

**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

**Judith Emanuel
November 2004**

**Commissioned by Manchester Anti-Bullying
Policy And Practice Network and funded by
Manchester Children's Fund**

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	3
1.1 Manchester Multi-Agency Anti-Bullying Policy and Practice Network	3
1.2 The Evaluation of the Network	3
1.3 Background to this study	3
1.4 Whose views, which views?	4
2. Findings	6
2.1 Anti-bullying as part of respondents' work	6
2.2 Awareness of and contact with Network	7
2.3 The Guidelines	8
2.4 Support and training needs	10
2.5 Updates	11
3. Conclusions and Recommendations	13
4. References	14

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

1. INTRODUCTION

1.2 Manchester Multi-Agency Anti-Bullying Policy and Practice Network

The Manchester Multi-Agency Anti-Bullying Policy and Practice Network (referred to as the Network) was established in 1999. 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).

In 2002 Guidelines produced by the Network were launched as part of the LEA's anti-bullying strategy. These are currently being piloted in one High School and 3 Primary Schools as part of the implementation programme, known as Creating Safe Learning (CSL).

1.2 The Evaluation of the Network

In early 2004, the Network, funded by Manchester Children's Fund, commissioned an independent evaluation. The approach of the evaluation is to support the development of evaluation processes and skills as an integral part of the Network's work in order to maximise learning. Network partners have jointly identified the issues for evaluation with the evaluator and been consulted about development of tools and in piloting them.

This report is the second of the evaluation. It is concerned with the experience of people who have been identified by the Network as having a potential key role to promote anti-bullying policy and practice and specifically support the dissemination of Creating Safe Learning. Hereafter they are referred to as, key people.

The first report considered the workings of the partnership (1). The final report will draw together the evaluation of the CSL pilot and will be available in early 2005.

1.3 Background to this study

In the last 18 months there have been 3 events which key people have been invited to attend. In broad terms the purpose of the events was to enable participants to develop a greater understanding of the Network, to provide an opportunity for them to influence the work of the Network and to encourage them to take an active role to support the Network's work.

The Healthy Settings Development Unit (HSDU)(2) at the University of Central Lancashire suggests that indicators of process and outcome need to be established for evaluation purposes. This report focuses on the process of how the Network is engaging with key people, with whom they plan to work to achieve their outcomes; which are more effective policies and strategies to prevent bullying and manage incidents in more schools. Process indicators relate to the necessary conditions for success. HSDU identified the following factors as appropriate for including as process indicators, national and local context within which the work is taking place eg policy, facilitation and support, back up eg resources and a critical mass of interested people and support of others. In particular, this report considers the potential opportunities and constraints of involving the key people in furthering the objectives of the Network; part of the critical mass of interested people.

The questionnaire was analysed to consider how key players understood, influenced and may support the Network. These are 3 principles, which should inform partnership and interagency work. The development of a shared understanding, the degree to which different players feel able to influence the work and as a result of these two factors the degree to which they feel able to support the work.

1.4 Whose views, which views?

The work is currently in a development phase; CSL is being piloted. The Network is also planning for rolling out CSL when the pilots have been completed and the programme adapted from the learning.

For this study, a questionnaire was sent out to 32 people from a range of agencies who it is anticipated may be involved in rolling out the programme. 24 completed questionnaires were analysed. The questionnaire focussed on

- knowledge of the network and the guidelines,
- contact with the network
- views about support, training and information needs concerning anti-bullying work
- key peoples' work in relation to anti-bullying.

The perspectives of schools and young people will be addressed in the evaluation of the pilot.

Organisation	No. sent questionnaires	No. returned	Not available to respond	Written response
Healthy School linkworkers*	5	4		
Education Welfare Service	5	5		
Diversity & Inclusion Team*	18	11	1	1
Educational Psychology	1	1		
Greater Manchester Police	3	3		

Table 1: Numbers of people invited to participate in evaluation and response rates by organisation

*Two people saw themselves as Healthy School link workers and members of the Diversity and Inclusion Team. One was counted in each group for the purpose of the questionnaire analysis.

