

# Expanded Learning 360°/365

## Professional Learning Community Evaluation

DECEMBER 2018

Fausto A. López | Francis Miller | Scott Houghton |  
Femi Vance | Deborah Moroney, PhD

MAKING RESEARCH RELEVANT



# Expanded Learning 360°/365

## Professional Learning Community Evaluation

DECEMBER 2018

Fausto A. López | Francis Miller | Scott Houghton |  
Femi Vance | Deborah Moroney, PhD



1000 Thomas Jefferson Street NW  
Washington, DC 20007-3835  
202.403.5000

[www.air.org](http://www.air.org)

Copyright © 2018 American Institutes for Research. All rights reserved.



# Contents

	Page
Executive Summary.....	i
Introduction .....	2
Methods.....	3
Evaluation Timeline .....	3
Literature Review.....	4
Observations .....	5
Review of Permanent Products .....	5
Interviews .....	5
Focus Groups .....	6
Analysis .....	6
Findings .....	6
Environment, Structure, and Inclusive Practice .....	7
Alignment Across Sectors .....	12
Implementation Strategies .....	14
Discussion.....	17
Social and Emotional Learning.....	17
Professional Learning Communities .....	18
Consulting Support .....	19
Limitations.....	20
Advisory Group and Dissemination .....	20
360°/365 Evaluation Advisory Group .....	20
Professional Conferences .....	21
References .....	22
Appendices.....	27
Appendix A. Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC Key Strategies .....	28
Appendix B. Expanded Learning 360°/365 Alignment and Implementation Strategies .....	34
Appendix C. Literature Review .....	38

Appendix D. Professional Learning in Action.....	46
Appendix E. Professional Learning Community Meetings and Goals.....	49
Appendix F. Expanded Learning 360°/365 Participation Agreement.....	51
Appendix G. Sample Alignment Rubric.....	53
Appendix H. Social and Emotional Learning Action Plan.....	59
Appendix I. Consultant Scope of Work Form.....	62
Appendix J. Sample 360°/365 PLC Facilitator Agenda .....	64
Appendix K. Evaluation Advisory Group Members .....	69
Appendix L. Observation and Interview Protocols .....	70

## Executive Summary

In January of 2017, American Institutes for Research began a qualitative evaluation of the Expanded Learning 360°/365 professional learning community and consulting practices facilitated by the Partnership for Children and Youth. Since 2015, the Expanded Learning 360°/365 initiative has convened teams of school-day and expanded learning opportunity staff from ten school districts, including seven California Office to Reform Education districts in quarterly professional learning community meetings. The Expanded Learning 360°/365 initiative and consulting support were designed with the goal of improving and aligning social and emotional learning practices across school-day and expanded learning opportunities in California. As part of the qualitative evaluation, the evaluation team partnered with the Partnership for Children and Youth to formatively evaluate the Expanded Learning 360°/365 initiative. The primary research questions we explored were: *(1) What conditions of the professional learning community promoted or challenged alignment strategies? (2) What strategies or structures did the professional learning community engage in to support teams? and (3) What strategies facilitated alignment at the district and site levels?* We conducted a literature review in which we formed grounded-theory themes to guide the evaluation methodology. The four main methods of inquiry of the evaluation included (1) interviews, (2) focus groups, (3) observations, and (4) the review of permanent products. Over the two-year period of the evaluation, the evaluation team reviewed, observed, and recorded the Expanded Learning 360°/365 professional learning experience.

The evaluation team found that the practices facilitated by the Partnership for Children and Youth were aligned to the grounded-theory themes (i.e., inclusive environment, alignment strategies, and implementation practices) and indicators. The Expanded Learning 360°/365 evaluation findings revealed that district and expanded learning opportunity participants reported a range of benefits. These benefits included multiple opportunities to actively engage in professional learning in an inclusive setting with team members and partners from across the state. Together, coordinators, consultants, and team members worked together to *assess, plan, and improve* social and emotional learning alignment in their districts. This continuous quality improvement process helped professional learning community teams address pressing challenges (e.g., competing district priorities, the training for staff, and logistical barriers) through collaboration and reflective inquiry. The goal of this report is to share the Expanded Learning 360°/365 evaluation findings with leaders from school and expanded learning settings to help them apply lessons learned, promote the use of professional learning communities as a key form of professional development, and expand the commitment of educators to align social and emotional learning strategies across school and expanded learning opportunities.

## Introduction

Over the past decade, social and emotional learning (SEL) has come to the forefront of education reform efforts specific to the impacts schools and expanded learning opportunities (ELOs) can have on social, emotional, and academic outcomes (Devaney & Moroney, 2018; Durlak & Weissberg, 2007; Gutman & Schoon, 2013). Authentic alignment between school-day and expanded learning opportunities is characterized by a set of collaborative practices aimed at achieving shared goals related to the education and positive development of young people (Anderson-Butcher, Stetler, & Midle, 2006; Bennett, 2015). To this end, the Partnership for Children and Youth (PCY) coordinated the Expanded Learning 360°/365 professional learning community (PLC). As part of the Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC, PCY coordinators and consultants facilitated quarterly meetings with district and ELO representatives (i.e., PLC teams). These PLC meetings consisted of strategic planning focused on SEL alignment and the continuous quality improvement (CQI) of school-day and ELO offerings. PLC teams engaged in an *assess, plan, and improve* process that included collaborative strategies and external support in the development of SEL action plans aimed at improving systems at the district level and practices at the site level.

This report includes sections focusing on the methods, findings, discussion, limitations, and advisory group and dissemination of an Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC evaluation carried out by the American Institutes for Research (AIR). The AIR team addressed the topics in the evaluation objectives (see Table 1) by using a grounded-theory approach to identify key PLC strategies, uncover SEL alignment practices, and identify practitioner perceptions of implementation. The research-informed grounded-theory themes include PLC characteristics associated with driving system- and site-level changes. Professional learning communities are considered a promising form of professional development (Joyce & Showers, 2002) that provide opportunities to enhance the skills of educators for implementing content as a result of collaboration and sharing information with peers (Newhouse, Vance, Atkins, & Salvaterra, 2015; Thompson, Gregg, & Niska, 2004; Vance, Salvaterra, Michelsen, & Newhouse, 2016a; Vescio, Ross, & Adams, 2008). The grounded-theory we employed in the evaluation included three themes and 10 observable indicators (see Table 3). We employed methods to investigate the following research questions:

1. What conditions of the PLC promoted or challenged PLC team alignment strategies?
2. What strategies or structures did the PLC engage to support PLC teams?
3. What strategies facilitated alignment at the district and site levels?

As part of the formative approach to the 360°/365 evaluation, AIR and PCY discussed and refined the research questions over the course of the evaluation (2017–2018). American



Institutes for Research developed and updated measures (i.e., protocols) to gather insights on the PLC practices that promoted collaboration and alignment between district and ELO partners at the system level (2017) and the site level (2018). Moreover, AIR and PCY coordinated the Expanded Learning 360°/365 Evaluation Advisory Group (EAG) to provide guidance on the evaluation approach and the implications and dissemination of the evaluation findings.

**Table 1. Evaluation Objectives**

Level	Objective
System	<b>Objective 1:</b> To understand what practices and processes at the district level, including CQI, create better alignment between school-day and expanded learning programs.
	<b>Objective 2:</b> To understand the intermediary role in supporting those practices and processes (i.e., developing the PLC content, structure, and consulting).
Site Level	<b>Objective 3:</b> To understand how PLC teams and intermediary practices lead to change at ELO programs or schools.
	<b>Objective 4:</b> To learn where additional supports are needed.

## Methods

This section contains information on the timeline or phases of the evaluation, the preliminary literature review, and our main methods of inquiry: interviews, focus groups, observations, and review of permanent products.

### Evaluation Timeline

The AIR evaluation consisted of two phases. In Phase 1 (2017), the AIR team reviewed existing 360°/365 permanent products (e.g., meeting agendas, SEL action plans) and conducted a literature review. The AIR team explored the coordination of the 360°/365 PLC, identified the grounded-theory themes, and developed protocols. In this phase, the AIR team collected and analyzed PLC permanent products from 2015–2017; conducted and analyzed PLC observations; and conducted and analyzed interviews with PLC team leads, PCY staff, and PCY consultants. In Phase 2 (2018) of the evaluation, the AIR team examined the concentrated shift of the Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC from district-level alignment to site-level implementation. In this phase, the AIR team collected and analyzed permanent products from 2018, observations, and interviews with PLC team leads and consultants. (See Table 2 timeline for more detailed information on data collection.) The following sections describe the methods and measures used in the data collection activities.

**Table 2. Data Collection Timeline**

Type of Data Collection	Sources	2017	2018
Literature review	40	●	
Review of permanent products (i.e., agenda, scope of work, action plans, applications)	210	●	●
PLC observations	8	●	●
PLC team lead phone interviews	16	●	
PLC team lead phone interviews	7		●
PCY coordinator phone interviews	2	●	
PCY consultant phone interview	5	●	
PCY consultant focus group	1		●

## Literature Review

In Phase 1 of the Expanded Learning 360°/365 evaluation, the AIR team conducted a review of literature related to engaging educators in PLCs. The purpose of the literature review was to explore the key characteristics of a PLC, the importance of SEL alignment across schools and expanded learning opportunities, and the benefits of consulting support (see Appendix C for the summary of the literature review). The literature review was used to form the grounded-theory themes and indicators that informed the development of the data collection methods, measures, and protocols (interview, focus group, and observation). The grounded-theory themes and indicators (see Table 3) describe conditions for professional learning in quality PLCs.

**Table 3. Grounded-Theory Themes and Indicators**

Theme	Indicator
<b>Environment, Inclusive Practice, and Structure</b>	Clear structure, vision, values, and purpose
	Support at all levels of the system
	Atmosphere of mutual trust and respect among members
	Collaboration among stakeholders
	Inclusive membership and collective responsibility
<b>Alignment Across Sectors</b>	Specific content to implement
	Learning across roles and profession
<b>Implementation</b>	Reflective inquiry on implementation
	Feedback and monitoring of PLC work
	Opportunities to address a pressing challenge or action item that promotes sustainability

## **Observations**

The purpose of the PLC observations was to observe and gather examples of PLC facilitation, coordination, and engagement strategies. In Phases 1 and 2, the AIR team observed eight Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLCs. The AIR team developed the observation protocol based on the grounded-theory themes established in the literature review. A representative of the AIR team captured observations and included detailed field notes and transcription of PLC meeting activities. The AIR team coded observation data using NVivo qualitative coding software (see Appendix L for a copy of the observation protocol).

## **Review of Permanent Products**

The purpose of the review of permanent products was to provide substantiating evidence to other measures and to surface sharable best practices for future endeavors. From January 2017 through October 2018, the AIR team reviewed 210 permanent products related to the implementation, facilitation, and documentation of Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC strategies. In the review of permanent products, the AIR team identified seven key strategies: (1) Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC Agendas (see Appendix J); (2) Expanded Learning 360°/365 Participation Agreement (see Appendix F); (3) Expanded Learning 360°/365 Consultants; (4) Expanded Learning 360°/365 Consultant Scope of Work (see Appendix I); (5) Expanded Learning 360°/365 Alignment Rubric (see Appendix G); (6) Expanded Learning 360°/365 SEL Action Plan (see Appendix H); and (7) Expanded Learning 360°/365 Consultant Check-Ins. The AIR team worked with PCY to access permanent products and the AIR team coded the documents using NVivo qualitative coding software (see Appendix A for descriptions of key PLC strategies).

## **Interviews**

The purpose of the interviews was to inquire about PLC participants' perspectives on their roles as Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC coordinators, consultants, and team leads. Over the course of 2017–2018, the AIR team conducted thirty 60-minute phone interviews with 30 key informants. The AIR team developed an interview protocol to explore the perceived successes and challenges of PCY coordinators, consultants, and team leads with regard to the PLC alignment goal. These protocols were based on the grounded-theory themes identified through the literature review. The interview protocol for PLC team leads included 24 open-ended questions; the one for PCY coordinators and consultants asked 21 questions that focused on the design and facilitation of PLC components. AIR worked collaboratively with PCY coordinators in Phases 1 and 2 to identify PLC team lead respondents. All interviews were transcribed using an external transcription service and coded using NVivo qualitative coding software. The interview protocols are included in Appendix L.

## **Focus Groups**

The purpose of the focus group was to gather perspectives of PCY consultants on the 2018 PLC application process and action plan support. In 2018, the AIR team conducted a 60-minute focus group with four 360°/365 PCY consultants. The focus group protocol consisted of six open-ended and nondirective questions focused on the consultant process, goal setting, and SEL action planning. A representative of the AIR team conducted the focus group and recorded the discussions via conference call (i.e., GoToMeeting), with the recording subsequently transcribed by an external transcription service and coded using NVivo qualitative coding software. The focus group protocol is included in Appendix L.

## **Analysis**

The AIR team employed traditional qualitative techniques to gather, analyze, and report the Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC evaluation findings. The AIR team then analyzed qualitative data across measures (interviews, observations, focus groups, and the review of permanent products) using research-based procedures for coding, reducing, organizing, and categorizing data (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003; Dey, 1993; LeCompte, 2000). This qualitative analysis began with the literature review. The AIR team then used the grounded-theory themes identified in the literature review to code and triangulate data from the multiple measures (e.g., interviews and review of permanent products) and sources (e.g., PCY facilitators, consultants, and participants) to identify patterns of practice (Yin, 2009). We also used the data from the review of permanent products to substantiate the findings where applicable. The AIR team looked across measures and sources to find patterns but also noted emergent themes in the data that had not previously been identified (Yin, 2009). In the following sections, the AIR team summarizes findings by pattern and theme and provides support for quantitative findings with quotes and examples found in the data.

## **Findings**

The research findings for the Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC evaluation are presented according to the grounded-theory themes (see Table 3). The Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC grounded-theory themes are organized by (1) environment, practices, and structure; (2) alignment across sectors; and (3) implementation strategies. The AIR team reported findings when there was agreement within a measure across at least four or more sources (e.g., PCY staff, PCY consultants, PLC team leads) and across at least three measures (e.g., interviews, focus group, observations, and permanent products). The following sections describe the Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC evaluation findings reported using the grounded-theory themes and the research questions.

## Environment, Structure, and Inclusive Practice

Professional learning communities are characterized by an inclusive and structured learning environment (DuFour, Eaker, & DuFour, 2005; Jackson & Temperley, 2007; Louis et al., 2006). This section includes findings that address the research question *What conditions of the PLC promoted or challenged PLC team alignment strategies?* The findings in this section are organized by grounded-theory theme and include the following indicators: (a) a clear structure, vision, values, and purpose; (b) support at all levels of the system; (c) an atmosphere of mutual trust and respect among members; (d) collaboration among stakeholders; and (e) inclusive membership and collective responsibility. The following findings met the inclusion criteria across both sources and measures as described in the analysis plan.

### *Clear structure, vision, values, and purpose*

The Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC established a clear understanding of the PLC vision, structure, and purpose for PLC teams. Data analysis of observations, interviews, and review of permanent products (e.g., PLC agendas and guidance) revealed that the PCY coordinators provided PLC members with a structured, goal-oriented, professional learning environment (see Appendix E for PLC meetings and goals). The review of permanent products revealed that the PLC vision, purpose, goals, and expectations were explicitly communicated and outlined in the 360°/365 participation agreement (e.g., monetary stipend and participation), consultant scope of work, and the “living” SEL action plan (explanations of key strategies are provided in Appendix A). Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC observations further demonstrated that meeting agendas included time for introductions, overviews, reflections, and group discussions on the vision and goal of the 360°/365 initiative. A team lead explained that “PCY helped to clarify [what] we were expected to do and [gave] us a clearer direction.”

