

Qualitative Evaluation of SUMO and PENN interventions.



*“For me it’s like when
being with new
people, making
conversation and
making new friends.
I’m more confident.
It’s like there was
a big wall there
but now it’s gone”*

(Student after experiencing the
Penn Resilience Programme.)

HeadStart Qualitative Evaluation of SUMO and PENN interventions.

“For me it’s like when being with new people, making conversation and making new friends. I’m more confident. It’s like there was a big wall there but now it’s gone.”
(Student after experiencing the Penn Resilience Programme.)

This report covers a qualitative evaluation of two school based interventions namely the Penn Resilience Programme conducted in Secondary Schools and The SUMO (Stop Understand, Move on) Programme in Primary Schools. It is set within the context of the National evaluation and the wider Wolverhampton Headstart Programme.

Introduction.

This small scale evaluation sits within existing larger scale frameworks and validated tools that are already ‘live’ within the system, (Hadfield 2008). There are two main sources of evidence that are being collected during the lifecycle of this project that can be used to inform the evolution of the Headstart programme in addition to the smaller scale pilots reported here. These are:

1. The Wolverhampton Health Related Behaviour Survey administered every two years across all schools in Wolverhampton, last administered in 2014 and set to be re administered in Feb 2016.

The Health Related Behaviour Survey is a physical and emotional wellbeing questionnaire carried out by pupils in primary, infant, junior, secondary, special schools and Pupil Referral Units (PRUs). A sample of pupils was surveyed from years 2, 4, 5, 6, 8 and 10. Overall, 7,700 children and young people participated in the survey from 66 schools across the City. The survey covers areas including; Healthy Eating, Physical Activity, Drugs, Alcohol and Tobacco, Emotional Health and Wellbeing, Health and Safety, Relationships and Sexual Health and Citizenship.

2. The National Head Start evaluation survey administered in February 2015.
This included four key scales:

1. General well-being
2. Mental health
3. Resilience
4. QALY Quality Adjusted Life Year Measure

The National evaluation will also conduct a qualitative review of one of the Wolverhampton project strands.

In the light of the national evaluation strategy, resilience survey base lining and qualitative interviews/ appraisal of one pilot strand this evaluation focused on complementary activities to explore and pilot additional measures that could be subsequently scaled to evaluate each individual interventions' effectiveness across a range of individual and system outcomes.

This evaluation therefore has two main foci:

Focus 1 looks at the way in which young peoples' capacity to access and use the resources in the system to support resilient behaviours has increased or decreased as a result of the Wolverhampton Headstart programme. To do this we will use a self efficacy/ children's confidence measure in combination with and social network analysis that incorporates elements of Ungar's (2013) framework for the development of capacity in resilience. Specifically this will explore the capacity of individuals to navigate their ways to resources that sustain well-being and the capacity of individuals' physical and social ecologies to provide those resources.

To do this we will use a version of social network analysis previously used in our Longitudinal Study of Early Years Practitioners (DFE, 2012). The aim is to explore the resources available to a group of "at risk" individuals within a particular geographical area and assess the "resilience capacity" of their current social networks. We are particularly interested in how individuals experience the system.

Focus 2 is the subject of this report and looks at the extent to which the SUMO (Stop Understand and Move On) and the Penn Resilience Programmes have raised the capacity of participants to support and develop resilient behaviours and increased capacity within the systems in which they are located. Capacity is based on the notion that the key operational tenets of the two programmes will be embedded within regular activities within organisations and that individuals will be able to use the strategies to make positive changes in their lives and contexts.

These two intervention programmes SUMO and Penn have been implemented in Wolverhampton's first two strands of activity.

Strand 1: 'Engaged' will deliver: trained pupil, parent and staff 'champions'; resilience-focused peer mentors; thematic curriculum delivery using the UK Resilience Programme and a locally developed bespoke resilience programme to test the effectiveness and value for money of both approaches.

Strand 2: 'Alternatively Engaged' targets children in non-mainstream schools/settings. This will adopt a similar approach to Pilot 1 but will be based in PRUs, a special school and an alternative education provider. This pilot will test the success of such interventions for those with additional needs, such as risk from crime and gangs as well as those with additional family related stressors.

Definitions of resilience and Big Lottery objectives frame the evaluation. (Please see evaluation proposal document for full details).

We have also used definitions of resilience from the Resilience Research Centre (2013)

Resilience Research Centre Definition (2013)

- The capacity of individuals to navigate their ways to resources that sustain well-being;
- The capacity of individuals' physical and social ecologies to provide those resources; and
- The capacity of individuals, their families and their communities to negotiate culturally meaningful ways to share resources.

Ungar (2014) adds the following dimensions, also looking at:

- individual resources;
- peer support;
- caregiver support;
- and the context within which the individual is located.

Context is divided into cultural, spiritual and educational domains.

We also consider concepts such as social capital, identity and personal agency based on literature from Ecclestone et al. (2010). This relates to how individuals interact and develop resilience as a result of adopting new strategies and changing identity and increasing agency.

- Identity – exploring the ways in which the individual sees themselves, and how they are able to compare and contrast their own interests and behaviours with those of others – being able to articulate a better understanding of self.
- Agency – the ways that individuals are able to identify and use different and new strategies to consider ways to behave within a range of contexts, and to gain from the involvement and ideas of others within and across networks – being able to manage situations better through better understanding of self and others.
- Capital (structure) – the ways that individuals are able to evaluate the potential for using agency, to support their own individual needs – being able to understand how to handle challenges, through better understanding of self, others, strategies and potential outcomes.

Focus 2 of the local evaluation used qualitative methods in order to assess the impact of the SUMO and Penn programmes. Three impact evaluation frameworks commonly used in the appraisal of educational training and intervention programmes were employed in order to structure the evaluation.

1. The Kirkpatrick Model (1994). Kirkpatrick developed his four-step model for the evaluation of training and development in business organisations. According to this model, evaluation should begin at level one and then, as time and budget allows, should move sequentially through levels two, three and four. Each successive level represents a more precise measure of the effectiveness of an intervention, but at the same time requires a more rigorous and time-consuming analysis.

The model consists of four stages, originally described as steps but since 1996 considered as levels, and is applicable for all forms of programme evaluation.

Level one: Reactions – what the participants in the programme felt about the project/programme, normally measured by the use of reaction questionnaires based upon their perceptions.

Level two: Learning – this moves the evaluation on to assessing the changes in knowledge, skills or attitude with respect to the programme/project objectives.

Level three: Behaviour – evaluation at this level attempts to answer the question: are the newly acquired skills, knowledge or attitude being used in the everyday environment of the programme?

Level four: Results – this level seeks to evaluate the success of the programme in terms of results for the organisation, usually stated in improvements in quality.

2. Coburn's (2004) four dimensions of scale.

Coburn identified four aspects of 'scale' that she considers are vital to the success of projects designed to bring about reform in practices. Scale is usually considered as the increasing 'take-up' of a particular reform. In her research on reform in schools, she suggests that evaluators should be redefining scale in four dimensions as current views are too limiting and take-up does not indicate change.

The four dimensions of scale are:

Depth – relates to the impact and recognition that the reform has on the individual, i.e. changed their behaviour, understanding and use of the new knowledge and skills within the reform.

Sustainability – is the capacity of the organisation increased to enable all staff to maintain these changes?

Spread – describes the reform in terms of the understanding and acceptance of its principles and norms, not just to schools but also to local authorities and collaborative groups.

Shift in reform ownership – no longer an 'external' reform controlled by a reformer but becomes an 'internal' reform with authority held by the participants who have the capacity to sustain, spread and deepen the reform principles themselves.