Thirty-two people, identified by a Network member, were invited to complete the questionnaires. They were all from statutory organisations, 25 from within LEA, 4 from Public Health Development and 3 from the Police. All 32 had registered to attend training days held in April 2003 and January 2004. 24 completed questionnaires were analysed; 19 of the respondents had attended the training days.

The questionnaire was sent out by post with a covering letter from the co-Chairs of the Network to 26 people: 8 were returned. A reminder by phone led to 16 further questionnaires being completed; 6 on the phone. Telephone follow-up identified six people who did not receive the initial questionnaire due to incomplete details on the initial list. One person was identified as being on long term sick.

Several people replied after encouragement; having not seen the value of their contribution as they did not see themselves as having much involvement and one refused to complete a questionnaire although submitted a written response for this reason. This did not appear to relate to the degree of involvement they had had, some people who had not had any contact with the group filled in questionnaires; whereas others had a relatively high level of involvement for the targeted group, including involvement with a pilot and network meetings, did not fill in a questionnaire. This raised a potentially important issue; the degree to which people feel a sense of involvement and ownership. This is something the Network is keen to encourage, however amongst people involved in the pilots for example, levels of ownership varied considerably.

The 24 respondents had a range of job roles, which included management posts, advisory and consultant posts in both public health development and education and training and development. The Diversity and Inclusion team members included people working in schools in the Behaviour Support Service and Personal, Social, Citizenship and Health Education areas of the Curriculum. They included people working with specific groups of young people including Travellers, Asylum seekers and Black and Minority Ethnic groups and staff, for example Lunchtime Organisers. There were also people with interests in bullying in relation to particular groups, for example homophobic bullying and those with English as an additional language.

Findings

Anti-bullying as part of key people's work

Respondents were asked to give a brief description of anti-bullying work in their job. The responses were diverse and analysed into the following categories. Several respondents covered more than one category.

Role	Number	From which group/service
Advice and Support		
To schools	4	4D
To parents/ carers	2	E/D
To young people	3	3D
Strategy/ policy development	2	H/E
Related to other LEA initiatives/ curriculum area	3	2 D/H
Specific area of bullying/staff group eg homophobic, asylum seekers, travellers, lunch-time organisers	4	H/3D
Integration of children into school	2	2D
Training	1	E
Service co-ordination	1	D
Received enquiries	2	P
Networking	1	EP
Not answered/ not specific	7	3D,2E, H, P

Table 2 : Anti-bullying work in the job of respondents

(D- from Diversity and Inclusion Team, E – from Education Welfare service, H – Healthy Schools linkworker, P from Police, EP from Education Psychology Service)

Four people felt that they had an advisory and/or support role to schools, school staff, parents, carers and/or young people. They came from the Diversity and Inclusion Team and Education Welfare Service. Three mentioned specific groups, two of whom were involved with integration of children into school from those groups, which involved advice to the school as well as support to the young people. The training and development officer saw a role in induction and training. Of the two who saw themselves as having a role around policies and strategies, one was involved in a pilot and the other described her/his role more as a monitoring role, 'ensuring' all schools had policies and strategies.

Seven did not answer this question, gave their job title or a very general statement eg '*it is an ongoing area of the work.*' Two described a reactive role,

that they received enquiries but did not give any information about what they did with the enquiries. Three felt they had responsibilities in relation to their curriculum area or another LEA initiative.

Overall it was clear that people saw their roles in diverse ways. Over half did not identify active roles at school level. Some had a role in terms of broader initiatives eg training and curriculum development; some did not answer the question or indicated a passive role. These results help explain some results explored below which indicate that some outputs of the Network eg training, meetings and guidelines are not always seen as relevant and appropriate to several respondents.

2.2 Awareness of and contact with the Network group

All respondents were aware that there is a Multi-Agency Anti-Bullying Policy and Practice Network in Manchester

Contact with the Network	Numbers
Yes	17
No	6
Details only	1

Table 3 : Contact with the Network

Most key people had had contact with the group. Several respondents gave details of the type of contact they had with the network, which fell into the following categories. Some respondents' comments were in more than one category.

