Report 4

Evaluation of pilot of Creating Safe Learning

Judith Emanuel
June 2005

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements

Evaluation demands time, trust and openness; all of which are hard to give in the pressured environments of schools and organisations trying to support them. However, everyone who was asked to participate in this evaluation gave of these things generously.

I am very grateful, particularly to:

- Everyone who helped from the pilot schools

- Members of the network, especially those who collected the data from the schools and in particular to Caroline Jackson whose ongoing assistance enabled the evaluation to take place.

- Manchester Children's Fund for funding the evaluation

I admired how everyone handled the challenges that the evaluation has thrown up. The report is based on the experience, ideas and suggestions offered by informants. The findings are my responsibility. I hope they will be helpful and constructive in the vital task of making school communities safe.

Judith Emanuel is an independent consultant she can be contacted at judith.emanuel@tiscali.co.uk

For further information about Manchester Anti-Bullying Policy And Practice Network please contact:
Caroline Jackson: Manchester Public Health Development Service
tel: 882 2312 – e-mail: caroline.jackson@northpct.manchester.nwest.nhs.uk, or
Jill Tordoff: Manchester Education Partnership
tel: 610 3370 – e-mail: j.tordoff@.manchester.gov.uk

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2004, the Manchester Anti-Bullying Policy and Practice Network, a multi-agency partnership piloted Creating Safe Learning (CSL). CSL is an initiative to support schools to involve staff, parents and carers and pupils in reviewing and developing anti-bullying policy and practice. It involves schools in a process of self evaluation and review and development of policy and practice, using guidelines produced by the network.

The pilot took place in 4 schools in Manchester. An external evaluator working alongside Network partners, evaluated the first 11 months of the pilot.

Section 1 gives brief information about CSL including the guidelines and the evaluation.

Section 2 consists of a case study of what happened at each school and key recommendations.

Appendix 3 provides more detailed recommendations for developing CSL, based on the suggestions of people involved in the pilots.

The key conclusions and recommendations include:

1. Informants from all schools valued CSL. Those asked, said they would recommend it to staff from other schools.

2. Having an outsider with dedicated time to support CSL was crucial in all the schools. The end of the Behaviour and Education Support Team (BEST) is likely to have an impact on sustainability, this should be acknowledged and will need to be addressed.

3. Schools initial interest in CSL was related to how they thought it may address needs they had identified and pressures from the national agenda. The progress and impact of CSL were associated with the priority schools gave to the process.

4. Good practice developed through CSL and alongside, other related initiatives. The potential of sharing across schools could usefully be explored.

5. The guidelines could include detailed advice about how CSL links with other related initiatives (eg Stay Safe, one of the 5 outcome strands of Every Child Matters.) and how they can be incorporated into school action and development plans to make links with other initiative more obvious and easy to achieve.

6. Schools valued the ways CSL involved staff through training and pupils. Some would value the development of a component of CSL to involve parents.

7. Working Parties may need to operate differently if they are to be more inclusive of pupils, parents and other people in wider school communities. A number of suggestions to increase ownership are made which are discussed in detail in Appendix 3.

8. Questionnaires and worksheets were considered an appropriate audit tool but the part of the pilot with which schools were least satisfied. It is recommended that they are rewritten and re-piloted with a clearer more limited focus. Detailed recommendations are given in Appendix 3.

9. The issue of bullying between adults and of children by adults emerged as a concern, which there had not been shared awareness of previously.

10. CSL needs to be developed in line with the recommendations of the report, alongside those detailed in Appendix 3, before being offered to other schools.

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Creating Safe Learning (CSL)

In 1999 the Manchester Multi-Agency Anti-Bullying Policy and Practice Network (referred to as the Network) was established. It involves partners from a range of statutory, voluntary and not for profit independent organisations to provide support for schools within Manchester Local Education Authority (LEA).

Guidelines (Jackson & Tordoff, 2002) for developing anti-bullying policy and practice were produced and launched by the Network as part of the LEA's anti-bullying strategy. The guidelines promote whole school and multi-agency approaches with particular emphasis on involvement of all stakeholders especially all school staff, young people and their parents and carers. The guidelines are intended to complement other national and local initiatives and once piloted the intention was that Manchester Education Partnership (MEP) and Manchester Healthy School Team members have a key role in implementation.