3. Most Significant Change (MSC) Methodology.

This will be used to add user narratives across the system. This will assess the major impacts that have occurred in the focus areas of each strand and the process that occurred in achieving that change. In addition it will add user engagement and reporting into the evaluation and system-wide collaboration.

"Essentially, the MSC process involves the collection of significant change (SC) stories emanating from the field level, and the systematic selection of the most significant of these stories by panels of designated stakeholders or staff. The designated staff and stakeholders are initially involved by 'searching' for project impact. Once changes have been captured, various people sit down together, read the stories aloud and have regular and often in-depth discussions about the value of these reported changes. When the technique is implemented successfully, whole teams of people begin to focus their attention on program impact."
(Davies and Dart 2005).

Key Research Questions

Have interventions increased capacity to support resilience across the system?	Focus 2
Are young people more aware of resilience strategies?	Focus 2
Are young people using resilience strategies at school/home?	Focus 2
What have been the main significant changes within participants, system and individuals?	Focus 2
Are young people better able to harness a range of available resources to increase resilience?	Focus 1
Have their networks changed / expanded?	Focus 1
Do interventions increase participants' self-efficacy? (Self efficacy is tied up with identity, agency and access to social capital) Do they actually use the strategies and networks and resources available to increase their well-being?	Focus 1

Research instrument for focus 2.

The frameworks described above were used to prepare a semi-structured questionnaire format for use with a range of stakeholders including headteachers, key staff implementing the programme and participants. Please see appendix 1.

A total of 16 interviews were carried out over a three-month period in 8 schools. Interviews with children were conducted in groups of 4-5 with a total sample of 31. In addition 12 key members of staff directly involved with the reform were also interviewed. This method was chosen for two reasons; firstly in order to minimize disruption to schools and secondly because we were aware of the national evaluations use of an online survey format we were conscious of the need to avoid placing an excessive workload on the participating institutions or duplicating the work of the national evaluation.

Sampling

The sampling method was essentially purposive due to the initial selection of pilot schools but also took account of the school type, Ofsted grading and ethnicity profile. Schools were included that were representative of the overall ethnicity breakdown of Wolverhampton schools in the primary and secondary phase. The Indicator of Child Deprivation Affecting Children was also noted should it become significant in future studies. In total 8 schools were included in the study out of a possible 16. This included 3 primaries, 1 pupil referral unit and four secondary schools.



SUMO and Penn Resilience Programme Qualitative Evaluation

Section 1.

Resilience Programmes in Primary Schools

Background information

This section reports on the impact of SUMO (Stop Understand and Move On) and how its key principles were implemented and adapted in four Primary schools at varying levels. In one school, SUMO had replaced SEAL (Social, Emotional Aspects of Learning (SEAL, DfES, 2005) whilst in other schools SUMO was gradually introduced to complement the existing learning and teaching that takes place, rather than it being viewed as a completely new phenomenon.

In the current Primary National Curriculum, (DfE, 2014) PSHE (Personal Social and Health Education) is no longer identified as a statutory subject. The DfE's guidelines state that spiritual, moral, social and cultural provision should be interwoven within other key areas of learning. This is in line with the new Ofsted framework for schools where spiritual, moral, social and cultural development of children and young people will be a significant focus during inspections. (Ofsted, 2014). Consequently, SUMO is possibly one way of supporting this aspiration in a cross curricular format.

After the first year of implementation, schools have timetabled the delivery and implemented the key principles of SUMO to complement the current practice with regard to the former PSHE and each schools' ethos and mission statements in their school prospectus.

Key members of staff (KMS) in school 1 (S1) were clearly knowledgeable about the key elements of SUMO:

Fruity Thinking. You eat fruit because it is good for you. So you need to have good thoughts. 5 a day fruit.

Beach Ball. See things from another point of view

Change your tee-shirt.... Change your attitude either as victim or a victim wearer.

Ditch Doris Day for Key Stage Two...In Key Stage One...we use Dare to Dream... and then at the start of Key Stage Two (Year 3, 7-8 years olds) we introduce Doris.

Hippo Time is okay..... It is okay to wallow.

Learn Latin..(Seize the Day).

and saw it as a replacement for SEAL:

SUMO will replace SEAL as from September. We have shelved that and the foundations are already in place for September 2015 to use SUMO. We will cover one principle per half term.

This staff member continued:

The school has adopted the SUMO scheme of work ('Stop, Understand, Move On') with the aim to follow on from previous Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning (SEAL) lessons and provide a fresh take on the key aims of PSHE teaching and learning. These will be taught for 3-4 weeks of each half term, after which a focus topic will be taught for the remainder of the half term.

This insight is important, as it is often the interventions that align most directly with the needs and concerns of individuals and the existing core activities of teachers/schools that have most chance of being adopted. (Hadfield et al, 2009).

However, not all schools had at the time of evaluation, implemented SUMO wholeheartedly with regular weekly sessions, but all schools were engaged with the program at some level and recognised its potential for wider use as an effective programme. In S2, for example they used it to complement other core activities... KMS School 2 (S2):

We currently use SUMO... 'Stop Understand Move On', but we have other systems such as our school rules in place (which complement it). Our reward system is also robust... and the parents know via postcards about how their children are doing.

Whilst schools 3 and 4 recognised the value of the key principles of SUMO they made a decision to choose the most pertinent elements that would best fit the culture in each school. Again we see the acceptance of the intervention alongside the need to fit with current activity. KMS (S3) commented:

We agree with the key principles but have chosen one element of it. 'Beach Ball' at this school. 'Change your Tee-shirt' is used in the other school. These are used as a whole school approach.

A key point from this first implementation of SUMO is that all of the schools in this evaluation are continuing with the programme in the current academic year. Schools have thought further about how to engage with SUMO so it supports children's learning and development. It is becoming more embedded within the school culture and systems; and participants value the range of "tools" that can help children to become more resilient.

Reactions

Participants were asked about their initial perceptions and the current progress of SUMO. All schools commented on the HeadStart activities in the Autumn Term of 2014 and reported that the activities were encouraging and ignited enthusiasm in the children that attended. The collective response was how the school could sustain this and how this small 'selected' focus group could engage in opportunities throughout the school day to share good practice with their peers. The impact of SUMO and success stories were initially highlighted at a conference given by Wolverhampton Headstart but initial questions were posed regarding the reality 'on the ground' of the practical implementation of SUMO in the schools. KMS (S3 and S4):

The first time I saw this was at a Head Teacher Conference where I was invited to come aboard and trial SUMO. The presentation did look exciting. I understood it to be a whole school behavior program that would ultimately have an effect on standards.

KMS (S1) said:

From our point of view SUMO took pop psychology, common sense and worldly wisdom and squished into a format that is accessible to kids. It provides a vocabulary that they can access across the school. This notion of giving a form of words to deal with emotional responses is a recurrent theme across the evaluation. These methods give a vocabulary for talking about emotions and responses to difficult/challenging situations.

Learning

All the schools confidently discussed and shared a common understanding of SUMO and its key principles. Schools were also clear in that the principles were teaching and supporting children to cope with day-to-day challenges, setbacks and issues within friendship groups. Similar strategies were incorporated in the PSHE curriculum and embedded in practice guided by the current policies in school. Participants were asked what they understood by the term 'resilience'. KMS (S1):

Resilience for us..what we are focusing on is 'bouncebackability'.. being able to overcome challenges...face challenges and deal with them....and look for ways forward. We look at raising expectations of what they can do...provide strategies to cope ...take a moment and deal with life.

