

# CLASSROOM SHAME RESILIENCE STRATEGIES

October 6, 2021

## Purpose

This training aid focuses on instructional strategies that support shame resilience in the classroom. The strategies are organized in a rubric for instructor self-assessment.

## Background

The literature on shame and shame resilience is found in many different areas of study. Certainly, psychologist and social workers have a vested interest in understanding shame and shame influencers for clients as they work towards positive outcomes in mental health. More recently, education has begun to look at shame as a barrier to learning.

Protective factors for students are seen in a variety of forms that build emotionally safe climates for teaching and learning. Higher education provides opportunities for students to engage in critical thinking and self-reflective practices while they develop essential knowledge, skills and attitudes for the workplace. These opportunities can be transformative in nature as students question and seek to understand their place, space, meaning making and knowledge production.

## How To

The Shame Resilience Rubric is developed with 5 pillars: Connection, Feedback, Design, Developing Empathy, and Psychological Safety. Each pillar in the rubric provides evidence-based instructional strategies. These strategies support a learning environment that protects against the negative influences of shame responses in the learning environment.

Instructors can use the rubric as a tool to identify shame resilient strategies and reflect on their current teaching practises.

*Grading implications and recommendations:*

- 0-24: not meeting basic standards for shame resilience; negative implications for resilience, retention and persistence; not meeting quality standards for curriculum design included in this rubric
- 25-37.5: not meeting basic standards for shame resilience; negative implications for resilience, retention and persistence; may not be meeting quality standards for curriculum design included in this rubric
- 38-49: meeting basic standards for shame resilience; positive implications for resilience, retention and persistence; may not be meeting quality standards for curriculum design included in this rubric
- 50: meeting standards for shame resilience; positive implications for resilience, retention and persistence; meeting quality standards for curriculum design included in this rubric

## Shame Resilient Classroom Rubric (Level 1)

<p><b>Outcomes</b></p>	<p><b>Excellent (10)</b> Shame resilience is forefront in planning assessments, lessons, activities and policy/ protocols, instructor presence and communication is consistent throughout the course; universal design of content and instructional practises are easily identified and follow the 5 pillars detailed in the rubric.</p>	<p><b>Good (7.5)</b> Shame resilience is forefront in planning: assessments, lessons, activities and policy/protocols; communication is consistent throughout the course; universal design of content, instructional practises, policy and protocols are easily identified and follow 4/5 pillars detailed in the rubric.</p>	<p><b>Needs Improvement (5)</b> Shame resilience is sporadic in planning assessments, lessons, activities and policy/protocols, instructor presence is minimal. Universal design content/ instructional practises/policy/protocols are identified and follow 3/5 pillars detailed in the rubric.</p>	<p><b>Unacceptable (0)</b> Shame resilience and universal design have not been addressed; instructor presence is minimal.</p>
<p><b>Connection</b></p>	<p>Course is designed to purposefully engage students in actively building the learning community through activities, assessments, content; course blueprint validates the scaffolding and efforts towards collegial connection and a student-centered learning community. Student's voices and agency are highlighted &amp; encouraged</p>	<p>Course is designed to engage students in actively building the learning community through activities, assessments, content; course blueprint shows the scaffolding and efforts towards collegial connection, student centered learning community.  Students' voices and agency are permitted</p>	<p>Course is designed with 'sage on the stage' methodology; a few activities that provide peer-to-peer interaction are included but they do not purposefully engage students in the learning community; students are regularly shut down and/or are not central to the teaching pedagogy</p>	<p>Course is designed with 'sage on the stage' methodology; no activities that provide peer-to-peer interaction; students are regularly shut down and are not central to the teaching pedagogy</p>

<p><b>Developing Empathy</b></p>	<p>Help seeking is supported (office hours, contact info; wholistic college and community services information is provided); Adult education principles &amp; practices are activated- (prior learning, experience is used to highlight identity, strengths, and form collegial bonds); Course design and teaching methodology supports peer to peer learning;</p>	<p>Help seeking is supported (office hours, contact info; wholistic college and community services information is provided); Course design and teaching methodology supports peer to peer learning</p>	<p>Help seeking is partially supported (office hours, contact info); community/campus information is not made available. Course design and teaching methodology does not support peer to peer learning and/or it is sporadic</p>	<p>Help seeking; community/campus information is not made available. Course design and teaching methodology does not support peer to peer learning</p>
<p><b>Feedback</b></p>	<p>Guidance is clear, transparent, and focused on aligning student's learning with the course objectives; identifies and avoids coded language and value-based comments; practices that assess unconscious and conscious bias are used for written and/or verbal interactions and/or materials are apparent.</p>	<p>Guidance is clear, transparent and focused on aligning student's learning with the course objectives; avoids coded language and value-based comments; practices that assess unconscious and conscious bias for written and/or verbal interactions and/or materials is not readily apparent.</p>	<p>Guidance is vague; minimal work has been done to understand or remediate value-laden feedback; coded language is avoided in verbal and written interactions; no practise to assess unconscious and conscious bias in written and verbal interactions and materials is used.</p>	<p>Guidance is not available; minimal work has been done to understand or remediate value-laden feedback; coded language is used in verbal and written interactions; unconscious and conscious bias is apparent in written and verbal interactions and materials.</p>