In 2004, Creating Safe Learning was designed to support use of the guidelines and piloted in 4 schools in Manchester; one High School and 3 primary schools. For reasons of confidentiality, the schools are referred to without disclosing details of their status.

The network encouraged schools to establish a working party to implement the pilot. Schools were advised to involve appropriate school staff and representatives from the school council and agencies that might have a role in anti-bullying policy and practice in the school. The working parties were to include representatives from the network.

The guidelines encourage each school working party to undertake a series of activities to develop anti-bullying policy and practice. This includes:

- worksheets and questionnaires, which have been developed to involve teachers, parents/carers and pupils to review needs
- the development of a framework to review current work, identify strengths and development needs for anti-bullying work.
- policy development or review
- policy implementation in relation to preventing and reducing bullying and dealing with incidents.

Staff training and drama workshops for pupils were also part of the pilot. It was anticipated that the CSL process would take 6 months.

1.2   The evaluation

The evaluator worked with the network in 2004 to evaluate different aspects of their work as well as doing some research (Emanuel J, 2004a, 2004b, 2005). A series of discussions were held with the co-chairs of the network and the funder and as part of Network meetings in order to identify the purpose of the evaluation, evaluation questions and the role of the evaluator. It was agreed that the evaluation should be useful both within the network, to guide the work, and externally. As well as carrying out evaluation of the network, the evaluator's role included:
-   to involve network members in identifying evaluation needs
-   to promote an evaluative culture through development of evaluation skills and processes amongst network members and within the work of the network as a whole
-   to disseminate findings in formats and forums whereby they could be utilised as soon as possible in the development of the work.

Appendix 1 gives details of how roles and responsibilities for evaluation of CSL were divided between the evaluator and network members.

The report focuses on progress made in the first 11 months of the pilot, up until the end of 2004.

It was initially anticipated that the evaluation would consider outcomes of CSL in the pilot schools as well as process. However implementing CSL has taken much longer than expected. The time frame of the formal evaluation was extended but pressure to roll out CSL made it imperative to complete the report after 12 months. Follow up questionnaires have been designed and can be conducted and analysed by network members.

The main body of the report consists of case studies, which are brief accounts of what happened at each school. General conclusions and recommendations are drawn from them. More specific conclusions and recommendations based on ideas and suggestions of people involved in the pilots are detailed in Appendix 3.

Results

2.   Case studies of each school

2.1   School 1

Background

In January 2004 a member of the Diversity and Inclusion (DI) team, who was based at the school at the time attended training about CSL and as a result expressed an interest in the school becoming a pilot school.

The school was already involved with the Behaviour and Education Support Team (BEST) and Healthy Schools programme. For the latter, a target was to develop an anti-bullying policy and to put in place two new strategies for addressing bullying.

The school had been formed from amalgamation of 2 schools, 6 years previously. A policy had been developed for one previous school only, which had not been reviewed since the new school had come into operation.

OFSTED have reported that pupils are well behaved at School 1 and that parents feel able to come into school and discuss issues of concern. 90% of children come from families of South Asian descent and the head teacher feels that there are features of the home cultures which encourage positive behaviour. A number of children that come to the school from overseas are not English speakers. An informant pointed out that this can raise particular issues; in the absence of a shared language, children will push and shove, as they do not have other means of communicating.

How CSL developed

The teacher who had been on the CSL training course (and was also the Healthy School Co-ordinator) became the school co-ordinator for CSL. Although the school had said that they wanted to develop policy, subsequent events indicated that it was not an immediate priority at the time. By the end of 2004 pupil and staff questionnaires had been completed (see Appendix 4 for details) but not analysed.

22 teachers did the staff training in May. Feedback suggested more focus on solutions and strategies would have been appreciated. Anti-bullying drama workshops for the children were held in June 2004 and staff evaluation was overall good. A buddying scheme was also developed.

The co-ordinator left the school in July 2004 and a new co-ordinator was identified in September 2004. The interest in buddying was maintained by the new co-ordinator.