Child (C) in S2 concurred with this 'bouncebackability' concept which is evident of the SUMO vocabulary being adopted, one child said:

I think of resilience as something called bouncebackability example you make a mistake instead of getting angry think you can do better and just carry on.

The introduction of SUMO has provided a set of principles that have in some cases enhanced and supported existing approaches to learning. Throughout the schools, children have used one or more of the principles of SUMO and applied these to their approaches to work and collaborative activities. KMS (S1) gives an example:

So in a situation where it would take ten minutes to discuss with a child what they have done wrong and steps forward and how they are going to remedy this... we say do you think you need to 'Change your Tee-shirt'.....Nursery have used it and through stories. The Owl who is afraid of the dark and introduce little SUMO snippets into that. Receptions take it on as well...so they are ready for Key Stage One.

Due to the infancy in the implementation of the SUMO program it is too early to make a judgment on whether the program is developing resilient mindsets across a whole school. It seems to be most effective where all stakeholders: the classroom teacher, learning support assistant, lunchtime supervisors and all who support children throughout the day consistently implement the principles both in and out of the classroom. This was echoed by KMS (S1)

The Year Six whole cohort started with Change your tee shirt and they liked that. The children realised they are not getting away from SUMO as the staff throughout the school use the language....we all talk about SUMO.....they hear about SUMO... we only started to see an impact end of this academic year.

There are individual success stories where the intervention strategies have supported children in their own daily challenges. At an earlier conference one boy (Year 6) had a lot of personal challenges and shared how he coped with these situations. The key principles were taken on board and he had adapted these for his own use out of school where his family circumstances were challenging. KMS (S4):

He used the principles of SUMO without using SUMO vocabulary (in the home environment).

Depth

Although the implementation of SUMO has varied the recognition of the usefulness and purpose was acknowledged by all participants. That said, time restrictions in the timetable and as mentioned previously, the fact that PSHE / SMSC (Spiritual, Moral, Social and Cultural) is not a discreet statutory subject in the Primary National Curriculum have proven to be a challenge (DfE, 2014). All schools acknowledge the key point that SUMO needs dedicated time to be given during the school day for it to be fruitful.

A key person was designated in each school to facilitate the implementation of the programme; the success of this has been dependent on the challenges and circumstances of staffing, time and financial constraints.

It (SUMO) is in its infancy stage (started as Autumn Term was underway) and we have set up some more SUMO training for September. Due to new staff and changes...our new lead person in school started in June and is becoming aware of school systems. We are always committed to run with any project which we feel is worthy ... it hasn't been driven as we would have liked...it is not about lack of commitment...just the changes in staffing and circumstances...

There is also an acknowledged conflict between the time given for SUMO at the expense of other curriculum subjects. KMS (S2) shared these frustrations but acknowledged the positive impact that SUMO has on the childrens' attitudes to their work and towards other children.

Key respondents felt that some of the key SUMO principles were not appropriate for Key Stage One (5 – 7 years old). The engagement in the activities successfully relies on them being able to comprehend vocabulary and understand key principles, so 'seizing the day' and 'Doris Day' are deemed unsuitable for the younger children or those with lower levels of emotional and social development. A shared response was that some of the SUMO 'activities' were predominantly appropriate for Key Stage Two, but an observation is that with all successful programs a gradual integration of the principles is more effective so children consolidate the learning and experiences from previous years.

Sustainability

The long-term impact of this SUMO programme after a year was discussed alongside some assumptions of what could happen in the future. As with all new programs time for change in attitudes and practice so that it is successfully embedded in the school ethos was deemed necessary. During the interview with the children from school 2, they agreed that they would continue to use SUMO next year and hope to able

to support other children. There seemed to be a desire to expand the reach of SUMO without necessarily taking time from other core activities,

C: change SUMO....maybe a teacher being in control of SUMO and go into each class and do a lesson... so each class can have a go... only five days and six classes... not everyone gets to do it five days a week.

C...could have Year Five and having someone going round the classes... telling them about SUMO and reminding them what SUMO is about.

C: SUMO scheme that is more complicated for high kids... and the smaller kids lower scheme.... Like an everyday lesson... ten minutes every day...

C...more lessons... if children are absent they miss it so they need to do more so they know what is going on...

KMS (S1) made an observation when asked about the long term impact of this on the Year Six children:

No they don't (use it) so not sure what's going to happen ... that is disappointing. All the secondary schools that our kids are going to don't use it...so that is something to mention. The year six have another year to consolidate. Will be interesting to see what happens when these children return from Summer holidays....we will need to review it all again at the start of the year.

With the view of the sustainability of SUMO in the long term, concerns were shared by KMS of all schools in how SUMO will feed into secondary schools. An example of this concern was shared by KMS (S3):

Asking for Hippo Time as a Year 7 could invite ridicule.

As with all new initiatives it takes time to be embedded into the full life of the school and has to be adapted to match the school's aims and values. Teachers are currently working hard to maintain levels of attainment so to adapt, and rewrite a new scheme of work that is not statutory although could benefit their children through the professional dialogue that is currently taking place. It would be useful if a long-term study could investigate the performance benefits as a result of taking part in a resilience programme.

The concept of whether the SUMO program is sustainable was discussed at length with all schools. Concerns were raised in relation to the longevity of the program. For instance, questions were posed surrounding what tools of resilience would the children at the start of Year 7 and in transition to secondary

use? However, one KMS (S1) in their experience of working with secondary children implied that children in the first three years of secondary schooling would welcome tools that enhance resilience.

It would work at Secondary school ... they could also buy into this... Year 7, Year 8, and Year 9... having the input. I believe in SUMO, therefore, I would make time to support the implementation of this. At Year 11 - GCSEs 'kick in' and they have a focus... I have worked with these kids. But it is those in Year 7, Year 8 and Year 9 that would benefit from this.

It was agreed that all stakeholders need to be made aware of the key principles of SUMO so that it is reinforced in all areas of the school, both in and out of the classroom setting. As with all programs such repetition could become tedious and lose its 'sparkle' (KMS, S3) if it is not reiterated in a way that incorporates it into the full ethos and values of the school. SUMO and its principles need to become part of the way things are done at each school although there are concerns about the longevity of such a programme because of its situational and transient nature.

The transferability of the key principles beyond the confines of the school setting was limited. One school (S1) had attempted to engage parents with the principles of SUMO. Two KMS discussed how the community played a key factor in changing parents' views. At School 1, parents were invited to a session explaining the overview of SUMO with follow-up tasks which was understood and well-received:

We did a parent drop-in session presentation on SUMO. We had a few parents say that children had said you need to change your tee shirt. One of our parent advisors worked with one parent...she has completed one program and come September she will come on board and work with us...slow but steady.... hopefully it will tie with new building. Hoping to do this again in September.

KMS (S3) shared the view that parents will either show interest or not but it is a cultural shift in the local community that you are trying to influence:

...It is like with all programs and new initiatives...you can say to parents you must read with your child every week...your child has been taught how to eat more healthily...but parents either will or they won't....depending on their own experiences and it is about trying to change a culture in the community.

Therefore, collectively, it would seem that programmes that include parents/carers may have more impact than those that are purely school based.

Shift in reform of ownership

In response to the following key question at interview, 'Are your young people better able to harness a range of available resources to increase resilience?' KMS answered:

KMS (S2):

Yes I believe this...they are drawing on their own skills...tee shirt.....hippo....beach ball....systems in place...our children are not coming backward in coming forward.... children are starting to sort their own problems...they come in and say we had a problem but we've sorted now.