The overarching goal of the Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC is described as supporting PLC teams in improving SEL practices and aligning strategies across the school day and expanded learning settings. The review of permanent products, observations, and interviews confirmed that PCY coordinators consistently reinforced the overall goal, purpose, and structure of the PLC with intentional activities. A PLC coordinator explained that “this work is more about intentionality. It’s about being more intentional and more purposeful in our collaborative efforts, in our meetings, in our conversation, to really hone in on SEL as the through line.” A PCY consultant noted that “meetings [were all] similarly structured so there [was] a space for broader information sharing, time for teams to collaborate within themselves because they’re such busy people, they don’t always have [time], and then time for teams to work across districts or share information across [teams].” A PLC team lead stated that “the sharing of

what's going on is really critical and important because we can see where we are, where we still need to grow, or get ideas [that help] to push the work forward, to keep us kind of focused on it. It has really built a bigger community around the SEL work within the state." Another PLC team lead reported that the team was "beginning to align a deeper level of coherence between our respective work and our vision, which is to support [youth] to be the best that they can be."

*"This work is more about intentionality. It's about being more intentional and more purposeful in our collaborative efforts, in our meetings, in our conversation, to really hone in on SEL as the through line."*

### **Support at all levels of the system**

The Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC initiative supported PLC team members in the planning and implementation of PLC strategies across district and ELO affiliations. Multiple sources (e.g., PCY coordinators, consultants, and PLC team leads) and measures (e.g., interviews, observations, and review of permanent products) confirmed that PLC members identified with a range of titles, roles, and responsibilities (see Tables 4 and 5 for detailed representation of PLC teams). From 2017 to 2018, PLC teams averaged seven members per team from a range of school and expanded learning affiliations. As one PLC team lead explained, "The work shifted our thinking around what it takes to implement SEL district-wide and realizing that when we talk about [SEL] it's not just about the school day [staff], but it's school day and afterschool." One ELO participant explained that as a result, ELO team members "felt more welcome, like they're part of the school team and community [and that their] presence and opinions were finally valued." Overall, PLC teams reported finding value in the ongoing opportunities to collaboratively plan across roles. One district PLC team lead explained that the "360°/365 meetings [were] an opportunity to pause, come together, and talk about our work [while] getting to know and learn about each other's work." A PCY consultant reported that consultants primarily "support the whole [PLC] team to work together to coordinate tasks by role and track progress" using the 360°/365 consultant scope of work and the SEL action plan. A PLC team lead described the 2018 work as implementing "inquiry-based workshops in the elementary schools to build [a] foundation of SEL with the school leads."

*"[The] 360°/365 meetings [were] an opportunity to pause, come together, and talk about our work [while] getting to know and learn about each other's work."*

**Table 4. Phase 1 Representation of School and Expanded Learning Program on PLC Teams**

PLC Team	School-Day Members	Expanded Learning Members	Members in School and Expanded Learning	Total
Fresno Unified School District	3	6	0	9
Los Angeles Unified School District	2	4	0	6
Oakland Unified School District	3	2	2	7
Sacramento City Unified School District	4	2	0	6
San Francisco Unified School District	4	1	0	5
San Leandro Unified School District	0	2	4	6
San Rafael City Schools	2	2	1	5
Santa Ana Unified School District	3	10	1	14
Visalia Unified School District	6	2	2	10

Source. Self-reported PLC district team rosters.

**Table 5. Phase 2 Representation of School and Expanded Learning Program on PLC Teams**

PLC Team	School-Day Members	Expanded Learning Members	Members in School and Expanded Learning	Total
Los Angeles Unified School District	2	4	0	6
Oakland Unified School District	1	4	2	7
Sacramento City Unified School District	5	4	0	9
San Francisco Unified School District	1	1	5	7
San Leandro Unified School District	0	6	2	8
Santa Ana Unified School District	2	5	1	8
Visalia Unified School District	7	2	0	9

Source. Self-reported PLC district team rosters.

### ***Atmosphere of mutual trust and respect among members***

The Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC fostered a respectful learning environment built on trust and transparency for PLC participants. Observations and interviews indicated that PCY coordination helped participants share values and expand their professional network and relationships. Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC observations indicated that meetings included large-group introductions and welcoming activities that modeled SEL strategies. A PLC team lead explained that the PLC encouraged “collaboration, trust, communication, understanding, and shared visions.” Observation data indicated that at each 360°/365 PLC, PCY coordinators created a space where each PLC team shared their expertise, progress, and context. Overall,

*“We don’t work side by side on a regular basis. [Through the PLC] we started to learn from each other and how we could work together.”*

PLC team leads reported being better able to learn from and share with colleagues from within their own organization due to the time set aside during the PLC for internal team planning. One district team lead explained that “we don’t work side by side on a regular basis. [Through the PLC] we started to learn from each other and how we could work together.” Teams across districts

and ELOs reported benefits in exploring the contribution of both settings in supporting SEL. Planning time provided valuable space for PLC teams to discuss the priorities and contributions of team members. One district PLC team lead explained that “our ELO programs in some cases have done more work around SEL than the school day. They don’t necessarily see SEL as something new.”

### ***Collaboration among stakeholders***

The Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC engaged PLC participants in regular and consistent collaboration and learning across stakeholder groups (district and ELO). Data analysis of observations, interviews, and permanent products indicated that PCY engaged PLC teams in a process of assessing, planning, and improving their SEL alignment strategies. A PLC coordinator described the process of leveraging the “simple power of collaboration and conversation.” Observations and review of permanent products indicated that the Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC agendas and activities required attendees to work within and across PLC teams to discuss and refine their SEL action plans. A PLC team lead explained that the PLC “forced us to be more intentional, focused, and more strategic in terms of how we engage with expanded learning; it was instrumental in helping us

*“[The PLC] forced us to be more intentional, focused, and more strategic in terms of how we engage with expanded learning; it was instrumental in helping us to cultivate a space to collaborate and plan.”*



to cultivate a space to collaborate and plan.” A PLC team lead described their work as collaborative, reporting that “meetings [were] an opportunity to pause, come together [as a team], talk about the work, get to know each other, and learn about each other’s work.” Moreover, PLC teams expressed benefits in the “focused, collaborative time” during Expanded Learning 360°/365 convenings. A PLC team lead reported that working with their peers and receiving feedback was essential to the advancement of their SEL action plans. An ELO PLC team lead explained that “through conversation and dialogue with different districts, we were able to see where [SEL] already fit into our existing program and what we could do moving forward to enhance it.”

### ***Inclusive membership and collective responsibility***

The Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC established an inclusive environment that fostered collective responsibility across PLC teams. Data analysis across measures (e.g., observations and review of permanent products) and sources (e.g., PCY coordinators, consultants, and PLC team leads) confirmed that PLC teams partnered across departments and included a diverse

*“Through conversation and dialogue with different districts, we were able to see where [SEL] already fit into our existing program and what we could do moving forward to enhance it.”*

representation of ELO members. A PCY consultant explained that “committing to including representation from both the school day and expanded learning” was stipulated in the Expanded Learning 360°/365 participation agreement (see Appendix F). The review of permanent products revealed that the Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC agreement outlined the goals, expected commitment, and benefits of participating in the PLC.

Moreover, a PLC team lead reported “building buy-in and assigning responsibility” through the co-construction of the SEL action plan and consultant scope of work. Team leads described this shared accountability as helping address the challenge of competing priorities that make the focus on SEL alignment “inconsistent because other priorities are addressed first, and teams have limited capacity to address “initiative overload.” One PLC team lead indicated that the PLCs gave the teams “an opportunity [to] be held accountable for the work and follow-up, to ensure that we are doing what we say we’re going to do.” In 2018 (Phase 2), PCY coordinators required PLC teams to submit an application. The purpose of the 2018 PLC application was for PLC teams to detail core team and implementation team members, including site-level school and expanded learning staff from established pilot sites. One PLC team lead explained that “we brought a diverse group of people together from different departments [that] literally do not see each other except in passing in the elevator occasionally. There are very few opportunities for us to work within departments, and this [PLC] has really brought us together.”

## Alignment Across Sectors

Authentic alignment between the school day and ELOs is characterized by a set of collaborative practices aimed at achieving shared goals related to the learning and development of young people (Anderson-Butcher, Stetler, & Midle, 2006; Bennett, 2015). The Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC provided participants with research, tools, and collaborative planning time to align SEL strategies at the system level and coordinate implementation strategies at the site level (see Appendix B for a summary of 2017–2018 alignment and implementation strategies). Following, we include findings that address the research questions *What strategies or structures in the PLC were effective?* and *What strategies facilitated alignment and implementation at the district and site levels?* The findings in this section are organized by the grounded-theory theme and include the following indicators: (a) specific content to implement and (b) opportunities to apply learning across roles and professionalism. The following findings met the inclusion criteria across both sources and measures found in the analysis plan.

### Specific content to implement

The Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC facilitated collaborative professional learning that highlighted relevant SEL content, tools, and resources. Interviews, observations, and the review of permanent documents revealed that PCY coordinators and consultants engaged PLC teams in the examination of alignment strategies, particularly the application of SEL practices. A PLC team lead noted that “the PLC is a learning laboratory [for PLC teams] and for PCY to hear and

*“The PLC is a learning laboratory [for PLC teams] and for PCY to hear and learn about what different districts are planning and share ways to implement [SEL].”*

learn about what different districts are planning and share ways to implement [SEL].” Specifically, a PLC team lead reported that through “collaboration with partners from other districts, [PLC teams] exchanged our practices from around the state, explored common pitfalls ... [and] shared our action items.” The review of permanent products and PLC observations confirmed that PLC

convenings included agenda time for PLC teams to share achievements and resources and learn from guest speakers about SEL policy and research (e.g., Edge Research, Shawn Ginwright, and the California Department of Education). A PCY consultant explained that the PCY coordinators planned for PLC teams to access information through “cross-district sharing of lessons learned, just as much as from expert presentations.”

### Learning across roles and professions

The Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC participants collaborated and shared learning across a range of titles, roles, and experience. Across measures and sources, the PLC data indicated that teams included representation from district and expanded learning stakeholders (Table 6 highlights the roles and titles across PLC teams). A team lead explained that “professionally, the [PLC] was a really great process to be involved in. The view of coming together to be trained as part of a learning community shifted our understanding on how the SEL content can be delivered.” The PLC teams ranged from five to 14 members, who attended quarterly PLC convenings and met periodically with their PCY consultant to apply, align, and implement SEL strategies. The review of permanent products (e.g., PLC team rosters) found that PLC team members identified with the following roles: direct service providers (e.g., afterschool staff, ELO instructor, teacher), site-level management (e.g., site coordinator, resource coordinator, principal), midlevel management (e.g., program manager, district coordinator, program officer), and senior leadership (e.g., executive director, CEO, network lead, superintendent). A district PLC team lead explained that the diverse membership “[lent] legitimacy to the work, and the working group [helped] carve out time and make [the SEL work] a priority across departments.” An ELO PLC team lead stated that “the SEL planning gave expanded learning staff a seat at the table at school-day meetings” (e.g., student support team meetings). However, PLC team leads explained that scheduling of professional learning opportunities was hindered by the PLC teams’ ability to consistently meet for long periods of time outside of the Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC. The PCY consultants and PLC team leads said that ensuring that PLC teams fully utilized the available PCY consultant support (30 hours) for in-depth planning proved difficult to coordinate.

*“Professionally, the [PLC] was a really great process to be involved in. The view of coming together to be trained as part of a learning community shifted our understanding on how the SEL content can be delivered.”*

**Table 6. Role and Affiliation Across PLC Teams**

Title/Role	Affiliation	
	School	ELO
Administrator	1	0
Superintendent	1	0
Coordinator	6	2
Program Manager	5	1

Title/Role	Affiliation	
	School	ELO
Program Specialist	1	1
Director	5	3
Executive Director	1	3
Site Director	0	5
Filed Coordinator	0	3
Site Coordinator	0	5
Principal	12	0
Assistant Principal	1	0
Youth Development Specialist	0	4
Restorative Practice Manager	1	1
SEL Director	1	0
Training Specialist	4	0
Teacher	2	0
Research, Planning, and Assessments Supervisor	1	1
Social Worker	2	2

Source. 2017 and 2018 PLC district team rosters.

## Implementation Strategies

The Expanded Learning 360°/365 *assess, plan, and improve* process engaged PLC teams in exploring alignment and implementation strategies (see Appendix B for PLC team summaries). Goals for a PLC typically solve a collective problem (e.g., alignment), develop new skills (e.g., adult SEL competencies), or connect professional practices to youth outcomes (e.g., implementation) (McKenzie, 2014; McLaughlin & Talbert, 2010; Newhouse et al., 2015; Vance, Salvaterra, Michelsen, & Newhouse, 2016b; Wenger-Trayner & Wenger-Trayner, 2015). In the following sections, we include findings that address the research question *What strategies facilitated alignment and implementation at the district and site level?* The findings are organized by grounded-theory theme and include the following indicators: (a) opportunities for reflective inquiry on implementation, (b) monitoring of PLC work and feedback, and (c) addressing of a pressing challenge or action item that promotes sustainability. The following findings met the inclusion criteria across both sources and measure found in the analysis plan.

### **Reflective inquiry on implementation**

The Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC provided PLC teams with multiple opportunities to engage in reflective practices. Data analysis indicated that the PLC process of CQI was both a strategy for advancing the PLC and an integral part of the SEL alignment between school and ELO settings. A PLC team lead indicated “that having goals around SEL and having a structured PLC to work on them has helped keep SEL at the forefront of our work.” The review of permanent products, interviews, and PLC observations demonstrated that each PLC convening included opportunities for individual and group reflections specific to successes, challenges, and ideas to advance alignment or implementation goals. A district PLC team lead explained that “it is a process of reflective inquiry ... [W]e focus on the work needing to be done, delve into solutions, and bring in data to understand where we are [and] refine [the plan] for reaching [our] goals.” One team lead explained that “the PLC helped us come together to actually start having conversations and talk about what work we want to move forward. For us, just being in the same room and having these conversations and having us start to align our thinking is huge.” A PLC team lead described using PLC planning time to apply strategies learned in the PLC to other initiatives, partnerships, and grants in the district: “[The PLC] makes everything seem to fit together rather than seem like separate initiatives.” Additionally, data analysis indicated that PLC teams focused on implementation of PLC strategies in their locales to address the pressing challenge of providing ongoing training to school-day and ELO staff. A review of permanent products and interviews identified a focus on adult SEL capacity development, SEL implementation, and continuous improvement. A team lead explained that “we are trying to be mindful and intentional about creating the same PLC community feel, where folks could learn from one another instead of being taught.”

*“The PLC helped us come together to actually start having conversations and talk about what work we want to move forward. For us, just being in the same room and having these conversations and having us start to align our thinking is huge.”*

### **Feedback and monitoring of PLC work**

The Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLCs provided PLC teams with ongoing opportunities to reflect and improve SEL implementation strategies within and across PLC teams. During an interview, one team lead indicated that he/she monitors progress with the PCY consultant by “[discussing] what we’ve accomplished thus far and what still needs to be done, [outlining] the [consultant] scope of work, [using] the rubric, collect[ing] information from implementing schools every year, and reflect[ing] on how the work is going.” The review of permanent products revealed that in addition to providing support at the quarterly PLC, PCY consultants played a critical role in

monitoring PLC teams in their SEL alignment and continuous improvement work. Despite the individualized nature of the one-on-one consulting relationship, PLC teams indicated that they sought guidance from their consultant in three main areas: (1) brokering resources, personal connections, and training; (2) promoting action and maintaining momentum; and (3) addressing topics specific to continuous improvement. One team lead explained that “the [consulting] was really differentiated and customized.” The PLC teams reported that consultants used the results of the 360°/365 alignment rubric (see Appendix G), team meetings, and consultation to chart the progress of PLC teams’ SEL goals (i.e., action plans). A consultant said, “The process is strategic; [we] provoke conversation and dig deeper and identify ‘ahas’ and act as a joint problem-solver.”