Type of contact	Numbers
Through individuals and other pieces of work	5
Attended an event put on by the network	5
Attend network meetings	3
Requested support	1
Part of school pilot working party	2

Table 4: Type of contact with the group

None of police had had contact with the group and one person said they had tried to get to events but had not managed to attend any. Some respondents felt that events held were not relevant to their role, for example the training and development officer, s/he felt 1:1 contact with network members was more appropriate.

2.3 The Guidelines

Awareness of the guidelines	Number
Yes	16
No	6
Details only	2

Table 5: Awareness of the guidelines

Two-thirds of respondents (16) were aware of the guidelines, a quarter were not and 2 gave details only. Of the 6 who were not, four said that they had not had any contact with the group but one was planning to go to a meeting and 2 said they had attended a training day and one had also attended a follow up meeting. This could be that they did not associate the guidelines with the materials discussed at the training day.

The responses and comments suggested that the profile of the guidelines is not very high and that awareness was not accompanied by much familiarity with the contents. This would suggest that discussion of the guidelines at the training day had not left a great impression over time.

Use of guidelines

Use of the guidelines?	Number
Yes	5
No	11
Not answered	6
Not applicable	1
Comment only	1

Table 6: Use of guidelines

Respondents who said they were aware of the guidelines were asked whether they had used them. There was variation of the ways people understood 'use'. While some people felt directing other people to them was 'use,' one did not feel they had used the guidelines despite being a lead person on a pilot school working party but prior to implementation. This may relate to the issue of awareness and profile of the guidelines suggested above.

Five out of the 16, just under one-third, said that they had used them and some gave details only. They had used them in the following ways:

As part of a working party in a pilot school

A Healthy Schools link worker had worked with schools to start them thinking about reviewing their policies using the guidelines

Members of the Diversity and Inclusion team had

- suggested advice to a School SENCO

- used them as a document to discuss issues within secondary schools
- referred to them in the briefing materials for another LEA initiative
- directed people to them at multi-agency groups

Of the 11 who said they had not used them and those who did not answer, some did not feel they would use them directly but may refer, or use them in training and development – for example, on an induction course. Some did not think it was applicable for them to use them. One respondent who had been in a school anti-bullying working party reported that s/he had had a '*superficial look at the guidelines.*'

This may beg the question of whether either the appropriate people are being targeted who might be involved in implementing the guidelines or if the people are appropriate whether the guidelines are sufficiently accessible and user friendly to them.

Accessing copies of the guidelines

People who had not used the guidelines were asked if they knew where to access a copy, 12 people responded to these questions. Eight people knew where to access a copy, including 2 who said they had their own copy. The four who did not have access were included in the eight who said they would look on Manchester Education Department or Manchester Healthy Schools websites for a copy of the guidelines, although one said, '*perhaps, if they thought of it.*' One person who would access it on a web-site if s/he had access to intranet.

None of the 4 who did not know where to access guidelines had had direct contact with the group although one had indirect contact through colleagues.

There were a few suggestions for updating the guidelines which all related to access and profile. These were:

They should be made more widely available to:

- Education Welfare Officers, School Nurses, Educational Psychologists
- Grassroots teachers

The updated guidelines should be launched. There should be a colourful leaflet that makes them stand out. It was felt that it was a good idea to put the Guidelines on a website; and they should go on a CD as well for people who do not have access to the web.

These findings suggest that putting the guidelines on a web-site would be welcomed but this may need to be done with some publicity which also indicates ways of accessing the guidelines for people who either do not have access to the web or are unlikely to use it.

Overall, it would appear that amongst this targeted group of people who might be involved in dissemination of CSL, awareness of the guidelines

was limited and use of them even more so. It was not apparent that many respondents felt familiar with the guidelines. It is recommended that these issues are explored further in deciding how to update and disseminate the guidelines.

2.4 Support and training needs

Respondents were asked to identify any support and training needs that the network might be able to offer to develop the respondents' anti-bullying work.