KMS (S1):

Yes I would say so... our children are taking more responsibility for their actions and their life. All we can do is give the tools.... Sometimes it feels all the hard work that we do with them regarding resilience is undone when they go home ... if I am honest.... so it will be interesting to see how things work out after the summer.

KMS (S3):

I don't think the children know how to access the 'external' resources that are out there. In primary schools, we don't help them...as in our caring ways; we do too much for them. We do support our children and a different approach has had a positive effect and has worked really well. Children have to become resilient. If children forgot their kit or musical instrument we used to contact the parents. Now we say, I am sorry but No, you need to remember.

Some children felt empowered with increased self-confidence and self-efficacy in their new 'pastoral' (peer mentor) roles in school and did apply the new found tools of 'resilience', such as 'Hippo Time' and the 'Beach-Ball' to support children to see both sides during a dispute primarily in the playground. Children from School 2 shared their views:

I have been better at understanding people 'cos before I came into Year Five I was always arguing about points of view...I think I've let that go...I feel really happy that I've got over and sorted that.

I feel like I am going to improve more... since peer support and SUMO came out ... it has really changed my personality... and when they have arguments they say how they feel.

SUMO does help a lot of childrencos some children in the school get upset over silly little things and they get angry.

The implementation of the SUMO across the schools has varied considerably, from one end of spectrum of whole heartedly engaging with the programme to choosing which elements suited their children for that academic year.

In all cases, representatives of the school believe that it is an interesting program that needs to be adopted by the whole school. However, how far it is used is limited by availability of staff to monitor and be on hand to support with SUMO given a range of existing responsibilities. Expectations are being put on schools to take it on board and implement the program within a short time frame and this has maybe hindered the hopeful transformation of children' resilience. It may be useful to involve schools in an evaluation of SUMO to see if it does have other spin off benefits with regard to pupil achievement.

Changes to the school ethos of any kind takes time and schools would welcome additional guidance for SUMO to be implemented effectively so all stakeholders could benefit from this program. KMS (S1) and (S3):

We have just written some lesson plans for the teachers across the Years Groups to use; they will be able to start these in the new year (KMS, S1.)

As with any new scheme, it starts as a file, but it won't happen in the classrooms unless the teachers feel they can access the materials presented to them ... teachers liked to be shown the what and the how. (KMS, S3)

Main Significant Change

During the discussions with the children in School 2, they were enthusiastic about the different activities and on reflection could see a significant change in themselves. These responses are evident in terms of increased self-esteem and self-efficacy not as individuals but of their observation of other children's attitudes and behaviours.

It makes me feel grateful.

SUMO does help a lot of children...cos ...Hippo Time helps them to calm time and to think...have time out ... and try what to do about it next time.

The same question was asked of the KMS of this school:

For children where SUMO has had a great impact I would share a case of a young lady in Year Five.... Academically she has always been a bit lower in ability, but has really come out of her shell, due to the responsibility and being in the role of 'Peer Support'... she probably won't recognise this in herself. She has newfound confidence and her efforts in

her work have improved. She's been given that chance and had some responsibility. This has had a massive impact on her. (Self-esteem)

KMS (S2) continued:

... Another situation is quite a confident young man, very sporty...not as much of a 'team player' but he went to a local sports event. He saw that another child from another school wasn't 'going to be the best'... he was nurturing towards another child during this event. Change in culture... even the confident children... they acknowledge their peers.... for these children, they know they need to calm down and think about the situation and SUMO has given them the tools to do this.

Three children in School A said they had even shared it with siblings at home:

Before I didn't get on as well with my little sister ... yeah ...but now we compromise ... I say what we are going to do together....we getting on loads better.

The job here at lunchtime I do ... I am a peer support in the playground and working with the infants in the school ...it has taught me how to communicate especially with my little sister.

I've have two brothers they always argue and fight...so my brother both come to the school.... they know about SUMO... so I tell them.... they argue lose their temper... either way you are going to get the chance to do whatever you want to do...

The beach ball concept (seeing different sides/viewpoints) is popular with all of the schools whether they have embraced SUMO as a complete package or used elements to support children in developing 'resilience'.

With SUMO when the younger children first hear it like us.... you hear it and you think what does that mean ... it is really complicated and then you have lessons and you see how helpful it is and that beach ball is a good one.

KMS (S2) concluded with:

The beach ball is the one for me.... whenever this is used ... see an argument from both sides.

Summary of findings in Primary Schools

Reactions

The SUMO programme was seen as a useful addition to the work and life of the schools. The most powerful attribute at first was seen as the simple language that children could relate to in order to frame negative emotions in a more constructive way.

Learning

All schools found elements of the SUMO principles effective. Again it was the way in which the language could be used in order to analyse complex situations and change or modify behaviours that was most powerful. Pupils and staff learned to use the concepts that suited them best and quickly employed them in everyday situations.

Depth

All participants acknowledged the usefulness and purpose of SUMO although there was evident time restrictions due to the prioritisation of other activities on the curriculum. It was recognized that SUMO needed time during the school day in order for it to be most effective. Most schools were considering how it could be implemented effectively whilst also aligning with other concerns such as increased performance in learning.

Sustainability

This was linked to three main issues. The first as mentioned above was about how to roll out SUMO to a greater number of children given the constraints on time and other demands. It was felt that schemes of work that were integrated into the other activities in the school would be useful and that this was a dialogue that was taking place. Secondly, concerns were held about what would happen in the transition to secondary schools that did not use the SUMO programme. This perhaps illustrates the level of commitment by schools to the value of the programme. A further concern was the reach beyond the school to parents/carers and communities. It was felt that this was vital in order for there to be a sustainable impact.

Shift in reform of ownership

There were clear signs that schools were going beyond treating SUMO as an external programme and were attempting to embed it into the values and ethos of the school. Much of this surrounds the professional “mechanics” of teaching and learning. Creating schemes of work and thinking of ways in which the programme can be delivered more widely. Children it seemed have less difficulty in embedding the programmes into their lives with some noting that it had changed their personality and helped them to understand people better. These changes seemed to be reflected in increased self-esteem and understanding with an ability to make effective changes in their own behaviour by using the language and vocabulary of SUMO.

Main significant changes

These were predominantly reported in terms of changes in children’s’ behaviours for the better and increases in self-esteem. Children reported that they “understood people better” and felt more in control over feelings by using the SUMO tools. Some teachers noticed children employing the principles of SUMO without the language props. Staff also remarked anecdotally that there were improvements in attainment as a result of the change in confidence and self-esteem due to involvement in the programme.



Section 2.

Resilience Programme Interventions in Secondary Schools

This section reports on data collected from interviews with pupils and KMS in secondary schools using the Penn Resilience Program (PRP) though two schools also run the SUMO program. Similarly to primary schools' use of the SUMO program, secondary schools applied the PRP differently to differing audiences depending on HeadStart directives. In some cases the application of the programme was tailored to accommodate the needs of individual schools both in terms of the pupils and structural/operational features of the school. A brief portrait of participating schools (S) follows:

S1: Has rolled out one 18 week PRP to a small cohort of yr9 pupils who were selected for reasons relating to behavioural issues, low self-esteem issues and/or learning difficulties. It was a timetabled regular session and followed the PRP as it is set out. Only one member of staff (Head of Year) has received training.

S2: This school delivers SUMO to yr7 through timetabled sport sessions. The school also runs the PRP as an after school club to a group of 16 selected pupils with some adaptation to the program to facilitate audience and timetabling issues. This school also delivers an annual resilience day by year group across the school. Three staff members oversee program delivery, two of which have received training.

S3: This school runs weekly PRP sessions across yr7 once a week within integrated studies (a humanities based curriculum underpinned by literacy skills). All staff across yr7 have an awareness of the PRP and have received Healthy Minds training in support of PRP objectives. There is 11 trained staff in PRP.