Since September, the school has also had an enrichment co-ordinator who has been able to develop work to improve the environment and activities for lunchtime. The buddying scheme has continued, links have been made between bullying issues and the PHSE curriculum, assemblies have promoted positive behaviour and a disciplinary measure has been instituted, a type of lunchtime detention for pupils whose behaviour is unacceptable which focuses on writing letters of apology. Parents are informed if an incident is considered serious enough to require this action.

Since the end of 2004, there has been 'readiness' to focus on policy development. The following factors may be relevant. Recognition that the school started from a position of having relatively good behaviour and that parents find the school accessible when there are problems. The school has put in place initiatives to further prevent bullying. The Head appreciates help with behaviour management issues and has found BEST to be helpful in relation to policy development. Help from BEST is now time limited, as the team will be disbanded at the end of the Summer Term. The purpose of the policy is:

> *'to develop consistent approaches by all staff to address incidents should preventive initiatives fail.'* (Head Teacher)

Since the end of 2004, three working party meetings have taken place where members of the group have shared out tasks. Parents and lunchtime organisers have completed questionnaires and pupil questionnaires have been analysed. The Head and Governors will complete the CSL self-evaluation framework by March 2005. An action plan has been devised, and plans to feedback the questionnaire results are in place.

The head has advised that the SENCO, PHSE Co-ordinator, Enrichment Co-ordinator (who is not currently involved) and senior lunchtime organiser need to work together with the BEST team to draft the policy and develop practice. The staff, governors and lunchtime organisers will become involved through consultation.

Both network representatives and people within the school struggled in the first 10 months with maintaining momentum for CSL. Since November 2004 factors including staff changes and knowledge that the BEST team would be finishing have made CSL a greater priority in the school and progress has been made.

Feedback about CSL

Overall interviewees appreciated the support and have been able to make suggestions about how to improve CSL in the light of their school's experience. These are included in Appendix 3.

2.2 School 2

Background

School 2 did not have an anti-bullying policy prior to involvement in CSL. They got involved in CSL after the Head was asked by a key member of the network if s/he would like the school to help with the pilot. The school was already involved with Healthy Schools and had experience of finding out parents perceptions on an issue through this work. They were interested in developing awareness of how staff, parents and children understood bullying, what can be done, individual roles and responsibilities and to develop their policy and practice.

The school has a highly transient population and the head felt that policy and practice:

> '*need to be clear to newcomers and the children need to be accepting*
> *to newcomers when classes have already gelled and newcomers*
> *may be from different races and speak different languages.*'

A member of the DI Team and of the Network was based at the school during the pilot to look at behaviour needs. The headteacher was happy for her time to be spent on CSL work.

How CSL developed

A working party was established. The group was led to a large extent by Network representatives and followed the guidelines. School staff were not familiar with the guidelines pack.

Details of completion of questionnaires can be found in Appendix 4. The main issues picked up by the working party from the questionnaires were:

- Parents and staff were not always clear about the procedures
- Staff bullying staff seen as an issue
- Main problem areas, lunch & break, namecalling, pushing, kicking

The questionnaire was seen to give people the opportunity to air their views but not discuss them. One of the worksheets has been used successfully to resolve incidents in a class and the school plan to use it with another class. They feel it is a good diagnostic tool and helped improve the understanding of staff of friendship networks and children who were making other children unhappy. Informing children of the unhappiness they are causing others has led to resolution of the problem. It has also been easier to talk to parents having a clearer picture of what is happening.

The head completed the self-evaluation framework and the results of the self-review had only been fedback to pupils.

Involvement

Drama has complemented other approaches. Children were seen to have had a positive level of involvement:

> *" The drama 'hooked' the children and more targeted work
> in the days and weeks following would have perhaps had
> more impact."* (network representative)

One spin off from the drama has been to use the drama group to also run their programme about asylum seekers.

One session of staff training took place in September 2004, which was well received.

There were differing views among informants about the involvement and ownership of staff and parents. One view was that both children and staff had had the opportunity to develop their awareness and skills through training and drama workshops but that parents also need opportunities to meet and develop their awareness and skills. Another view was that parents had been reached but staff had not been sufficiently involved.

