of all ages and all raters for ease of administration and score comparison. Items were grouped based on CASEL 5 SEL core competencies with the addition of optimism, an important concept from the resilience literature.

A standardized T-score for each of the eight scales and a total Social-Emotional Composite score are derived. Profiles of individual students, classrooms, or other groups of students are generated by hand or by using scoring software.

The DESSA-mini is an eight-item teacher rating form that allows teachers to screen their entire classroom in a single planning period. The DESSA-mini has four alternative forms that can be used interchangeably for frequent progress monitoring. The DESSA-mini does not yield scale scores, but only a single Social-Emotional Total Score that classifies students in the same way as the longer form 80% of the time.

The DESSA and the DESSA-mini is available in English and Spanish. Online administration, scoring, interpretations and reporting program is available for the DESSA. The online report provides data of entire individual students and entire classrooms. It was designed, in part, for school-wide assessment.

See Figure 5 for a sample of the DESSA.

STRENGTHS:

The DESSA is a the strengths-based assessment with strong psychometric properties. It has solid conceptualization and ease of administration. In addition, the profiles are easy to read and interpret, and online administration, scoring and reporting is available. Information on the website is readily available and easy to access.

WEAKNESSES:

Does not assess risk factors or maladaptive behaviors, which are often of interest to schools and districts. Teachers/parents have to complete, which requires a lot of time for teachers and it may be difficult to get high response rates when assessing an entire school/district.

TECHNICAL PROPERTIES:

The DESSA standardization sample consists of 2,500 children matched to U.S. census data (LeBuffe, Shapiro, & Naglieri, 2008).

Reliability.

Internal Reliability: Good

Test-Retest Reliability: Good

Validity.

Criterion Validity: A study conducted by the authors (LeBuffe, Shapiro, & Naglieri, 2008) compared DESSA scores of students who had already been identified as having social, emotional, or behavioral disorders to their non-identified peers. The results of the study show that the DESSA is very effective in differentiating between students with and without social, emotional, and behavioral problems, and indicates the DESSA has strong criterion validity.

Convergent Validity: Nickerson and Fishman (2009), in an article published in *School Psychology Quarterly*, reported strong convergent validity of DESSA scores with the Behavioral Assessment Scale for Children, Second Edition (BASC-2) and BERS-2 scores.

TECHNICAL SUPPORT:

Manual provides user-friendly tools for detecting differences between raters and across time. Fee-based in-service training is available, but not necessary. Free video and audio training presentations are available online. For more information on the Devereaux Center for Resilient Children, visit the website,

www.centerforresilientchildren.org, or call 866-872-4687.

AVAILABILITY:

For purchase through Kaplan (www.k5kaplan.com). The cost is \$115.95 for the DESSA Kit, which includes the DESSA manual, the DESSA Norms Reference Card, and 25 DESSA Record Forms (hand scoring). Addition packages of 25 forms can be purchased for \$39. 95. The online DESSA Scoring Assistant costs \$32.25 for 25 online “forms.”

*Information was reviewed by the Devereux Center for Resilient Children

School Social Behaviors Scale

SECOND EDITION (SSBS-2)

OVERVIEW:

The School Social Behavior Scale (SSBS-2), primarily designed as a behavior-rating instrument for teachers or other school personnel of students in Grades K-12, can be used as a screening instrument to identify possible at-risk students, determine student eligibility for intervention programs, measure the effectiveness of interventions over time, remove barriers to learning and help children reach their goals, bring families into the process to provide the best support for children, and examine social competence and antisocial behavior patterns of children and adolescents.

Teachers or other school personnel complete SSBS-2, a simple 2-page rating scale that looks at both Social Competence and Antisocial Behavior. Specific items on both positive and negative behaviors give users accurate results and provide direction for intervention and support in school. In addition the SSBS-2:

- Screens both positive and negative behaviors, so users get the big picture of a child's social and emotional development
- Is norm-referenced and standardized—norming sample included children from diverse backgrounds and with a wide range of disabilities
- Requires no training and very little time—is easy to complete in minutes
- Screens behaviors inside and outside the classroom, so users get the full picture of the child's behavior and can target interventions

PROGRAM TARGET AGE:

The SSBS can be used with children and youth in Grades K through 12.

CONSTRUCTS MEASURED:

Scale A: Social Competence

- Peer Relations
- Self-Management/Compliance
- Academic Behavior

Scale B: Antisocial Behavior

- Hostile/Irritable
- Antisocial/Aggressive

- Defiant/Disruptive

STRUCTURE:

The SSBS differs from most other behavior-rating scales in that it contains two separate major scales, both normed on the same population, for use in assessing both behavioral domains. It also differs from many other behavior-rating scales in that it was designed specifically for school-based use; the items therein contain behavioral descriptors relevant to educational settings.

The SSBS has two scales: Social Competence and Antisocial Behavior. Each of these major scales contains three empirically derived subscales, which are useful in identifying specific social and antisocial behavior patterns.

The SSBS includes 65 items on two major scales (Social Competence, 32 items; Antisocial Behavior, 33 items) and items are rated using a 5-point scale, “1 = Never” to “5 = Frequently.” The rating scales take approximately 10 minutes to complete. The empirically derived structure for each scale includes three subscales and a total score. All subscales and total scores are converted to Social Functioning Levels, which serve as general indicators on the normative range of skill deficits and problem excesses. Additionally, standard scores and percentile ranks are created by converting the total scores for each scale.

The Social Competence scale has 32 items that represent adaptive and prosocial behavioral competences as they generally transpire in the classroom. The Peer Relations subscale has 14 items that measure social competency in initiating and developing affirmative relationships and earning social acceptance from peers. The Self-Management/Compliance subscale has 10 items that measure social competency in cooperation, self-management and regulation, and observance to established school rules and classroom boundaries. The Academic Behavior subscale has 8 items relating to successful completion and engagement on academic tasks.

The Antisocial Behavior scale has 33 items that describe problematic behaviors, either other-directed (directed or guided chiefly by external standards as opposed to their own standards or values) or likely to cause negative social interactions or environments. The Hostile/Irritable subscale has 14 items that measure antisocial behavior in confrontational and antagonistic trends in academic tasks and social interactions with peers. The Antisocial/Aggressive subscale has 10 items that describe behaviors concerning intimidation or harms to other children and deliberate infringement of rules and boundaries. The Defiant/Disruptive subscale has 8 items that describe potentially disruptive behaviors to the classroom climate and unacceptable demands on teacher and child.