S4: A behavioural unit for pupils aged 11 to 14. This unit runs the SUMO programme, as it is more accessible for these pupils. The programme is delivered mostly through one-to-one mentoring though all staff are trained and allocated SUMO materials. It is not delivered as a set program due to high turnover of pupils joining at different points in the term but all staff (including teaching assistants) share the language and are committed to the techniques.

Reactions

Participants were asked how they felt about the program and to describe their initial reactions. All KMS responsible for facilitating the PRP reported that their initial reactions to the program were very positive. The following Head of Year (HoY, S1) identified an immediate relevance of the program as a preventative intervention for particular groups of vulnerable pupils stating:

After the course, I was very excited. It was never going to be a whole school thing to start with, which was going to be too much of a gamble. It was always going to be a small group. And because being Head of Year and we have so many issues where we're not being proactive enough, like self-harming, I was looking for something we could do with the students before things got to that stage. So for me this was something that we definitely need.

However, the following KMS (S3) was initially more cautious and questioned the methods through which the school could ensure that the PRP achieved desired outcomes:

I could see the value in it but was thinking, how am I going to make this work? How are the kids going to respond? How are we going to support the kids and make those links with families so it sounded exciting but also that it was going to take some real thought.

When asked whether their initial reactions had changed, this KSM replied:

Yes. Working with the students and how they were able to open up so quickly and how they were receptive to it I could see that it had the potential to be really, really powerful if it was well supported from other aspects of their lives as well. It's a very, very relevant program.

Most KMS had some initial concerns about the volume of content to be delivered and how this could be adequately delivered against the pressures of curriculum and timetabling. However, for one school, issues were resolved by adapting the PRP to ensure feasibility such as implementing the PRP through an after school club with selected pupils (S2). For the Head of the pupil referral unit (S4), the SUMO program was seen very much as a behaviour management tool to address challenging behaviour on a day-to-day basis. As such and only those elements that were considered applicable to this setting were used:

Very positive. It seemed to be what we needed. I didn't feel we were addressing the behaviour issues as much as we needed to. SUMO gave us that opportunity. My initial thoughts have not changed though don't use the 'Ditch Doris Day' or 'Que Sera'. It's using the elements that deal with the here and now so 'asking how you're going to feel in 6 months time' for example, is a concept too far so it's very much about the Beach Ball and about the Hippo Time and the Fruity Thinking".

Concurrent across pupils was their initial apprehension about the PRP but this became increasingly more positive as the program progressed:

I did wonder what it was gonna be like and didn't really get it but now I do. – the way you think about things and how you respond to them. It's got better (S2).

At the start I wasn't confident and wouldn't tell anyone anything but because of the sessions, I've learnt to open up and let other people help me (S2).

At first I didn't like the group stuff but I can do that now (S2).

I wasn't sure what it was about. But now I don't mind it (S1).

I didn't know what it was about and then when I started to do the booklets and stuff thought it was good (S1).

When we first started it, we had these booklets and you had to write how you feel and when I first started I was like 'what's this!' but now I really like it and it makes you think about other people and every day situations (S3).

I thought it was a good idea but then I realised it was going to be quite hard to use considering some of the situations you end up in in this school. It's the complex situations I end up getting myself into. But I know how to use them [strategies], they're quite easy. Before, sometimes I just wanted to run away (S4).

Learning

Following the initial dialogue regarding the reaction to the programme, discussions then moved towards exploring participants' learning i.e. the changes in their knowledge, skills or attitude with respect to the program. KMS were asked if they felt the PRP was meeting its objectives. Concurrent across KMS was the view that there had been noticeable improvements in pupil behaviour and their ability to deal with the daily challenges they face:

There are pockets of students where you can see tangible differences in their behaviour (S3).

However, trying to evaluate any impact on a measurable scale was considered more difficult. It should be borne in mind that program delivery at the time of interview was either nearing the end of first delivery or had completed only one roll out. One school (S2) had implemented a resilience questionnaire that they had located on the Internet and adapted for their needs. This was administered to all yr7 pupils before a resilience day event and repeated at the close of the day. Results indicated for example: in the morning only 30% of pupils could recognise problems that other people may be experiencing which rose to 50% by the end of the day. Furthermore, more pupils felt they could join in conversations about different emotions. However, so much data was generated that these KMS have yet to properly process this data and welcomed external help to analyse the findings.

The head teacher of the behavioural unit (S4) explained how for them, it was not about achieving SUMO objectives in isolation from other interventions. Some tangible evidence may be gleaned from pupils' personal action plans however the focus was primarily directed towards pupils' personal development in response to a range of interventions by ensuring they are embedded across the school:

Writing up the personal actions plans for students and looking at the changes from previous plans so we can look at whether there are less incidences where things have happened or less incidences of exclusion, whether the actual targets are changing so it's a little bit about looking at their journey. It's an individual level at this centre. It's very difficult to look at the cohort because it changes so drastically. So we don't look at how well they're doing at SUMO, we look at making sure it's embedded and the students are developing as a result of all interventions.

Another MKS (S3) commented that whilst the points achievement system linked to behaviours has seen a marked improvement for particular pupils, whether the PRP was responsible for meeting these objectives was difficult to gauge:

Difficult question to answer. The results are difficult to measure. I think talking to the young people and seeing the change in their behaviour, if you can see that it's had an impact but how you measure that in any scientific way is difficult. Outcomes may not be something you see on paper but it's the conversations you have with that child. Something enlightening that's happened for them. That's of the greatest value.

This staff member reflected on whether this could be due to maturity but was more inclined to think the PRP had a significant influence.

After about 2 to 3 weeks, the pupils get it [PRP]. They start using that language and start to be able to deal with things better. 2 or 3 pupils have been outstanding and they've gone to events across the city to talk about it.

All pupils were able to comprehend how an individual's response to an event can determine the final outcome and that by taking time to apply the PRP strategies they could avoid rising to provocation. Pupils talked of improved skills in self-regulation and stress management. For many pupils, improved reflective skills as a result of PRP had been significant:

I get angry really quickly and in that moment, I don't realise I'm doing it but after it's all happened I sit down and think about it and calm down (S3).

It's ways to change things and make things better. Ways to handle stress and that. It's reading situations and how to handle it from positive and negative points of view (S1).

One pupil reported that previously she found her shyness very inhibiting with group work being particularly difficult. However, the PRP had improved her ability to work collaboratively with her peers and as a result, felt an enormous sense of achievement. This was recognised by a KMS (S1) working with this pupil:

She wasn't going to be able to do the group work especially with people she never usually speaks to but she did really well. In fact they ended up winning. She had been pushed out of her comfort zone and she recognised it in herself. She was really pleased. It helps them. They communicate with others better.

A significant theme across all pupils was the opportunities and benefits of sharing experiences. Exploring social and moral dilemmas during these discussions in relation to personal experience was reported as being very powerful in encouraging alternative perspectives as well as increasing tolerance and understanding. Pupils understood that what was discussed in the classroom, stayed in the classroom. Discussion groups developed a mutually supportive environment where pupils listened and supported each other. As one HoY (S1) explained:

That's the beauty of the course, the actual discussions about their own personal experience, it's far more meaningful because they can relate to their personal life rather than just reading something from the script or doing an activity from the book. So that's why we do a lot of talking.

Another KMS (S3) spoke about a particular pupil and how opportunities to share sensitive experience benefited the whole group:

X was prone to bullying and was very tearful when he spoke about it but what I liked was the way the group listened to each other and they didn't laugh at him. We have an understanding – what is said in the room stays in the room and the kids are amazing. It's made a difference to the whole group.

