We received questions on a number of topics. Below, we summarize those questions and provide responses and/or resources that address those questions. We appreciate the interest and look forward to follow up dialogue. Our email address is secdlab@gmail.com

1.   Please provide PowerPoints for the presentation.
         a. Powerpoints are attached here and posted on the website *secdlab.org*

2.   I am interested in learning more about the virtues you selected, why you selected those that you did, and exactly how they fit into the SECD framework.
         a.   We elaborate on this in an article in *Education* https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1162434

CITATION: Hatchimonji, D.R., Linsky, A.V., & Elias, M.J. (2017). Cultivating Noble Purpose in urban middle schools: A missing piece in school transformation. Education, 138 (2) 162-178.

3.   In what ways do you use an asset-based approach to your work in Tier 2, and why do you not discuss articulation of the Tier 1 model into Tier 3?
         a. While we framed the Tier 1-Tier 2 paper in the context of prevention, our overall approach, deriving from community psychology, is focused on strengths. Our fundamental position is that all students have SECD capacities and that the task of educators and other caregivers is to develop those capacities, or assets, to the extent possible. We do note that the Tier 1-2-3 structure used actively in schools in the U.S., and elsewhere to some degree, is focused more on prevention and, as was noted in the presentation, often derives from screening that is responsive to relative deficits (not a practice we necessarily favor). In such a context, it is important to not lose touch with the abilities and assets students possess, even as efforts are made to help them improve SECD areas in which further development would be helpful for them. One important element of our approaches is involving students in reflecting on and identifying both their assets and areas they wish to improve and developing action plans for this, something that we advocate happen in Tiers 1, 2, and 3.
         b. We fully agree with and advocate for articulation of SECD approaches across Tiers 1, 2, and 3. Our strategy for getting to Tier 3 has been cumulative/developmental, moving the synergy from Tiers 1 to 2 to 3. But we agree a case can be made for articulation directly between Tiers 1 and 3 as they are both more strongly curricular- based. And, historically, almost all of the current universal/Tier 1 interventions emerged from those kinds of interventions being used first within Tier 3.

4.   Can you share more about your action-research and qualitative data gathering process?
         a.   One frame of reference we use is formative and summative evaluation, with the former defined as the process of getting feedback on implementation and the latter getting feedback on the outcomes of what was implemented. Clearly, one cannot do sound summative evaluation until the intervention is working well—but it is often typical to do summative evaluation too soon. Action research involves iterative cycles of gathering formative information, making changes in the intervention/program procedures/processes, and continuing to do so until there is a sense that the program operationalizes the vision and therefore should be evaluated for its outcomes.
         b.   In this paper (https://doi.org/10.1080/00098655.2017.1386000) we summarize our ongoing processes for gathering both qualitative and quantitative information about the MOSAIC curriculum from students and teachers. Our field consultants to each participating school also kept extensive field notes about their visits and observations of and conversations about implementation of lessons and the surrounding support processes.

 CITATION: Hatchimonji, D.R., Linsky, A.V., +DeMarchena, S., Nayman, S.J., +Kim, S., & Elias, M.J. (2017). Building a culture of engagement through participatory feedback processes. The Clearing

     c. Another element of action-research is to embed this process into our MOSAIC curriculum and impart it to students as a social action pedagogy. We want students to approach the task of citizenship in a democracy as action researchers. We want them to think seriously about issues in their classrooms, schools, communities, and world, take positions, recommend actions, share those action, get feedback, try to implement, get feedback from their process, and develop a commitment to this continuous cycle. This process, which we refer to as STAT – Students Taking Action Together—is described in this article [forthcoming] and also is the focus of our current work with the Helping People Get Along Better Fund project, for which we will be setting up a section of our web site very soon.

CITATION: Linsky, A.V., Hatchimonji, D.R., Kruzik, C.L., Kifer, S., Franza, N., McClain, K., Nayman, S.J., & Elias, M.J. (In press). Students taking action together (STAT): Social action in urban middle schools. *The Middle School Journal.*

5. Some observations/takeaways about school turnaround and intervention in the note cares collected:
     a. The Turnaround principles can be applied to other contexts, such as school struggling with inclusion, climate, etc. (i.e., may be applicable to other than "failing" schools)
     b. Implementation of SECD and related interventions in schools must be well organized to succeed. There needs to be a clear infrastructure and lines of communication and accountability.
     c. School climate is an essential element in any turnaround and requires both school personnel and students to work together to achieve and maintain it.
     d. Principle #7—linking SECD to existing mandates—applies to creating a socially inclusive school in that all students require a school of social-emotional competence and character, students require SECD for success in the classroom, lunchroom, bus rides, work contexts, peer relationships, clubs and teams, etc., and adults need SECD in order to model and cope with the challenges of creating a socially inclusive school. So SECD is a key ingredient in meeting virtually ANY mandate that a school is asked to, or aspiring to, address, both directly and indirectly.