19 people answered this question with suggestions, one felt that she did not have support or training needs and 4 did not answer the question. The responses have been analysed into categories along with relevant issues raised in response to other questions or submissions.

Improving links with other initiatives

A number of suggestions were made in relation to the links between the work of the network and other initiatives. These included:

- Links with other whole school approaches in general
- lack of co-ordination/ mainstreaming of linked bullying issues for example, homophobic bullying and needs of children with English as an additional language.
- While one person thought that links with KS3 behaviour and attendance strategy should be made more obvious another respondent pointed out that bullying is one of ten areas of KS3 strategy and the schools choose which to engage with.
- How to support assessors in their questions to schools going through Manchester Inclusion standard.
- Training of Healthy Schools link workers to ensure that they are able to help schools to develop anti-bullying work

Resources

Two respondents who had not had contact with the network wanted resources and materials for use in schools, one of whom also wanted funds. One respondent wanted time.

One respondent felt it had been helpful at multi-agency meetings to be able to say that training, resources and the network are available.

Strategies for prevention, management and implementation

A range of requests were made for advice on strategies some of which was quite general, for example, lesson plans and assembly ideas

Most of the requests related to managing incidents, these included a general request on approaches to dealing with bullying and specific requests for information and training on solution focussed approaches, mediation skills and practical support for alternatives to exclusion or access to mediation

Ideas for minimising possibilities for bullying at playtime were requested and on how to motivate staff to support and implement changes to policy. Also two people wanted support for developing advice and information for parents and carers. One respondent was keen to have support and training on working on anti-bullying issues within the Primary School setting

One respondent felt there should be more emphasis on the potential for teachers bullying children and potential for them to role model positive relationships.

Delivery of support and training

As well as identifying areas of support and training, a number of respondents said how they would like it to be delivered. Two people were keen on shadowing others, one felt keeping up to date with relevant information and initiatives is needed. There was some positive feedback about planned initiatives:

'plans to pair members of the Diversity and Inclusion team with network partners will work'

Some Diversity and Inclusion team members thought the meeting at the end of September would have helped. 5 people had gone from one office, which raised awareness:

'The meeting had been good and action focussed although it was a bit short of time.'

Issues could now go to team meetings. This was an indication that some respondents did perceive a pro-active role in relation to the Network's work. Where there were suggestions, they were for practical ways of obtaining support and training, namely shadowing and paired work.

2.5 Updates

All respondents felt that there is a need for updates of relevant information and initiatives concerning anti-bullying. One person was particularly interested in good practice and another wanted up to date information on Theatre groups offering workshops. One person who thought links with Special Educational Needs Co-ordinators (SENCO's) in schools were important felt it was particularly important to make the

group obvious at the beginning of the academic year when new SENCO's are likely to start.

Type of media	Number
In Touch With You	9
In Education	4
Internet sites on anti-bullying through a search engine	10
Posters	7
Attend seminars	11
Attend conferences	11

Table 7: Media or events through which respondents thought they might access information

Seminars and conferences were the most popular method of dissemination. These were particularly popular amongst some professional groups and not others. For example the majority of EWO's said they would go to a conference and the majority of 3/4 Healthy School linkworkers said they would go to a seminar. Just under half the EWO's said they would go to a seminar and half the healthy School's linkworkers to a conference. One quarter to a third of Diversity and Inclusion people said they would go to a seminar or conference whereas the police would not go to either preferring to get information from the internet. Consideration about who the Network want to attract should inform the type of events held. For example, the respondent keen to involve SENCO's thought it would be hard for them to attend seminars but a well timed annual conference would be useful. One person felt that seminars were more appropriate in house and they would only go to a conference if very good quality speakers were on offer.

Over one-third of respondents thought they would access information through In Touch With You, an in-house education newsletter. Only one person said that they would access information through In Education who would not access information from In Touch with You, however s/he did not identify any other source from which s/he might access information. One person thought they were most likely to access information from the Times Education Supplement.