This staff member explained how she too has personally and professionally benefitted from involvement with the PRP:

There are times when I use it myself and think 'ok, take a step back'. Assess the situation.... Where's this going to lead, Think of the consequences ... I think knowing a bit more about individuals on a personal level has helped the way I interact with them.

Other KMS also reported the benefits the PRP had brought them in terms of improved relationships with pupils.

Depth

Discussion then moved to exploring depth of the reform i.e. the impact and recognition that the PRP and SUMO had upon individuals. Pupils recognised the positive impact that the PRP had had upon their behaviour. For some pupils the application of strategies learned was in response to specific incidences whereas for others, they were now able to apply strategies more generally in peer-to-peer interactions and through the course of the school day. Some pupils talked about how the culture of the playground had changed to a less challenging one:

People aren't pushing each other over like before, they'd be tripping people up and everything and other pranks so every body's getting along more (S3).

For one pupil with Autistic Spectrum Disorder (ASD, S4), the SUMO techniques had helped in developing his interpersonal skills, which was a significant step from his primary education experience where he lacked the skills to manage peer relationships. This pupil recognised and could clearly articulate how the program had aided his personal and social development:

I understand other kids much better now so instead of me saying 'you've got a big nose' its beach ball (seeing from other perspective) and wondering why they've attacked me. I understand other peoples' feelings now... cuz in primary school I was hopeless I absolutely ruined myself.

Improved peer-to-peer relations were a common theme. Pupils reported being better able to make the right choices in friendships and effectively manage their friendships as the following pupils expressed:

I now know what friends to pick and what friends not to pick (S1).

Because I've changed, some friends don't accept that so friendships have changed. It's a good thing because I know who my real friends are (S1).

It's helped me with friends. I was always having problems with friends but now I can sort them out better (S2).

I've learned that if someone has done something bad, you don't have to follow them (S1).

A significant number of pupils talked of the impact the PRP had upon their academic learning. For some, fewer distractions in class and a new found ability to avoid getting involved in peers' class time disruption had promoted a more focused approach to studies. For others pupils, increased confidence levels had enhanced their ability to participate in lessons as the following comments demonstrate:

Before, I couldn't answer questions, I wouldn't speak up but now I am confident and I get praise for it (S2).

I can listen better. My confidence in lessons. Before I just used to rush the answers but now I think more (S2).

I've changed my attitude and I can try to focus more on my work. I used to always join in with them but I'm more confident now and can concentrate on my own work (S3).

Another pupil reported the benefits of improved stress-management stating:

I don't get too worked up about exams (S2).

Sustainability

In exploring the sustainability of the programs, discussions explored key factors in ensuring sustainability and any barriers that may impact upon this. Pupils were asked about likes and dislikes. Pupils clearly identified aspects of the program they liked and tended to draw on those strategies that appealed most to them. The role-play and discussions were preferred to the elements of the program that required writing activity. Others benefitted from keeping a diary that they could record their thoughts and reflect upon. When asked whether they thought the PRP had 'stickability', pupils responded positively saying that the approaches had become embedded in everyday school life as the following pupil stated:

Yeh cuz I think it'll happen without us even trying to do it. We'll naturally do it (S3).

It's just become natural (S2).

One pupil offering a more prophetic view:

Yeh cuz say we all learnt it and all the year did then it could spread to other years and we get along even more and it could spread to different schools as well and it could grow and grow and grow and could be a good fortune to the world (S3).

KMS too, reported that within a few weeks, pupils adopt the language of the PRP and SUMO and they could see the impact in terms of improved pupil behaviour and application to their schoolwork (S1, S2, S4).

Schools had varying levels of trained staff. For those schools with only one or two trained staff members, this significantly restricted the possibility of rolling out the PRP across the wider school. As one KMS commented:

I would like to see it as a whole school thing; I just need more trained staff (S1).

As with the SUMO program, the issue of timetabling proved to be a significant challenge in the roll out of the PRP. One KMS (S1) felt 18 sessions was too long and estimated that a 12 to 13 programme would be preferable. Another KMS felt that the volume of content on the PRP required more than 18 weeks to complete it effectively and thus they changed the duration of the program:

The program has so much content we spread it over 24 weeks instead of the 18 (S2).

This school runs the PRP as an after school club and incorporates activities/trips such as caving which may explain why they are able to extend the PRP as they are not restricted by timetable or curriculum demands. However, there was some doubt about the sustainability of this approach due to the time and commitment of staff.

This school has taken the essential principles of PRP and uses these as the basis for an annual 'resilience day' in which all pupils participate. The sessions draw on available initiatives such as Barclays Life Skills (Through the Transformation Trust) which provide free life skill workshops on inset days and also a soap box challenge where pupils design/make and sell soap:

We've crossed the resilience theme with different things so we've bought in employability skills so say getting them to find out what they are good at. A lot of them think they're not very good at anything. So it all links in very well (S2).

The Head Teacher of S4 stated that by using SUMO through integrating the program with other interventions, this would ensure sustainability:

I think that by putting it [SUMO] into some of the other intervention programs, it has a better chance of surviving. It becomes part of what you do. Other things can get in the way or you run out of time but we are soon to have three staff as being the lead on

SUMO, which will mean it can keep going. It also means that the students, who need that specific input, continue to get it.

One KMS (S3) raised concerns regarding potential issues around pupils' disclosure of sensitive information:

Some of the things that they divulge and having to deal with that. It can leave me in a bit of a predicament as to how to deal with it. That's a worry. Where would I go with that?

However, the KSM overseeing the PRP in this school had already identified a need for training in this area. As a result, external resources had been identified and training was imminent.

Shift in reform of ownership

The next line of discussion involved exploring whether the programs had led to a shift from external to internal control: i.e. the capacity of participants to sustain, spread and deepen the reform principles themselves. At pupil level, they reported being better able to anticipate consequences of certain actions and could now avoid those consequences by dealing with the immediate situation differently. They talked of how they could now respond to adverse situations with a more positive attitude and circumvent more negative outcomes.

In terms of pupils extending learning acquired through the program beyond the school, one pupil reported using the breathing techniques at night time and two other pupils made the following comments:

I don't react much at my mum and my dad like I used. I can calm down much quicker (S1).

I have problems with my anger but it's changed in a healthy way so if I have issues with my mum and dad, later on I can come back in the room and have a conversation about it. I've calmed down and can have a sensible adult conversation (S3).

However these were the only pupils to demonstrate ways in which they had transferred skills beyond the school environment. Most pupils did not use skills acquired on the PRP outside of the school context. The following pupils speculated on whether they could transfer skills beyond the school:

I get the resilience but when I'm at home I just forget about it like if me and my mum are arguing, I still make sure I have to have the last say but I could use it if I wanted (S2).

Yeh I agree, it's easier to do it with friends but harder to do it with family (S2)

It is important to mention here that due to the infancy of program delivery, fostering stronger links with parent/carers had not as yet been implemented. Most schools recognised the need to develop these links and planned to do so at next iteration. One HoY (S3) made direct links between the success of the programme and the need for stronger links with the home environment:

The only thing I think we're lacking is getting the parents on board as well because I think if you're asking kids to unpick the way they think about things and then perhaps deploy different coping strategies then parents need to have a greater understanding of what's happening at home because it could be that they're acting completely differently within an argument and parents need to be supportive of that so it's how we can further strengthen that.