### ***Opportunities to address a pressing challenge or action item that promotes sustainability***

The Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC *assess, plan, and improve* process allowed PLC teams to focus on the pressing challenge of SEL alignment. Interviews and observations demonstrated that PCY coordinators and consultants engaged PLC teams in the co-creation of action items that addressed SEL alignment and sustainability of implementation strategies. The review of permanent products substantiated that PCY consultants promoted accountability to action items by clearly recording tasks and point people in the PLC SEL action plan. Team leads reported that consultants consistently provide time for PLC members to create goals, plan action steps, and discuss how to sustain progress. The review of permanent products revealed that the PCY consultant scope of work (see Appendix I) was used by PCY consultants to outline various types of coordination, including the co-creation of PLC documents, meeting agendas, trainings, and tools. A team lead explained that “[through the] complimentary coaching (i.e., PCY consultant), the team really felt like [they] could utilize the support in a way that exactly [met] the needs of the district.” Observations and interviews indicated that the PCY consultants played various roles depending on the situation but primarily connected PLC teams with community partners, brokered cross-district discussions and site visits, facilitated trainings, and explored SEL assessment tools. A PCY coordinator explained that the role of the consultant was intended to be “flexible and to add capacity to folks whose plates were already full before they started this project. They’ve drafted curricula, they’ve drafted training plans, they’ve delivered training, [and] they’ve facilitated meetings.”

*“[Through the] complimentary coaching (i.e., PCY consultant), the team really felt like [they] could utilize the support in a way that exactly meet[s] the needs of the district.”*

Data analysis across sources and measures indicated that the PCY consultant reinforced the larger 360°/365 PLC commitment to continuous improvement. Team leads described the

consultant role as providing the necessary structures, processes, and tools that the PLC team “utilized to assess, plan, and improve.” The review of permanent products (e.g., consultant scope of work) indicated that the PCY consultants participated in site visits, provided feedback around SEL implementation, observed trainings, reviewed training materials, and “acted as an ad hoc member” who provided feedback and reflected on progress and challenges with the PLC teams. A PCY consultant noted that PLC teams “don’t have to be pushed hard to reflect, because it’s part of the practice. I [used] *reflection* questions with the [team], but they are in a constant state of reflection.” One team lead explained that through the PLC process, the team “[experienced] what good SEL skill building looked like. We [shared] commonalities between school day and afterschool [to] deepen our competencies and our capacities to be aware of what SEL looks like in action and how to keep it going.”

## Discussion

This section contains a discussion of the existing PLC literature and how the Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC evaluation contributes to that literature. Particularly, we explore the implications of engaging district and expanded learning professionals in collaborative planning specific to SEL alignment. We also discuss the implications of the evaluation on SEL initiatives, PLCs, and PCY consulting supports.

### Social and Emotional Learning

District and expanded learning opportunities require collaborative alignment aimed at achieving shared goals related to the social and emotional development of young people (Anderson-Butcher et al., 2006). The Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLCs facilitated by PCY provided PLC teams with collaborative planning time to practice and reflect on their SEL strategies through a CQI process (Smith et al., 2012; Yohalem et al., 2012). This was of particular interest to the AIR team in addressing Objective 1 of the evaluation: *To understand what practices and processes at the district level, including continuous quality improvement (CQI), create better alignment between school-day and expanded learning programs.* The Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC evaluation suggests that the Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC facilitated engaging professional learning that provided PLC teams with relevant content to *assess, plan, and implement* system- and site-level SEL strategies. Specifically, the evaluation identified the importance of creating an inclusive learning environment for PLC members built on trust. The Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC leveraged PLC team members’ expertise and supported PLC team members across roles in the planning and implementation of SEL strategies. Fundamentally, the Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC process provides clear guidelines for intermediaries, foundations, districts, and ELO



programs across the country to explore the pressing challenge of SEL alignment. The Expanded Learning 360°/365 evaluation findings highlight the necessity for educators to acquire SEL expertise, practice skills, and solve collective problems that emerge due to competing priorities that can marginalize the focus on SEL alignment at the system and site levels.

## Professional Learning Communities

PLCs engage participants in active professional learning through a learning cycle. The learning cycle includes the examination of practices, implementation of new insights, and reflection on adapted practices (Stoll, Bolam, McMahon, Wallace, & Thomas, 2006). The Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC evaluation highlights the critical role of an intermediary in the coordination and facilitation of PLCs. This was of interest to the AIR team in addressing Objective 2: *To understand the intermediary role in supporting those practices and processes (i.e., developing the PLC content, structure, and consulting)*. Educators, including ELO practitioners, focused on SEL alignment benefit from participation in a PLC that allows members to (1) collaborate, (2) practice, and (3) reflect (Vance et al., 2016) on their shared learning across titles, roles, and professional experience implementing SEL. The evaluation found that the coordination of logistics, including the participation agreements (e.g., stipends), consultant scope of work, and alternating meeting locations were integral to the overall PLC participant experience. The review of the data sources and measures indicated that PLC teams overwhelmingly cited the importance of the following PLC features:

1. **Collaboration:** The PLC teams engaged in structured, active meetings with intrateam planning time to draft and update SEL alignment goals and action plans. Team meetings included ample time and activities for cross-district PLC teams to learn from each other in a respectful learning environment built on trust and transparency.
2. **Practice:** The PLC teams were provided time to learn new strategies and exchange promising practices, including SEL alignment needs with team members, PCY consultants, and across PLC teams.
3. **Improvement:** The PLC teams found value in making data-driven decisions guided by the PCY consultant and organized by the 360°/365 action plan and consultant scope of work.

Unfortunately, professional learning can be complicated by competing priorities, funding, staff turnover, and logistics (e.g., meeting coordination) at the system and site levels. The Expanded Learning 360°/365 initiative can provide districts and ELO partners across the country with a PLC model and key strategies (see Appendix A) that can be deployed to engage education professionals in consistent collaboration across stakeholder groups. The implications of the evaluation findings



can support the enhancement of system building and collective impact initiatives interested in engaging stakeholders in assessing readiness, planning alignment, and implementing SEL strategies.

## Consulting Support

Consulting is a critical component of the Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC (see key strategies in Appendix A). Research suggests that consultant or coach support can enhance the effectiveness of a PLC and the implementation of PLC initiatives (Bouffard, 2004). The evaluation findings clearly defined the role of PCY consultants as essential to monitoring PLC work through reflective inquiry and formative feedback. The PCY consultant role, tools, and resources (e.g., menu of services, scope of work, and SEL action plan) captured the Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC work and provided PCY coordinators insight into how teams transfer learning from the PLC to their sites. The evaluation highlights how external support from a PCY consultant, combined with broader PLC activities, can contribute to an increase in knowledge about SEL (e.g., shared language, assessment tools) and the application of strategies at the site level (e.g., joint professional development, school and ELO PLCs). This phenomenon was of interest to the AIR team in addressing Objective 3, *To understand how PLC teams and intermediary practices lead to change at ELO programs or schools*, and Objective 4, *To learn where additional supports are needed*. The evaluation findings indicate that the PCY consultants are key to engaging and monitoring PLC teams' work across levels. The PCY consultants provide differentiated support based on PLC teams' existing and emerging work in aligning SEL with district and ELO stakeholders. Fundamentally, the PCY consultant role is at the pulse of PLC team achievements, needs, and ongoing learning. Nevertheless, the evaluation findings indicated that scheduling hinders district, school, ELO, and PCY consultant ability to meet and collaborate for long periods of additional planning time specific to SEL. The implications of the Expanded Learning 360°/365 evaluation findings indicate that although external support from an expert consultant is helpful, more guidance from PCY coordinators may be required to strategically support PLC teams in the *assess, plan, improve* process at the site level. Unfortunately, the AIR team did not have the opportunity to study site-level practices or changes. However, the Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC evaluation highlights the importance of codifying the consulting model and key strategies at the district and site level. The dissemination of Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC guidance and resources can help districts and ELO partners across the country to coordinate across levels and solidify strategies that promote SEL outcomes in youth.

Overall, the evaluation found that the Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC practices successfully align to the research-informed grounded-theory themes. Through the formative evaluation

findings, PCY has the opportunity to share how PLC coordinators and consultants can empower PLC participants to collaboratively *assess, plan, and improve* SEL alignment in their districts.

## Limitations

The Expanded Learning 360°/365 evaluation had limitations in the design and data collection of the project. This section outlines the limitations in the evaluation sample, logistics, and approach. The sample of respondents across all measures was small and nonrepresentative and may not reflect the opinions of the entire initiative. Similarly, the AIR team only observed select PLCs. In cases where we did not observe a PLC, we compiled agendas and attended the PCY coordinator and consultant post-PLC meetings and gathered relevant updates to include in the review of permanent products. Finally, as is common in formative evaluations, changes in the design of the initiative resulted in changes in the evaluation approach.

In 2018 (Phase 2), the PLC shifted the PLC teams' focus to a more intensive approach of coordinating site-level practices, while maintaining the district-level practices that are required to support eventual scaling. The 2018 PLC was organized into two stages: a planning phase (March–August 2018) and an implementation phase (September 2018–December 2019). The goals of the 2018–2019 Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC were to: (1) deepen SEL practice at the district and site levels; (2) document and disseminate effective strategies, structures, and tools for SEL implementation and school and expanded learning alignment; and (3) gather K–12 partners and champions to communicate the value of SEL and expanded learning alignment. Due to the timing of the evaluation, the AIR team was limited to the data collection (e.g., interviews and observations) and analysis of Phase 2 activities. Further data collection is necessary to explore the implications across the 2018 stages and results of site-level implementation through 2019.

## Advisory Group and Dissemination

As part of the Expanded Learning 360°/365 evaluation, the AIR team and PCY partnered to coordinate two additional activities that informed the direction and dissemination of the PLC findings. In this section, we provide additional information regarding the 360°/365 EAG and the 2018 presentations facilitated at professional conferences across the United States.

### 360°/365 Evaluation Advisory Group

The purpose of the 360°/365 EAG was to (a) provide feedback on the approach to conducting the evaluation, (b) inform the project team of how the project is being perceived in the field,

and (c) serve as ambassadors for the project among peers and stakeholders. The AIR team hosted two virtual meetings: The first was held on February 11, 2015, and the second on June 19, 2018 (see Appendix K for a list of 360°/365 EAG members). The EAG meeting discussions and recommendations provided AIR and PCY guidance specific to the importance of: outlining effective PLC strategies, enabling district contexts and priorities, identifying key SEL alignment practices, and disseminating the findings of the Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC.

## Professional Conferences

In 2018, PCY and AIR developed a series of conference workshops based on the feedback and advice of the EAG. AIR and PCY facilitated the following workshops (see Table 7) and shared preliminary findings of the Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC evaluation (see Appendix D for the Professional Learning in Action brief), PCY coordination resources, and tools.

**Table 7. Professional Conferences**

Conference	Date	Location
California District Superintendent Conference (Title 1 Conference)	Fall 2017	Monterey, CA
National Afterschool Association	Spring 2018	Atlanta, GA
Every Hour Counts	Spring 2018	Atlanta, GA
Ready By 21	Spring 2018	Palm Beach, FL
Best Out-of-School Time (BOOST) Conference	Summer 2018	Palm Spring, CA
Grant Makers for Education Conference	Fall 2018	San Diego, CA
Schools-Out Washington Bridge Conference	Fall 2018	Seattle, WA

## References

- Anderson-Butcher, D., Stetler, G., & Midle, T. (2006). Collaborative partnerships in schools: A case for youth development. *Children & Schools*, 28(3), 155–163.
- Bennett, T. (2015). Examining levels of alignment between school and afterschool and associations with students' academic achievement. *Journal of Expanded Learning Opportunities*, 1(2), 4–22.
- Bolam, R., McMahon, A., Stoll, L., Thomas, S., Wallace, M., Greenwood, A., ... Smith, M. (2005). *Creating and sustaining effective professional learning communities* (Research Report 637). London, England: DfES and University of Bristol.
- Bouffard, S. (2004). Promoting quality out-of-school time programs through professional development. *The Evaluation Exchange*, X (1).
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1994). Ecological models of human development. In *International Encyclopedia of Education* (2nd ed., Vol. 3). Oxford, England: Elsevier.
- Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning. (2017). *Key implementation insights from the Collaborating Districts Initiative*. Chicago, IL: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.casel.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/CDI-Insights-Report-May.pdf>.
- Collins, A. & Metz, A. (2009). *How program administrators can support out of school time staff* Publication #2009-32, Part 4 of Implementing Evidence-Based Practices in Out-of-School Time). Bethesda, MD: Child Trends.
- Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (2003). *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Devaney, E., & Moroney, D. (2018). *Social and emotional learning in out-of-school time*. Current Issues in Out-of-School Time. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Dey, I. (1993). *Qualitative data analysis: A user friendly guide for social scientists* (1st ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- DuFour, R. (2004). What is a “professional learning community”? *Educational Leadership*, 61(8), 6–11.

- DuFour, R., Eaker, R., & DuFour, R. (2005). *On common ground: The power of professional learning communities*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.
- DuFour, R., & Fullan, M. (2013). *Cultures built to last: Systemic PLCs at work*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.
- Durlak, J. A., & Weissberg, R. P. (2007). *The impact of after-school programs that promote personal and social skills*. Chicago, IL: Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning.
- Eccles, J., & Gootman, J. (Eds.). (2002). *Community programs to promote youth development*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Farrington, C., Roderick, M., Johnson, D. W., Keyes, T. S., Allensworth, E., Nagaoka, J., & Beechum, N. O. (2012). *Teaching adolescents to become learners: The role of noncognitive factors in shaping school performance*. Chicago: Consortium on Chicago School Research, University of Chicago.
- Gutman, L. M., & Schoon, I. (2013). *The impact of non-cognitive skills on outcomes for young people: Literature review*. London, England: Institute of Education and Social Research, University of London.
- Heckman, J. & Kauz, T. (2013). *Fostering and measuring skills: Interventions that improve character and cognition*. Washington, DC: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Hord, S. M., & Sommers, W. A. (2008). *Leading professional learning communities: Voices from research and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Jackson, D., & Temperley, J. (2007). From professional learning community to networked learning community. In L. Stoll & K. Seashore Louis (Eds.), *Professional learning communities: Divergence, depth and dilemmas* (pp. 45–62). Berkshire, England: Open University Press.
- Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (2002). *Student achievement through staff development*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- LeCompte, M. (2000). Analyzing qualitative data. *Theory Into Practice*, 39(3), 8–45.