See Figure 6 for a sample of the SSBS.

STRENGTHS:

The SBSS is a practical instrument that has the advantage of focusing solely on social behaviors within the school context, and provides norm-referenced data on social competence and antisocial problem

behavior. It has adequate to good psychometric properties, and the ease and simplicity of administration and scoring make the instrument ideally suited to the demands of screening, classification, and the development of interventions in middle schools. In addition, the revised second edition of the SSBS has increased the ethnic and geographic diversity of the students rated in the standardization sample.

Note: A cross-informant version of the SBSS has been developed for parents and community-based informants. The Home and Community Social Behaviors Scale (HCSBS) has the same general rating format and social competence/antisocial behavior scale division.

WEAKNESSES:

Given the numbers of studies that have been conducted using the SBSS, there is an inadequate number conducted by independent researchers. No provision for aggregating data for a large number of students is given, so expertise in this area may be needed.

TECHNICAL PROPERTIES:

The SBSS standardization sample consisted of 1,858 teacher ratings of students in Grades K through 12 from 22 different public school districts in the United States. These school districts were drawn from 18 different states, and the four U.S. geographical regions were adequately represented. The 22 participating school districts were in a mix of urban, suburban, small town, and rural communities.

Reliability: (see Merrell, 1993)

Internal Reliability: Good

Test-Retest Reliability: Adequate to Good

Validity.

Convergent and/or Discriminant Validity: Correlation studies conducted with the SBSS and five other behavioral instruments indicated moderate to high correlations, and that the scale has strong convergent and discriminant validity (Emerson, Crowley, and Merrell 1994).

Other studies (cited by Merrell, 2003), have demonstrated that the scale has a high degree of sensitivity and has the capacity to discriminate group differences with a variety of educational subgroups, such as students with disabilities, gifted students, at-risk students, and regular education students.

TECHNICAL SUPPORT:

Information on scoring is provided in the SBSS 2 technical manual, available for purchase from Brookes Publishing.

AVAILABILITY:

For purchase through Brookes Publishing: <http://www.brookespublishing.com>. The User Manual can be purchased for \$49.95 and a set of 25 rating forms can be purchased for \$34.95.

Social Skills Improvement System Rating Scales

(SSIS-RATING SCALE)

OVERVIEW:

The Social Skills Improvement System (SSIS: Gresham & Elliot, 2008) Rating Scales enables targeted assessment of individuals and small groups to help evaluate social skills, problem behaviors, and academic competence. It was designed to replace the SSRS Social Skills Rating System.

The SSIS-Rating Scales can be used to assess children with behavioral and interpersonal skills difficulties, screen for problem behaviors, and identify students at risk for social behavior difficulties and poor academic performance. In addition, it can be used to identify specific social behavior acquisition and performance deficits that can be addressed with skill-building school and home interventions and identify social skills strengths. It is also used to provide a baseline for post-intervention progress evaluation as well as to track progress.

PROGRAM TARGET AGE:

The SSIS can be used with students ages 3 to 18.

CONSTRUCTS MEASURED:

Social Skills:

- Communication
- Cooperation
- Assertion
- Responsibility
- Empathy
- Engagement
- Self-Control

Problem Behaviors:

- Externalizing
- Bullying
- Hyperactivity/Inattention
- Internalizing
- Autism Spectrum

Academic Competence: (teacher form only)

- Reading Achievement
- Math Achievement
- Motivation to Learn

STRUCTURE:

There are forms for the student (ages 8-18 only), parents, and teacher. Each form takes 10 to 25 minutes to complete. The student and parent forms are available in Spanish. The number of items differs based on the form and age of child. There are approximately 140 items per form. On the student form, students rate how true various sentences are about them on a 4-point scale: not true, a little true, a lot true, very true. On the parent and teacher forms, parents and teachers rate the frequency that various behaviors are exhibited by the student on a 4-point scale.

The forms can be hand scored or computer scored. Reports are generated from the scoring software. There are detailed instructions on scoring and interpreting the scores in the manual. The manual also provides instructions when collecting data from multiple raters.

The normative sample included 4,700 students aged 3 through 18; 385 teachers; and 2,800 parents.

STRENGTHS:

The SSIS is a revised version of the widely used SSRS, which has a strong history of use in schools.

WEAKNESSES:

There is extensive research and information on the Social Skills Rating System, but not as much has been done on the newer SSIS. Also, the cost of the SSIS is high compared to other surveys. Knowledge of compiling data and creating reports may also be necessary, as this is not included in the software package.

TECHNICAL PROPERTIES: (SEE GRESHAM & ELLIOTT, 2008)

Reliability. (see Gresham & Elliott, 2008)

Internal Reliability: Good

Test-Retest Reliability: Good

Validity. (see Gresham & Elliott, 2008)

Criterion Validity: The manual demonstrates evidence of adequate criterion validity.

Convergent Validity: The SSIS manual reports adequate support for the convergent and

discriminant validity of the SSIS rating subscales. Correlations between SSIS and other rating scales demonstrated low or moderate correlations.

TECHNICAL SUPPORT:

The technical manual provides detailed information on administration, scoring, and interpreting results.

AVAILABILITY:

The SSIS can be purchased from Pearson at www.pearsonassessments.com. The cost of the SSIS Manual is \$103.00 and a package of 25 forms is \$42.60. The computer-assisted software ranges from approximately \$500 to \$1,000, depending on the package.

Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ)

FROM YOUTH IN MIND

OVERVIEW:

The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) is a brief behavioral screening questionnaire for youth ages 3 to 16. It is designed to be used by researchers, clinicians and in educational settings. The SDQ assesses psychological attributes, some positive and others negative. The SDQ can be used for clinical assessment, evaluating outcomes of interventions or programs, epidemiology, research and screening.

PROGRAM TARGET AGE:

The SDQ can be used to assess youth 3 to 16 years old.

CONSTRUCTS MEASURED:

- Emotional Symptoms
- Conduct Problems
- Hyperactivity/Inattention
- Peer Relationship Problems
- Prosocial Behavior

STRUCTURE:

The SDQ exists in several forms. The informant-rated version of the SDQ is designed to be completed by a parent or teacher. It consists of 25 items and can be used to rate children ages 4 to 16 (Goodman, 1997). There is a slightly modified version for parents and teachers of 3 and 4 year olds. There is also a self-report version for completion by adolescents ages 11 to 16. It asks about the same 25 traits with slightly different wording (Goodman et al, 1998).