This staff member shared a range of possible future directions to remedy this including drop in sessions for parents, sharing related literature, possible small group training and creating/recruiting parent champions. This KMS also discussed the possibility of extending the reach and scope of PRP delivery in the future:

Would like to roll it out to other year groups, particularly key stage 4 where the programs of study are much harder and perhaps dealing with disappointment or failure and being resilient, bouncing back and moving forward. These are real skills that are needed in key stage 4. And to be able to deal with the curved balls that life throws at you. We are preparing young people to become good citizens; preparing to go into the outside world so it's brilliant for the year 7's but we're mindful as to how we can utilize it throughout the rest of the school so you get a whole school community that has that mutual respect for each other.

KMS talked about the ways in which they had adapted the PRP to suit their individual school needs. One HoY (S1) explained how she has adapted some aspects of the PRP:

There is homework but I don't set it because then it becomes curriculum, it becomes a chore and that's not how I want to run the course. I might ask them in preparation for next week to reflect and have a think about a situation but I don't give set homework. Kids aren't robots. On my program, it's actually got a script, which is useful as a recap but to sit there and read a script doesn't work. It becomes stilted. It doesn't flow and you'll never get the message across. I stick to the content but adjust it to the groups' needs. The training course recommends adhering to the script, lesson plans etc., but I don't.

The PRP sessions themselves are sequenced and require adherence to this sequence however, one KMS felt that the language used in some instances was unsuitable and therefore benefitted from tailoring the language to the student group on these occasions. Another KMS (S3) felt there needed to be more room

for reflection for pupils, which would inform how far the program has been embedded in the childrens' behaviours:

Opportunities for reflection and talking to students we could see how far it's been embedded. Have they used it? Did we skip over something that they weren't quite sure about? Is there any part they want to go back to? Because ultimately, it's a development program for them and they and the direction they're going should inform it so there's value in revisiting but the program is quite tight in terms of the schedule you have to keep.

Some schools reported that the lack of trained staff restricted any wider roll out of the program across the school and in addition the cost of the training presented another obstacle:

You can't teach the PRP having not had the training, which is a bit of a problem because the course is about £2000 (S1).

However, with S4, visual reminders of the SUMO principles located at multiple points around the school, plus dissemination across wider (untrained) staff resulted in consistency of delivery and use of SUMO language.

Main significant change

In exploring participants' main significant change (MSC), the consensus across KMS was that pupils had increased their confidence in talking about their experiences and challenges. This was particularly noticeable in pupils that previously, had very low self-esteem. Increased confidence was viewed as a particularly strong MSC as demonstrated in the following comments:

I feel like I've got more confidence and can do more stuff with that confidence (S2).

I can listen better. My confidence in lessons (S2).

Changes in attitudes and the ability to respond to situations in more appropriate ways was also considered a MSC. Pupils had become much more assertive but also able to give reasoned responses when faced with challenging incidences or situations. This was also concurrent across pupils who expressed that their decision-making skills had seen a significant improvement and could now "walk away if there's an issue" (S1).

For one pupil with Autistic Spectrum Disorder (S4), the MSC was as a result of particular strategies within the SUMO program:

Fruity thinking cuz I can keep myself from hurting other people's feelings and hippo

time is very good for me. It's helped me in a lot of situations but I think fruity thinking is the best one. If you've got autism you say stuff before you think and that's why it [fruity thinking] is very good for helping me with that.

Notably a significant change expressed by both pupils and KMS was the improvement across interactions with pupil-to-pupil and pupil/staff relationships. For one pupil, improved relations with a KMS were directly attributed to the PRP:

My relationship with Miss is much better now. I understand her expectations. Before, she would get me mad. I thought she didn't like me and I would just walk out but now I get it. I understand and we get on now (S3).

Another pupil saw the benefits of improved relations with KMS and accepted personal responsibility for any negative behaviour:

I don't speak to Miss like I used to. If you change your behaviour you can get more rewards whereas if you carry on you lose things because of what you've done and it's not anybody else's fault (S3).

For many pupils, the MSC for them had been the benefits and results of being able to share experience as the following comments illustrate:

Just being able to open up and tell people how I feel instead of keeping it to myself, and then it all gets a bit much (S2).

For me it's like when being with new people, making conversation and making new friends. I'm more confident. It's like there was a big wall there but now it's gone (S3).

I talk to people more now instead of hiding it all and exploding. I talk to the teachers, the mentors and my friends (S3).

Other comments indicating a more general MSC include the following:

Just trying harder to be better (S2)

I'm happy (S3).

Summary of findings

Reactions

- Both staff and pupils responded positively to the program(s) despite some having initial concerns in terms of operating the programme against time tabling and curriculum demands.
- The volume of content within the PRP caused some concerns though most schools were able to complete the 18-week delivery. Only one school delivered over an extended period of 24 weeks. However, this was only possible by running the program as an after school club.
- Pupils reported initial apprehension but became increasingly more positive as the program progressed. Initial anxieties centered on the unknown and what to expect as well as specific worries about participating in group work or sharing of personal experience. Such anxieties were quickly overcome.

Learning

- KMS reported marked improvements in pupil behaviour and pupils' ability to deal with the daily challenges they face.
- Evaluation of any impact on a measurable scale was believed to be problematic. Whether reduced exclusions or gains made in points achievement system linked to improved behaviours were attributable to the programs was difficult to gauge.
- There was a notable increase in the capacity of pupils to draw on resources that encourage and sustain well-being and resilience. Pupils were clearly able to convey the objectives of the programs and recognised the positive impact the programs had upon their attitudes and behaviours. Pupils felt empowered with increased self-confidence and self-esteem.
- A significant theme across all pupils was the opportunities and benefits of sharing experiences which facilitated the development of more empathetic relationships and an ability to 'open up'. Staff also reported the benefits of sharing experience in terms of increasing the knowledge and understanding of pupils.
- Improved relationships between pupil to pupil and staff to pupil were seen as a direct result of program intervention. Consequently, this also increased pupils' access to social capital.
- In determining whether programs had become embedded in the life of the school, KSM reported that the adoption of a shared language arising from the PRP and SUMO was an indicator of success.

Depth

- Some pupils applied strategies learned in response to specific incidences whereas for others, they were now able to apply strategies more generally in peer-to-peer interactions and through the course of the school day. Techniques had become embedded and a natural response to given situations.
- For those pupils with a history of difficulties with social relationships and challenging behaviour, they reported a range of significant personal gains resulting from the program and they discussed how it had positively impacted upon their relationships and behaviour.
- Pupils talked of being better able to make the right choices in friendships and effectively manage their friendships.
- A significant number of pupils talked of the positive impact that the programs had upon their academic learning and achievement due to reduced low-level disruption in class resulting from improvement in behavior behavior. Increased confidence in pupils had also directly impacted upon their ability to work collaboratively, contribute in lessons and be more focused.

Sustainability

- Pupils enjoyed the programs and agreed they had 'stickability' and were happy to continue.
- KMS too, felt that the programs were sustainable given adequate numbers of trained staff. Greater levels of trained staff would facilitate whole-school dissemination for those schools wanting to do this in the future. Other schools used the PRP targeted at small groups of more vulnerable pupils. Here too, KMS felt that the success of the programmes as evidenced in the gains that pupils had made, would ensure its sustainability.
- For both SUMO and PRP, the issue of timetabling proved to be a significant challenge with some schools trialling different ways to deliver the programme such as through after school clubs. However, the sustainability of such an approach was in doubt due to the time and commitment of staff.