- Lerner, R. M., Wertlieb, D., & Jacobs, F. (2003). Historical and theoretical bases of applied developmental science. In R. M. Lerner, F. Jacobs, & D. Wertlieb (Eds.), *Handbook of Applied Developmental Science: Promoting positive child, adolescent, and family development through research, policies, and programs: Vol. 1. Applying developmental science for youth and families: Historical and theoretical foundations* (pp. 1–28). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Little, P. (2009). *Supporting student outcomes through expanded learning opportunities*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Family Research Project, Harvard Graduate School of Education.
- Louis, K. S., Kruse, S. D., & Associates. (1995). *Professionalism and community: Perspectives on reforming urban schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Mayo, R., Moroney, D., & Huff, B. (2019). Practical guidance for policy and practice: Strategies and tools for assessing and building readiness and for launching local efforts. In D. Osher, K. Kendziora, R. Jagers, L. Wood, & M. Mayer, *Keeping students safe and helping them thrive: A collaborative handbook for education, safety, and justice professionals, families, and communities* (Chapter 21). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.
- McKenzie, W. (2014). *The guilded age: Professional learning communities in education*. Retrieved from <http://inservice.ascd.org/the-guilded-age-professional-learning-communities-in-education>.
- McLaughlin, M. W., & Talbert, J. E. (2010). Professional learning communities: Building blocks for school culture and student learning. *Voices in Urban Education (VUE)*, Spring 2010, 35–45. Retrieved from [http://www.academia.edu/29864630/Professional\\_Learning\\_Communities\\_Building\\_Building\\_blocks\\_for\\_School\\_Culture\\_and\\_Student\\_Learning](http://www.academia.edu/29864630/Professional_Learning_Communities_Building_Building_blocks_for_School_Culture_and_Student_Learning).
- National Implementation Research Network (NIRN). (2017). *NIRN: Systemic Change*. Chapel Hill, NC: Author.
- Newhouse, C., Vance, F., Atkins, J., & Salvaterra, E. (2015). *Professional learning communities in the expanded learning field*. Oakland, CA: Public Profit. Retrieved from <http://www.publicprofit.net/Professional-Learning-Communities-In-The-Expanded-Learning-Field>.

- Pierce, K., Bolt, D., & Vandell, D. (2010). Specific features of after-school program quality: Associations with children's functioning in middle childhood. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 45(3), 381–393.
- Pirtle, S. S., & Tobia, E. (2014). Implementing effective professional learning communities. *SEDL Insights*, 2(3). Retrieved from [http://www.sedl.org/insights/2-3/implementing\\_effective\\_professional\\_learning\\_communities.pdf](http://www.sedl.org/insights/2-3/implementing_effective_professional_learning_communities.pdf).
- Sheldon, J., and Hopkins, L. (2008). *Supporting success: Why and how to improve quality in after school programs*. Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.
- Smith, C., Akiva, T., Sugar, S. A., Lo, Y. J., Frank, K. A., Peck, S. C., ... Devaney, T. (2012). *Continuous quality improvement in afterschool settings: Impact findings from the Youth Program Quality Intervention study*. Washington, DC: Forum for Youth Investment.
- Starr, E., Stavsky, S., & Gannett, E. (2016). Strengthening and safeguarding continuous quality improvement systems: Lessons from afterschool system builders. Wellesley, MA: National Institute on Out-of-School Time.
- Stoll, L., Bolam, R., McMahon, A., Wallace, M., & Thomas, S. (2006). Professional learning communities: A review of the literature. *Journal of Educational Change*, 7, 221–258.
- Thompson, S. C., Gregg, L., & Niska, J. M. (2004). Professional learning communities, leadership, and student learning. *Research in Middle Level Education Online*, 28 (1). Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ807417.pdf>.
- Traphagen, K., & Stevens, P. (2016). *Funders' guide to quality in out-of-school time*. Grantmakers for Education's Out-of-School Time Funder Network. Retrieved from [https://edfunders.org/sites/default/files/OST\\_Funders\\_Guide\\_2016\\_final.pdf](https://edfunders.org/sites/default/files/OST_Funders_Guide_2016_final.pdf).
- Vance, F., Salvaterra, E., Atkins Michelsen, J., & Newhouse, C. (2016a). Professional learning communities: An alternative to the one-stop workshop. In K. M. Pozzoboni & B. Kirshner (Eds.), *The changing landscape of youth work* (pp. 147–165). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Vance, F., Salvaterra, E., Michelsen, J. A., & Newhouse, C. (2016b). Getting the right fit: Designing a professional learning community for out-of-school time. *Afterschool Matters*, 24, 21–32.

- Vescio, V., Ross, D., & Adams, A. (2008). A review of the research on the impact of professional learning communities on teaching practice and student learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*, 80–91.
- Weiss, H. B., & Little, P. M. D. (2008). *Strengthening out-of-school time nonprofits: The role of foundations in building organizational capacity*. New York, NY: Wallace Foundation.
- Wenger-Trayner, E., & Wenger-Trayner, B. (2015). *Communities of practice: A brief introduction*. Retrieved from <http://wenger-trayner.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/07-Brief-introduction-to-communities-of-practice.pdf>.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Yohalem, N., Devaney, E., Smith, C., & Wilson-Ahlstrom, A. (2012). *Building citywide systems for quality: Guide and case studies for afterschool leaders*. Washington, DC: Forum for Youth Investment, The Wallace Foundation.



## Appendices

Key Strategies and Outputs .....	28
Appendix A. Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC Key Strategies .....	28
Appendix B. Expanded Learning 360°/365 Alignment and Implementation Strategies .....	34
Appendix C. Literature Review .....	38
Appendix D. Professional Learning in Action.....	46
PCY Tools and Resources .....	49
Appendix E. Professional Learning Community Meetings and Goals.....	49
Appendix F. Expanded Learning 360°/365 Participation Agreement.....	51
Appendix G. Sample Alignment Rubric.....	53
Appendix H. Social and Emotional Learning Action Plan.....	59
Appendix I. Consultant Scope of Work Form.....	62
Appendix J. Sample 360°/365 PLC Facilitator Agenda .....	64
Partner Engagement .....	69
Appendix K. Evaluation Advisory Group Members .....	69
Evaluation Measures.....	70
Appendix L. Observation and Interview Protocols .....	70

## **Key Strategies and Outputs**

---

### ***Appendix A. Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC Key Strategies***

The AIR team found several key strategies used by PCY coordinators, consultants, and PLC teams to develop, track, and execute alignment strategies. In the following sections, we describe these strategies: (1) 360°/365 PLC Agendas, (2) 360°/365 Participation Agreement, (3) 360°/365 Consultants, (4) 360°/365 Consultant Scope of Work, (5) 360°/365 Alignment Rubric, (6) 360°/365 SEL Action Plans, (7) 360°/365 Consultant Check-Ins, and (8) 2018 Site Inventory. Findings in this appendix were identified through the review of PLC permanent products.

#### **360°/365 PLC Agendas**

PCY 360°/365 coordinators and consultants developed detailed facilitator and participant agendas that included meeting activities, duration of activities, name of lead facilitator, necessary resources, and supporting coordinator notes (see Appendix J for a sample PLC agenda). The 360°/365 PLC convening contained a mix of reflection, interdistrict discussion, intradistrict discussion, large-group presentations, a variety of small-group discussion and reflection exercises, and collaborative SEL action planning. Participants were provided a participant agenda outlining the goals for each PLC meeting (2015–2018). One district lead noted, “I’ve been part of a lot of PLCs. This has probably been one of the most successful [experiences] that I’ve been a part of because of the consistency, and because the facilitation has been so well done. We all know why we’re there, and it is always so productive.” Common strategies used across meetings included icebreakers, overview of goals and objectives, framing of PLC purpose, acknowledgment of visitors, individual and group reflections, a working lunch, large-group discussion, cross-district peer sharing, group energizers, intradistrict planning time with consultant, and session feedback (i.e., evaluations). At the end of each PLC meeting, PCY coordinators requested feedback from participants regarding the applied knowledge, skills, and goals, as well as the quality of the PLC experience. The PCY coordinators and consultants participated in a debrief after each convening and reviewed the meeting evaluation data to assess participant satisfaction and coordinate consultant follow-up.

#### **360°/365 Participation Agreement**

The 360°/365 Participation Agreement is entered into between PCY and the PLC teams and outlines the commitment and stipend for participation in the 360°/365 PLC. The stipend stipulated in the agreement (\$5,000–\$10,000) covers travel costs (e.g., airfare, hotel, food,

mileage, parking); staff time for PLC team members related to the initiative; and other costs related to 360°/365 planning, alignment, and implementation. As part of the 360°/365 PLC, the PLC teams agreed to active participation of PLC team members in four PLC meetings (i.e., quarterly); attendance of at least two PLC representatives at all four PLC meetings (three statewide, one regional); and representation from both the school-day and expanded learning staff (see Appendix F). The PLC teams also agreed to active engagement in a quality improvement process (assess, plan, improve) documented by the following:

- A scope of work outlining tasks and timeline for using the 15 hours of PCY-provided consulting to support implementation of the SEL action plan (i.e., improve)
- Assessment of progress in implementing strategies defined in the SEL action plan. (i.e., assess)
- An updated SEL action plan outlining “next step” strategies to better align social-emotional learning practices across the school-day and expanded learning time (i.e., plan)
- Engagement with the external consultant at least once per month to communicate recent activities, successes, and challenges (by phone, in-person meeting, or e-mail)
- Completion of tasks between PLC meetings, preparation for meetings, and ongoing SEL action planning

In 2018, PCY revised the 360°/365 agreement and included the following deliverables:

- Pilot implementation of SEL practices aligning ELO and the school day at two to five sites
- Attendance at four PLC meetings per year (at least two members of each 360°/365 core team must commit to attending all four meetings, and core teams must include both school-day and expanded learning representation)
- Submission of an SEL action plan describing goals and strategies for improving district- and site-level practices
- Convening of site-level school-day and expanded learning staff (360°/365 implementors) between PLC meetings to plan for site-level work, as described in SEL action plans
- Submission of a scope of work describing how consulting support will be used each year (this scope will be developed with the PCY-contracted consultant and will include 30 hours per year)

### **360°/365 Consultants**

A core component of the Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC is the support of an expert, external consultant. Consulting or coaching can enhance the effectiveness of a PLC and the

implementation of PLC initiatives (Bouffard, 2004). Consultants were contracted by PCY and provided up to 30 hours of support to PLC teams to assess, plan, and improve their SEL alignment strategies (see Tables A1 and A2 for 2017 and 2018 PCY consultants and their corresponding PLC teams). Teams agreed to actively engage with PCY consultants as part of the initial 360°/365 participation agreement (see Appendix F). Teams reported that the consultant support, combined with broader PLC activities, contributed to the successful development and implementation of PLC teams' goals and action plans. Based on 2016 feedback, PCY rebranded the preexisting coach role to that of consultant to help clarify the role and responsibility of the 360°/365 PCY consultant. Specifically, PCY coordinators and consultants expressed the need to differentiate between instructional coaching at the district level and quality coaching in the expanded learning field.

From 2016 to 2018, PCY, consultants, and PLC teams collaboratively outlined the role and agreement of their consultant in a detailed scope of work. The scope of work was used in conjunction with the 360°/365 menu of consultant services that was developed by PCY as guidance to PLC teams. The menu of services included (a) meeting planning and facilitation, (b) training and professional development, (c) program quality (e.g., program observations), (d) strategic support (e.g., documenting continuous improvement and action planning), and (e) cross-district learning (e.g., site visits, cross-district conversations).

**Table A1. 2017 PCY Consultants and PLC Teams**

PCY Consultant	PLC Team
Michelle Perrenoud, Los Angeles County Office of Education	Los Angeles
Oscar Wolters-Duran, Blue Thistle Consulting	Oakland
Oscar Wolters-Duran, Blue Thistle Consulting	Sacramento
Oscar Wolters-Duran, Blue Thistle Consulting	San Francisco
Megan Agee, Partnership for Children and Youth	San Leandro
Oscar Wolters-Duran, Blue Thistle Consulting	San Rafael
Chris Becerra, Orange County Department of Education	Santa Ana
Kim Boyer, Central Valley Afterschool Foundation	Visalia
Lori Carr, Fresno County Office of Education	Fresno

**Table A2. 2018 PCY Consultants and PLC Teams**

PCY Consultant	PLC Team
Michelle Perrenoud, Los Angeles County Office of Education	Los Angeles
Oscar Wolters-Duran, Blue Thistle Consulting	Oakland
Oscar Wolters-Duran, Blue Thistle Consulting	Sacramento
Oscar Wolters-Duran, Blue Thistle Consulting	San Francisco
Megan Agee, Partnership for Children and Youth	San Leandro
Lupita Cruz, Orange County Department of Education	Santa Ana
John Madrid, Central Valley Afterschool Foundation	Visalia

### 360°/365 Consultant Scope of Work

The 360°/365 PCY coordinators and consultants developed a scope of work template that PLC teams fill out to describe the district's overall strategy for utilizing the 30 hours of consultant support (15 hours direct and 15 hours indirect). In conjunction with their assigned consultant, PLC teams outlined deliverables and refined goals, tasks, and implementation steps. The template included a table laying out the proposed methodology and timeline, activities, deliverables, corresponding goals from the action plan, hours, timeline, and status. Teams delineated the activities for which the coach and district would be responsible. Ultimately, the scope of work allowed consultants to establish baseline expectations and benchmark PLC team accomplishments and action steps. Consultants provided written reports on SEL action plan progress for each district to PCY as a stipulation of the district stipend that was outlined in the initial agreements. (e.g., consultant and districts will connect once per month). Throughout this process PCY provided consultants with guidance, opportunities for reflection, and peer-to-peer support via consultant check-in calls (e.g., implementing a gradual release model and menu of services). See Appendix I for a scope of work template.

### 360°/365 Alignment Rubric

The 360°/365 PLC coordinators promoted trust and transparency through the collaborative needs assessment process, which consisted of collaboratively scoring the SEL alignment rubric (see Appendix G for sample alignment rubric). In March 2015, PCY engaged PLC teams in the development of the 360°/365 alignment rubric. This self-evaluation tool has columns for the domain and the indicators of well-aligned district, school-day, and ELO practices, including the following:

1. A clear and shared strategic plan
2. A culture and climate of inclusive decision making

3. A shared approach to building stakeholder capacity to meet student needs
4. Equitable distribution of resources to meet program goals
5. Effective systems and structures for communication and collaboration
6. Responsiveness to the diverse needs of our stakeholders
7. Engagement in a cycle of continuous quality improvement

PCY coordinators provided PLC teams with time during PLC convenings to score, reflect, and discuss rubric data. Teams could also elect to develop their consultant scope of work and action plan to track, update, and revisit the rubric domains. In Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the evaluation (2017–2018), the rubric process and results were used to help PLC teams identify their unique needs, develop goals, and coordinate next steps with their 360°/365 PCY consultant.

### **360°/365 SEL Action Plans**

The 360°/365 PLC SEL action plans consisted of a set of goals and strategies for increasing ongoing collaboration, establishing shared accountability, and identifying improvement opportunities. PLC teams worked with their peers and consultant to develop goals and action steps based on the district alignment rubric results (see Appendix G). For each goal, PLC teams detailed “How will we know the goal is met?” and “What will be the impact when we meet the goal?” PLC teams outlined strategies for meeting established goals, providing the answers to “Who’s responsible?” and “By when?” and detailing “resources or information needed” as well as “current status.” During PLC meetings, participants worked within and across PLC teams to develop and align their work and SEL action plans among district colleagues and provide cross-district feedback. One PLC participant reported that PCY “always set aside time for us to share our successes and challenges with one another. By sharing our successes and challenges [other districts] are learning from us.” Submitted SEL action plans were summarized for PCY at the end of Phases 1 and 2 of the evaluation. Appendix H provides a district SEL action plan template.

### **360°/365 Consultant Check-Ins**

PCY coordinators convened consultants virtually and provided updates for each district, reporting on “recent/current activities with district,” “next steps,” “what’s working,” and “coaching challenges/questions.” Topics included the following:

- Vision for the 360°/365 consulting model
- Gradual-release approach
- Facilitation of regional PLCs

- Report-out on districts
- What's working well/challenges
- Resource sharing
- Peer support
- Discussion of consultant involvement in upcoming PLC meetings
- Improvements for the coming year

At the start of each PLC cycle, PCY engages consultants in identifying promising practices and discussing challenges in terms of both PCY consultant tools and strategies and district practices. At the start of each year, PCY updated consultants on PLC logistics, including the PLC plan, role in developing SEL action plan, development of the scope of work, and district communication. Topics included making the SEL action plan a living document, increasing ELO representatives at the meetings, SEL action planning, site-level implications, and allocation of PCY consultant hours.