Under one-third of respondents identified posters. One thought posters would be especially useful in Primary Schools. One thought flyers should be circulated in the education bag from Overseas House to go into each staff room another recommended leaflets. Given the relatively high numbers who said they would access information via the Internet, posters may be important to develop awareness of where local

information can be accessed. One person thought it was important to publicise the network in free papers to raise the profile with parents.

Suggestions included using the council intranet, council e-mail note system and equivalent system for schools and e-mail, but several of the respondents did not have access to the internet so this like other methods should not be used exclusively.

A range of methods for disseminating information is important because no single method was identified by 50% of respondents as ways they would be likely to use. The network should appraise options on the basis of who may be attracted by different approaches.

3 Conclusions and recommendations

Three-quarters of people contacted complete questionnaires. All the respondents knew about the Network.

Understanding

Three-quarters of respondents said they had had contact with the network and a similar number were aware of the guidelines. However despite the majority of people being aware of the Guidelines, few felt familiar with the contents and only 5 had used them. This suggests that the training days and meetings had had a limited impact in terms of developing a sense of familiarity with the guidelines, one of the objectives of the events.

This could be for a number of reasons for this. These include that they had forgotten them because they had not used them or that they are not accessible or user friendly. The network should get further information clarifying this before the Guidelines are updated and disseminated at the end of the pilot.

One person felt that they did not understand how the network worked or have an overview of what it does. Several key people were keen that the Network developed its profile through a range of media and events. There should be awareness that different media and events will attract different groups.

Influence

Respondents identified specific types of bullying that they felt should be a more mainstream part of the work of the network including homophobic bullying, the needs of children with English as an additional language, bullying by teachers.

Support

Respondents identified a wide range of roles in relation to bullying in schools. While some respondents clearly did see ways in which they could and wanted to support the rolling out of the network's work this was not a common view. Over half of respondents did not identify themselves as having an active role at school level.

The Network may therefore need to explore if they are targeting the right people to implement CSL or what it is practical to expect in terms of rolling out CSL through the key people currently identified.

References

(1) Emanuel, J (2004) Draft Report 1: Findings from a survey of network partners. Evaluation Of Manchester Anti-Bullying Policy And Practice Network. Commissioned by Manchester Anti-Bullying Policy And Practice Network and funded by Manchester Children's Fund

(2) Healthy Settings Development Unit: The challenge of evaluation from www.uclan.ac.uk/facs/health/hsdu/evidence/evaluation.htm accessed on 03/02/04

EVALUATION OF MANCHESTER ANTI-BULLYING POLICY AND PRACTICE NETWORK

Report 2: Conclusions and recommendations from a questionnaire of 'key people'

A questionnaire was sent to 32 people from the Education Service, Healthy School Linkworkers and Police who have been identified as potential key people for rolling out Creating Safe Learning, the whole school approach to anti-bullying which is currently being piloted by the Network.

24 completed questionnaires and 1 written response were analysed. The conclusions and recommendations are summarised below.

Principles for effective partnership	Main Findings	Recommended action
Understanding the Network	<p>All the respondents knew about the Network. 75% said they had had contact with the Network and a similar number were aware of the Guidelines. Few felt familiar with the contents.</p> <p>Several key people were keen that the Network develop its profile through a range of media and events.</p>	<p>Network should review why training days and events were not reaching objective of developing a familiarity with the guidelines before the Guidelines are updated and disseminated at the end of the pilot.</p> <p>Profile development will require using a range of media and events, which will attract different groups.</p>
Influencing the Network	<p>Some key people were concerned that specific types of bullying should be a more mainstream part of the work of the network including homophobic bullying and the needs of children with English as an additional language, bullying by teachers.</p>	<p>Review how specific types of bullying can become more mainstream part of network's work.</p>
Supporting the Network	<p>While some respondents clearly did see ways in which they could and wanted to support the rolling out of the network's work this was not a common view. Over half of respondents did not identify themselves as having an active role at school level.</p>	<p>The Network may therefore need to explore if they are targeting the right people to implement CSL or what it is practical to expect in terms of rolling out CSL through the key people currently identified.</p>