Shift in reform of ownership

- There was some evidence of schools drawing on external resources and outside agencies to support wider program delivery across the school and to support staff training.
- Pupils could independently draw on the techniques and skills learned to use them in every-day situations and effectively respond to adverse situations with a more positive attitude as well as circumvent more negative outcomes. However, few pupils extended use of the techniques beyond the school environment.
- KMS talked about the ways in which they had adapted the program to suit their individual schools and pupils. KMS adhere to the content but adjust delivery to suit individual group needs. Adjustments include avoiding setting homework and altering the language to the appropriate pupil level. Despite having only three trained staff, one school has tried to ensure that it is embedded across the school by all staff having awareness and access to program materials. Pupils and staff also adopt the language of SUMO.
- For some schools, the future direction involves rolling the intervention out across the whole school with key stage 4 being identified as a year group that would particularly benefit from the PRP.

Main significant change

- KMS reported the main significant change to be a dramatic improvement in attitudes and behaviour. Pupils were now more able to respond to situations in more appropriate ways. They had become much more assertive yet more skilled in giving reasoned responses when faced with challenging incidences or situations.
- Pupils reported a range of MSCs including increased confidence, improved decision-making skills, but more significantly pupils also reported improvements in relationships between pupil and between pupils and staff.
- For many pupils, the MSC had been the benefit of being able to share experiences with their peers in discussion time. Being able to "open up" was a huge step for some pupils, which positively impacted upon many other aspects of their personal and social development.

Recommendations

- Adaptability of programs is key. Programs need to be responsive to the needs of the school. However, there is less opportunity for this with PRP than SUMO due to the sequential nature of the program sessions.
- Utilising external resources and outside agencies should be encouraged and build on existing good practice as evidenced by some of the schools.
- Building effective partnership with parent/carers and local communities and expanding the programme to these stakeholders will further support the sustainability and success of programs.
- Issues of disclosure require appropriate mechanisms in place to respond accordingly. Staff require training to effectively support pupils at moments of disclosure and also to support referrals on to

other sources of support.

- Greater levels of trained staff will increase the capacity of schools in terms of the reach across the school system.
- Consideration of the suitability of language and concepts shared in both Key Stage One and Two.
- A SUMO related scheme of work modelled on the SEAL package where teachers could select activities and resources would be helpful in increasing take up and sustainability.
- The implementation was unavoidably rapid. Time is needed for schools to consolidate good practice and trial new ideas based on the teaching and principles of SUMO.
- Establish regular feedback meetings from schools about the intervention possibly in the “teach meet” format to promote a community of practice.
- Schools and pupils reported some quite deep changes in behavior and improved performance. Future evaluations should seek to measure this impact with a random control trial or large simple trial.
- There was some initial evidence to suggest that changes in the way individuals perceived themselves (identity), their ability to have more choice over their actions (agency) and the consequent improvement in relationships enabled them to have enhanced access to capital which may lead to better performance at school in the longer term. There is some evidence to suggest that this was in part due to increased student self-esteem and confidence to make changes in their lives. A future study should seek to establish whether such programmes do in fact increase self efficacy and confidence. That is, the ability to not only know what to do but have the confidence to be able to employ the techniques effectively in order to increase capability and valued functioning.

References:

Coburn, C. E. (2003). Rethinking Scale: Moving Beyond Numbers to Deep and Lasting Change: *Educational Researcher*, 32(6), 3-12.

Côté, J.E. (2005). Identity capital, social capital and the wider benefits of learning: generating resources facilitative of social cohesion. *London Review of Education*, 3 (3), 221-237

Davies, R., & Dart, J. (2005). 'The 'Most Significant Change' (MSC) Technique: A Guide to Its Use', MandE, Melbourne, Australia.

Department for Education and Skills, (DfES) (2005). Excellence and Enjoyment: social and emotional aspects of learning Guidance. Norwich: HMSO.

Department for Education. (DfE) (2014). The national curriculum in England Framework document. Manchester: Crown Copyright.

Ecclestone, K., Biesta, G. & Hughes, M. (2010). Transitions in the lifecourse. The role of identity, agency and structure. In Ecclestone, K., Biesta, G. and Hughes, M. (eds) *Transitions and Learning through the Lifecourse*. London: Routledge.

Hadfield, M., Jopling, M., Royle, K., & Southern, L. (2009). Evaluation of the Training and Development Agency for Schools' funding for ICT in ITT Projects. TDA: London.

Kirkpatrick, D.L. (1994). *Evaluating Training Programs: The Four Levels*. San Francisco, CA: BerrettKoehler.

The Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted) 2014. *The School Inspection Handbook*. Manchester: Crown Copyright.

Warin, J. (2013 online). Creating identity capital in school: An application from a longitudinal ethnographic study of self-construction during the years of school. *British Journal of the Sociology of Education*, doi: 10.1080/01425692.2013.849565

Wasserman, S. & Faust, K. (1994). *Social Network Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ungar, M. (2013). The Child and Youth Resilience Measure (CYRM) Youth Version : Accessed 26,09.15 from <http://www.resilienceproject.org/research/resources/tools/33-the-child-and-youth-resilience-measure-cyrm>

Appendices

Appendix 1.

	Pupils	Professionals	Resource holders/HTs
Background info	Which programme are you taking part in? How/often is this delivered? Regular sessions? Every so often – special events? Other?	Describe what your setting has implemented and currently has in place. Regular sessions? Periodic events? Other?	Describe what your setting has implemented and currently has in place. Regular sessions? Periodic events? Other?
Reactions	How did you feel about it at first? What do you think about it now? (If a change) why do you think this is?	What did you initially think about the programme? Have your initial thoughts about the programme changed in any way? (If a change) how/why?	What did you initially think about the programme? Have your initial thoughts about the programme changed in any way? (If a change) how/why?
Learning	What do you understand by the term resilience? What skills have you learned in being able to implement resilience? In what ways does developing these skills help you?	Can you outline the aims of the programme? Can you see changes in skills, understanding, and attitudes? Explain? What have you learned? Has it changed your approach in other areas?	How do key staffs feed back to you? What are you hearing? How do you know the programme is meeting objectives?

<p>Depth</p>	<p>Has it changed the way you think about things? How? And have you been able to apply that in your daily lives? Can you give specific examples of how you or your peers have used resilience strategies?</p>	<p>Have you received training? Other training available? Has there been any impact upon pupil's behaviour? Their understanding of resilience? Can you give specific examples of how particular pupils have benefitted from the programme? You and your understanding? Change in approach?</p>	<p>What training provision has been put in place? Key staff? Whole school dissemination?</p>
<p>Sustainability</p>	<p>What do you like most about it? Are there any bits you don't like or find challenging? Stickability... do you think you will still use it in 6 months.. say date.</p>	<p>Do you think this something that can be maintained and continue in your school/setting? Are there any barriers/obstacles in sustaining delivery?</p>	<p>Do you think this something that can be maintained in your school/setting? Are there any key factors in ensuring sustainability of this programme? Are there any barriers/obstacles in sustaining delivery?</p>
<p>Shift in reform of ownership</p>	<p>Thinking about the strategies, have you been able to use them 'in the moment' - to know how to adapt them for particular events/situations? Is this something you have to think about or something that you just do?</p>	<p>Have you adapted the programme in any way? Describe. How is it embedded/ contextualized in your school? Has it spread outside the initial group? If so how? What would you do if the programme stopped tomorrow? Would it continue?</p>	<p>What stage do you feel you are at in terms of programme implementation and outcomes? Future directions?</p>
<p>MSC</p>	<p>Have you noticed any changes in yourself/peers/school environment? What has been the biggest change?</p>	<p>What changes have you noticed as a result of the programme? What do you think the most significant change is?</p>	<p>What changes have you noticed as a result of the programme - Pupils/Staff/School? What do you think the most significant change is?</p>