In addition to the basic SDQ, there is a version of the SDQ that includes the core 25 on the front of the page and an additional impact supplement on the back. The impact supplement questions ask whether the respondent thinks the young person has a problem, and if so, inquire further about chronicity, distress, social impairment, and burden to others. This provides useful additional information for clinicians and researchers (Goodman, 1999).

There are also follow-up versions of the SDQ that include not only the 25 core items and the impact questions, but two additional follow-up questions for use after an intervention. (Has the intervention reduced problems? Has the intervention helped in other ways, e.g. making the problems more bearable?). To increase the chance of detecting change, the follow-up versions of the SDQ ask about ‘the

last month', as opposed to 'the last six months or this school year', which is the reference period for the standard versions. Follow-up versions also omit the question about the chronicity of problems.

The SDQ can be scored by hand or online. Reports for individual youths can be generated online; however, there is no online system for compiling data from multiple respondents.

See Figure 6 for a sample of the SDQ.

STRENGTHS:

The SDQ is an easy to use, brief instrument that can be used for clinical assessment, evaluating outcomes of interventions or programs, epidemiology, research and screening. It is available free of charge and in many languages.

It has strong psychometric properties, and the ease and simplicity of administration and scoring make the instrument ideally suited to the demands of screening, classification, and the development of interventions in middle schools. Also, there are several extended versions of the basic SDQ survey that provide additional information that can be useful in planning and evaluating intervention programming.

WEAKNESSES:

This survey is shorter than many of the others included in this report because it is designed to be a brief screening tool; therefore, it is not as in-depth as many of the other surveys.

There is no psychometric data for the youth self-report SDQ for US populations.

TECHNICAL PROPERTIES:

Reliability.

Internal Reliability: Adequate to Good, with the exception of the Conduct Problems and Peer Problems subscales on the self-report, which were below the acceptable limits (Goodman, 1999, 2001; Muris, Meesters, Eijkelenboom, & Vincken, 2004; Muris, Meesters, & van den Berg, 2003).

Test-Retest Reliability: Adequate to Good (Muris, Meesters, & van den Berg, 2003).

Validity.

Criterion Validity: The self-report SDQ has been shown to adequately discriminate between clinical and community populations (Goodman, Meltzer, & Bailey, 1998) and has been shown to identify individuals with psychiatric diagnoses with a high degree of specificity (Goodman, Ford, Simmons, Gatward, & Meltzer, 2000).

Convergent and/or Discriminant Validity: Correlations between parent, teacher, and self-report SDQs are moderate and compare favorably to the correlations of other

cross-informant measures (Goodman, 1997, 2001). The SDQ has been shown to correlate in a theoretically meaningful way with the Rutter's questionnaire, Achenbach questionnaires and measures of anxiety and ADHD (Goodman, 1997; Goodman & Scott, 1997; Muris, Meesters, Eijkelenboom, & Vincken, 2004; Muris, Meesters, & van den Berg, 2003).

Note: Most of the research on the psychometric properties of the SDQ has been done using European populations.

TECHNICAL SUPPORT:

Information about the SDQ can be found on the following website: www.sdqinfo.org. The website offers information on scoring, technical properties, and allows for the downloading of the various forms of the SDQ.

AVAILABILITY:

The paper version of the SDQ is available for non-commercial purposes for free at www.sdqinfo.org. In addition, reports for individual youths can be generated for free at www.sdqscore.org. Pricing for the online version of the survey is negotiable.

Washington State Healthy Youth Survey

FROM THE WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

OVERVIEW:

The Washington State Healthy Youth Survey (HYS) assesses health risk behaviors that contribute to morbidity, mortality, and social problems among youth in Washington State. These behaviors include alcohol, tobacco, and other drug use; behaviors that result in unintentional and intentional injuries (e.g., violence); dietary behaviors and physical activity; and related risk and protective factors (see <http://www.doh.wa.gov/healthyyouth>).

The survey produces estimates of the prevalence of major adolescent health risk behaviors and provides crucial information to school officials, health professionals, human service agencies, policymakers, and parents as they work together to ensure the optimum health of young people across the state. In addition, the survey results also provide important needs assessment data for program planning and offer insight into the effectiveness of statewide prevention and health promotion initiatives designed to reach a range of education and health-related goals at the federal and state levels.

The HYS is a collaborative effort of the Washington State Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Department of Health, the Department of Social and Health Service's Division of Behavioral Health and Recovery, the Department of Commerce, and the Liquor Control Board.

The Washington State Healthy Youth Survey is available for schools and districts in Washington State. Many other districts and states offer their own state surveys, including The Illinois Youth Survey in Illinois; The Climate and Connectedness Survey in Anchorage, Alaska; and the California Healthy Kids Survey in California.

PROGRAM TARGET AGE:

The Healthy Youth Survey is conducted in Grades 6, 8, 10, and 12. It is highly recommended that analysis be limited to a single grade. However there are situations in which combining grades may be desirable, for example when comparing to the high school estimates from the Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance system, or if there are very small numbers that cannot be reported.

CONSTRUCTS MEASURED:

School Climate

- Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drugs
- Family Risk and Protective Factors

Demographics

- Health
- Quality of Life
- Community Risk and Protective Factors
- Peer and Individual Risk and Protective Factors
- School Risk and Protective Factors

STRUCTURE:

The questionnaire items were derived primarily from four established surveys that have been used throughout the United States—some for more than 25 years. Each of these surveys has been subjected to scientific research regarding reliability and validity and has been field tested extensively.

- Communities That Care (Developed by the Social Development Research Group, University of Washington)
- Global Youth Tobacco Survey (Developed by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention)
- Monitoring the Future (Developed by the Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan)
- Youth Risk Behavior Survey (Developed by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention)

The survey is given to 8th-, 10th-, and 12th-grade youth as a two-form “interleaved” administration. To manage the length of the survey with the breadth of information desired by agencies and stakeholders, there is a “form A” and a “form B” for the survey. “Form A” is comprised of 101 items, whereas “form B” is comprised of 110 items. The surveys take approximately 40-50 minutes to complete. Alternately seated students receive “form A” and “form B,” but it is not obvious to youth sitting next to each other that they have different versions. All youth have the same “core” questions in their surveys. Youth who complete “form A” go on to answer additional questions about risk/protective factors while youth who complete “form B” answer additional questions about health risks and outcomes.