Developments from CSL

Overall involvement in CSL has been seen to be positive. By the end of January 2005, the following action was planned:

- Playground Pals training in response to some of the issues raised by young people in the questionnaire. This will be joint training for lunchtime organisers and pupils; the first time pupils will be jointly trained with adults in school. The EWO involved is keen to involve children who have been missing school because they are frightened of break times and the DI worker to involve children excluded because of bad behaviour.
- The DI team worker also has a performance management target to reduce name-calling as a result of the questionnaire information. She has been doing circle time and work on self-esteem and plans to use the follow up questionnaire to monitor this. This is an example of how CSL has fed into management and monitoring systems.
- The head and PHSE Co-ordinator would write an anti-bullying policy.
- In the summer term another audit will be done in preparation for the next 3 year school strategic plan. CSL will be part of this.

Feedback about CSL

Guidance on the links between CSL and other initiatives was thought to be useful. One suggestion was that establishing more focus and time scales may help to maintain momentum in CSL.

2.3   School 3

Background

School 3 had an anti-bullying policy prior to involvement in CSL and had anti-bullying as a target for their Healthy Schools work. The school got involved as a pilot through a BEST worker who also attended network meetings.

How CSL developed

A working party was established amalgamating the BEST and healthy schools work to implement CSL. The key drivers of CSL were the network representatives, the head teacher and a teaching assistant / governor. They were initially the main working party participants. Towards the end of the pilot a wider group of staff and pupils have got involved in the working party. This has been:

> *'Good for Foundation people to see children who are thoughtful, able to express themselves and identify strategies to deal with situations; it has increased respect for children among teachers.'*
>
> (Head teacher)

The Headteacher sees management of bullying as a:

> *'thread that runs through everything'.*

S/he thinks good management is essential for:
> *'providing a good environment for teaching and reducing stress of teachers and other children.'*

To be able to deal with bullying related situations themselves both inside and outside school, the focus is on empowering the whole community. This includes all children, including those who find managing their own behaviour difficult, staff and parents and carers.

Details of completion of questionnaires can be found in Appendix 4. The main issues picked up from the questionnaires by the working party included:

- Differences in perception of extent of bullying: 7 out of 10 staff thought that there was little bullying in school whereas 7 out of 10 of pupils thought there was a lot of bullying in school
- 9 out of ten children said they were happy coming to school although 7 out of ten reported that they had been bullied and one-third of them did not tell anyone. Nearly half of younger pupils said they were sad in the playground and lunchtime was identified as the most difficult time of day.

Other issues included, staff bullying staff and staff bullying pupils and uncertainty about procedures amongst parents and staff. Definitions were generally shared except around falling out with friends.

Approximately 30 people attended staff training most of who were teachers. They were used to identify priorities which concerned the ethos of the school and prevention. Questionnaire results, were used and thought to be:

> *'a good way to enable staff to see how other people see things,*
> *to be reflective and develop more consistent practice'* (Head Teacher)

Developments from CSL

Since being involved in the pilot, the following has taken place or is in progress in the school to promote anti-bullying:

General awareness raising and involvement

Everyone has been involved:
- Through assemblies to raise the issues to a wide forum
- Children have produced posters
- Production of 2 leaflets, one for parents and one for children (based on ones produced by Bully Free Zone) about what to do if bullying is taking place.
- A campaign to encourage children to tell someone if they are being bullied
- Learning mentors have established a worry box which has given some children confidence to disclose.

Prevention

- The playground and playtime are being developed to increase the level of structured and focussed activities in order to prevent incidents from arising
- Use of a kindness tree

Training

- Training for lunch time organisers
- All teaching staff have been trained to facilitate circle time

Dealing with incidents

- Greater consistency about how incidents are dealt with
- The school has improved strategies for supporting children who need help to manage anger including group and 1:1 work to promote emotional literacy

- The Special Education Needs Coordinator, learning mentors and learning support assistants have attended a course to develop their skills to support children needing help to manage their behaviour.
- A room has been developed as a calm, restful place
- Involvement of families through family intervention by BEST

The school felt as a result of CSL:

- Children are putting up with less pushing, shoving and namecalling
- The head teacher and lunchtime organisers reported that lunchtimes have become much easier for everyone, in the period that CSL has been piloted and there have been fewer incidents.
- CSL has been successful in involving different parts of the school community to work together to address bullying issues. A good example is the improved relationship between lunchtime organisers and children:

'The lunchtime organisers listen more to children's views about how to solve problems. They shout less and command more respect from the children. Children feel there is greater fairness.' (Head teacher)

The headteacher felt that the hardest part of CSL had been involving parents. S/he was keen that workshops for parents were also available.