<b>Psychological Safety</b>	Pedagogical statements & assessments, course content is developed and vetted by colleagues for trauma informed practice; Universal design is purposefully used; students see themselves in the course design, environment and methodology; students are encouraged and engaged to be a central part of the learning community; classroom management is co-created and safety is defined; policy and expectations are clearly explained; boundaries are transparent and maintained	Pedagogical statements & assessments, course content is developed and vetted by colleagues for trauma informed practice; Universal design is purposefully used; students see themselves in the course design, environment and methodology; students are encouraged and engaged to be a central part of the learning community; classroom management is instructor centric; policy and expectations are clearly explained; boundaries are transparent and maintained	Pedagogical statements & assessments, course content is underdeveloped; trauma informed practice; Universal design is sporadic or non-existent; students cannot see themselves in the course design, environment and methodology; classroom management is instructor centric; policy and expectations are not clearly explained or are non-existent; boundaries are not transparent and/ or may be co-dependent /intrusive	Pedagogical statements & assessments, course content does not consider shame, trauma or EDI; students cannot see themselves in the course design, environment and methodology; classroom management is instructor centric; policy and expectations are not clearly explained or are non-existent; boundaries are not transparent and/or may be co-dependent /intrusive
<b>Design</b>	Assignments that are scaffolded; provide clear, transparent rubrics/marketing strategies; due dates are clear; provide a flexible marking policy (i.e.-late day policy; free pass card. Etc.).	Assignments that are scaffolded; provide clear, transparent rubrics/marketing strategies; due dates are clear; marking policy does not provide flexibility (i.e.-late day policy; free pass card. Etc.).	Assignments are not scaffolded; rubrics/marketing strategies are sporadic or non-existent; due dates are not clear; marking policy does not provide flexibility (i.e.-late day policy; free pass card. Etc.).	Assignments are not scaffolded; rubrics/marketing strategies are non-existent; due dates available; marking policy does not provide flexibility (i.e.-late day policy; free pass card. Etc.).

## References

- Brackett, M. A., Bailey, C. S., Hoffmann, J. D., & Simmons, D. N. (2019). RULER: A Theory-Driven, Systemic Approach to Social, Emotional, and Academic Learning. *Educational Psychologist*, 54(3), 144–161. <https://proxy.assiniboine.net:4132/10.1080/00461520.2019.1614447>
- Brown, B. (2018). *Dare to Lead: Brave Work. Tough Conversations. Whole Hearts*. Random House.
- Brown, B. (2008). *I Thought it was Just Me (but it Isn't): Making the Journey from "what Will People Think?" to "I Am Enough"*. Avery.
- Brown, B. (2007). Shame resilience theory. *Contemporary human behavior theory: A critical perspective for social work*.
- Carello, Janice and Butler, Lisa (2015) Practicing What We Teach: Trauma-Informed Educational Practice, *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, 35:3, 262-278, DOI: 10.1080/08841233.2015.1030059
- Cotler, J. L., DiTursi, D., Goldstein, I., Yates, J., & Del Belso, D. (2017). A mindful approach to teaching. *Information Systems Education Journal*, 15(1), 12.
- Harrison, E. G. (2006). Working with Faculty toward Universally Designed Instruction: The Process of Dynamic Course Design. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, 19(2), 152-162.
- Johnson, J., Bauman, C., & Pociask, S. (2019). Teaching the whole student: Integrating wellness education into the academic classroom. *Student Success*, 10(3), 92.
- Kasabova, A. (2017). From shame to shaming: Towards an analysis of shame narratives. *Open Cultural Studies*, 1(1), 99-112.
- Rata, E., McPhail, G., & Barrett, B. (2019). An engaging pedagogy for an academic curriculum. *Curriculum Journal*, 30(2), 162–180.  
<https://proxy.assiniboine.net:4132/10.1080/09585176.2018.1557535>
- Vito-Thomas, D., Allyn, P., Wagner, L. B., Hodges, T., & Streitmatter, S. S. (2018). The Evidence-Based Practice Fulcrum: Balancing Leadership and Emotional Intelligence in Nursing and Interprofessional Education.
- Lee, A., Williams, R., & Kilaberia, R. (2012). Engaging Diversity in First-Year College Classrooms. *Innovative Higher Education*, 37(3), 199–213.  
<https://proxy.assiniboine.net:4132/10.1007/s10755-011-9195-7>