The 6th-grade survey is a single version with fewer questions (68 questions). Questions are consistent with the longer form A and form B questionnaires. These differences are because 6th-grade youth do not have reading skills to complete a longer survey, because some questions applicable to older youth are not appropriate for younger youth, and because there are more small buildings for 6th graders than for older grades where giving results would be impacted by having only half the youth take a particular version.

Note: Each form of the survey includes a perforated, optional tear-off page of relatively sensitive questions that schools can remove prior to the survey administration if they prefer not to present those questions to the students.

The RMC Research Corporation assists with the generation of reports and program evaluation.

See Figure 7 for a sample of the Healthy Youth Survey.

STRENGTHS:

The Healthy Youth Survey produces estimates of the prevalence of major adolescent health risk behaviors and provides crucial information to school officials, health professionals, human service agencies, policymakers, and parents as they work together to ensure the optimum health of young people across the state. The survey results are then calculated to estimate the current status of these health risk behaviors and examine trends in the behaviors over the past 20 years.

The survey results provide important needs assessment data for program planning. They also offer insight into the effectiveness of statewide prevention and health promotion initiatives designed to reach a range of education and health-related goals at the state and federal levels.

WEAKNESSES:

Even though the HYS is composed of reliable and valid questions from other well-known surveys, there is limited psychometric data on the HYS.

TECHNICAL PROPERTIES:

The Washington State Department of Health does not report the technical properties of the HYS. The HYS is not a single scale and so an overall test such as Cronbach's alpha would not be meaningful. However, the HYS only uses items from established surveys with solid psychometric properties, such as the CTC Youth Survey (page 19 of this report) and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS).

TECHNICAL SUPPORT:

The survey is conducted by the Washington State Department of Health in conjunction with RMC Research Corporations. RMC specializes in research and evaluation to improve education and other human service systems. Training will soon be available and will be conducted online. To complete the training, Survey Coordinators will review a Coordinator Training Presentation PowerPoint, Tips for Training Survey Administrators, and review the administration instructions. After reviewing all the materials, the Survey Coordinator will complete and submit the short quiz that asks important questions about the HYS administration.

AVAILABILITY:

The Healthy Youth Survey is available to the public for free at <http://www.doh.wa.gov/healthyyouth/>. However, there may be costs if services from RMC Research Corporation or other research contractors are needed.

For more information, contact Kevin Beck at the Washington State Department of Health at 360-236-3492 or email him at Kevin.Beck@doh.wa.gov.

To contact RMC Research Corporation, call 503-223-3492.

*Information was reviewed by the Washington State Department of Health

Table 2. Summary of Recommended Measures

	PURPOSE	CONSTRUCTS	
ASEBA System; Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL), Youth Self-Report (YSR), Teacher Report Form (TRF)	Assesses adaptive and maladaptive functioning of children and adolescents. It is a multi-modal assessment that measures the child's behaviors from three perspectives: the child, teacher, and parent/guardian.	<i>Syndrome Scales</i> • Anxious/Depressed • Withdrawn/Depressed • Somatic Complaints • Social Problems • Thought Problems • Attention Problems • Rule-Breaking Behavior • Aggressive Behavior	<i>Diagnostic Scales</i> • Affective Problems • Anxiety Problems • Somatic Problems • Attention Deficit/ Hyper-activity Problems • Oppositional Defiant Problems • Conduct Problems
Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale; Second Edition (BERS-2)	Measures the personal strengths and competencies of children and adolescents in five areas. It is a multi-modal assessment that measures the child's behaviors from three perspectives: the child, teacher, and parent/guardian.	• Interpersonal Strength • Involvement with Family • Intrapersonal Strength • School Functioning • Affective Strength	
Communities That Care (CTC) Survey	To assess risk and protective factors at the individual, school, family and community levels, as well as to assess outcomes including substance use, depression, and antisocial behavior.	• Community Risk Factors (e.g., Community Disorganization) • Community Protective Factors (e.g., Opportunities for Pro-social Involvement) • Family Risk Factors (e.g., Poor Family Management) • Family Protective Factors (e.g., Attachment) • School Risk Factors (e.g., Academic Failure) • School Protective Factors (e.g., Opportunities for Prosocial Involvement) • Peer-Individual Risk Factors (e.g., Rebelliousness) • Peer-Individual Protective Factors (e.g., Belief in the Moral Order) • Outcome Measures (e.g., Depression)	

	PURPOSE	CONSTRUCTS	
The Comprehensive School Climate Inventory (CSCI)	Measures school climate, defined as the quality of school life as it relates to norms and values, interpersonal relations and social interactions, and organizational processes and structures. Allows for student, parent, and school personnel perceptions.	• Safety (e.g., Rules and Norms) • Teaching and Learning (e.g., Support for Learning) • Interpersonal Relationships (e.g., Respect for Diversity) • Institutional Environment (e.g., School Connectedness/Engagement) • Staff Only (e.g., Leadership)	
Developmental Assets Profile (DAP)	Assesses how youth are faring personally, socially, and within the family, school, and community contexts. It measures eight developmental assets, which are positive experiences and qualities essential for healthy psychological and social development.	Asset View • Support • Empowerment • Boundaries and Expectations • Constructive Use of Time • Commitment to Learning • Positive Values • Social Competencies • Positive Identity	Context View • Personal • Social • Family • School
Devereux Student Strengths Assessment (DESSA)	Assesses social-emotional competencies that serve as protective factors. The assessment is entirely strength-based and does not assess risk factors or maladaptive behaviors.	• Self-Awareness • Social Awareness • Self-Management • Goal-Directed Behavior • Relationship Skills • Personal Responsibility • Decision Making • Optimistic Thinking	
School Social Behaviors Scale, Second Edition (SSBS-2)	A behavior rating scale designed to identify possible at-risk students, help determine student eligibility for intervention, and measure the effectiveness of interventions over time.	• Social Competence (Peer Relations, Self-Management/Compliance, and Academic Behavior) • Antisocial Behavior (Hostile/Irritable, Antisocial/Aggressive, and Defiant/Disruptive)	

	PURPOSE	CONSTRUCTS
Social Skills Improvement System Rating Scales (SSIS-Rating Scale)	Enables targeted assessment of individuals and small groups to help evaluate social skills, problem behaviors, and academic competence.	• Social Skills (e.g., Empathy) • Problem Behaviors (e.g., Bullying) • Academic Competence (e.g., Motivation to Learn)
Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ)	A brief behavioral screening questionnaire designed to be used by researchers, clinicians and in educational settings. It assesses psychological attributes, some positive and others negative. The SDQ can be used for clinical assessment, evaluating outcomes of interventions or programs, epidemiology, research and screening.	• Emotional Symptoms • Conduct Problems • Hyperactivity/Inattention • Peer Relationship Problems • Prosocial Behavior
Washington State Healthy Youth Survey (HYS)	Measures health risk behaviors that contribute to morbidity, mortality, and social problems among youth. The results are used to monitor the health status of adolescents and track progress on state and federal education and health-related goals.	• School Climate • Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drugs • Family Risk and Protective Factors • Demographics • Health • Quality of Life • Community Risk and Protective Factors • Peer and Individual Risk and Protective Factors • School Risk and Protective Factors

Glossary of Terms

Developmental Assets:

Positive values, experiences, and qualities that help kids succeed. Assets influence choices young people make and help them become caring, responsible adults.