Future action

- The head is drafting a new policy for consultation. It is anticipated that it should be ready for adoption by the Governors in April.
- Anti-bullying is not a separate project; further work needs to link it with aspects of the curriculum, whole school issues and other initiatives eg Every Child Matters. This will be addressed in the school improvement plan.
- Use of a proforma to report any serious incidents
- Use proforma to measure number of incidents; they feel there has been a reduction and want to show it
- The experience of involving young people in CSL has established that there is now 'readiness' to set up a School Council

Feedback about CSL

The headteacher felt that 12 months was the right length of time for CSL, that the school should have access to additional support when needed and a review every couple of months.

2.4   School 4

Background

Prior to involvement in CSL the school had a behaviour statement to address bullying which outlined aims and objectives. A BEST worker and school counsellor initiated an anti-bullying working party before the BEST worker encouraged the school to become part of the CSL pilot.

The school were also developing a school council at the time and saw involvement in the pilot as a focus for involving the school council in policy development.

How CSL developed

Details of completion of questionnaires can be found in Appendix 4.   The main areas identified by the school council and working party for change by involvement in CSL were:
- amount of bullying going on in school
- ease of talking to a member of staff
- increase staffing levels in areas identified where bullying takes place

There were a number of learning points identified in the evaluation process by people in the school:

A key teacher felt that the audit has created a good climate for a policy. It has shown that parents, staff and children all thought that bullying was a problem in school especially in unsupervised areas. The school has also recognised that many pupils find it hard to disclose and vulnerable students go to the Learning Support Unit and BEST office, indicating there is currently a need for a place of refuge in school.

Pupils were involved at every stage; namely, in the working party, design, completion and analysis of questionnaires, feedback of questionnaire results and there are plans to involve them in identifying strategies to address bullying in school for the policy. Finding time for pupils to disseminate results proved difficult at times.   Pupils opted to give results to year groups that were younger than them.   Parents received a letter from the school council.

The working party existed before the school became part of the pilot. Becoming part of the pilot made people on the working party aware of significant issues but had reduced ownership of the initiative from within the school (see Appendix 3 for detailed recommendations).

CSL has had to work against a complex mix of competing agendas, which has been an obstacle to progress at times. For example, due to pressure on inset time, staff training has not yet taken place.

Developments from CSL

The following had taken place or was planned to promote anti-bullying:

- Form tutors now have anti-bullying recording forms, which are there to actively encourage pupils to report bullying.

- Questionnaire results were used to identify when and where bullying took place; largely in corridors and playgrounds, staffing has been increased in these areas at communal times. A confidential talk box has been established at the school to enable pupils to report bullying.

- The drama workshops were considered *'excellent'* and there is interest in following them up with a second play about bullying. Two Year 9 peer mentors were involved in the workshops which has helped them develop their pro-active peer role in school. One is affiliated to a Year 7 class and comes to see them regularly.

- The school feel that their anti-bullying strategy is in early stages of development. A policy has been drafted, students have not had an active involvement to date but the intention is to make it:

  'an active, living policy which will be reviewed annually.'

  Staff intend to work very closely with young people to identify solutions and would welcome support with this. They aim to respond to the need of youngsters who come from diverse backgrounds.

Feedback about CSL

Suggestions for improvement to the guidelines were:
- improved questionnaires
- information showing how anti-bullying links to other initiatives eg Every Child Matters, Healthy Schools, Key Stage strategies. The school is aiming to be a full service extended school.
- In order to maintain ongoing reflection and evaluation, it was suggested that meetings could start by considering what was working well and why.
- There should be greater opportunities to build on existing work and for schools to influence how CSL is developed in the individual school context

2.5   General conclusions:

Specific conclusions and recommendations can be found in Appendix 3

1. Informants from all schools valued CSL. Those asked, said they would recommend it to staff from other schools.

2. Having an outsider with dedicated time to support CSL was crucial in all the schools (eg Diversity and Inclusion, Healthy Schools and BEST). BEST has had a crucial role in the pilot in 3 out of the 4 schools. The BEST Team will not be continued after Summer 2005.