### **2018 Site Inventory**

In 2018, PLC teams were asked to identify pilot implementation sites. The Partnership for Children and Youth developed a site inventory questionnaire where PLC leads described the assets, needs, and perceived readiness of pilot sites to implement the identified SEL alignment strategies. Prior to the March 2018 convening, PLC teams were asked to identify pilot sites and consider the following: (1) qualified site leadership (e.g., expanded learning site leader, principal, or school-day leadership); (2) school capacity, including existing initiatives (e.g., multitier system of supports [MTSS]) and ELO partnerships; and (3) coordination abilities across multiple ELO programs and commitment to continuous improvement. Teams were instructed to select two to five pilot sites, create an inventory plan that included the consultant role (i.e., scope of work), conduct inventories, and aggregate information for sharing at the October 2018 PLC. The inventory included nine open-ended questions that outlined the following domains:

- Motivation to innovate and implement
- Data collection and continuous improvement processes
- Professional development structures
- Student supports
- School-day/expanded learning alignment structures
- Initiatives and SEL-related curricula
- School/program-wide policies or practices
- Communication with families

## Appendix B. Expanded Learning 360°/365 Alignment and Implementation Strategies

### 2017 Crosswalk of PLC Teams' Alignment and Implementation Strategies

PLC teams included a variety of strategies in their SEL action plans, many of which overlapped across districts. In 2017, AIR reviewed PLC teams' action plans and found that teams cited eight different strategies, which are outlined in this section. Table B1 shows a crosswalk of the overlapping PLC team strategies based on the review of the 2017 PLC team action plans. Teams most frequently included professional development plans that support SEL practice ( $n = 8$ ), followed by communication strategies to promote SEL awareness ( $n = 4$ ) and the use of observation tools to assess SEL implementation ( $n = 4$ ). Following is a summary of the eight strategies.

- Professional Development Plan.** The PLC teams collaboratively created professional development plans to enhance staff members' SEL skills and prepare staff to implement SEL practices. Eight PLC teams drafted professional development plans. In 2017, one district designed a two-tiered professional development plan in which returning staff participate in a PLC and new staff attend an SEL orientation. Team plans are geared toward ELO staff but include school site leads, district personnel, and community-based partners. One team's professional development plan included school and ELO site leads, teachers, and staff to help establish a shared vision and coordinate implementation.
- Communication Strategies.** Teams used various strategies for communicating their SEL vision and agreements to stakeholders (e.g., district personnel, ELO staff, and families). Examples included websites, presentations, and webinars. One team reported hosting weekly meetings and conducting regular site visits to enhance communication between ELO providers and the district.
- Observation Tools.** Teams reported developing new observation tools, exploring existing observation instruments, or infusing SEL standards into existing tools. PLC teams used these tools to monitor SEL implementation and tailor professional learning to staff needs. One team established a set of observable indicators for the ELO program to help with consistency.
- Embedded CQI Process.** Teams engaged in a CQI process to evaluate and adjust SEL strategies on an ongoing basis. One team implemented a CQI process that will help measure the quality of SEL implementation across time, identify best practices, and guide team reflection. Another PLC team incorporated SEL into its ELO quality action plan and developed plans to measure growth in SEL skills using School Quality Index indicators.



- **Site Implementation.** Teams coordinated the selection of pilot sites to implement SEL alignment strategies. Team plans included lessons learned from sites to help inform SEL alignment at future sites. One PLC team selected a pilot site to implement aligned SEL practices between school-day and ELO activities. Another team reported providing support, professional learning, and resources to five school sites to develop a positive learning culture across settings.
- **Launch of SEL Curriculum.** Teams reported using PLC planning time to identify and launch the SEL curriculum. One team launched a targeted SEL curriculum for the ELO program, whereas other teams have implemented the same SEL curriculum in both the school-day and ELO programs. Another PLC team indicated developing a plan to provide professional development specific to the chosen curriculum.
- **Resource Hub.** Teams reported organizing a one-stop shop for school and ELO staff to access SEL tools and resources. Teams described the benefits of an SEL website that houses resources for ELO staff and a resource guide with sample SEL-focused activities for schools and ELO programs.
- **Incorporation of SEL Into District Frameworks.** Teams indicated incorporating SEL into an existing district framework. One team reported using this strategy to encourage school administrators to develop and evaluate SEL-related goals.

**Table B1. 2017 Crosswalk of PLC Teams' Alignment and Implementation Strategies**

PLC Team	Professional Development Plan	Communication Strategies	Observation Tools	Embedded CQI Process	Site Implementation	Launch of SEL Curriculum	Resource Hub	Incorporation of SEL Into District Frameworks
Fresno	X		X					
Los Angeles	X	X					X	X
Oakland	X			X	X	X		X
Sacramento	X		X				X	
San Francisco	X			X				
San Leandro	X	X	X					
San Rafael	X	X			X			
Santa Ana	X		X	X	X	X		
Visalia		X						

## 2018 Crosswalk of PLC Teams' Alignment and Implementation Strategies

In 2018 (Phase 2), the AIR team reviewed PLC team action plans and found that district teams focused their efforts on three primary strategies. These strategies included PD and SEL implementation ( $n = 7$  districts), school-day and afterschool collaboration ( $n = 4$  districts), and data use and continuous improvement ( $n = 6$  districts). Table B2 shows a crosswalk of the overlapping district team strategies:

**PD and SEL Implementation.** Teams reported conducting PD to implement SEL strategies that are aligned across school-day and afterschool staff. Districts described facilitating the sharing of common SEL language and supporting the implementation of specific SEL strategies and programs. For example, one district is providing SEL materials and resources to support site-based implementation of one to three SEL practices that were jointly identified and implemented by the site's school-day and afterschool staff. Other districts are providing training and coaching around SEL programs, such as positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS), Mindfulness, and the implementation of Second Step. To improve students' SEL skills, one district's school-day staff will teach one Second Step lesson per week, and the afterschool staff will be trained to provide supplemental sessions based on the school-day unit and then measure student development. Specific PD approaches across districts included monthly videos, articles, and activities to build a common SEL understanding; PLC and work-group meetings to align practices; and professional learning sessions focused on understanding SEL skills, building culturally responsive teaching and equity, and learning student and adult SEL practices.

**School-Day and Afterschool Collaboration.** Four PLC teams described deliberate efforts to enhance collaboration across school-day and afterschool staff. For example, action plans called for afterschool staff to participate in school-day staff meetings, joint classroom walkthroughs facilitated by the core team, and relationship building across school-day and afterschool staff throughout the year, including through PLC planning meetings.

**Data Use and Continuous Improvement.** Six out of seven PLC team sites are using data and/or a continuous improvement process as part of their implementation strategy. For example, school-day and afterschool staff engage in a cycle of continuous improvement to inform SEL strategy implementation or use student data to establish a site-level goal, assess ongoing progress, and refine programming. Districts are using pre- and post-data to measure school-day and afterschool staff relationship building, student SEL development, and school climate. Two sites mentioned using Aeries student and family data to collaborate across school-day and afterschool learning and align supports for youth.

**Table B2. 2018 Crosswalk of PLC Teams' Alignment Strategies**

PLC Team	PD and SEL Implementation	School-Day and Afterschool Collaboration	Data Use and Continuous Improvement
Sacramento	x	x	x
San Francisco	x		x
San Leandro	x	x	x
Visalia	x	x	
Oakland	x	x	x
Santa Ana	x		x
Los Angeles	x		x

## **Appendix C. Literature Review**

### **Introduction to 360°/365 Professional Learning Communities**

In January of 2017, American Institutes for Research (AIR) began a qualitative evaluation of the Expanded Learning 360°/365 professional learning community (PLC) and consulting practices facilitated by the Partnership for Children and Youth (PCY). The PCY PLC and consulting strategies are designed with the goal of improving and aligning social and emotional learning (SEL) practices across school-day and expanded learning opportunities (ELO) in California. Since 2015, the 360°/365 PLC initiative has convened teams of school-day and ELO staff from nine school districts, including seven CORE districts,<sup>1</sup> to assess, plan, and improve strategies to improve and align SEL practices across these settings. The Expanded Learning 360°/365 PLC brings together teams of educators and ELO professionals to collaborate around a common goal, which is to provide a collaborative setting for school-day and expanded learning partners to align SEL strategies. The Expanded Learning 360°/365 evaluation highlights PLC practices that facilitate changes in the implementation of coordinated SEL practices at the system, program, and practitioner levels.

### **A Focus on SEL**

The 360°/365 PLC is a unique initiative because of its dual focus on SEL and the alignment between two prominent learning contexts. Social and emotional learning is defined as the process by which children learn critical knowledge, attitudes, and skills needed to nurture relationships, manage their emotions and behaviors, and make constructive decisions (Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning, 2017). These SEL competencies are essential for young people's success in school, postsecondary education, work, civic engagement, and personal well-being (Farrington et al., 2012; Heckman & Kautz, 2013). In the last decade, SEL has come to the forefront of education reform efforts with an emphasis on the impacts schools and expanded learning programs (ELPs) can have on social, emotional, and academic outcomes (Devaney & Moroney, 2018; Durlak & Weissberg, 2007; Gutman & Schoon, 2013). Authentic alignment between the school day and ELPs is characterized by a set of collaborative practices aimed at achieving shared goals related to the learning and development of young people (Anderson-Butcher, Stetler, & Midle, 2006; Bennett, 2015). In fact, youth have exhibited higher mathematics and reading skills when schools and ELPs were aligned, and misalignment between the two contexts was associated with lower mathematics

---

<sup>1</sup> So-called CORE districts are a set of eight districts that received a waiver from the California Department of Education to revamp accountability systems to include both academic and social and emotional indicators. Such districts use a data-driven approach to developing and monitoring their innovative strategies. To learn more about the CORE districts, visit <http://coredistricts.org/>.

achievement (Bennett, 2015). Improving the alignment and quality of an ELP promotes positive outcomes for young people (Eccles & Gootman, 2002; Pierce, Bolt, & Vandell, 2010). Alignment between schools and ELPs is of particular interest to the 360°/365 PLC because young people benefit when caring adults in multiple contexts—home, school, and community programs—coordinate their efforts (Bronfenbrenner, 1994; Lerner, Wertlieb, & Jacobs, 2003).

## **Professional Learning Communities**

Professional learning communities are practice-focused and offer participants opportunities to practice skills, deepen understanding, and engage in collaborative inquiry. Goals for PLCs typically include solving a collective problem, developing new skills, or connecting professional practices to youth outcomes (McKenzie, 2014; McLaughlin & Talbert, 2010; Newhouse, Vance, Atkins, Salvaterra, 2015; Vance, Salvaterra, Michelsen, & Newhouse, 2016; Wenger-Trayner & Wenger-Trayner, 2015). McKenzie (2014) outlined the six key phases of learning associated with participation in a well-coordinated PLC. These key phases include building understanding, acquiring expertise, practicing skills, solving problems, contributing new knowledge, and creating original products. Hord and Sommers (2008) outlined six characteristics of effective PLCs with educators that includes: 1) supportive and shared leadership; 2) shared beliefs, values, and vision; 3) intentional collective learning; 4) shared practice; 5) collegial or relational conditions; and 6) physical or structural conditions. Quality PLCs facilitate participant learning and experiences through a learning cycle. The cycle can be condensed into three core PLC strategies: (1) practice, (2) reflection, and (3) collaboration (Stoll, Bolam, McMahon, Wallace, & Thomas, 2006; Vance et al., 2016).

Effective PLCs consist of eight key characteristics (DuFour & DuFour, 2005; Jackson & Temperley, 2007; Louis et al., 2006):

1. **Shared values and visions:** common purpose that provides a basis for shared decision making.
2. **Collective responsibility:** mutual accountability for achieving shared vision and goals.
3. **Reflective professional inquiry:** ongoing dialogue and pursuit of knowledge through collective examination of practice, particularly the application of new practices and ideas.
4. **Collaboration:** deep, interdependent, shared practice and feedback with the goal of improved practice and shared purpose.
5. **Collective and individual learning:** participants share in the professional learning process and work together to collectively make sense of information and data. This learning and participant engagement is cultivated by empowering participants with information and tools, anticipating challenges, facilitating buy-in, and planning for sustainability (Mayo, Moroney, & Huff, 2019).

6. **Mutual trust, respect, and support among members:** quality relationships support the growth and sustainability of the PLC.
7. **Inclusive membership:** the professional learning community includes support staff and reaches a schoolwide community instead of smaller groups.
8. **Openness, networks, and partnerships:** gaining external support and developing partnerships to promote and sustain the PLC.

Coordinated effectively, PLCs are considered one of the most effective forms of professional development (Joyce & Showers, 2002) that enhance the skills of educators (Thompson, Gregg, & Niska, 2004; Vance et al., 2016; Vescio, Ross, & Adams, 2008). These benefits include collaborative professional learning (Bolam et al., 2005); gaining of content knowledge to implement as a result of sharing information with peers (Newhouse et al., 2015); a greater sense of self-efficacy; a supportive learning environment; improved instruction (Pirtle & Tobia, 2014); and exposing youth to content knowledge learned through participation in a PLC (Newhouse et al., 2015).

### Expanded Learning 360°/365 Consulting

As part of the Expanded Learning 360°/365 initiative, PCY provides PLC teams with a dedicated 360°/365 consultant. Prior to 2017, the consultant role was referred to as a coach. The Partnership for Children and Youth shifted terminology to clarify the role of the additional support provided to the PLC teams as part of the 360°/365 initiative. Consultants provide support to PLC teams through a continuous quality improvement process (Starr, Stavsky, & Gannett 2016; Smith et al., 2012; Yohalem, Devaney, Smith, & Wilson-Ahlstrom, 2012) that supports the teams through the PLC phases, learning cycles, and applied strategies. Consulting is a critical support that can enhance the effectiveness of a PLC and the implementation of PLC initiatives (Bouffard, 2004). The role of consultant allows PCY facilitators to gain insight into how teams transfer learning from the PLC to their sites and how this knowledge is practically applied (Vance et al., 2016). Joyce and Showers (2002) found that this type of direct support, combined with broader PLC activities, contributes to an increase in knowledge and the application of skills. The consultant role enhances the practice-oriented nature of a PLC and promotes the implementation of new strategies, skillful alignment of strategies to their aims and circumstances, the improvement of skills over time, and increased communication of the purpose of new strategies at the practitioner level (Sheldon & Hopkins, 2008; Weiss & Little, 2008). To facilitate this process, the 360°/365 consultants coordinate with PLC teams and provide additional resources specific to the alignment and implementation of PLC strategies that promote system-level partnerships between the district and ELO settings (Traphagen & Stevens, 2016; Collins & Metz, 2009; Little, 2009).