Evidence-based programs, practices and policies:

Approaches to prevention or treatment that are based in theory and have undergone specifically defined levels of evaluation that demonstrated their effectiveness.

Outcome:

An intrinsic aspect of children's health and development (as opposed to some administrative indicator of service use). Examples of outcomes central to this report include children's emotional, behavioral and social development.

Promotive Factor:

A characteristic, experience or event that is generally associated with positive outcomes. The broad concept of promotive factor can be conceptualized as two different concepts:

(1) Promotive factors: Those experiences associated with positive outcomes regardless of risk.

(2) Protective factors: Those experiences that in the context of a risk, buffer children from harm. A protective factor is not simply the antonym or inverse of a risk factor; rather, it interacts with risk to oppose the likelihood of negative outcomes. For example, avoidance-based coping strategies may not always be effective, but in the context of an acute physical danger it may be protective.

Reliability:

Refers to an instrument's ability to generate consistent answers or responses across situations where variation is not desired or expected.

(1) Internal Consistency (Reliability): Measures whether items that propose to measure the same general construct produce similar scores and are positively correlated with their scale scores and the total test score. Internal consistency is usually measured with Cronbach's Alpha, which ranges from 0 to 1.00 (Good is .70 and above; Adequate is .60 - .69; and Poor is .59 and below).

(2) Test-Retest Reliability: Measures the consistency of an assessment over time. Results are typically presented as a correlation coefficient from 0 to 1.00. (Good is .70 and above; Adequate is .60 - .69; and Poor is .59 and below).

Risk Factor:

A characteristic, experience, or event that is associated with an increased probability (risk) of a particular negative outcome occurring.

Social Emotional Learning Competencies:

The five social and emotional learning include:

Self-Awareness. Accurately assessing one's feelings, interests, values, and strengths; maintaining a well-grounded sense of self-confidence.

Self-Management. Regulating one's emotions to handle stress, controlling impulses, and persevering in addressing challenges; expressing emotions appropriately; and setting and monitoring progress toward personal and academic goals.

Social Awareness. Being able to take the perspective of and empathize with others; recognizing and appreciating individual and group similarities and differences; and recognizing and making the best use of family, school, and community resources.

Relationship Skills. Establishing and maintaining healthy and rewarding relationships based on cooperation; resisting inappropriate social pressure; preventing, managing, and resolving interpersonal conflict, and seeking help when needed.

Responsible Decision Making. Making decisions based on consideration of ethical standards, safety concerns, appropriate social norms, respect for others, and likely consequences of various actions; applying decision-making skills to academic and social situations; and contributing to the well-being of one's school and community.

Validity:

Is the extent to which an assessment measures what it is intended to measure (American Educational Research Association, 1999).

(1) Criterion-Related Validity: Degree to which a measure is related in expected ways to some type of criterion or outcome, measured either at the same time (concurrent validity) or a later time (predictive validity).

(2) Convergent and/or Discriminant Validity: Convergent validity is the degree to which scores on a measure are associated positively with scores on measures of the same or highly similar constructs; discriminant validity is the degree to which scores on a measure are not associated at unexpectedly high levels with scores on measures of distinct constructs.

Well-being:

A state of being that not only includes the absence of impairment to health and development (i.e. poor outcomes), but also encompasses positive dimensions of development (such as happiness, or mutually supportive relationships).

Figure 1. Sample of the Child Behavior Checklist

Please print			CHILD BEHAVIOR CHECKLIST FOR AGES 6-18			For office use only ID # _____		
CHILD'S FULL NAME First Middle Last			PARENTS' USUAL TYPE OF WORK, even if not working now. <i>(Please be specific — for example, auto mechanic, high school teacher, homemaker, laborer, lathe operator, shoe salesman, army sergeant.)</i>					
CHILD'S GENDER ☐ Boy ☐ Girl		CHILD'S AGE _____		CHILD'S ETHNIC GROUP OR RACE _____			FATHER'S TYPE OF WORK _____ MOTHER'S TYPE OF WORK _____	
TODAY'S DATE Mo. ____ Day ____ Year ____			CHILD'S BIRTHDATE Mo. ____ Day ____ Year ____					
GRADE IN SCHOOL _____ NOT ATTENDING SCHOOL ☐			Please fill out this form to reflect <i>your</i> view of the child's behavior even if other people might not agree. Feel free to print additional comments beside each item and in the space provided on page 2. Be sure to answer all items.			THIS FORM FILLED OUT BY: (print your full name) _____ Your gender: ☐ Male ☐ Female Your relation to the child: ☐ Biological Parent ☐ Step Parent ☐ Grandparent ☐ Adoptive Parent ☐ Foster Parent ☐ Other (specify) _____		

I. Please list the sports your child most likes to take part in. For example: swimming, baseball, skating, skate boarding, bike riding, fishing, etc.		Compared to others of the same age, about how much time does he/she spend in each?		Compared to others of the same age, how well does he/she do each one?	
None ☐		Less Than Average Average More Than Average Don't Know		Below Average Average Above Average Don't Know	
a. _____		☐ ☐ ☐ ☐		☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	
b. _____		☐ ☐ ☐ ☐		☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	
c. _____		☐ ☐ ☐ ☐		☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	

II. Please list your child's favorite hobbies, activities, and games, other than sports. For example: stamps, dolls, books, piano, crafts, cars, computers, singing, etc. (Do <i>not</i> include listening to radio or TV.)		Compared to others of the same age, about how much time does he/she spend in each?		Compared to others of the same age, how well does he/she do each one?	
None ☐		Less Than Average Average More Than Average Don't Know		Below Average Average Above Average Don't Know	
a. _____		☐ ☐ ☐ ☐		☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	
b. _____		☐ ☐ ☐ ☐		☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	
c. _____		☐ ☐ ☐ ☐		☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	

III. Please list any organizations, clubs, teams, or groups your child belongs to.		Compared to others of the same age, how active is he/she in each?	
None ☐		Less Active Average More Active Don't Know	
a. _____		☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	
b. _____		☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	
c. _____		☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	

IV. Please list any jobs or chores your child has. For example: paper route, babysitting, making bed, working in store, etc. (Include both paid and unpaid jobs and chores.)		Compared to others of the same age, how well does he/she carry them out?	
None ☐		Below Average Average Above Average Don't Know	
a. _____		☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	
b. _____		☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	
c. _____		☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	

Be sure you answered all items. Then see other side.