3. Initial interest in CSL was general, in two schools and more specific in 2. In School 1 interest was in anti-bullying policy development, and in School 4, pupil involvement with the newly evolving school council. Interest will also change according to the priority given to anti-bullying within national targets for schools.

4. The progress and impact of CSL were associated with the priority schools gave to the process.

5. Questionnaires and worksheets were considered an appropriate audit tool by the schools, which had a value in raising awareness of issues and shared concern of different groups in school communities about bullying issues. In a number of schools, the issue of bullying between adults and of children by adults emerged as a concern, which there had not been shared awareness of previously. The questionnaires were also the part of the guidelines which people involved with the pilot were least satisfied with because both of problems with the content and difficulties using them.

6. Schools valued the ways CSL involved stakeholders in discussion eg staff through training and pupils through drama and found parental involvement hardest to achieve. Most of the working parties did not involve parents and pupils and in the one school where this had been achieved before CSL got involved wider involvement was not maintained.

7. While links with involvement in Healthy Schools and BEST work was apparent, there was little evidence that CSL work had been integrated into school plans or linked formally with other initiatives (eg Manchester Inclusion Standard, curriculum strategies etc). This was not surprising given that policy development was incomplete when this report was written; some informants plan to integrate CSL into school plans in the next few months.

8. Good practice developed through CSL and alongside related to other initiatives.

2.6   General recommendations:

1.   CSL should be continued in line with the conclusions and recommendations that were identified through the evaluation

2.   The end of the BEST team is likely to have an impact on sustainability, this should be acknowledged and will need to be addressed in line with findings of Report 2 (Emanuel 2004b).

3.   It may be valuable to develop criteria to check out that schools can give sufficient priority to the demands of the process at the time of proposed involvement.   Suggestions for how to address this and maintain momentum are covered in Appendix 3.

4.   Questionnaires and worksheets could be rewritten and re-piloted with a clearer and more limited focus. Detailed recommendations are given in Appendix 3.

5.   A component of CSL for parents would be valued by some schools

6.   Working Parties may need to operate differently if they are to be more inclusive. A number of suggestions to increase ownership are made which are discussed in detail in Appendix 3.

7.   The guidelines could include detailed advice about how CSL links with other related initiatives eg Stay Safe, one of the 5 outcome strands of Every Child Matters) and how it can be incorporated into school action and development plans.

8.   The potential of sharing across schools could usefully be explored eg network representatives encouraging contact between teachers who may be able to help each other.

9.   CSL needs to be developed in line with the specific recommendations outlined in Appendix 3 before being offered to other schools.

References

Department for Education and Skills: Every Child Matters Outcomes Framework, Dec 2004 accessed from http://www.everychildmatters.gov.uk/_content/documents/Outcomes%20Framework.pdf on 31st January 2005

Department of Health (2004) Choosing Health: Making Healthy Choices Easier

Emanuel J (2004a) Evaluation Of Manchester Anti-Bullying Policy And Practice Network Report 1 : Findings From A Survey Of Network Partners. Commissioned by Manchester Anti-Bullying Policy And Practice Network and funded by Manchester Children's Fund

Emanuel J (2004b) Evaluation of Manchester Anti-Bullying Policy And Practice Network Report 2 : Understanding, influencing and supporting the Network: Views and roles of 'key people' identified to support implementation in schools. Commissioned by Manchester Anti-Bullying Policy And Practice Network and funded by Manchester Children's Fund

Emanuel J 2005 Draft Report 3 : Feeling safe : An exploratory study exploring views of young people in East Manchester. Commissioned by Manchester Anti-Bullying Policy And Practice Network and funded by Manchester Children's Fund

Jackson & Tordoff, 2002, Guidelines for Developing Anti-Bullying Policy and Practice. Manchester Multi-Agency Anti-bullying Policy and Practice Network, Manchester City Council and Manchester North, Central and South Primary Care Trusts.

APPENDIX 1

The evaluation process – roles and responsibilities

- Development of MABPPN self evaluation framework agreed by MABPPN (see Appendix 2)
- Network representatives in the schools were responsible for data collection using a checklist
- The evaluator developed the checklist and took on a support role including meetings to discuss progress.
- The evaluator took on responsibility for leading analysis of the data and writing up the report and to promote independence of the evaluation, undertook interviews with key players in the schools.