## References

- Anderson-Butcher, D., Stetler, G., & Midle, T. (2006). Collaborative partnerships in schools: A case for youth development. *Children & Schools*, 28(3), 155–163.
- Bennett, T. (2015). Examining levels of alignment between school and afterschool and associations with students' academic achievement. *Journal of Expanded Learning Opportunities*, 1(2), 4 - 22.
- Bolam, R., McMahon, A., Stoll, L., Thomas, S., Wallace, M., Greenwood, A., Smith, M. (2005). *Creating and sustaining effective professional learning communities* (Research Report 637). London: DfES and University of Bristol.
- Bouffard, S. (2004). Promoting quality out-of-school time programs through professional development. *The Evaluation Exchange*, X (1). Retrieved from <http://www.hfrp.org/evaluation/the-evaluation-exchange/issue-archive/evaluating-out-of-school-time-program-quality/promoting-quality-out-of-school-time-programs-through-professional-development>.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1994). Ecological models of human development. In *International Encyclopedia of Education*, Vol. 3. 2nd. Ed. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Collins, A. & Metz, A. (2009) How Program Administrators can Support Out of School time Staff. Child Trends, Part 4 in a Series on Implementing Evidence-Based Practices in Out-of-School Time. Publication #2009-32 June 2009
- Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning. (2017). *Key implementation insights from the Collaborating Districts Initiative*. Chicago, IL: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.casel.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/CDI-Insights-Report-May.pdf>.
- Devaney, E., & Moroney, D. (2018). *Social and emotional learning in out-of-school time*. Current Issues in Out-of-School Time. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Durlak, J. A., & Weissberg, R. P. (2007). The impact of after-school programs that promote personal and social skills. Chicago, IL: Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning.
- DuFour, R., Eaker, R., & DuFour, R. (2005). On common ground: The power of professional learning communities. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

- DuFour, R. (May 2004). What is a “professional learning community”? *Educational Leadership*, 61(8), 6–11.
- Eccles, J., & Gootman, J. (Eds.). (2002). Community programs to promote youth development. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Farrington, C., Roderick, M., Johnson, D. W., Keyes, T. S., Allensworth, E., Nagaoka, J., & Beechum, N. O. (2012). Teaching adolescents to become learners: The role of noncognitive factors in shaping school performance. Chicago: Consortium on Chicago School Research, University of Chicago.
- Gutman, L. M., & Schoon, I. (2013). *The impact of non-cognitive skills on outcomes for young people: Literature review*. London: Institute of Education and Social Research, University of London.
- Heckman, J., & Kauz, T. (2013). *Fostering and measuring skills: Interventions that improve character and cognition*. Washington, D.C.: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Herman, M. (2012). Reflective practice meets youth work supervision. *Youth & Policy*, (109), 118–128. Retrieved from [http://www.youthandpolicy.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/herman\\_reflective\\_practice\\_meets\\_youth\\_work\\_supervision.pdf](http://www.youthandpolicy.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/herman_reflective_practice_meets_youth_work_supervision.pdf)
- Hord, S. M., & Sommers, W. A. (2008). Leading professional learning communities: Voices from research and practice. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Jackson, D., & Temperley, J. (2007). From professional learning community to networked learning community. In L. Stoll & K. Seashore Louis (Eds.), *Professional learning communities: Divergence, depth and dilemmas* (pp. 45–62). Berkshire, England: Open University Press.
- Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (2002). *Student achievement through staff development*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Lerner, R. M., Wertlieb, D., & Jacobs, F. (2003). Historical and theoretical bases of applied developmental science. In R. M. Lerner, F. Jacobs, & D. Wertlieb (Eds.), *Handbook of Applied Developmental Science: Promoting positive child, adolescent, and family development through research, policies, and programs: Vol. 1. Applying developmental science for youth and families: Historical and theoretical foundations*. (pp. 1-28). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications



- Little, P. (2009). *Supporting student outcomes through expanded learning opportunities*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Family Research Project, Harvard Graduate School of Education. Retrieved from <http://www.hfrp.org/out-of-school-time/publications-resources/supporting-student-outcomes-through-expanded-learning-opportunities>.
- Louis, K. S., Kruse, S. D. & Associates. (1995). *Professionalism and community: Perspectives on reforming urban schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press Inc.
- Mayo, R., Moroney, D. and Huff, B. (2019). Practical guidance for policy and practice: strategies and tools for assessing and building readiness and for launching local efforts. In Osher, D., Kendziora, K., Jagers, R., Wood, L., and Mayer, M. (in press). *Keeping Students Safe and Helping Them Thrive: A Collaborative Handbook for Education, Safety, and Justice Professionals, Families, and Communities*, Chapter 21. Praeger, May 2019.
- McKenzie, W. (2014). *The guilded age: Professional learning communities in education*. Retrieved from <http://inservice.ascd.org/the-guilded-age-professional-learning-communities-in-education>.
- McLaughlin, M. W., & Talbert, J. E. (2010). Professional learning communities: Building blocks for school culture and student learning. *Voices in Urban Education (VUE)*, 35–45. Retrieved from [http://www.academia.edu/29864630/Professional\\_Learning\\_Communities\\_Building\\_Blocks\\_for\\_School\\_Culture\\_and\\_Student\\_Learning](http://www.academia.edu/29864630/Professional_Learning_Communities_Building_Blocks_for_School_Culture_and_Student_Learning).
- Newhouse, C., Vance, F., Atkins, J., & Salvaterra, E. (2015). *Professional learning communities in the expanded learning field*. Oakland, CA: Public Profit. Retrieved from <http://www.publicprofit.net/Professional-Learning-Communities-In-The-Expanded-Learning-Field>.
- Pierce, K., Bolt, D., & Vandell, D. (2010). Specific features of after-school program quality: Associations with children's functioning in middle childhood. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 45(3), 381–393.
- Pirtle, S. S., & Tobia, E. (2014). Implementing effective professional learning communities. *SEDL Insights*, 2(3). Retrieved from [http://www.sedl.org/insights/2-3/implementing\\_effective\\_professional\\_learning\\_communities.pdf](http://www.sedl.org/insights/2-3/implementing_effective_professional_learning_communities.pdf).

- Sheldon, J., and Hopkins, L. (2008). *Supporting Success: Why and How to Improve Quality in After School Programs*. Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.
- Smith, C., Akiva, T., Sugar, S. A., Lo, Y. J., Frank, K. A., Peck, S. C., Devaney, T. (2012). *Continuous quality improvement in afterschool settings: Impact findings from the Youth Program Quality Intervention study*. Washington, DC: Forum for Youth Investment.
- Starr, E., Stavsky, S. and Gannett, E. (2016) *Strengthening and Safeguarding Continuous Quality Improvement Systems: Lessons from Afterschool System Builders*. National Institute on Out-of-School Time, June 2016.
- Stoll, L., Bolam, R., McMahon, A., Wallace, M., & Thomas, S. (2006). Professional learning communities: A review of the literature. *Journal of Educational Change*, 7, 221–258.
- Thompson, S. C., Gregg, L., & Niska, J. M. (2004). Professional learning communities, leadership, and student learning. *Research in Middle Level Education Online*, 28 (1). Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ807417.pdf>.
- Traphagen, K. & Stevens, P. (2016) *Funders' Guide to Quality in Out-of-School Time* Grantmakers for Education's Out-of-School Time Funder Network. Retrieved from: [https://edfunders.org/sites/default/files/OST\\_Funders\\_Guide\\_2016\\_final.pdf](https://edfunders.org/sites/default/files/OST_Funders_Guide_2016_final.pdf).
- Vance, F., Salvaterra, E., Atkins Michelsen, J., & Newhouse, C. (2016). Professional learning communities: An alternative to the one-stop workshop. In K. M. Pozzoboni & B. Kirshner (Eds.), *The changing landscape of youth work* (pp. 147–165). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Vance, F., Salvaterra, E., Michelsen, J. A., & Newhouse, C. (Fall 2016). Getting the right fit: Designing a professional learning community for out-of-school time. *Afterschool Matters*, 24, 21–32.
- Weiss, H. B., & Little, P. M. D. (2008). *Strengthening out-of-school time nonprofits: The role of foundations in building organizational capacity*. New York: Wallace Foundation.
- Wenger-Trayner, E., & Wenger-Trayner, B. (2015). Communities of practice: A brief introduction. Retrieved May 13, 2015.

Vescio, V., Ross, D., & Adams, A. (2008). A review of the research on the impact of professional learning communities on teaching practice and student learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24, 80–91.

Yohalem, N., Devaney, E., Smith, C., & Wilson-Ahlstrom, A. (2012). Building citywide systems for quality: Guide and case studies for afterschool leaders. Washington, DC: Forum for Youth Investment & New York, NY: The Wallace Foundation.

## Appendix D. Professional Learning in Action

The Partnership for Children and Youth (PCY) is implementing an initiative to support cross-sector professional learning, called the Expanded Learning 360°/365 professional learning community (PLC). Through the initiative, PCY engages teams of school-day and expanded learning programs from nine California school districts to align social and emotional learning (SEL) practices across school and expanded learning settings.

American Institutes for Research is partnering with PCY to explore and describe the practices that promote quality PLC implementation with district and expanded learning partners.

### 360°/365 Districts

1. Fresno
2. Los Angeles
3. Oakland
4. Sacramento City
5. San Francisco
6. San Leandro
7. San Rafael
8. Santa Ana
9. Visalia

---

*“360°/365 meetings are an opportunity to pause, come together, and talk about our work [while] getting to know and learn about each other’s work.”*

– District Team Member

---

## Key aspects of a professional learning community

As part of the evaluation, we explored the various aspects that foster learning and collaboration in the 360°/365 PLC. Participants said eight key components were instrumental in the PLC experience.

- **Shared values and vision.** Together, participants build guidelines and norms, including overarching goals, commitment, and accountability for active participation.
- **Mutual trust and respect.** Facilitators establish a space where district teams can share expertise and reflect openly on their local experience.
- **Collective responsibility.** Convenings are structured and provide ample time for teams to collaborate, reflect, and build participants goals (for alignment with SEL).
- **Reflective practice.** Meetings include opportunities for teams to engage in ongoing dialogue to share insights, successes, and challenges.
- **Inclusive membership.** Facilitators encourage participants to expand their learning community membership to include other key stakeholders.
- **Collaboration.** Participants have opportunities to work within their own district teams and across districts to share promising practices, discuss experiences, and advance action plans.

- **Knowledge building.** Teams spend part of each PLC sharing and learning about relevant SEL content, strategies, and research from internal and external experts.
- **Networks and partnerships.** Facilitators provide external supports through consultants who broker resources, expand partnerships, and support continuous quality improvement.

#### PLC Facilitation Tips

- TRUST the process
- LISTEN to participant feedback
- Be FLEXIBLE
- COLLABORATE
- REFLECT and ADJUST
- SHARE lessons learned

*“[It has] become clear, this is a prolonged iterative process, and it needs time in order to be successful, and it’s not overnight, or in one school year. It’s not a short game, it’s a long game, and that’s important to know when taking it on.”*

— District Team Member

## The professional learning community experience

The 360°/365 PLC initiative focuses on the alignment of SEL between school day and expanded learning opportunities. Through active participation in PLC activities, district and expanded learning teams report having:

- Developed a shared language
- Adopted SEL expectations and standards
- Piloted SEL strategies and curricula
- Included SEL in district continuous improvement processes
- Conducted site visits
- Participated in cross-sector PD
- Adopted observation and assessment tools
- Implemented district-level working groups

Through active participation in PLC activities, district and expanded learning teams experienced:

- **Collaboration:** active meetings with intra-team planning time to draft and update SEL alignment goals and action plans.
- **Practice:** time to learn new strategies and exchange promising practices, including common pitfalls, across PLC teams.
- **Reflection:** continuous improvement driven by data (qualitative and quantitative), including external support from a consultant with a defined scope of work.

---

*“...through dialogue with different districts we were able to see where SEL fit into our existing program and then what we could do moving forward to enhance it.”*

— Expanded Learning Opportunity Team Member

---



**Expanded Learning 360°/365**  
Skills for Success in School, Work and Life

Expanded learning: 360°/365 is a collaborative project dedicated to promoting the development of critical skills beyond academics that research has identified as essential to young people's success in school, work, and life.

For more information please visit, [www.partnerforchildren.org/social-emotional-learning](http://www.partnerforchildren.org/social-emotional-learning).

## PCY Tools and Resources

### Appendix E. Professional Learning Community Meetings and Goals

**Table E1. 2017–2018 PLC Meetings and Goals**

PLC Date	Location	Theme	Duration	Goals
January 31, 2017	Los Angeles, California	Framing SEL	5 hours	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Explore the implications of new SEL research findings and apply them to current work.</li> <li>2. Learn about the latest statewide SEL/expanded learning efforts.</li> <li>3. Give input on future 360°/365 PLC content.</li> <li>4. Identify ways in which team consultants will support SEL action plan activities.</li> </ol>
March 22, 2017	Oakland, California	Equity lens on SEL and ELO	5 hours	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Explore the intersection between equity and SEL.</li> <li>2. Share strategies for promoting equity within districts.</li> <li>3. Offer PCY advice on messaging SEL as an equity issue.</li> <li>4. Apply the day's information to each district team's SEL action plan and work.</li> </ol>
July 11, 2017	Regional (Los Angeles, Visalia, San Francisco, Oakland)	SEL at the site level	3.5 hours	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Build team cohesion.</li> <li>2. Explore point-of-service practices at school-day and expanded learning sites that build SEL skills.</li> <li>3. Identify high-priority aligned practices and create a simple observation tool.</li> <li>4. Practice a site observation using our prepared observation tool.</li> </ol>
October 25, 2017	Oakland, California	Celebrating Success	5 hours	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Revisit effective alignment practices and assess progress toward elements of the Alignment Rubric and the SEL action plans.</li> <li>2. Learn what research has shown are effective practices for strengthening SEL skills at the site level.</li> <li>3. Begin to identify new activities to strengthen SEL practices and alignment in the 2018–19 school year.</li> </ol>

PLC Date	Location	Theme	Duration	Goals
March 15, 2018	Oakland, California	Taking it to the Sites	5 hours	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Understand the plans for the 2018–19 PLC.</li> <li>2. Become familiar with the tools and resources available to support the work.</li> <li>3. Understand key decisions to be made and next steps to take before the next PLC meeting.</li> </ol>
May 23, 2018	Los Angeles, California	Analyze, Prioritize, Plan!	5 hours	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review and analyze information collected from the pilot sites.</li> <li>2. Identify site-level issues and begin drafting site-level goals for 2018–19.</li> <li>3. Share draft goals, questions, and ideas across district teams.</li> <li>4. Begin making plans for next steps in the planning process.</li> </ol>
July 24, 31, 2018	Regional (NorCal, Visalia, Santa Ana, Santa Ana)	Planning for Action	3 hours	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Begin drafting the action steps to reach site-level goals.</li> <li>2. Begin identifying the people and resources required to complete each action step.</li> <li>3. Share strategies for engaging implementation team members in this work.</li> <li>4. Make plans for next steps in the SEL action planning process.</li> </ol>
October 18, 2018	Oakland, California	Leading Change	5 hours	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Explore best practices to support effective change management at the district and school levels.</li> <li>2. Learn about actions that other districts are taking to support SEL alignment.</li> <li>3. Work within district teams to identify next steps in implementation process.</li> <li>4. Give PCY feedback about possible PLC direction and content in 2019.</li> </ol>



## Appendix F. Expanded Learning 360°/365 Participation Agreement



### 360°/365 Participation Agreement for the 20XX Learning Community

This agreement describes the stipend provided by the Partnership for Children & Youth (PCY) to [DISTRICT NAME] for involvement in Expanded Learning 360°/365, an initiative to improve the consistency of social-emotional learning (SEL) practices across expanded learning and school-day environments.

A stipend is being provided to support the district and its community partners' participation in this initiative. The stipend is intended to cover travel costs (e.g., airfare, hotel, food, mileage, parking), staff time for Learning Community team members' participation and work related to the initiative, and other costs related to 360°/365 planning and activity implementation.