Figure 2. Sample of the Communities that Care Survey

These questions ask for some general information about the people completing the survey. Please mark the response that best describes you.

1. How old are you?
☐ 10 ☐ 12 ☐ 14 ☐ 16 ☐ 18
☐ 11 ☐ 13 ☐ 15 ☐ 17 ☐ 19 or older

2. What grade are you in?
☐ 6th ☐ 7th ☐ 8th ☐ 9th ☐ 10th ☐ 11th ☐ 12th

3. Are you:
☐ Female ☐ Male

4. Are you Spanish/Hispanic/Latino?
☐ No, not Spanish/Hispanic/Latino
☐ Yes, Mexican American
☐ Yes, Mexican
☐ Yes, Chicano
☐ Yes, Puerto Rican
☐ Yes, Cuban
☐ Yes, Central or South American
☐ Yes, other Spanish/Hispanic/Latino

5. What is your race? (Select one or more.)
☐ White, Caucasian or European
☐ Black or African American
☐ Asian or Asian American
 ☐ Chinese ☐ Japanese
 ☐ Korean ☐ Asian Indian
 ☐ Cambodian ☐ Vietnamese
 ☐ Other Asian
☐ American Indian or Alaskan Native
 ☐ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
 ☐ Filipino ☐ Samoan
 ☐ Hawaiian ☐ Guamanian
☐ Other (Please specify _____)

6. Please choose the ONE answer that BEST describes what you consider yourself to be.
☐ White, not of Hispanic Origin
☐ Black or African American
☐ American Indian/Native American, Eskimo or Aleut
☐ Spanish/Hispanic/Latino
☐ Asian or Pacific Islander
☐ Other (Please specify _____)

7. What is the zip code where you live? →

0	0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9	9

8. Where are you living now?
☐ On a farm
☐ In the country, not on a farm
☐ In a city, town, or suburb

This section asks about your experiences at school.

9. Putting them all together, what were your grades like last year?
☐ Mostly F's
☐ Mostly D's
☐ Mostly C's
☐ Mostly B's
☐ Mostly A's

10. During the LAST FOUR WEEKS how many whole days of school have you missed ...

11 or more days	☐
6-10 days	☐
4-5 days	☐
3 days	☐
2 days	☐
1 day	☐
None	☐

a. because of illness ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

b. because you skipped or "cut" ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

11. Does your school provide a counselor, intervention specialist, or other school staff member for students to discuss problems with alcohol, tobacco, or other drugs?
☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

YES!	☐
yes	☐
no	☐
NO!	☐

12. In my school, students have lots of chances to help decide things like class activities and rules. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

13. Teachers ask me to work on special classroom projects. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

14. My teacher(s) notices when I am doing a good job and lets me know about it. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

15. There are lots of chances for students in my school to get involved in sports, clubs, or other school activities outside of class. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

16. There are lots of chances for students in my school to talk with a teacher one-to-one. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

+ 2 +

Figure 3. Sample of the Comprehensive School Climate Inventory

Think about your experience in your school as you read each statement below. Then fill in the circle that best describes how much you agree or disagree with each statement. Mark one answer on each line like this: ● Not like this: (X) (✓) (○)		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree (Neutral)	Agree	Strongly Agree
1.	My school tries to get students to join in after school activities.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.	Adults who work in my school treat students with respect.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3.	In my school, we talk about ways to help us control our emotions.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.	Many students at my school go out of their way to treat other students badly.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5.	Adults in my school seem to work well with one another.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6.	Students in this school respect each other's differences (for example, gender, race, culture, etc.).	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7.	In my school, we have learned ways to resolve disagreements so that everyone can be satisfied with the outcome.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8.	My school tries to get all families to be part of school activities.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9.	My teachers encourage me to try out new ideas (think independently).	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10.	I have been insulted, teased, harassed or otherwise verbally abused more than once in this school.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11.	In my school, we talk about the way our actions will affect others.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12.	Students have friends at school they can turn to if they have questions about homework.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13.	In my school, we discuss issues that help me think about how to be a good person.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14.	In my school, there are clear rules against physically hurting other people (for example, hitting, pushing or tripping).	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15.	Students have friends at school they can trust and talk to if they have problems.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16.	Adults in this school have high expectations for students' success.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Figure 4. Sample of the Developmental Assets Profile

DEVELOPMENTAL ASSETS PROFILE				(DAP) Sample Page
Self-Report for Ages 11-18				
NAME / ID: _____		TODAY'S DATE: Mo: _____ Day: _____ Yr: _____		
SEX: ☐ Male ☐ Female		AGE: _____		GRADE: _____
BIRTH DATE: Mo: _____ Day: _____ Yr: _____				
RACE/ETHNICITY (Check all that apply):				
☐ American Indian or Alaska Native		☐ Asian		
☐ Black or African American		☐ Hispanic or Latino/Latina		☐ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
☐ White		☐ Other (<i>please specify</i>): _____		
INSTRUCTIONS: Below is a list of positive things that you might have in <i>yourself, your family, friends, neighborhood, school, and community</i> . For each item that describes you now or within the past 3 months , check if the item is true:				
Not At All or Rarely Somewhat or Sometimes Very or Often Extremely or Almost Always				
If you do not want to answer an item, leave it blank. But please try to answer all items as best you can.				
Not At All or Rarely	Somewhat or Sometimes	Very or Often	Extremely or Almost Always	
I ...				
☐	☐	☐	☐	1. Stand up for what I believe in.
☐	☐	☐	☐	2. Feel in control of my life and future.
☐	☐	☐	☐	3. Feel good about myself.
☐	☐	☐	☐	4. Avoid things that are dangerous or unhealthy.
☐	☐	☐	☐	5. Enjoy reading or being read to.
☐	☐	☐	☐	6. Build friendships with other people.
☐	☐	☐	☐	7. Care about school.
☐	☐	☐	☐	8. Do my homework.
☐	☐	☐	☐	9. Stay away from tobacco, alcohol, and other drugs.
☐	☐	☐	☐	10. Enjoy learning.
☐	☐	☐	☐	11. Express my feelings in proper ways.
☐	☐	☐	☐	12. Feel good about my future.
☐	☐	☐	☐	13. Seek advice from my parents.
☐	☐	☐	☐	14. Deal with frustration in positive ways.
☐	☐	☐	☐	15. Overcome challenges in positive ways.
☐	☐	☐	☐	16. Think it is important to help other people.
☐	☐	☐	☐	17. Feel safe and secure at home.
☐	☐	☐	☐	18. Plan ahead and make good choices.
☐	☐	☐	☐	19. Resist bad influences.
☐	☐	☐	☐	20. Resolve conflicts without anyone getting hurt.
☐	☐	☐	☐	21. Feel valued and appreciated by others.
☐	☐	☐	☐	22. Take responsibility for what I do.
☐	☐	☐	☐	23. Tell the truth even when it is not easy.
☐	☐	☐	☐	24. Accept people who are different from me.
☐	☐	☐	☐	25. Feel safe at school.