Appendix 2 : Creating Safe Learning Self-Evaluation Framework

Question	Step	Outcome	How will you know if you have achieved this? (Possible Indicators)	By whom?
1. Did schools review their policies and how? - process of involvement - ownership	Establish an anti-bullying working group	Reps from a cross-section of school community with an emphasis on children's and other young peoples participation to co-ordinate the development	Lists of representatives Examination of minutes Observation Policy document	Network reps with support from schools and evaluator
	School self-review	To establish whole school baseline data (to identify strengths and areas for further development and increase commitment from the whole school community)	Questionnaires – percentage given out and completed by children and young people, all staff, parents/carers Self evaluation frameworks completed by Governors & Senior staff	Schools Network reps with support from evaluator
	Feedback from school self review	Children and young people involved in dissemination of information via classes, form groups, assemblies, newsletters, school councils	newsletters, school council minutes lesson plans other??	Network reps with support from schools and evaluator
2. How many staff were involved in the review of anti-bullying policy and practice? Did it impact on their confidence?	Staff training	Raising of awareness of <u>all</u> staff on the complexity and diversity of bullying and use of whole school procedures.	Attendance lists List of all staff Staff feel more confident (questionnaire)	Network reps with support from schools and evaluator
3. How were young people involved in the process?	Pupil participation to shape future anti-bullying policy and practice	Pupils were involved in every step of the process and feel that they have influenced policy and practice	Integral to question 1,4	

4. Has Creating Safe Learning made people feel safer in school?	Implementation	.eg Pupils feel school is safer environment Parents/carers feel school is safer environment for pupils Staff feel school is safer environment for themselves Pupils think it is easier to talk to a member of staff if they fell they are being bullied	12 months after initial needs assessment there should be improvement in responses from questionnaire questions relating to these issues. Focus group work should be done alongside to explore what the changes mean.	Schools Network reps with support from evaluator
5. In what ways does CSL written information achieve objectives for it set by the network?	Pilot guidelines	New edition of guidelines, taking on board learning from the pilot.	Information obtained on tool to be developed with details of: Ease of use of guidelines as a whole Especially questionnaires (feedback on what is understood by questions, ease of truthfulness in answering, ease of collating results, analysis, policy and practice development.)	Anti-bullying school group co-ordinators/ Network reps/ evaluator
6. How well does CSL complement other initiatives concerning safety at school?	Liaison with developers/ implementers of other initiatives eg Healthy Schools, Inclusion standard, KS3, BIP including BEST, Primary National Strategy, Every Child Matters, Extended Schools	CSL complements other initiatives concerning safety at school	Feedback from SMT, D& I Team Integrated action plans which refer to other areas or strands Education Development Plans School Development Plan	Network reps with support from schools, D&I reps and evaluator

From Manchester Multi-Agency Anti-Bullying Policy and Practice Network self evaluation framework

Appendix 3   Making CSL even better!

Appendix 3 draws together suggestions from interviewees and other lessons from the pilots, which have been developed as recommendations of how the CSL guidelines could be further developed.

A3.1 Working together

The case studies illustrate that working party meetings helped to *'move things on'* and were often steered strongly by network representatives, which sometimes had a negative impact on school ownership.

Only one school working party had involved pupils during the evaluation period and involvement of school staff, parents and local agencies eg school nurses and the police in all schools was limited.

A number of suggestions were made by informants about how to create greater school ownership and involvement from initial stages onwards. Which have been developed into the following recommendations.

Recommendations

Initial stages

The guidelines should include an initial exercise, involving school self evaluation, for negotiation for involvement in CSL which addresses the following:

- The senior leadership team commits to participation in CSL
- Schools identify what they want to achieve by being involved with CSL and criteria that will show what they can use to measure what they achieve.
- Network representatives should initially:
  - build a relationship with key people in the school
  - develop an understanding of what is already available in school on which CSL can build including methods; approaches and resources eg circle time, quiet room etc. This may be more cost effective than introducing new ideas.
- The school selects activities from the guidelines, which will help them to achieve what they want. Activities that will ensure CSL begins and continues to maintain a high profile in the school are recommended; these are likely to involve obvious benefits from the programme as early as possible eg effective strategies to prevent and address bullying.
- Ensure adequate resources are available for CSL eg DI and/or Healthy School involvement, including for questionnaire collation and analysis.
- A time frame is agreed.