As part of the 360°/365 Learning Community and this stipend, the district agrees to the following deliverables:

- Participation of Learning Community team members in 4 Learning Community meetings.
  - At least 2 representatives must commit to attending all 4 meetings (3 statewide, 1 regional).
  - The team must include representation from both the school day and expanded learning staff.
  - We encourage inclusion of community-based expanded learning partners in the team.
- Active engagement with the cycle of quality improvement, as evidenced by:
  - A documented “best guess” scope of work describing specific tasks and timeline for using the 15 hours of PCY-provided consulting to support implementation of the 2017 Action Plan and planning for 2018. (*Improve*)
  - Assessment of progress in implementing strategies defined in the 2017 Action Plan. (*Assess*)

- A new or updated Action Plan for 2018, describing “next step” strategies to better align social-emotional learning practices across the school day and expanded learning time.  
(Plan)
- Engagement with the PCY-provided consultant at least once per month to communicate recent activities, successes, and challenges. (Can be conducted via phone, in-person meeting, or email.)
- Completion of tasks, as needed, between Learning Community meetings to prepare for meetings and to move the Action Plan forward.

The stipend check will be sent upon receipt of this signed agreement.

This agreement is in effect from January to December, 20XX.

- ☐ By checking this box, I agree to the sharing of our Action Plan with other Learning Community teams, 360°/365 partners, and initiative funders.

By signing below, I agree to the terms and conditions of the agreement:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature  
[LEAD DISTRICT CONTACT]  
[TITLE]  
[DISTRICT NAME]

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature  
[REPRESENTATIVE]  
[TITLE]  
[ORGANIZATION]

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

District EIN: \_\_\_\_\_ [Employee Identification Number]

## Appendix G. Sample Alignment Rubric



**Expanded Learning 360°/365**  
Skills for Success in School, Work and Life

PLC Team: \_\_\_\_\_ PLC Members Completing this Rubric: \_\_\_\_\_

**Instructions:** Please discuss the seven rubric elements and corresponding indicators and record the thoughts of the PLC team. Remember, this is not a definitive tool, but a guideline that can help you consider your alignment strengths and challenges. To use the rubric, first put an “x” in one of the first three columns (blue). Follow the prompts and capture notes in the last three columns.

<i>SEL is well-aligned between school day and afterschool when...</i>		<i>We do not have/do this</i>	<i>We sometimes do this</i>	<i>We excel at this</i>	<b>How are we successful in this element</b>	<b>What challenges do we face with this element</b>	<b>What action items will help with this element</b>
<b>1. We have a clear and shared strategic plan.</b>							
	1.1 Our schools, district, board and afterschool providers have a clearly-articulated shared vision, mission and goals.						
	1.2 We have a manageable number of initiatives and the capacity to succeed.						

<i>SEL is well-aligned between school day and afterschool when...</i>		<i>We do not have/do this</i>	<i>We sometimes do this</i>	<i>We excel at this</i>	<b>How are we successful in this element</b>	<b>What challenges do we face with this element</b>	<b>What action items will help with this element</b>
	1.3 Staff have clarity around their roles in the plan.						
<b>2. We foster a culture and climate of inclusive decision-making.</b>							
	2.1 We appreciate multiple perspectives and value working together.						
	2.2 We keep an open mind.						
	2.3 We bring youth voice to the table.						

<i>SEL is well-aligned between school day and afterschool when...</i>		<i>We do not have/do this</i>	<i>We sometimes do this</i>	<i>We excel at this</i>	<b>How are we successful in this element</b>	<b>What challenges do we face with this element</b>	<b>What action items will help with this element</b>
<b>3. We have a shared approach to building stakeholder capacity to meet student needs.</b>							
	3.1 We offer aligned PD for all layers of leadership and our workforce (including afterschool staff) in order to build capacity and buy-in at all levels.						
	3.2 We make supporting stakeholder capacity a priority.						
	3.3 We are intentional and explicit in everything we do.						
<b>4. We distribute resources equitably to meet program goals.</b>							
	4.1 We blend funding across departments, schools, and functions, and make resources equitably accessible to all.						

<i>SEL is well-aligned between school day and afterschool when...</i>		<i>We do not have/do this</i>	<i>We sometimes do this</i>	<i>We excel at this</i>	<b>How are we successful in this element</b>	<b>What challenges do we face with this element</b>	<b>What action items will help with this element</b>
	4.2 We have aligned our funding and human resources to support our vision and goals.						
<b>5. We have effective systems and structures for communication and collaboration.</b>							
	5.1 We value collaboration and teamwork and have cross-departmental teams working together on projects.						
	5.2 We communicate regularly and clearly across departments and with key stakeholders.						

<i>SEL is well-aligned between school day and afterschool when...</i>		<i>We do not have/do this</i>	<i>We sometimes do this</i>	<i>We excel at this</i>	<b>How are we successful in this element</b>	<b>What challenges do we face with this element</b>	<b>What action items will help with this element</b>
	5.3 We hold ourselves and others in the district accountable for tasks and progress.						
<b>6. We are responsive to the diverse needs of our stakeholders.</b>							
	6.1 We focus on the best interest of students.						
	6.2 We assess stakeholder needs.						
	6.3 We value diversity and create a common space for difference.						

<i>SEL is well-aligned between school day and afterschool when...</i>		<i>We do not have/do this</i>	<i>We sometimes do this</i>	<i>We excel at this</i>	<b>How are we successful in this element</b>	<b>What challenges do we face with this element</b>	<b>What action items will help with this element</b>
<b>7. We engage in a cycle of continuous quality improvement.</b>							
	7.1 We share qualitative and quantitative data.						
	7.2 We engage in data-informed decision-making that is aligned to our vision and goals.						
	7.3 We focus on best practices and objective outcome measures.						



## Appendix H. Social and Emotional Learning Action Plan



**Expanded Learning 360°/365**  
Skills for Success in School, Work and Life

Program/District: \_\_\_\_\_ Team Members: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Goal or deliverable:</b> <i>a) Aligned professional development (PD) for school and afterschool staff.</i> <i>b) Increased communication between school and afterschool program.</i>		<b>What will be the impact when the goal is met?</b> <i>a) Improved SEL alignment between school and afterschool programs.</i> <i>b) Development of school and afterschool program quality taskforce.</i>		
<b>Why is this our goal?</b> <i>a) SEL has been identified by the district as a priority area (i.e. school climate).</i> <i>b) Combined PD will increase staff capacity, relationships, and communication.</i>		<b>What will be the impact on students when the goal is met?</b> <i>Students who attend afterschool programs will exhibit growth in SEL skills as measured by quality observations, staff, teacher, family, and youth surveys.</i>		
Strategy/Action Step	Responsible Person(s)	Timeline	Resources, Information, or data that is needed	Status
Identify SEL framework and various SEL curriculum/activities	PQ Taskforce; Enrichment specialist	February 2018	SEL resources, curriculum, evidence based practices.	Completed
Conduct adult SEL self-reflection	School and OST staff	March 2018	SEL Self-reflection tool	Completed
Professional development with school and OST staff (emphasis on SEL)	PQ Taskforce	March 2018	In-School and Afterschool SEL Connection Tool	Completed

Develop observation and communication schedule	PD and school lead	March 2018	Observation tool	In-process
Develop shared activity and lessons plans supported by SEL	Enrichment team	Ongoing	Enrichment planning tools	Pending
Data planning meetings	PQ taskforce	May 2018	Agenda; student and school data; program observations	Pending

Program/District: \_\_\_\_\_ Team Members: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Goal or deliverable:</b> a)  b)	<b>What will be the impact when the goal is met?</b> a)  b)
<b>Why is this our goal?</b> a)  b)	<b>What will be the impact on students when the goal is met?</b>

Strategy/Action Step	Responsible Person(s)	Timeline	Resources, Information, or data that is needed	Status

## Appendix I. Consultant Scope of Work Form



Expanded Learning 360°/365  
Skills for Success in School, Work and Life

### Consultant Scope of Work

District: \_\_\_\_\_

Consultant: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

### Proposed Methodology and Timeline

Activity	Deliverables	Corresponding Goal in Action Plan	Hours	Timeline	Status (Note date of status updates)
	■				
	■				
	■				
	■				
	■				
Total Hours: 15 hours direct / 15 hours indirect					

**Areas of Responsibility**

**Consultant will be responsible for the following activities:**

- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 

**District will be responsible for the following:**

- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
-

## Appendix J. Sample 360°/365 PLC Facilitator Agenda

### Meeting X, 201X



**Goal:** To support districts in better aligning expanded learning resources and programs to improve student Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) outcomes.

By the end of this PLC session, participants will:

- ❖ Explore the implications of new SEL research findings and apply them to current work.
- ❖ Learn about the latest statewide SEL/expanded learning efforts.

- ❖ Give input on future 360°/365 PLC content.
- ❖ Identify ways in which team consultants will support SEL action plan activities.

Time	Length	Session	Materials
10:00	20 min	<b>Welcome and Warm-Up - Emoji Bingo (Michelle)</b> <b>Purpose:</b> To reconnect with/get-to-know each other, and to report back to their peers about recent progress made towards the identified concrete action. <b>Instructions:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(10:05 am) Michelle welcomes everyone and introduces the warm-up activity, Emoji Bingo...</li> </ol>	<input type="checkbox"/> Participant folders <input type="checkbox"/> Emoji Bingo handouts
10:20	20 min	<b>Introductions (Megan)</b> <b>Purpose:</b> Participants and guests will be introduced, and agenda for the day will be reviewed. <b>Instructions:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Megan will welcome everyone.</li> <li>Inform participants that they will be asked to introduce themselves to the rest of the room.               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Before individual introductions, ask teams to huddle for 1 minute and come up with either 1 nugget of wisdom/advice for the year. Have one team member share this wisdom/advice/wish during introductions.</li> </ol> </li> <li>Introduce guests as visiting experts who are here both to observe, as well as to contribute their knowledge and expertise throughout the day.</li> <li>Review the agenda for the day.</li> </ol>	<input type="checkbox"/> Agreements

Time	Length	Session	Materials
		5. Review group agreements.	
10:40	80 min	<p><b><u>Wallace Foundation/Edge Research - Social and Emotional Learning: Feedback and Communications Insights from the Field (Katie, Pam Loeb, Stacia Tipton)</u></b></p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> Present and explore the implications of new SEL research from the Wallace Foundation and Edge Research.</p> <p><b>Instructions:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(5 minutes) Katie calls everyone back together. Introduce Wallace/Edge Researchers, Pam Loeb and Stacia Tipton. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Frame context: Wallace commissioned Edge Research to comprehensively explore the language and framing for SEL that is most compelling among some key audiences: K-12 leaders, after school providers, policymakers, and parents.</li> <li>Why this information matters...</li> <li>Pam and Stacia will present the research findings and then we'll have time for some Q&amp;A.</li> </ol> </li> <li>(20 minutes) Edge Researchers present findings, focusing on the "frames" portion of their research.</li> <li>(10 minutes) Pam and Stacia field Q&amp;A.</li> <li>(25 minutes total) Discussion: Audiences and frames <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Katie asks participants to select an audience they would like to explore further, and to group themselves accordingly beneath the corresponding audience sign: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>K-12 leaders</li> <li>Policymakers</li> <li>After School leaders</li> <li>Parents</li> </ol> </li> <li>(3 minutes) Think / Pair / Share: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Once in their groups, ask participants to consider: Which frame resonates most strongly for YOU? Why?</li> <li>Share your response with someone sitting next to you.</li> </ol> </li> <li>(3 minutes) On a worksheet, ask participants to jot down their answers to the following questions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In your district, what frame(s) might resonate with this audience?</li> <li>How might the frame(s) be used?</li> <li>What are potential roadblocks to using the frame(s) with this audience?</li> <li>What are detours around these roadblocks?</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Virtual chat connection with Edge Research</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Webcam</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Worksheet - Frames questions</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> 2 sheets chart paper for each audience group</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Signs for each audience group</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Markers</li> </ul>

Time	Length	Session	Materials				
		<table border="1"><tr><td>What frame(s) resonate?</td><td>How to use?</td></tr><tr><td>Roadblocks?</td><td>Detours?</td></tr></table> <p>d. (19 minutes) Give each team two sheets of chart paper. Ask each team to identify a scribe and a reporter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. Within each group, have participants share no more than one answer they have to each of the four questions. The scribe will take notes.</li><li>ii. Ask teams to discuss, using the following questions as possible prompts, if helpful:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. What do you notice?</li><li>2. What commonalities exist across districts?</li><li>3. What strategies stand out as most effective?</li></ul></li></ul> <p>5. (5 minutes) Large group debrief</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Go around the room and ask the reporter from each group to share <u>one</u> takeaway, aha, or topic that was discussed.</li></ul> <p>6. (15 minutes) - District team debrief</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Have participants reconvene with their district team members and discuss:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. What did you just hear, learn, or discuss with your audience group?</li><li>ii. What can you apply to your SEL action plan goals or strategies?</li></ul></li></ul> <p>7. Katie closes out the session and transitions to lunch.</p>	What frame(s) resonate?	How to use?	Roadblocks?	Detours?	
What frame(s) resonate?	How to use?						
Roadblocks?	Detours?						
12:00	45 min	<u><b>Lunch</b></u> <b>Purpose:</b> Participants will eat!					
12:45	15 min	<u><b>Energizer - Step In, Step Out (Megan)</b></u> <b>Purpose:</b> Reconvene and get the group energized. <b>Instructions:</b> Megan will lead the group in a short energizer activity, Step In, Step Out.					
1:00	15 min	<u><b>Updates from CDE’s Expanded Learning Division (Megan, Michael)</b></u> <b>Purpose:</b> For Michael to respond to what he heard in the morning, and to provide CDE/ExLD updates. <b>Instructions:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Megan reintroduces Michael and invites him to share his reactions/reflections about what he heard in the morning and updates on the SEL planning process from CDE.</li></ul>					



Time	Length	Session	Materials
1:15	20 min	<p><b><u>The 360°/365 Initiative in 2017 (Megan)</u></b></p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> Participants will hear briefly about the changes being made to the 360°/365 initiative in 2017 and will also see a “road map” of the what lies ahead.</p> <p><b>Instructions:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(5-7 minutes) Megan will introduce and frame proposed revisions to the initiative. These changes are part of our own continuous improvement process and meant to reflect our intention to evolve with the needs of our participants.</li> <li>Distribute the handout detailing the changes. Also distribute the participation agreement templates. Participants will have a few minutes to read through the handout and ask any questions.</li> <li>(13-15 minutes) Megan will share a roadmap of where the initiative is headed with a brief outline of what to expect in the 2017 PLCs. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Share the following themes, along with the options within each of them: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>March 22 - <i>Equity lens on SEL and ELO</i></li> <li>July 11 - <i>SEL at the site level</i></li> <li>October 25 - <i>Celebrating Success</i></li> </ol> </li> <li>Inform participants that we’d like feedback on these proposed topics. Stations around the room will have a sign stating each PLC theme, and then options for activities/topics within the theme. They will have about 10 minutes for a “gallery walk.”</li> <li>Participants will be asked to write comments on chart papers about: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What they like about the ideas presented.</li> <li>Ideas they have to innovate or improve upon the ideas presented.</li> </ol> </li> <li>An extra flip chart will be available for participants to write down any topics that we haven’t listed.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Handout with 360°/365 revisions</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> 2 copies of participation agreement per team</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Signs with PLC themes</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Signs with options for each theme</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Chart papers with PLC topics and tables for feedback. (Columns: What do you like? What ideas do you have to improve?)</li> </ul>
1:35	20 min	<p><b><u>360°/365 Qualitative Evaluation with AIR (Katie, Deb Moroney, Fausto Lopez)</u></b></p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> Present qualitative evaluation and next steps.</p> <p><b>Instructions:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Frame the purpose of conducting the qualitative evaluation.</li> <li>Introduce Deb and Fausto. They share who they are and their planned process.</li> </ol>	