PLEASE TURN OVER AND COMPLETE THE BACK.

Figure 5. Sample of the Devereux Student strengths assessment



Child's Name: _____ Gender: _____ Date of Birth: _____ Age: _____
School/Organization: _____ Classroom/Program: _____
Person Completing this Form: _____ Relationship to Child: _____
Date of Rating: _____

Item #	During the past 4 weeks, how often did the child...	Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Frequently	Very Frequently
1	remember important information?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2	carry herself/himself with confidence?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3	keep trying when unsuccessful?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4	handle his/her belongings with care?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5	say good things about herself/himself?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6	serve an important role at home or school?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7	speak about positive things?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8	cope well with insults and mean comments?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9	take steps to achieve goals?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10	look forward to classes or activities at school?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11	get along with different types of people?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12	try to do her/his best?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13	seek out additional knowledge or information?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14	take an active role in learning?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15	do things independently?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16	say good things about his/her classmates?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17	act respectfully in a game or competition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
18	ask to take on additional work or responsibilities?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
19	respect another person's opinion?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
20	encourage positive behavior in others?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
21	prepare for school activities, or upcoming events?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
22	contribute to group efforts?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
23	do routine tasks or chores without being reminded?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
24	act as a leader in a peer group?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
25	resolve a disagreement?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
26	show creativity in completing a task?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
27	share with others?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
28	get things done in a timely fashion?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
29	seek out challenging tasks?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
30	say good things about the future?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
31	cooperate with peers or siblings?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
32	show care when doing a project or school work?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
33	work hard on projects?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
34	forgive somebody who hurt or upset her/him?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
35	follow rules?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
36	express high expectations for herself/himself?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
37	follow the example of a positive role model?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
38	compliment or congratulate somebody?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
39	accept responsibility for what she/he did?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
40	do something nice for somebody?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
41	make accurate statements about events in her/his life?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
42	show good judgment?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
43	pay attention?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
44	wait for her/his turn?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
45	show appreciation of others?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
46	focus on a task despite a problem or distraction?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
47	greet a person in a polite way?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
48	act comfortable in a new situation?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
49	teach another person to do something?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
50	attract positive attention from peers?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
51	perform the steps of a task in order?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
52	seek advice?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
53	think before he/she acted?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
54	pass up something he/she wanted, or do something he/she did not like, to get something better in the future?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
55	express concern for another person?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
56	accept another choice when his/her first choice was unavailable?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
57	ask questions to clarify what he/she did not understand?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
58	show an awareness of her/his personal strengths?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
59	ask somebody for feedback?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
60	stay calm when faced with a challenge?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
61	attract positive attention from adults?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
62	describe how he/she was feeling?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
63	give an opinion when asked?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
64	make a suggestion or request in a polite way?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
65	learn from experience?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
66	follow the advice of a trusted adult?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
67	adjust well to changes in plans?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
68	show the ability to decide between right and wrong?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
69	use available resources (people or objects) to solve a problem?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
70	offer to help somebody?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
71	respond to another person's feelings?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
72	adjust well when going from one setting to another?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Figure 6. Sample of the Strengths and Difficulties questionnaire

Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire

S 11-17

For each item, please mark the box for Not True, Somewhat True or Certainly True. It would help us if you answered all items as best you can even if you are not absolutely certain. Please give your answers on the basis of how things have been for you over the last six months.

Your name..... Male/Female

Date of birth.....

	Not True	Somewhat True	Certainly True
I try to be nice to other people. I care about their feelings	☐	☐	☐
I am restless, I cannot stay still for long	☐	☐	☐
I get a lot of headaches, stomach-aches or sickness	☐	☐	☐
I usually share with others, for example (TV's, games, food	☐	☐	☐
I get very angry and often lose my temper	☐	☐	☐
I would rather be alone than with people of my age	☐	☐	☐
I usually do as I am told	☐	☐	☐
I worry a lot	☐	☐	☐
I am helpful if someone is hurt, upset or feeling ill	☐	☐	☐
I am constantly fidgeting or squirming	☐	☐	☐
I have one good friend or more	☐	☐	☐
I fight a lot. I can make other people do what I want	☐	☐	☐
I am often unhappy, depressed or tearful	☐	☐	☐
Other people my age generally like me	☐	☐	☐
I am easily distracted, I find it difficult to concentrate	☐	☐	☐
I am nervous in new situations. I easily lose confidence	☐	☐	☐
I am kind to younger children	☐	☐	☐
I am often accused of lying or cheating	☐	☐	☐
Other children or young people pick on me or bully me	☐	☐	☐
I often offer to help others (parents, teachers, children)	☐	☐	☐
I think before I do things	☐	☐	☐
I take things that are not mine from home, school or elsewhere	☐	☐	☐
I get along better with adults than with people my own age	☐	☐	☐
I have many fears, I am easily scared	☐	☐	☐
I finish the work I'm doing. My attention is good	☐	☐	☐