- Identified benefits for young people early in the CSL process. This will also maintain a high profile of CSL
- CSL process models what it is trying to achieve eg using participative methods and promoting reflective practice in working party and parents meetings
- More facilitative and supportive role for Network representatives
  School ownership of the vision and time frame should make activity more focussed and it easier for network representatives to take a more facilitative and supportive role.

A3.2 Worksheets and questionnaires

Questionnaires and worksheets were considered an appropriate audit tool by the schools, which had a value in raising awareness of issues and shared concern of different groups in school communities about bullying issues. They were also the part of the guidelines which people involved with the pilot were least satisfied with because both of problems with the content and difficulties using them.

More detailed analysis of the use of the worksheets and questionnaires is available on request. They should be revised and re-piloted with the following in mind:

1. Worksheets and questionnaires should have a limited, specific and clear purpose. Those suggested by informants from schools were:
   - o Clarify what bullying is
   - o Raise awareness
   - o Give CSL a profile in school

The questions should be carefully framed and focus more on workable and sustainable solutions.
2. They should be easy to use and feedback by members of the school community. They should be:
   a) age appropriate
   b) inclusive in design, so that parents, carers and pupils with limited English and/or literacy can participate
   c) limited in size to 2 sides of A4, pt 14 print.
3. Some ethical and confidentiality issues need to be reviewed eg:
   a) No tool should expect young people to disclose information in a format that may make them feel unsafe; obtaining personal information should be avoided. (The evaluation and research included consultation with young people who felt that people of their age would not always answer personal questions truthfully.)
   b) Anyone administering questionnaires needs to be trained to obtain informed consent and in issues of confidentiality

including pupils. (Pupils were involved in administering questionnaires to parents)

4. Easy to collate and analyse
   a) open questions were often not analysed or used; all questions should be closed (answered with a a tickbox or yes/no)
   b) Resources and facilities (eg software and personpower) should be available to primary schools to ensure analysis can be done rapidly and fed back to schools

5. Extreme care should be taken if the questionnaires are to be used for outcome information.

- Specialist advice should be sought to ensure that they would produce the required information.
- Ensure that the questionnaire does not try to do too many things and do none of them well. Eg a longer questionnaire may produce a poorer response rate and thereby reduce ownership

A3.3 Staff involvement

- The main component of CSL directed at staff was training. This took place in the 3 of the schools; the fourth was unable to find space in the Inset programme. The staff training was valued.
- There was limited involvement of teaching assistants and lunchtime organisers in training.
- Some informants felt that staff should be more centrally involved in CSL and the profile of CSL with staff should be higher. Guidelines will not be used by many staff and producing a more accessible leaflet about CSL to complement guidelines should be considered.

Appendix 4 : Table : Completion of worksheets and questionnaires in each school

	Primary 1	Primary 2	Primary 3	High School
Pupils	1 class in each year completed in Summer 2004. 1 class set lost Analysed Jan 2005	All completed. Have also used worksheets to address incidents with KS2 classes	1 class in Year 2-5 completed. Worksheets completed in groups in KS1	One-third The school council and the Working Party made some changes
Staff	26 (12 with one page missing) completed, May 2004 Analysed by network rep but insufficient time to use in staff training Lunchtime organisers completed, Jan 2005	20(39)	48(70)	41(160)
Parents/ Carers	Simplified version developed & administered by children in playground (Jan 2005) to overcome lack of access to interpreters	69	15/30 Children administered more in the playground, under adult supn. to increase nos. (details and results not included here)	100
Administ-ration	Majority questionnaires analysed by BEST member(Jan 2005)	Staff circulated questionnaires. Teachers & teaching assistants helped pupils complete. DI Team member & Healthy School Link worker collated. All data used.	All analysed, apart from comments on pupils', by network rep.	The BEST worker - co-ordinated & carried out distribution - co-ordinated analysis of the adult data A statistics teachers analysed the pupil data with pupils.

Where details of numbers of questionnaires circulated are available, the figure is in brackets.
The majority of staff who completed questionnaires were teachers