Time	Length	Session	Materials
1:55	35 min	<p><b><u>Team Planning Time (Katie)</u></b></p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> Participants will have time to work on SEL action plan implementation and begin drafting “best guess” consultant scopes of work.</p> <p><b>Instructions:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Share a “menu” with examples of how the consultant can help/services available to advance SEL action plan strategies.</li> <li>2. Teams will have time to begin filling in “best guess” consultant scopes of work. Consultants will be available to confer with as needed.</li> <li>3. For teams who finish early, they can work on SEL action plan implementation/next steps.</li> <li>4. Note that consultant scopes of work are due no later than March 1, 2017.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> District SEL action plans (teams provide their own)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Menu of consulting supports</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Blank “best guess” scopes of work templates</li> </ul>
2:30	30 min	<p><b><u>Next Steps, Closing, and Evaluation (Megan, Kim)</u></b></p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> Bring a sense of closure to the meeting, and get feedback.</p> <p><b>Instructions:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Megan will note next steps:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Reference evaluations in the folders</li> <li>b. Homework:                 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Participation agreements due March 1, 2017.</li> <li>ii. Consultant scopes of work due March 1, 2017.</li> </ol> </li> <li>c. Reminder to connect with consultant at least once monthly.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Kim leads the closing activity, Journaling 3-2-1.</li> <li>3. Thank everyone for coming!</li> <li>4. Collect evaluations at the exit.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Box for evaluations</li> </ul>

## Partner Engagement

### Appendix K. Evaluation Advisory Group Members

**Table K1. 360°/365 EAG Meeting Participants**

Name	10/03/17	07/19/18
Itai Dinour, Einhorn Family Charitable Trust	x	
Michael Funk, California Department of Education	x	
Rebecca Goldberg, SD Bechtel, Jr. Foundation	x	x
Claudia DeMegret, Wallace Foundation		x
Tran Key, WestEd	x	x
Joel Knudson, American Institutes for Research	x	
Hanna Melnick, Learning Policy Institute	x	
Corey Newhouse, Public Profit	x	
Haviland Rummel, Susan Crown Exchange		x
Christine Olmstead, Orange County Department of Education	x	x
Karen Pittman, Forum for Youth Investment	x	
Pricilla Little, Forum for Youth Investment		x
Arun Ramanathan, Pivot Learning	x	
Sujie Shin, California Collaborative for Educational Excellence	x	x
Vivian Tseng, WT Grant	x	
Nicholas Yoder, American Institutes for Research	x	x
Megan Agee, Partnership for Children and Youth		x
Katie Brackenridge, Partnership for Children and Youth	x	x
Jennifer Peck, Partnership for Children and Youth	x	x
Fausto López, American Institutes for Research		x
Deb Moroney, American Institutes for Research	x	x
Femi Vance, American Institutes for Research	x	

## Evaluation Measures

---

### Appendix L. Observation and Interview Protocols

#### SEL PLC Participant Protocol

*Good afternoon, my name is [NAME] and I work at American Institutes for Research. We are working with The Partnership for Children and Youth to better understand the social and emotional learning professional learning community and what districts are gaining by participating.*

*I would like to talk to you today about your experience with the 360°/365 PLC which I will refer to as the PLC. As you may already know, the PLC is focused on helping schools and expanded learning programs better align their efforts to improve the social and emotional skills of students. The purpose of this interview is to for us to better understand how your district is approaching improving the alignment between these two learning environments. We also want to learn how the SEL PLC has supported your efforts.*

*Your participation in this interview is voluntary and you may choose to stop the interview at any time. I would like to record this conversation for notetaking purposes if that is okay with you.*

[START RECORDING IF CONSENT IS GIVEN BY PARTICIPANT]

#### Background Questions

*Let's start with a few questions about your role in the district and the SEL PLC.*

1. Name, position/title
2. What district do you work for?
  - a. What is your role in the district?
3. How long have you been in that position?
4. How long have you been a part of the SEL PLC?
  - a. What is your role on the district SEL PLC team?

#### SEL Alignment Strategies

*Now that I know a little bit more about what you do in the district and the SEL PLC, I would like to learn more about the district's plans to align SEL efforts between schools and expanded learning programs.*

5. What goals did the district decide to work on during the SEL PLC?
  - a. How did the district decide on those specific goals?
  - b. What strategies was the district using to promote SEL prior to joining the SEL PLC?
6. *It is likely that the district is taking multiple steps to reach its SEL goals.* What SEL alignment strategies is the district using to make progress toward its SEL goals?

7. How would you say you/your team use a continuous quality improvement process to monitor the SEL alignment strategies?
  - c. If so, can you describe the CQI process that you use?
8. *The district's work on SEL alignment in the PLC is fairly recent. What progress have you seen so far on the SEL goals?*
9. What challenges have you encountered while implementing the SEL alignment strategies?

### PLC Implementation

*I'd like to hear about your experience in the SEL PLC. To begin, I'll ask a couple of questions about the vision and purpose of the PLC.*

10. How was the vision of the PLC initiative communicated to you?
11. How is the purpose of each PLC meeting shared with you/group?

*I am also interested in hearing how PLC participants work together.*

12. *We think of strong professional relationships as having a foundation of trust and mutual respect.*  
How does the SEL PLC build professional relationships among participants?
13. What opportunities have you had to collaborate with others during the SEL PLC?
14. Have you had a chance to lead or co-lead any of the SEL PLC activities? If so, tell us about that opportunity.

***Let's talk a little bit about how the SEL PLC supports the SEL alignment work in your district.***

15. Every district is unique – in what ways does the SEL PLC address the unique needs of your district?
16. What opportunities do you have to reflect on the SEL alignment strategies that your district is using?
17. Which content from the SEL PLC have you chosen to use in your alignment strategies?
  - a. Why did you choose to use that particular content from the SEL PLC?
18. How has the SEL PLC helped you **address challenges** that you've had while implementing your SEL alignment strategies?
19. What opportunities do you have to receive feedback on your district's SEL alignment strategies from other SEL PLC participants?
20. How has your **consultant** helped the district team to implement SEL alignment strategies?

*I would like to end the interview with a few questions about feedback for the SEL PLC.*

21. How do you provide feedback to the SEL PLC facilitators about aspects of the PLC (e.g. content, structure, tools etc.)?
22. What feedback do you have for improving the SEL PLC?

### Closing Question

23. Are there any additional comments that you would like to share about the SEL PLC?

*Thank you for taking the time to talk to me today. If you think of comments that you would like to add please feel free to contact me. You can reach me at (provide phone or email address).*

## PCY Coordinator Protocol

*Good morning/afternoon, my name is [NAME] and I work at American Institutes for Research. We are working with The Partnership for Children and Youth to better understand the social and emotional learning professional learning community and what districts are gaining by participating.*

*I would like to talk to you today about your experience designing and leading the social and emotional learning PLC which I will refer to as the SEL PLC. The purpose of this interview is to for us to better understand how the SEL PLC supports districts' efforts to align school and expanded learning environments.*

*Your participation in this interview is voluntary and you may choose to stop the interview at any time. I would like to record this conversation for notetaking purposes if that is okay with you.*

[START RECORDING IF CONSENT IS GIVEN BY THE PARTICIPANT]

### Intermediary Background

*Let's start with a few questions about your role in the district and the SEL PLC.*

1. What is your position at PCY?
2. What are your responsibilities in this role?
3. What responsibilities do you have that are specifically related to the SEL PLC?

### PLC Design

*Now that I know a little bit more about what you do for the SEL PLC, I would like to learn more about how the PLC was designed by your team.*

4. Can you describe the content that you covered in the SEL PLC last year?
  - a. What content did you plan to cover this year?
  - b. How much of the planned content have you covered so far with SEL PLC participants?
  - c. *Think back to the start of the PLC until now.* What tools and resources have you provided to SEL PLC participants?
5. How do you decide which content to provide to districts?
6. What led your team to frame the SEL PLC around continuous quality improvement?
7. What are some district needs that you have had to be responsive to when designing the SEL PLC?

### PLC Implementation

*The next set of questions will help me to better understand specific opportunities that PLC participants have during the sessions.*

8. How did you communicate the vision of the SEL PLC to participants?
9. How did you share the purpose of each SEL PLC session with the group?
10. How do you decide which content to provide to districts?
11. How did you/do you structure the PLC's to encourage participants to develop trusting relationships?
12. What opportunities do you provide SEL PLC participants to collaborate with one another?
13. How does PCY promote a sense of belonging among SEL PLC participants?
14. What opportunities do you provide SEL PLC participants to lead or co-facilitate during PLC sessions?
15. What opportunities are provided to the SEL PLC participants to reflect on the SEL alignment strategies that they are using in their districts?
16. What opportunities do SEL PLC participants have to receive feedback from their peers on their SEL alignment strategies?
17. How do PLC participants provide feedback about the SEL PLC?
  - a. What feedback have you received so far?

### District Implementation

*I'd like to close the interview with a few questions about how districts are using the content that they have learned about in the SEL PLC.*

18. To what extent have you seen districts use the content that they've been exposed to in the SEL PLC?
19. What are some common challenges that districts encounter when implementing their SEL alignment strategies?
  - a. What supports have you provided districts to help them address these challenges?
20. How do you prepare districts to sustain their SEL alignment strategies beyond the life of the PLC?

### Closing Question

21. Are there any additional comments that you would like to share about the SEL PLC?

*Thank you for taking the time to talk to me today. If you think of comments that you would like to add please feel free to contact me. You can reach me at (provide phone or email address).*

## PLC Consultant Interview Protocol

*Good morning/afternoon, my name is [NAME] and I work at American Institutes for Research. We are working with The Partnership for Children and Youth to better understand the social and emotional learning professional learning community and what districts are gaining by participating.*

*I would like to talk to you today about your experience consulting for the social and emotional learning PLC which I will refer to as the SEL PLC. The purpose of this interview is to for us to better understand how the SEL PLC supports districts' efforts to align school and expanded learning environments.*

*Your participation in this interview is voluntary and you may choose to stop the interview at any time. I would like to record this conversation for notetaking purposes if that is okay with you.*

[START RECORDING IF CONSENT IS GIVEN BY THE PARTICIPANT]

### Background

*Let's start with a few questions about your background as a consultant.*

1. For which district are you a consultant?
  - a. What connections did you have with this district prior to the SEL PLC?
2. What experience do you have working with other districts as a consultant?

### Approach to Consulting

*I'd like to learn more about your approach to consulting with the district team.*

3. In general, what are your responsibilities as a consultant?
4. *PCY shared the scope of work template that is meant to guide the work of the consultants.* How did you work with your district to develop this scope of work?
5. What resources are available to help you carry out what is in the scope of work for your district?
6. What are some district needs that you've had to be responsive to as a consultant?
7. What content have you provided the district team so far?
  - a. How do you decide what content to provide to the district team?
8. How do you incorporate the continuous quality improvement process in your coaching?
9. How do PLC participants provide feedback about the support that they receive from you?
  - a. What feedback have you received so far?

### PLC Design

*Let's talk a little bit about how you encourage members of the district team to work together.*

10. How do you communicate the vision of the SEL PLC to participants?
11. In what ways do you help district teams to develop trust among the members of the group?



12. How do you encourage district team members to collaborate in and outside of the SEL PLC sessions?
13. What strategies do you use to promote a sense of belonging among members of the district team?

#### PLC Implementation

14. How do you encourage district teams to reflect on the SEL alignment strategies that they are using?
15. What opportunities do you provide for PLC participants to lead or co-facilitate? *This could be during PLC session but can also include meetings or presentations that they've planned in addition to the PLC sessions.*

#### District Implementation

*I'd like to close the interview with a few questions about how districts are using the content that they have learned about in the SEL PLC.*

16. To what extent have you seen districts use the content that they've been exposed to in the SEL PLC?
17. Which district characteristics have emerged as assets to districts as they implement their SEL alignment strategies?
18. What are some common challenges that districts encounter when implementing their SEL alignment strategies?
  - a. How do you help districts to navigate these challenges?

#### Closing Questions

19. What advice would you give to future SEL PLC facilitators?
20. Are there any additional comments that you would like to share about the SEL PLC?

## PLC Coach Focus Group Protocol

*Good morning/afternoon, my name is [NAME] and I work at American Institutes for Research. We are working with The Partnership for Children and Youth to better understand the social and emotional learning professional learning community and what districts are gaining by participating.*

*I would like to talk to you today about your experience coaching for the social and emotional learning PLC which I will refer to as the SEL PLC. The purpose of this focus group is to for us to better understand how the you support districts' efforts to align school and expanded learning environments.*

*Your participation in this focus group is voluntary and you may choose to stop participating at any time. I would like to record this conversation for notetaking purposes if that is okay with you.*

[START RECORDING IF CONSENT IS GIVEN BY ALL PARTICIPANTS]

### Background

*Let's start with a few questions about your background as a coach.*

1. For which district(s) are you a coach?
  - a. What connections did you have with this district prior to the SEL PLC?
  - b. How long have you coached these districts as part of this initiative?

### Approach to Consulting

*I'd like to learn more about your approach to consulting with the district team.*

2. How do you work with each of your district teams?
  - a. What are your responsibilities as a coach for each district?
  - b. How did you work with your district to develop this scope of work?
  - c. How do you balance the scope of work and being responsive to the district team needs?
    - i. Probe specifically about action planning.
  - d. How do you communicate with the teams?
    - i. Who are you mainly in contact with?
3. What was your role in the 2018 PLC application process?

### PLC and District Implementation

*I'd like to close our discussion by talking about how districts are using the content that they have learned about in the SEL PLC.*

4. What are some of the main content areas, tools, and/or strategies you have supported district teams in using?
  - a. How have you seen this play out?

5. How do you encourage district teams to reflect on and grow from the SEL alignment strategies that they are using?

#### Closing Questions

6. Are there any additional comments that you would like to share about the SEL PLC?

### Observation Protocol

*Please make note of any activities, strategies, or practices observed while attending the professional learning community (PLC) meetings.*

Number of Participants: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Theme	Observation
<b>Environment, Inclusive Practice, and Structure</b>	
<b>(1) Provides a clear structure, vision, values, and purpose for stakeholders</b>	
<b>(2) Provides support at all levels of the system (stakeholder engagement)</b>	
<b>(3) Atmosphere of mutual trust and respect among members</b>	

Theme	Observation
<b>(4) Encourages collaboration among stakeholders</b>	
<b>(5) Promotes inclusive membership and collective responsibility</b>	
<b>(6) Provides a clear structure, vision, values, and purpose for stakeholders</b>	
<b>(7) Other</b>	

Theme	Observation
<b>Alignment Across Sectors</b>	
<b>(1) Provides participants with specific content to implement</b>	
<b>(2) Supports participants' learning, role, and level of professionalism</b>	
<b>(3) Other</b>	
<b>Implementation</b>	
<b>(1) Opportunities for reflective inquiry on implementation</b>	

Theme	Observation
(2) Participants monitor PLCs work and provide constructive feedback	
(3) Addresses a pressing challenge or action item that promotes sustainability	
(4) Other	
Additional comments or observations:	



AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH®

Established in 1946, the American Institutes for Research (AIR) is an independent, nonpartisan, not-for-profit organization that conducts behavioral and social science research on important social issues and delivers technical assistance, both domestically and internationally, in the areas of education, health, and workforce productivity.

## MAKING RESEARCH RELEVANT

AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH  
1000 Thomas Jefferson Street NW  
Washington, DC 20007-3835 | 202.403.5000  
[www.air.org](http://www.air.org)

### LOCATIONS

**Domestic:** Washington, DC (HQ) | Monterey, Sacramento, and San Mateo, CA | Atlanta, GA | Honolulu, HI | Chicago and Naperville, IL | Indianapolis, IN | Metairie, LA | Waltham, MA | Frederick and Rockville, MD | Chapel Hill, NC | New York, NY | Columbus, OH | Cayce, SC | Austin, TX | Reston, VA

**International:** El Salvador | Ethiopia | Haiti | Honduras | Zambia