Your Signature

Today's Date

Thank you very much for your help

© R. D. Gooding, 2006

Figure 7. Sample of the Washington State Healthy Youth Survey

1. How old are you? a. 12 or younger e. 16 b. 13 f. 17 c. 14 g. 18 d. 15 h. 19 or older 2. What grade are you in? a. 7th e. 11th b. 8th f. 12th c. 9th g. Ungraded or other d. 10th 3. Are you: a. Female b. Male 4. How do you describe yourself? (Select one or more responses.) a. American Indian or Alaskan Native b. Asian or Asian American c. Black or African-American d. Hispanic or Latino/Latina e. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander f. White or Caucasian g. Other 5. What language is usually spoken at home? a. English f. Chinese b. Spanish g. Korean c. Russian h. Japanese d. Ukrainian i. Other e. Vietnamese	8. I like my neighborhood/community. a. NO! b. no c. yes d. YES! 9. How wrong would most adults in your neighborhood or community think it was for kids your age: A. To use marijuana? a. Very wrong b. Wrong c. A little bit wrong d. Not wrong at all B. To drink alcohol? a. Very wrong b. Wrong c. A little bit wrong d. Not wrong at all C. To smoke cigarettes? a. Very wrong b. Wrong c. A little bit wrong d. Not wrong at all 10. If a kid drank some beer, wine, or hard liquor (for example, vodka, whiskey, or gin) in your community would he or she be caught by the police? a. NO! b. no c. yes d. YES! 11. If a kid smoked marijuana in your community would he or she be caught by the police? a. NO! b. no c. yes d. YES! 12. If a kid carried a handgun in your community would he or she be caught by the police? a. NO! b. no c. yes d. YES!
--	---

These statements and questions are about the neighborhood and community where you live.

6. I'd like to get out of my neighborhood or community.

a. NO!

b. no

c. yes

d. YES!

7. If I had to move, I would miss the neighborhood or community I now live in.

a. NO!

b. no

c. yes

d. YES!

References

- Achenbach, T. M., & Rescorla, L. A. (2001). *Manual for the ASEBA School-Age Forms & Profiles*. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont, Research Center for Children, Youth, and Families.
- Arthur, M. W., Hawkins, J. D., Pollard, J. A., Catalano, R. F., & Baglioni, A. J. (2002). Measuring risk and protective factors for substance use, delinquency, and other adolescent problem behaviors: The Communities That Care Youth Survey. *Evaluation Review*, 26, 575-601.
- Arthur, M. W., Briney, J. S., Hawkins, J. D., Abbott, R. D., Brooke-Weiss, B. L., Catalano, R. F. (2007). Measuring risk and protection in communities using the Communities That Care Youth Survey. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 30, 197-211.
- Cohen, J., Geier, V. K. (2010). *School Climate Research Summary: January 2010*. New York, NY.
- Epstein, M. H., Mooney, P., Ryser, G., & Pierce, C. D. (2004). Validity and reliability of the Behavior and Emotional Rating Scale (2nd Edition): Youth Rating Scale. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 14, 358-367.
- Epstein, M. H., Nordness, P. D., Nelson, J. R., & Hertzog, M. (2002). Convergent validity of the Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale with primary grade-level students. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 22, 114-121.
- Epstein, M. H., Ryser, G., & Pearson, N. (2002). Standardization of the Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale: Factor structure, reliability and criterion validity. *Journal of Behavioral Health Services and Research*, 29, 208-216.
- Epstein, M. H., & Sharma, H. M. (1998). *Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale: A strength based approach to assessment*. Austin, TX: PRO-ED.
- Emerson, E. N., Crowley, S. L., & Merrell, K. W. (1994). Convergent validity of the School Social Behavior Scales with the Child Behavior Checklist and Teacher's Report Form. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 12, 372-380.
- Glaser, R. R., Van Horn, M. L., Arthur, M. W., Hawkins, J. D., & Catalano, R. F. (2005). Measurement properties of the Communities That Care® Youth Survey across demographic groups. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 21, 73-102.
- Goodman R (1997) The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire: A Research Note. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 38, 581-586.
- Greenberg, M. T., Weissberg, R. P., O'Brien, M. U., Zins, J. E., Fredericks, L., Resnik, H., & Elias, M. J. (2003). Enhancing school-based prevention and youth development through coordinated social, emotional, and academic learning. *American Psychologist*, 58, 466-474.

- Gresham, M. & Elliott, S. N. (2008). Rating Scales Manual. SSIS Social Skills Improvement System. Minneapolis, Pearson.
- Hawkins, J. D., Catalano, R. F., Miller, J. Y. (1992). Risk and protective factors for alcohol and other drug problems in adolescence and early adulthood: Implications for substance-abuse prevention. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 64-105.
- Hawkins, J. D., Kosterman, R., Catalano, R. F., Hill, K. G., & Abbott, R. D. (2005). Promoting positive adult functioning through social development interventions in childhood: Long-term effects from the Seattle Social Development Project. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine*, 159, 25-31.
- Harniss, M. H., Epstein, M. H., Ryser, G., & Pearson, N. (1999). The Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale: Convergent validity. *Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 17, 4-14.
- Kerr, D., Ireland, E., Lopes, J., Craig, R., & Cleaver, E. (2004). Citizenship education longitudinal study: Second annual report: First longitudinal study. *National Foundation for Educational Research*, 1-154.
- Kuperminc G., Leadbeater B. J., Emmons C., Blatt, S. J. (1997). Perceived school climate and difficulties in the social adjustment of middle school students. *Applied Developmental Science*, 1, 76-88.
- Malecki, C. M., & Demaray, M. K. (2002). Measuring perceived social support: Development of the child and adolescent social support scale (CASSS). *Psychology in the Schools*, 39, 1-18.
- Merrell, K. W. (1993). Using behavior rating scales to assess social skills and antisocial behavior in school settings: Development of the school social behavior scales. *School Psychology Review*, 22, 115-133.
- National School Climate Council. (2007). The School Climate Challenge: Narrowing the gap between school climate research and school climate policy, practice guidelines and teacher education policy. On www.schoolclimate.org/climate/policy.php.
- Nickerson, A. B., & Fishman, C. (2009). Convergent and divergent validity of the Devereux Student Strengths Assessment. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 24, 48-59.
- Payton, J., Weissberg, R. P., Durlak, J. A., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., Schellinger, K. B., & Pachan, M. (2008). *The positive impact of social and emotional learning for kindergarten to eighth-grade students: Findings from three scientific reviews*. Chicago, IL: Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning.
- The Collaborative for Search Institute. (2005). *Developmental assets profile user manual*. Minneapolis, MN: Search Institute.